Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

LOCAL PLAN (2024-2042): DRAFT SPATIAL STRATEGY, 2025

Habitats Regulations Assessment. Information to support an updated assessment of the Regulation 18 submission under Regulation 105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

UK0028504.1063
NOVEMBER 2025

PUBLIC

TYPE OF DOCUMENT (VERSION) PUBLIC

PROJECT NO. UK0028504.1063

OUR REF. NO. UK0028504.1063

DATE: NOVEMBER 2025

WSP

Kings Orchard
1 Queen Street
Bristol
BS2 0HQ

Phone: +44 117 930 6200

WSP.com

QUALITY CONTROL

Issue/revision	First issue	Revision 1	Revision 2	Revision 3
Remarks	Draft for client review	Amendments following client review	Final draft	Final
Date	October 2025	October 2025	November 2025	November 2025
Prepared by	CH	CH BF	CH BF UD JE	CH BF UD JE
Checked by	UD	UD	JJ	JJ
Authorised by	BF	AP	AP	AP
Project number	UK0028504.1063	UK0028504.1063	UK0028504.1063	UK0028504.1063
Report number	01	02	03	04

CONTENTS

APPENDICES

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL (BDBC) LOCAL PLAN

1.1.1. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council ('the Council') adopted the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (ALP) in May 2016.

1.1.2. The Council is currently updating the Local Plan (LP) to cover the period 2024 to 2042. This follows a decision by the Council in May 2019 to review and update the Plan to ensure it remains fit for purpose, reflects national planning guidance, delivers local priorities, and meets future needs whilst restoring a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Several of the initial non-statutory stages of plan making have already been completed including an Issues and Options consultation in 2020, a full draft Plan regulation 18 consultation in early 2024 and the ongoing development of a detailed evidence base to guide decision making.

1.1.3. Following updated government guidance in late 2024 with a requirement for local authorities to deliver increased housing targets, the Council initiated a 'call for sites' exercise in early 2025 to inform an updated draft spatial strategy for the LP.

1.1.4. BDBC is completing the plan preparation process on the following broad timeline as set out in the Local Development Scheme:

- Consultation on updated draft spatial strategy (Regulation 18) – Autumn/Winter 2025
- Publication of Submission Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) – Summer 2026
- Submission (Regulation 22) – Winter 2026
- Examination and Main Modifications (MMs) – Spring 2027
- Adoption - Winter 2027

1.2 HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT

1.2.1. Regulations 105 and 107 of *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations')[1] transpose the provisions of Articles 6(3) and 6(4) of Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (the 'Habitats Directive') as they relate to land-use plans in England and Wales. Regulation 105 states that if a land-use plan is "*(a) is likely to have a significant effect on a European site[2] or a European offshore marine site[3] (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects); and (b) is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site*" then the plan-making authority must "…*make an appropriate assessment of the implications for the site in view of that site's conservation objectives*" before the plan is given effect.

1.2.2. The plan can only be given effect if it can be concluded (following an 'appropriate assessment') that the plan "…*will not adversely affect the integrity*" of a site, unless the provisions of Regulation 107 are met.

1.2.3. The process by which Regulation 105 is met is known as Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)[4]. An HRA determines whether there will be any 'likely significant effects' (LSE) on any European site as a result of a plan's implementation (either on its own or 'in combination' with other plans or projects)[5] and, if so, whether (following an appropriate assessment), any adverse effects on the integrity of any European sites can be ruled out by mitigation or similar'[6]. The Council has a statutory duty to prepare the Local Plan and is therefore the Competent Authority for an HRA.

---

1 The 2017 Regulations have been amended by the *Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019* to reflect the UK's exit from the EU, although these largely carried forward the provisions and terminology of the 2017 Regulations and do not fundamentally alter their interpretation. This report therefore primarily refers to the 2017 Regulations and (where appropriate for clarity) the relevant provisions of the Habitats Directive.

2 As noted, the 2019 amendment to the Habitats Regulations largely carried forward the provisions and terminology of the 2017 Regulations, and so the term 'European site' is currently retained and for all practical purposes the definition is essentially unchanged. European sites are therefore: any Special Area of Conservation (SAC) from the point at which the European Commission and the UK Government agreed the site as a 'Site of Community Importance' (SCI) (if this was before 31 Jan 2020); any classified Special Protection Area (SPA); and any candidate SAC (cSAC). However, the term is also commonly used when referring to potential SPAs (pSPAs), to which the provisions of Article 4(4) of Directive 2009/147/EC (the 'new wild birds directive') are applied; and to possible SACs (pSACs) and listed Ramsar Sites, to which the provisions of the Habitats Regulations are applied a matter of Government policy (NPPF para. 194) when considering development proposals that may affect them. "European site" is therefore used in this document in its broadest sense, as an umbrella term for all of the above designated sites. Note, it is likely that this term will be supplanted at some point in the future although an appropriate UK-wide alternative has not yet been agreed (e.g. the NPPF in England has adopted the term 'Habitats sites' to refer collectively to those sites defined by Regulation 8, whereas the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 uses the term 'National Site Network').

3 'European offshore marine sites' are defined by Regulation 18 of The Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017; these regulations cover waters (and hence sites) over 12 nautical miles from the coast.

4 The term 'Appropriate Assessment' has been historically used to describe the process of assessment; however, the process is more accurately termed 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA), with the term 'Appropriate Assessment' limited to the specific stage within the process.

5 Also referred to as the 'test of significance'.

6 Also referred to as the 'integrity test'.

1.3 THIS REPORT

1.3.1. Regulation 105 essentially provides a test that the final plan must pass; there is no statutory requirement for HRA to be undertaken on draft plans or similar developmental stages (e.g. issues and options; preferred options). However, it is accepted best-practice for the HRA of strategic planning documents to be run as an iterative process alongside plan development, with the emerging policies or options reviewed during development to ensure that potentially adverse effects on European sites can be identified at an early stage, and avoided or mitigated through the plan development process. This is undertaken in consultation with Natural England (NE) and other appropriate consultees.

1.3.2. In 2023, WSP UK Ltd produced a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) report entitled 'Information to support an assessment of the Regulation 18 submission under Regulation 105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017' Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) report (WSP, 2023) (the '2023 HRA Report'). The 2023 HRA Report provided an initial, high-level screening and appropriate assessment of development management and spatial policies of the LPU as drafted at the time, and was consulted on in 2024 prior to the updated government guidance on housing targets.

1.3.3. In 2025, the Council engaged WSP UK Ltd to undertake an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) specifically of the updated draft spatial strategy for the LP (hereafter the 'Updated Spatial Strategy'). The IIA will incorporate HRA, Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA).

1.3.4. The agreed scope of the IIA/HRA was to undertake an updated screening assessment of the Updated Spatial Strategy only, with the aim of identifying the required assessments and work to inform the Regulation 19 stage (Submission Draft Local Plan). Updated screening of development management policies, which have not changed since the 2023 HRA Report and are not the subject of consultation, are outside the scope of this report.

1.3.5. This report accompanies the Updated Spatial Strategy for the Local Plan (Regulation 18) that is being published for consultation, and should be considered to supersede the screening assessment of spatial policies within the 2023 HRA Report due to the proposed changes in spatial strategy and the updated baseline scenario for some impact pathways which has become apparent since the 2023 HRA Report.

1.3.6. As the Local Plan is still under development, **this report does not constitute a formal 'HRA screening' or Appropriate Assessment** and so any screening or appropriate assessment conclusions would be premature. Instead, the principles of HRA screening are applied to (a) provide an initial, high-level assessment of the likely HRA conclusions, were the plan adopted as currently drafted; (b) identify additional data requirements and/or additional measures that may be required to ensure that the Submission Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19) has no adverse effects on any European sites; and (c) provide an opportunity for consultees to comment specifically on HRA-related issues.

1.3.7. This report therefore adopts the broad layout and anticipated content of the final (Submission Draft) HRA report, minus the formal screening and the Appropriate Assessment, and includes the following aspects:

- Details of the approach to the HRA of the Local Plan (Section 2).
- A summary of the baseline condition of the European sites and features that are potentially vulnerable (i.e. both exposed and sensitive) to the likely effects of the Local Plan, and the impact pathways (Section 3).
- A summary of the initial screening assessments undertaken as part of the HRA of the emerging policies and proposals of the Updated Spatial Strategy, identifying those European sites and features where there is no credible threat or impact-effect pathway from the Updated Spatial Strategy proposals that could undermine the conservation objectives (Section 4).
- Identification of additional data requirements and/or additional measures that may be required to ensure that the Submission Draft Local Plan (Reg. 19) plan does not adversely affect the integrity of any sites (Section 5).

1.3.8. This Regulation 18 HRA Report (this report) has been issued for consultation alongside the Updated Spatial Strategy. The Council's website provides details of the emerging Local Plan and the current consultation.

2 APPROACH TO HRA OF THE LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

2.1 OVERVIEW

2.1.1. A detailed overview of the four stages of HRA, and the iterative approach to HRA of local plans, is set out in Section 2 of the 2023 HRA Report and is not repeated here due to the focused nature of the Updated Spatial Strategy which is currently being consulted upon.

2.2 GUIDANCE

2.2.1. The following guidance has been used during the review and assessment of the Updated Spatial Strategy:

- UK Government (2019). *Appropriate assessment: Guidance on the use of Habitats Regulations Assessment* [online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/appropriate-assessment [Accessed September 2025].
- Tyldesley, D. & Chapman, C. (2023). *The Habitats Regulations Assessment Handbook* [online]. DTA Publications Limited. Available at: https://www.dtapublications.co.uk/handbook/. [Accessed September 2025].
- EC (2018). *Managing Natura 2000 sites: The provisions of Article 6 of the 'Habitats' Directive* 92/43/EEC. Commission Notice C(2018) 7621 final, Brussels, 21.11.2018.
- Natural England (2020). *Guidance on how to use Natural England's Conservation Advice Packages in Environmental Assessments*. Natural England, Peterborough.
- European Commission (2018). *Managing Natura 2000 sites - The provisions of Article 6 of the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC*. European Union, 1-86.
- Defra (2012). *The Habitats and Wild Birds Directives in England and its seas: Core guidance for developers, regulators & land/marine managers* [online]. Available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/82706/habitats-simplify-guide-draft-20121211.pdf. [Accessed September 2025].
- PINS Note 05/2018: *Consideration of avoidance and reduction measures in Habitats Regulations Assessment: People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta*. [withdrawn].
- SNH (2019). SNH Guidance Note: *The handling of mitigation in Habitats Regulations Appraisal – the People Over Wind CJEU judgement* [online]. Scottish Natural Heritage. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2019-08/Guidance%20Note%20-%20The%20handling%20of%20mitigation%20in%20Habitats%20Regulations%20Appraisal%20-%20the%20People%20Over%20Wind%20CJEU%20judgement.pdf. [Accessed September 2025].

2.2.2. Additional topic-specific guidance (for example, in relation to the assessment of air quality effects) and relevant case law is identified within the relevant assessment sections where necessary.

2.3 CONSULTATION AND PLAN EVOLUTION

2.3.1. The HRA process is completed alongside the development of the Plan, and the HRA reports issued at each stage of the plan development reflect the assessment and process at that point in time.

2.3.2. The consultations to date are as follows:

- Initial consultation on the intended approach to HRA with Natural England, May 2022; and
- the 2024 Regulation 18 public consultation.

2.3.3. Appropriate HRA reports will be produced to accompany the future plan consultation stages; additional consultations on specific technical aspects are undertaken and documented as required.

2.4 STUDY AREA

2.4.1. The zone of influence of a Local Plan varies according to the aspect being considered (for example, noise effects would rarely extend more than a few hundred metres from the source), and so it is not usually appropriate to employ 'arbitrary' spatial buffers to determine those European sites that should be considered within an HRA.

2.4.2. However, as distance is a strong determinant of the scale and likelihood of most effects, the considered use of a suitably precautionary search area as a starting point for the assessment (based on an understanding of both the likely plan outcomes and European site interest features) has some important advantages. Using buffers allows the systematic identification of European sites using GIS, so minimising the risk of sites or features being overlooked, and ensures that sites for which there are no reasonable impact pathways can be quickly and transparently excluded from any further screening or assessment. It also has the significant advantage of providing a consistent point of reference for consultees following the assessment process, allowing the screening to focus on the potential effects, rather than on explaining why certain sites may or may not have been considered in relation to a particular aspect of the plan.

2.4.3. Most Local Plan HRAs adopt a 10-15km buffer for the identification of European sites that may be subject to significant effects, with sites beyond this distance considered as required. The HRA of the Local Plan Update plan therefore considers:

- all European sites within 15km of the Council's administrative area (see **Table 3-2**);
- any additional sites that may be hydrologically linked to the Local Plan's zone of influence; and
- any additional sites identified by Natural England following the SA Scoping Consultation (particularly in relation to air or water quality, see below).

2.4.4. This is considered to be a suitably precautionary starting point for the assessment of the Local Plan. European sites located outside of the ZOI or that do not meet the criteria above are assumed to have 'no effect' either alone or in combination with other plans and projects and effectively scoped out of further assessment.

2.5 DATA COLLECTION

2.5.1. The screening and appropriate assessment stages take account of the baseline condition of the European sites and their interest features[7], including (where reported) data on:

- the site boundaries and the boundaries of the component SSSIs;
- the conservation objectives;
- information on the attributes of the European sites that contribute to and define their integrity;
- the condition, vulnerabilities and sensitivities of the sites and their interest features, including known pressures and threats;

[7] The interest features are taken to be the qualifying features; and other site features that may be relevant to site integrity, particularly 'typical species' (for SACs) and within-site supporting habitats for SPAs.

- the approximate locations of the interest features within each site (if reported); and
- designated or non-designated 'functional habitats' (if identified).

2.5.2. These data are derived from:

- the most recent JNCC-hosted GIS datasets;
- the Standard Data forms for SACs and SPAs and Information Sheets for Ramsar sites;
- Article 12 and 17 reporting;
- the published site Conservation Objectives;
- Supplementary Advice to the Conservation Objectives (SACO) where available[8];
- Site Improvement Plans (SIPs); and
- the supporting Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) favourable condition tables where relevant and where no SACOs applicable to the features are available.

2.5.3. Note:

- For SPAs, the qualifying features are taken as those identified on the most recent JNCC datasets and citations where these post-date the 2nd SPA Review (i.e. it will be assumed that any amendments suggested by the SPA review have been made) unless otherwise identified to us by NE; any site-specific issues relating to the SPA Review can be addressed in the screening and appropriate assessment of the draft Local Plan (see below).
- The conservation objectives for Ramsar sites are taken to be the same as for the corresponding SACs / SPAs (where sites or feature ecological characteristics are coincident); SSSI Definition of Favourable Condition (FCTs) are used for those features or areas not covered by SAC/SPA designations.

2.5.4. Where possible the site data is used to identify other features that may be relevant to site integrity, particularly '**typical species**' (for SACs), within-site **supporting habitats**, and designated or non-designated '**functional habitats**'.

2.5.5. A **'typical species'** is broadly described by EC guidance as being any species (or community of species) which is particularly characteristic of, confined to, and/or dependent upon the qualifying Annex I habitat feature at a particular site. This may include those species which:

- are critical to the composition or structure of an Annex I habitat (e.g. constant species identified by the National Vegetation Classification (NVC) community classification);
- exert a critical positive influence on the Annex I habitat's structure or function (e.g. a bioturbator (mixer of soil/sediment), grazer, surface borer or predator);
- are consistently associated with, and dependent upon, the Annex I habitat feature for specific ecological needs (e.g. feeding, sheltering), completion of life-cycle stages (e.g. egg-laying) and/or during certain seasons/times; or
- are particularly distinctive or representative of the Annex I habitat feature at a particular site.

[8] The interest features are taken to be the qualifying features; and other site features that may be relevant to site integrity, particularly 'typical species' (for SACs) and within-site supporting habitats for SPAs.

2.5.6. Within-site **supporting habitats** are those which support the population(s) of the qualifying species and which are therefore critical to the integrity of the feature.

2.5.7. '**Functional habitats**' are generally taken to be habitats or features outside a European site boundary that are important or critical to the functional integrity of the site habitats and / or its interest features. These might include, for example:

- 'buffer' areas around a site (e.g. dense scrub areas preventing public access; areas of land that reduce the effects of agricultural run-off; etc.);
- specific features or habitats relied on by mobile species during their lifecycle (e.g. high-tide roosts for waders; significant maternity colonies for bats known to hibernate within an SAC; areas that are critical for foraging or migration; etc. Note, this is not intended as a speculative catch-all covering any habitat that might be occasionally used by or suitable for a particular species[9]).

2.6 REVIEWING THE EMERGING PLAN

2.6.1. The principles[10] of 'screening' are applied to the emerging plan and its components (i.e. in this report, the policies and allocations associated with the updated draft spatial strategy) as part of an iterative review process, to ensure that:

- any necessary technical assessments focus on those plan aspects that are likely to result in significant effects on European sites; and
- that the policies of the adopted plan are drafted to provide appropriate overarching safeguards that help (alongside any subsequently identified mitigation) to ensure that the adopted plan will have no significant effects or no significant adverse effects.

2.6.2. The outcomes of the HRA reviews are reported as appropriate at each consultation stage; this reporting may outline anticipated conclusions in relation to specific plan aspects. The outcomes of these reviews are re-visited throughout plan evolution to ensure that they remain robust, and that the overall performance of the plan in relation to the safeguarding of European sites meets expectations.

2.6.3. The reviews are intended to be a coarse filter for identifying potential effect pathways that cannot be self-evidently discounted, and hence those aspects where further investigation ('appropriate assessment') is required to determine the scale or nature of any effects and / or any bespoke mitigation that is necessary, rather than detailed assessments in their own right.

[9] Case law notes that such land should be necessary to the conservation of the protected habitat types and species (*Holohan v An Bord Pleanala C-461/17*) or play an important role in maintaining or restoring the population of qualifying species at favourable conservation status.

[10] i.e. exploring whether significant effects on European sites are possible; note, from a strict procedural perspective the tests in Regulation 105 (including the 'test of significance') can only be formally applied to the plan intended for adoption and not to its various phases or iterations; therefore, the term 'screening' is used advisedly when applied to assessments completed at earlier stages of the plan development.

2.7 SCREENING OF THE UPDATED SPATIAL STRATEGY

2.7.1. The ‘screening’ in this HRA report does not constitute a formal screening of likely significant effect but it identifies the following aspects and excludes them from the scope of further assessment:

- those European sites where credible impacts from the Updated Spatial Strategy can be ruled out without the need for further scrutiny; and
- those policies and allocations that may promote development but where credible likely significant effects either alone or in-combination can be ruled out without further scrutiny, or which cannot be assessed at the plan level.

2.7.2. The ‘screening’ does not take into account ‘mitigation’, in accordance with ‘People over Wind’.

2.7.3. The 'Appropriate Assessment' stage which explores if mitigation or other measures are necessary to ensure the plan avoids adverse effects on the integrity of European sites in the area, is not included in this report. It will, however, be included at the Regulation 19 stage when the evidence base is complete.

2.7.4. Consideration of ‘**in combination**’ effects is not a separate assessment but is integral to both the screening and appropriate assessment stages (although it should be noted that effects that are considered nil or nugatory alone, and indistinguishable from background variations cannot operate ‘in combination’ and so can be excluded at the screening stage).

2.7.5. The plans identified by the IIA will provide the basis for the assessment of ‘in combination’ effects; these plans are reviewed to identify any potential effects and then considered in this and any future appropriate assessment stage as necessary.

2.8 UNCERTAINTY AND ‘DOWN THE LINE’ ASSESSMENT

2.8.1. For most policies, even at the strategic level, it will be clear if adverse effects are likely at an early stage, and in these instances the policy should not be included within the plan since plans should not include proposals which would be likely to fail the Habitats Regulations tests at the project application stage. For other options, however, the effects may be uncertain and it is therefore important that this uncertainty is addressed either through additional investigation or (if this is not possible) appropriate mitigation measures that provide certainty that the predicted effect will not occur or will not adversely affect site integrity.

2.8.2. It is usually possible to incorporate caveats or measures within policy text that are sufficient to ensure that adverse effects will not occur. However, for other policies this may not be possible because there is insufficient available information about the nature of the development that is being proposed through the policy to enable a robust conclusion to be reached. In these instances, it may be appropriate and acceptable for assessment to be undertaken ‘down-the-line’ at a lower tier in the planning hierarchy. For this to be acceptable, the following conditions must be met:

- the higher tier plan appraisal cannot reasonably predict the effects on a European site in a meaningful way; whereas;
- the lower tier plan, which will identify more precisely the nature, scale or location of development, and thus its potential effects, retains enough flexibility within the terms of the higher tier plan over the exact location, scale or nature of the proposal to enable an adverse effect on site integrity to be avoided; and
- HRA of the plan at the lower tier is required as a matter of law or Government policy.

2.8.3. This approach is applied as appropriate to the screening stages within this report.

3 BASELINE SUMMARY AND IMPACT PATHWAYS

3.1 EFFECT PATHWAYS AND KEY REGIONAL PRESSURES

3.1.1. The provisions of the Habitats Regulations ensure that 'direct' (encroachment) effects on European sites as a result of land use change (i.e. the partial or complete destruction of a European site) are extremely unlikely under normal circumstances, and this will not occur as a result of the Local Plan. Indeed, local plans will generally assist the safeguarding of European sites through their protective policies. However, there will be a number of areas where the direction, controls or influence provided by a plan can result in outcomes that can affect European site interest features.

3.1.2. Most potential effect pathways are associated with broad 'quantum of development' or population growth aspects, and whilst a local plan is not necessarily the main driver of these effects, they do have a key role in managing them locally through the site allocation process. In this context, the main aspects through which the updated draft spatial strategy of the Local Plan could affect European sites in the study area are:

- through individual allocations or supported developments that are 'directed' to a specific location or area; or
- through 'in combination' effects resulting from the cumulative impacts of development associated with the Local Plan and with the plans and programmes of external authorities (such as neighbouring LPAs).

3.1.3. In broad terms, the Updated Spatial Strategy and accompanying IIA includes consideration of the:

- number of homes and employment land that should be provided for over the plan period (the quantum of growth);
- policies providing geographical direction for development (typically specific housing and employment site allocations); and
- policies broadly supporting development or other changes, but which do not specify a quantum or location.

3.1.4. These aspects could affect European sites on their own, through typical development-related mechanisms operating at the local scale in relation to specific allocations (e.g. noise, lighting, etc.; see **Table 3-1**); or collectively by exacerbating regional pressures (e.g. pressures on water supply).

Table 3-1 - Typical Effect Pathways and Environmental Changes Associated with Terrestrial Development

Pressure / Threat	Common Environmental Changes
Hydrological changes	Temperature Salinity Water flow Flood regime

Pressure / Threat	Common Environmental Changes
Pollution and other chemical changes	Introduction of other substances (solid, liquid or gas) De-oxygenation Nutrient enrichment Organic enrichment
Physical loss	Physical loss of habitat Physical change to another habitat
Physical damage	Habitat structure changes Changes in suspended solids Siltation rate changes
Other physical pressures	Litter Noise Introduction of light Barrier to species movement Death or injury by collision
Biological pressures	Visual disturbance Genetic modification and translocation of indigenous species Introduction or spread of non-indigenous species Introduction of microbial pathogens Exploitation / harvesting of species Removal of non-target species during exploitation / harvesting

3.1.5. Significant effects as a result of individual allocations 'alone' are typically unlikely as most environmental changes have a limited 'zone of influence' (for example, noise effects on species will rarely be significant over 500m from the source based on natural rates of attenuation alone). However, the Local Plan HRA must also consider the potential for development supported by the plan to operate 'in combination' both internally (e.g. between allocations) or with external plans and programmes (e.g. cumulative housing growth regionally). 'In combination' changes are often of an inherently larger scale or operate over larger areas.

3.1.6. There is obviously a wide range of potential mechanisms and pathways for 'in combination' effects depending on the source and the characteristics of the European sites and features. However, there are several key mechanisms by which local plans (etc.) can operate in-combination to affect European sites; these are noted below, and provide the broad framework for assessing potential 'in combination' effects associated with the Updated Spatial Strategy:

- **Recreational pressure**: Many European sites will be vulnerable to some degree of impact as a result of recreational pressure, such as trampling, fires, litter/pollution etc, although the effects of recreational pressure are complex and very much dependent on the specific conditions and interest features at each site. Local plans can influence recreational pressure through their allocations and associated controls.

- **Urbanisation**: Urbanisation is generally used as a collective term covering a suite of often disparate risks and impacts that occur due to increases in human populations near protected sites. This would include varied aspects such as fly-tipping or vandalism, predation by cats, or the dispersal of invasive species, although the effects of these aspects depend on proximity, accessibility and the interest features of the sites. This is generally only realised where allocations are close to a designated site.
- **Atmospheric pollution**: The most relevant air pollutants to habitats and species (particularly plant species) are the primary pollutants sulphur dioxide (SO2, typically from combustion of coal and heavy fuel oils), nitrogen oxides (NOx, mainly from vehicles) and ammonia (NH3, typically from agriculture and, to a lesser degree, road traffic). These pollutants affect habitats and species mainly through acidification and eutrophication, albeit there can also be direct effects from NOX and NH3 emissions. Local Plans will generally have few specific point-sources for air emissions and such emissions would typically be controlled through project-level permissions. Typically, the main issue for local plans is the assessment of 'in combination' effects due to air quality changes that might be associated with the quantum of development growth proposed / supported by a Local Plan, particularly in relation to traffic and nitrogen (N) deposition.
- **Water resources and flow regulation**: The exploitation and management of water resources is connected to a range of activities, most of which are not directly controlled or influenced by local plans; for example, agriculture, flood defence, recreation, power generation, fisheries and nature conservation. Much of the water supply to water-resource sensitive European sites is therefore managed through specific consenting regimes that are independent of local plans. Increased housing growth (which is likely to be supported by a local plan) increases demand on public water supply abstractions, some of which are associated with European sites; however, the consenting regimes are subject to HRA and, importantly, water companies are required to produce 25-year Water Resource Management Plans (WRMPs) that take into account predicted population growth and protected sites when considering future water resource provision. This aspect is most typically managed through policy.
- **Water quality**: Most waterbodies and watercourses are affected to some extent by point or diffuse sources of pollutants, notably nitrates and phosphates. Point sources are usually discrete discharge points, such as wastewater treatment works outfalls, which are generally managed through specific consenting regimes that are independent of local plans. In contrast, diffuse pollution is derived from a range of sources (e.g. agricultural run-off; road run-off) that cannot always be easily traced or quantified. Development promoted or supported by local plans is likely to increase demand on wastewater treatment works, and potentially increase run-off which could indirectly affect downstream European sites.

3.1.7. In addition, many European interest features (particularly more mobile animal species) may use or be reliant on non-designated habitats outside of a European site during their life-cycle. All of the above aspects (recreation, water resources, etc.) can therefore also affect European site integrity indirectly through effects on 'functional habitats' (or functionally linked-land/water) outside of the designated site boundary.

3.1.8. It should be noted that BDBC has completed various reports and studies to update the environmental baseline for the Local Plan, some of which will be relevant to the HRA baseline including:

- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2021, with an updated assessment ongoing);
- Water Cycle Study (originally completed in 2022, with an updated assessment ongoing) and Water Cycle Study Addendum (2024);
- Climate Change Study (2021).

- Interim Transport Assessment (Regulation 18, 2023)

3.1.9. These are available at https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/local-plan-update-evidence.

3.1.10. BDBC has also commissioned full transport modelling which will form part of the evidence base, which was not available at the time of drafting this report.

3.2 EUROPEAN SITE SUMMARIES

3.2.1. The 2023 HRA Report of the Local Plan Update considered potential effects on:

- all European sites within 15km of the Council's administrative area;
- any additional sites that may be hydrologically linked to the Local Plan's zone of influence; and
- any additional sites identified by Natural England following the HRA Scoping Consultation.

3.2.2. This was considered to be a suitably precautionary starting point for the assessment of the Local Plan Update and is also used for the purposes of this updated spatial strategy HRA report.

3.2.3. Since the completion of the 2023 HRA Report, Natural England has subsequently advised local authorities of areas of habitat along the River Test and River Meon which will perform a compensatory function for protected features of the River Itchen SAC that are expected to suffer adverse effects of abstraction in drought situations[11]. As a result, these areas of 'compensatory habitat' along the River Test and River Meon are required to be given the same level of protection as designated European sites, and are therefore included within the scope of this assessment.

3.2.4. Therefore, the European sites within the study scope for this focused assessment of the Updated Spatial Strategy are those previously within scope of the 2023 HRA Report and the areas of identified compensatory habitat along the River Test and the River Meon, as detailed in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 - European Sites within Study Scope (in distance order)

Site	Location Relative to the BDBC Administrative Area
River Itchen SAC	Chalk river ~2.4km to the south of the BDBC area; hydrologically linked; identified to BDBC in NE's advice on nutrient neutrality (2022).
River Test Compensatory SAC Habitat	Discrete areas of chalk river within the River Test catchment which have been identified by Natural England for the provision of compensatory measures to maintain the site network coherence of the River Itchen SAC in the event that drought orders are enacted. This includes the following areas: ■ River Dever (3.5km from nearest allocation within BDBC area) ■ Bourne Rivulet (6.42km from nearest allocation within BDBC area) ■ River Dun (26.4km from nearest allocation within BDBC area) ■ Middle River Test between Wherwell and Kimbridge/Mottisfont (14.36km from nearest allocation within BDBC area) ■ Cheriton Stream (already within River Itchen SAC)

[11] Natural England letter to local authorities (22nd November 2024) *Compensatory measures on the River Test and River Meon arising from the Lower Itchen Drought Order and Candover Augmentation Scheme Drought Order.*

Site	Location Relative to the BDBC Administrative Area
River Meon Compensatory SAC Habitat	Discrete areas of the River Meon (22.4km from nearest allocation within BDBC area) which have been identified by Natural England for the provision of compensatory measures to maintain the site network coherence of the River Itchen SAC in the event that drought orders are enacted.
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	Floodplain meadows ~2.4km to north of the BDBC area; not hydrologically linked.
Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC	Alder-ash floodplain woodlands alongside the Kennet ~3.2km north of the BDBC area; not hydrologically linked.
River Lambourn SAC	River ~3.4km to the north of the BDBC area; not hydrologically linked.
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Network of heathlands ~3.4km east north of the BDBC area at the closest point.
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	Woodlands ~7km to the south-east of the BDBC area.
Shortheath Common SAC	Valley mire and heathland site ~9.5km to the east of the BDBC area; not hydrologically linked.
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	Large heathland site ~9.7km to the east of the BDBC area; not hydrologically linked.
Hartslock Wood SAC	Chalk woodland and grassland site ~12.9km to the north of the BDBC area.
Woolmer Forest SAC	Large lowland heathland ~13.4km to the south-east of the BDBC area.
Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA	Large lowland heathland ~13.7km to the south-east of the BDBC area.
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	Large lowland heathland ~13.7km to the south-east of the BDBC area.
Salisbury Plain SPA	Extensive chalk grassland ~14.6km west of the BDBC area.
Salisbury Plain SAC	Extensive chalk grassland ~14.6km west of the BDBC area.
The Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Estuarine site downstream of BDBC area via the River Itchen and River Test; identified to BDBC in NE's advice on nutrient neutrality (2022).
The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar	Estuarine site downstream of BDBC area via the River Itchen and River Test; identified to BDBC in NE's advice on nutrient neutrality (2022).
Solent Maritime SAC	Estuarine site downstream of BDBC area via the River Itchen and River Test; identified to BDBC in NE's advice on nutrient neutrality (2022).
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA	Estuarine site downstream of BDBC area via the River Itchen and River Test; identified to BDBC in NE's advice on nutrient neutrality (2022).

3.2.5. Initial consultations with Natural England for the 2023 HRA report did not identify any additional sites that are likely to require assessment.

3.2.6. With regard to downstream receptors, just under half of the BDBC area is within the catchment of the Solent (~48%; the remainder is within the Thames catchment); however, only around 8% is within the catchment of the River Itchen (an area south of Basingstoke, around Preston Candover).

3.2.7. The key data for these sites are set out in Appendix A. This provides a summary of the European sites within the scope, including:

- a contextual overview of each site;
- the interest features of the site;
- the condition of the site; and
- the current threats and pressures identified for each site[12].

3.2.8. These are based on the citations, the Site Improvement Plants (SIPs), information on the condition of the underlying SSSIs and any supplementary advice provided by Natural England[13]. The extent of each site in favourable or unfavourable condition has been estimated using the Natural England condition assessments for the corresponding SSSI units, although it must be noted that the boundaries of the component SSSI units (to which the condition assessments relate) do not always match the European site boundaries exactly (i.e. the SSSIs are often larger) and it is not always possible to split SSSI units to determine the precise area of the European site (or interest feature) that is in each condition category.

3.2.9. The potential mechanisms by which the Updated Spatial Strategy could affect these sites are discussed in **Section 3.1**.

CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES

3.2.10. The Conservation Objectives and Supplementary advice documents for the SACs and SPAs benchmark Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) for each feature. Guidance[14] from the UK Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs) provides a broad characterisation of FCS, stating that it "*relates to the long-term distribution and abundance of the populations of species in their natural range, and for habitats to the long-term natural distribution, structure and functions as well as the long-term survival of its typical species in their natural range. It describes a situation in which individual habitats and species are maintaining themselves at all relevant geographical scales and with good prospects to continue to do so in the future*".

[12] The Natural England Site Improvement Plans identify 'pressures' which are factors that are known to be currently affecting a site, and 'threats' which are factors that may not be exerting a pressure at the moment but which have the potential to do so based on local site knowledge.

[13] Natural England have published '*Supplementary advice on conserving and restoring site features'* for certain European sites which describe in more detail the range of ecological attributes which are most likely to contribute to a site's overall integrity and the targets each qualifying features needs to achieve in order for the site's conservation objectives to be met.

[14] JNCC (2018). *Favourable Conservation Status: UK Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies Common Statement* [online]. Available at: https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/b9c7f55f-ed9d-4d3c-b484-c21758cec4fe/FCS18-InterAgency-Statement.pdf. [Accessed October 2025].

3.2.11. The conservation objectives for the sites noted above have been revised by Natural England in recent years to improve the consistency of assessment and reporting. As a result, the high-level conservation objectives for all sites are effectively the same:

3.2.12. For SACs:

- *With regard to the SAC and the natural habitats and/or species for which the site has been designated (the 'Qualifying Features'...), and subject to natural change; ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the Favourable Conservation Status of its Qualifying Features, by maintaining or restoring* [as applicable to each site]*;*
  - *The extent and distribution of the qualifying natural habitats;*
  - *The extent and distribution of the habitats of qualifying species;*
  - *The structure and function (including typical species) of the qualifying natural habitats;*
  - *The structure and function of the habitats of qualifying species;*
  - *The supporting processes on which the qualifying natural habitats rely;*
  - *The supporting processes on which the habitats of qualifying species rely;*
  - *The populations of qualifying species; and,*
  - *The distribution of qualifying species within the site*.

3.2.13. For SPAs:

- *With regard to the SPA and the individual species and/or assemblage of species for which the site has been classified (the 'Qualifying Features'...), and subject to natural change; ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the aims of the Wild Birds Directive, by maintaining or restoring:*
  - *The extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features;*
  - *The structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features;*
  - *The supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely;*
  - *The population of each of the qualifying features; and*
  - *The distribution of the qualifying features within the site*.

3.2.14. The conservation objectives for Ramsar sites are taken to be the same as for the corresponding SACs / SPAs (where sites overlap). The conservation objectives are considered when assessing the potential effects of plans and policies on the sites; information on the sensitivities of the interest features also informs the assessment. Links to the conservation objectives are provided in **Appendix A**.

3.2.15. As noted, NE has published 'Supplementary advice on conserving and restoring site features' for some European sites, which describe in more detail the range of ecological attributes which are most likely to contribute to a site's overall integrity, and the minimum targets each qualifying feature needs to achieve in order to meet the site's conservation objectives. These are considered at the screening stage within this report, as necessary.

3.3 IN COMBINATION PLANS AND PROJECTS

The plans identified by the SA provide the basis for the assessment of 'in combination' effects with strategic plans (see **Appendix B**).

4 LOCAL PLAN 'SCREENING'

4.1 UPDATED DRAFT SPATIAL STRATEGY OF LOCAL PLAN SUMMARY

4.1.1. The current BDBC Local Plan was adopted in May 2016 and covers the period 2011 to 2029. BDBC is currently undertaking an update to the Local Plan which will extend the plan period to 2042.

4.1.2. The draft Local Plan sets out the strategic vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the borough, as well as the planning policies which will help to determine the future location, scale, type and design of new development in the borough. A consultation exercise for the original Regulation 18 draft Local Plan and accompanying HRA was undertaken in early 2024.

4.1.3. To account for increased housing growth targets set by the central government in late 2024, an update to the spatial strategy of the Local Plan is required, and is the subject of this Regulation 18 consultation. A summary of the changes to the spatial strategy since the 2024 Regulation 18 consultation is set out below in **Table 4-1.**

Table 4-1 – Summary of the Updated Draft Spatial Strategy Considered within this HRA

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
SPS1	Scale and Distribution of Development	N/A	The policy has been updated to reflect the changes to the standard method and strategy to meet housing needs. Wording has been updated to express the requirement to meet employment needs and retail and leisure needs.
SPS2	Neighbourhood Renewal	N/A	The policy has been strengthened to outline more fully what relevant proposals will need to deliver, including a demonstrable benefit to the local community. The amount of new homes to be delivered has been increased from 200 to 1,000, over the plan period. A number of specific issues such as heritage impact, have been added to the supporting text to reflect comments made during the previous Regulation 18 consultation. The policy name has changed from neighbourhood regeneration to neighbourhood renewal. The Policy has been supplemented by the addition of Policy SPS2a, which identifies the priority areas for Neighbourhood Renewal.
SPS2a	Buckskin and South Ham Neighbourhoods	N/A	A new policy providing more detail on the specific renewal neighbourhoods and the emerging masterplan for these areas.

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
SPS3	Delivering the Basingstoke Town Centre Masterplan	N/A	The policy highlights the suitability of the town centre for education and medical uses and reinforces that the primary function of the Primary Shopping Area is to accommodate retail uses. The first paragraph of the policy has been amended to clarify that it applies to development proposals within, or closely related to, the Basingstoke Town Centre Masterplan area, as designated on the Policies Map. The contribution made by the town centre to the supply of housing within the plan period has been increased from 400 to 500 homes. This reflects the potential for additional new homes. The boundary of the Town Centre Masterplan area has been amended to accord with that of the Town Centre Masterplan adopted by the Council in 2022 (other than Eastrop Park and War Memorial Park which are not included in the area covered by Policies SPS3 and SPS4 as the focus of these policies is on areas with opportunities for redevelopment).
SPS4	Basingstoke Town Centre – Areas of Change	N/A	Additional references to the need for development to have due regard to the Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and to the setting of listed buildings have been introduced. The Policies Map/Illustrative Plan (Figure 4.1) has been amended to include an extension eastward of the eastern boundary of the Church Street Area of Change. This will facilitate a more comprehensive improvement. Wording has been added on the opportunity for the River Loddon to become a feature as part of a wider network of public spaces. Wording has been amended on the allowed storey heights of buildings.
SPS5	Sites allocated for Housing-led Development	N/A	The policy has been updated to reflect the new proposed site allocations. The changes clarify when masterplans and strategic design codes will be produced and required.
SPS5.1	Northern Manydown	3,700	An overall vision has been added for Western Basingstoke. This includes Policies SPS5.1, SPS5.2 and SPS5.3. Site was included in the Adopted Local Plan (ALP) and already benefits from planning permission for approximately 3,620 homes (Manydown: outline permission for up to 3,520 homes (17/00818/OUT)

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
			and Worting Park: full permission for up to 104 homes (22/02792/FUL)). An additional parcel of land at Scrapps Hill does not benefit from planning permission but forms part of the allocation and could accommodate approximately 80 homes. The site was included in the Regulation18 LP (previously draft policy SS5.1). The policy has not significantly changed since the 2024 consultation, other than the land south of the railway has been removed and separated into its own policy (Policy SPS5.2, Land North of Pack Lane). This reflects the fact that the majority of Northern Manydown already has planning permission, whereas the land south of the railway does not, and there is an opportunity for it to be comprehensively planned with Southern Manydown (Policy SPS5.3). The land at Beckets Rise in Worting has also been removed from the site allocation boundary as the development on this land is already completed. Wording has been added on protecting and enhancing the ecological network including rare arable flora, Ancient Woodlands, and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, linking to opportunities identified in the Hampshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Wording has also been added to the policy on securing 10% biodiversity net gain and ensuring the protection of groundwater.
SPS5.2	Land north of Pack Lane	300	The site, which is also known as Parcel 6a, was included in Adopted Local Plan (ALP) as part of the North Manydown site allocation. As this part of the wider allocation does not benefit from planning permission and is geographically distinct from the above area it is now being brought forward as a separate allocation. The site was included in the Reguation18 LP (previously part of draft policy SS5.1).
SPS5.3	Southern Manydown	2,750	The draft allocation consists of two separate development areas which would join together beyond the plan period to 2042. The area was included in the Regulation 18 LP (previously draft policy SS5.4). The yield in the plan period has increased following further work, and the extension to the plan period. The overall site capacity has reduced to 6,000 to take account of identified constraints. The allocation continues to include a new hospital and also land to accommodate logistics and industrial employment floorspace to meet the

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
			majority of such floorspace needs identified in the ENA (2025). Further masterplanning work has been undertaken to refine the site's boundary and its capacity. This has resulted in the overall capacity of the site being reduced to 6,000 dwellings, subject to further refinement including understanding the density of development linked to Garden City principles and the overall vision. The proposed settlement policy boundary has been reviewed and this has resulted in a small increase in the developable area north of Jeffery's Copse (on the western boundary, adjacent to Oakley) that responds to the site's topography. At the southern end of the site the development has been pulled away from North Waltham so that it would be screened behind the Beech Break to the north of the village. The concept plan includes a planting buffer along the site's western boundary to screen the development from the wider landscape and provide improved ecological connectivity between the ancient woodlands. Further green connections are shown within the site to ensure that impacts upon the ancient woodlands are avoided. The specific site for the new hospital and employment uses has also been identified. The policy maintains its focus on prioritising active travel and public transport, and highlights some of the key areas where off-site highways mitigation would be required. Wording has been added to ensure the developments at SPS5.1, SPS5.2 and SPS5.3 have public and active travel corridors throughout, including a new active modes crossing over the railway line. Wording has been added to ensure the protection of groundwater, enhance and protect the ecological network, and ensure lighting impacts are minimised. Wording has been added on retaining the Scheduled Monument as an area of multifunctional green space, forming a heritage park.

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
SPS5.4	Land at Whitmarsh Lane	1,500 (900 at previously named East of Basingstoke site and 600 at previously named Lodge Farm)	The overall vision for Eastern Basingstoke has been added. This includes policies SPS5.4, SPS5.5, SPS5.6 and SPS5.7. The allocation for the site includes the 450 homes from the ALP plus an additional 450 homes within the previously named 'East of Basingstoke' portion of the site. This element remains unchanged from the Regulation 18 LP (2024) (previously part of draft policy SS5.6). It is proposed that the allocation is extended to the east to include the site known as Lodge Farm, to provide an additional 600 homes within the allocation. It is a previously shortlisted site that was not required to meet housing need in the Regulation 18 LP (2024). When compared with the East of Basingstoke policy (which covered a smaller site area) the following changes have been made: Updates have been made to refer to the River Loddon Valued Landscape (L1). Updates have been made to criteria relating to the ecological network and Biodiversity Net Gain with reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and offsite habitat restoration/creation. Updates have been made to the SUDS criteria as the geology of the site may not be suitable for infiltration features. Clarification that supporting infrastructure is brought forward in a co-ordinated manner in line with a Phasing Strategy, to be agreed by the Council Updates have been made to the infrastructure criteria to refer to early years provision and to clarify the position with regards to the existing access at Whitmarsh Lane. Wording has been added to explain the requirement for and purpose of the masterplan and strategic design code.
SPS5.5	Redlands (Phase 4)	70	New proposed allocation. This site was proposed in response to the Regulation 18 LP consultation (2024) and would be phase 4 of the ongoing Redlands development. The site is subject of a current planning application (25/00946/FUL).
SPS5.6	Redlands Lodge	15	The site was included in the Regulation 18 LP (2024) (previously draft policy SS5.11). The housing capacity has been reduced from 16 to 15 dwellings.

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
			Two potential principal access options are now shown. A new access is shown from the Redlands allocation to the east instead of via the site to the north (which was also formally known as Redlands). This limits disruption to the footpath running along the northern boundary. Furthermore, showing two access options means less reliance on the delivery of the Land at Whitmarsh Lane allocation to the west should this be slower to come forward. Update to SUDs criteria to refer to consideration of individual site geology/constraints. Update to criteria on the ecological network and Biodiversity Net Gain with reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. New criteria for archaeology. Wording has been added on the requirement to work with all site promoters for Eastern Basingstoke to create an overall masterplan to be adopted as an SPD.
SPS5.7	Sherfield Hill Farm	385	The site was included in the Regulation 18 LP (2024) (previously draft policy SS5.7). The yield has been increased from 300 to 385 in light of the resolution to grant planning permission for 350 homes (23/02707/OUT) on the majority of the site, plus the opportunity for additional delivery on a parcel not covered by the application. Update to criteria on the ecological network and Biodiversity Net Gain with reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. New criteria for archaeology. Update to SUDs criteria to refer to consideration of individual site geology/constraints. Wording has been added to ensure an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy is provided. Wording has been amended to ensure the site responds sensitively to the significance of heritage assets. Wording has been added on the requirement to work with all site promoters for Eastern Basingstoke to create an overall masterplan to be adopted as an SPD.

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
SPS5.8	Popham Garden Village	1,800	The site was included in the Regulation 18 LP (2024) (previously draft policy SS5.5) for 1,400 homes in the Plan period and 3,000 in total. The yields have been increased to 1,800 over the plan period and 4,250 in total as a result of a larger area now being allocated, reflecting additional work undertaken by the site promoter for and since the call for sites. The larger allocation will address key concerns expressed during the last Regulation 18 LP consultation which related to the sustainability of the allocation and its ability to be self-contained. Higher order facilities, including a secondary school, could be sustained within the larger allocation, reducing the need to travel to such facilities. The site boundary has been extended northwards and westwards to accommodate the increased level of development. New woodlands are proposed along the northern boundary of the site to improve the screening of the development in views from the north. Extensive green connections are provided across the site to provide biodiversity corridors and to enhance the landscape setting of the housing. A larger Solar Farm has been introduced into the scheme split between two locations in the west and south-east of the site. Further to advice from the statutory providers, the policy refers to the on-site provision of an early-years childcare facility and health care facilities.
SPS5.9	Upper Swallick	1,200	New proposed allocation for 2,500 homes (extending beyond the plan period). This was a previously shortlisted site, but it was not required to meet housing need in the Regulation 18 LP (2024). 1,200 homes are to be delivered within the plan period as part of an allocation which would form a new settlement south of the M3.

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
SPS5.10	Land West of Marnel Park	250	The site was included in the Regulation 18 LP (2024) (previously draft policy SS5.8). The yield has increased by 50 homes due to an updated site boundary which reflects the conclusion of further detailed site-based work. The site is subject of a current planning application (23/00205/OUT). The site boundary has been extended southwards with a new access from Chineham Lane. This will allow a higher housing capacity (change from 200 to 250 dwellings. The visual separation of Basingstoke with Sherborne St John will be maintained whilst this alteration will enable a lower housing density more in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The new access from Chineham Lane will enable less reliance on vehicular travel through the existing neighbourhood to the east and will allow improved retention of the green infrastructure corridor to the north. Access will be provided from Gibbons Place. Update to criteria on the ecological network and Biodiversity Net Gain with reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Additional criteria relating to scheme design and noise mitigation. Requirement for hydrogeological risk assessment.
SPS5.11	Weybrook Park Golf Course	210	The site was included in the Regulation 18 LP (2024) as two allocations (previously draft policies SS5.9 and SS5.12). The main Weybrook Park Golf Course site (originally for 220 homes) and the Land adjacent to the Weybrook Park Golf Course (for 30 homes) have been combined to form one allocation and ensure the delivery of a comprehensive development. The yield has decreased by 40 homes overall as a result of further detailed site-based work. The site is subject of a current planning application (23/02622/OUT). In order to retain the trees in the centre and north of the main Weybrook Park Golf Course site, the housing yield has been reduced by 40 homes. Additional text has been added to protect the right of way footpath along the western site boundary and to ensure that any noise arising from golf related activities to the west is suitably mitigated. The Environment Agency (EA) provided comments during the previous Regulation 18 consultation that the smaller site (for 30 homes) has potential off-site contamination risks and potential contaminants from previous uses. Relevant wording has been added to the policy to address these concerns.

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
			Building heights have been more limited on the south-western part of the site. Additional text has been added to ensure archaeological constraints are respected. The concept plan has been updated to show the two sites combined as one, in addition to the retention of the aforementioned trees. An 'all modes access point' has been shown connecting the main allocation to the smaller site to the south-west and the actual location of the banjo enclosure (archaeological site) has been included. The entire site would be accessed from the A340.
SPS5.12	Land west of Upper Cufaude Farm	220	New proposed allocation. This was a previously shortlisted site that was not required to meet housing need in the Regulation 18 LP (2024).
SPS5.13	65 New Road	6	Site allocation was included in the Regulation 18 LP (2024) (previously draft policy SS5.14). Wording amended for the protection and enhancement of ecological networks. Wording added to require investigation into any potential sources of on-site contamination. Wording added to require the provision of SuDS.
SPS5.14	Oakley Farm, Wash Water	500	New proposed allocation following new site promotion in call for sites.
SPS5.15	Land at West End Farm, Mortimer	350	New proposed allocation following new site promotion in call for sites.
SPS5.16	Skates Lane, Tadley	245	New proposed allocation. This was a previously shortlisted site that was not required to meet housing need in the Regulation 18 LP (2024). The site is subject of a current planning application (24/00349/OUT).
SPS6	Neighbourhood Planning	N/A	The policy has been updated to reflect the housing requirements identified for the rural settlements in the updated Settlement Study (2025).
SPS7	Ensuring a supply of Deliverable Sites	N/A	No changes made.
SPS8	Atomic Weapons Establishment	N/A	The policy has been amended so that it more closely aligns with the policy in the West Berkshire Local Plan, provides a more accurate description of the

Draft New Policy Number	Policy/Site Name	Site Yield in the Plan Period (2024-2042)	Commentary
	Aldermaston and Burghfield		situation and reflects the presumption against development in the DEPZ.
SPS9	Basing View	N/A	The policy has been amended to reflect the conclusions of the work the Council has undertaken on the suitability of Tall Buildings in Basing View and the opportunities for Intensification of Basing View, particularly the introduction of a mix of uses, including residential uses. Wording has been added to require a green and blue infrastructure network, minimum 10% biodiversity net gain, investigations into any potential sources of on-site contamination, and ensure the protection of groundwater. Wording has been added to avoid development and points of access within flood zones 2 and 3 and require appropriate flood risk management strategies. Wording has been amended to refer to listed buildings and ensure the historic asset is better used in placemaking.
ENV2	Strategic Gaps	N/A	The policy has been updated to refer to an additional strategic gap between Cliddesden and Upper Swallick.

4.1.4. These aspects could affect European sites on their own, through typical development-related mechanisms operating at the local scale in relation to specific allocations (e.g. noise, lighting, etc.; see **Table 4-2**); or collectively by exacerbating regional pressures (e.g. pressures on water supply or sewerage treatment).

4.2 REVIEW / 'SCREENING' OF PLAN COMPONENTS: POLICIES AND ALLOCATIONS

REVIEW OF DRAFT SITE ALLOCATIONS

4.2.1. This report aims to consider the potential impact of the new and revised spatial policies (including new and revised site allocations) to take account of changes in housing targets. Given the changes in the environmental baseline since the 2023 HRA (i.e. the new compensatory SAC habitat on the River Test and River Meon), the original outcomes of the 2023 HRA cannot be relied upon. Accordingly, this new assessment will consider these again.

4.2.2. In combination effects cannot be ruled out via recreational pressure, water resources, water quality and air quality pathways (see above).

4.2.3. When considering the likely effects of a policy, it is recognised that some policy 'types' cannot usually result in impacts on any European sites. Different guidance documents suggest various classification and referencing systems to help identify those policies that can be 'screened out' on that basis; the general characteristics of these policy types are summarised in **Table 4-2**.

Table 4-2 - Policy 'types' that can Usually be Screened Out

Broad Policy Type	Notes
General statements of policy / aspiration	The European Commission recognises that plans or plan components that are general statements of policy or political aspirations cannot have significant effects; for example, general commitments to sustainable development. This may include policies that support development or other changes but which are too general (e.g. locations, scale, quantum etc. not specified below the geographical level of the plan) to allow any specific assessments of effects, provided that the type of development proposed is not such that significant effects would be unavoidable regardless of location etc.
General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development	A general 'criteria based' policy expresses the tests or expectations of the plan-making body when it comes to consider proposals, or relates to design or other qualitative criteria which do not themselves lead to development (e.g. controls on building design; requirements for affordable homes; etc); however, policies with criteria relating to specific proposals or allocations should not be screened out.
External plans / projects	Plans or projects that are proposed by other plans or permissions regimes and which are referred to in the plan being assessed for completeness (for example, Highways Agency road schemes; specific waste development proposals promoted by a County Minerals and Waste Plan; DCO applications being advanced separately from the plan at hand); however, these would be considered as part of the plan-level 'in combination' assessment.
Environmental protection policies	Policies designed to protect the natural or built environment will not usually have significant or adverse effects (although they may often require modification if relied on to provide sufficient safeguards for other policies).
Policies which make provision for change but which could have no conceivable effect	Policies or proposals that cannot affect a European site (due to there being no impact pathways and hence no effect; for example, proposals for new cycle path several kilometres from the nearest European site; criteria for a development's appearance; etc.) or which cannot undermine the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination, if impact pathways exist.

* EC, 2000, Managing Natura 2000 sites: the provisions of Article 6 of the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC April 2000 at 4.3.2

4.2.4. It must be noted that it is inappropriate to uncritically apply a policy classification tool (as in **Table 4-2**) to all policies of a certain type. There will be some occasions when a policy or similar may have potentially significant effects, despite being of a 'type' that would normally be screened out. Moreover, many policies will have a number of elements to them which may meet different criteria.

4.2.5. The criteria in **Table 4-2** were applied and incorporated into a colour coding system (see **Table 4-3**) has been used for the purposes of screening the Local Plan policies in **Appendix B**.

Table 4-3 - Colour Coding for Screening of Local Plan Policies

	No effect or no LSE – policy will not or cannot affect any European sites and can therefore be screened out (subject to a brief review of the final policy prior to adoption).
	Policies with mitigating/moderating elements that do not have significant effects but which are relied on (at least in part) to ensure that significant or significant adverse effects from specific pathways do not occur; these are examined through AA.
	Policies that have potential pathways for effects that require examination through appropriate assessment; note, this does not imply such policies will have adverse effects or even (potentially) significant effects; rather it is an assessment flag.

4.2.6. It should be noted that the inclusion of a policy in the 'yellow' category does not mean that significant effects are inevitable since in many instances the assessments reflect uncertainties that need to be explored through further analysis (and it would be possible to undertake an appropriate assessment stage and still conclude (following a further screening) that there will be no significant effects).

4.2.7. The review considers the policies collectively and individually, and so takes the non-specific cross-cutting protective policies within the plan into account although cross-cutting or overarching policies are not relied on where specific mitigation for specific effects is considered necessary for the policy (this is particularly relevant for policies that provide broad or non-specific support for development but which are screened out because they do not define or direct particular developments or activities; in these instances the plan's protective policies will form a key part of the overall decision-making process). The review also considers any internal tensions within the plan that may be relevant to HRA.

4.2.8. In summary, Policies SPS1-SPS4, SPS6-SPS9 and Policy ENV2 contained within the Updated Spatial Strategy are categorised as 'no effect' or 'no significant effect' policies (see **Appendix B**). However, the allocated site policies (SPS5, and SPS5.1-5.16) in **Table 4-4** are screened in and will require further exploration through appropriate assessment as further data becomes available.

Table 4-4 - Policy Aspects Requiring Examination Through Appropriate Assessment

Policies	Screening Rationale
Policy SPS5: Sites Allocated for Housing-led Development	The policy identifies the sites that are proposed for allocation and provides general criteria relating to how sites will come forward, including the use of design codes. The policy has the potential to significantly affect European sites through effect pathways associated with quantum of development etc. and aspects of it need to be examined through appropriate assessment. The effectiveness of cross-cutting mitigating policies requires review.
Policies SPS5.1 – SPS5.16: (Allocation-specific policies)	Policies relate to specific allocations and their locations; these are unlikely to affect any sites alone but will contribute to 'in combination' effects.

4.3 REVIEW / 'SCREENING' OF EUROPEAN SITES

4.3.1. European sites or interest features within a study area can often be excluded from further assessment at an early stage in the assessment process ('screened out') because the plan or project will self-evidently have either 'no effect' or 'no significant effect' on these sites (i.e. no credible threat or impact

4.3.2. The following sections provide a brief summary of the screening of the European sites and their interest features based on the baseline data summarised in **Section 3** and the policies and proposals of the Updated Spatial Strategy. It should be noted that this aspect of the screening process is a 'low bar', with sites, aspects or features only 'screened out' if they will self-evidently be unaffected by the Updated Spatial Strategy (i.e. it is aiming to identify those aspects that will clearly have 'no effect' or 'no significant effect' (alone or in combination) due to an absence of credible threat or impact pathways which could undermine the conservation objectives). It does not attempt a detailed quantification if significant effects via particular pathway cannot be simply or self-evidently excluded (this will be completed at a future 'appropriate assessment' stage, when mitigation is also accounted for).

4.3.3. When screening it is appropriate to assume that all relevant lower-tier consents and permissions (etc.) will be correctly assessed and controlled, and that any activities directly or indirectly supported by the Local Plan will adhere to the relevant legislative and regulatory requirements and all normal best-practice (e.g. it would be inappropriate to assume that normal controls on, for example, the installation of a new discharge to a watercourse would not be correctly followed). The screening also recognises that there are some aspects over which the Local Plan Update will have no control (e.g. agricultural practices).

Screening at the Regulation 18 Stage

4.3.4. Note, the screening tests are strictly applied to the final, submitted plan and not to emerging or developmental stages; any 'screening conclusions' set out in the following sections are necessarily provisional, therefore, based on the plan as currently conceived; however, they are intended to be robust should the plan be adopted as currently drafted. In some cases there may be data gaps or uncertainties associated with policy implementation, and some baseline studies are being updated by BDBC (see below); however, it does indicate those aspects that may require specific consideration prior to finalisation of the Local Plan, and those that would appear to have a low probability of affecting European sites or features.

4.3.5. It should be noted that BDBC is completing various reports and studies to update the environmental baseline for the Local Plan, some of which will be relevant to the HRA baseline. Additional studies will be undertaken or co-opted as required depending on the impact pathways that are identified during the plan development process; these might include new or ongoing regional investigations, or studies relating to specific allocation sites.

4.3.6. Note, **for European sites <u>not</u> identified in Table 3-2 the final HRA will almost certainly conclude that there will be 'no effect' (and hence no possibility of 'in combination' effects) on these sites due to the absence of reasonable pathways for effects.** This is based on initial assessments of the emerging plan and will be reviewed as the plan is developed, but is a robust conclusion based on the currently available information. **Only sites identified in Table 3-2 are therefore considered further in this report**.

RECREATIONAL PRESSURE

4.3.7. Many European sites will be vulnerable to some degree of impact as a result of recreational pressure, although the effects of recreational pressure are complex and very much dependent on the specific conditions and interest features at each site. For example: some bird species are more sensitive to disturbance associated with walkers or dogs than others; some habitats will be more sensitive to trampling or mechanical disturbance than others; some sites will be more accessible than others.

4.3.8. The most typical mechanisms for recreational effects are through direct damage of habitats, or disturbance of certain species. Damage will most often be accidental or incidental, but many sites are particularly sensitive to soil or habitat erosion caused by recreational activities and require careful management to minimise any effects (for example, through provision and maintenance of 'hard paths' (boardwalks, stone slabs etc.) and signage to minimise soil erosion along path margins).

4.3.9. Disturbance of species due to recreational activities can also be a significant problem at some sites, although the relationship (again) is highly variable and depends on a range of factors including the species, the time of year and the scale, type and predictability of disturbance. Most studies have focused on the effects on birds, either when breeding or foraging.

4.3.10. In contrast, some species are largely unaffected by human disturbance (or even benefit from it) which can result in local or regional changes in the composition of the fauna. The scale, type and predictability of disturbance is also important; species can become habituated to some disturbance (e.g. noise), particularly if it is regular or continuous. Unpredictable disturbance is most problematic.

4.3.11. Most recreational activities with the potential to affect European sites are 'casual' and pursued opportunistically (e.g. walking, walking dogs, riding) rather than structured (e.g. organised group activities or trips to specific discrete attractions), which means that it can be difficult to quantify or predict either the uptake or the impacts of these activities on European sites and (ultimately) harder to control or manage effects. It also means that it is difficult to explore in detail all of the potential aspects of visitor pressure at the strategy level. However, it is possible for plans and strategies to influence recreational use of European sites through the planning process, for example by increasing the amount of green space required within or near developments if potentially vulnerable European sites are located nearby.

4.3.12. Visitor surveys are often sought to determine whether public access is having a significant or adverse effect on a site Probably the most common metric used for 'buffer zones' or 'zones of influence' is the distance within which approximately 70 - 75% of visitors live; these have been determined for several sites around the UK where visitor pressure is considered significant enough to warrant policy-based interventions.

Table 4-5 - Summary of European Site Issues in Relation to Visitor Pressure

Site	Notes	Screen In?
River Itchen SAC	Visitor pressure is not identified as a pressure or threat within the Site Improvement Plan (SIP – refer to Appendix A to links for all relevant SIPs) for the River Itchen SAC, although it is noted that frequent recreational activities within the channel such as kayaking could lead to degradation of qualifying habitats.	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	In general, public access to the River Itchen is limited, with the majority of access (including car parks and footpaths) associated with the Itchen Valley Country Park and tidal areas near to Southampton, over 20km from the BDBC boundary. Footpaths are present along the River Itchen at Winnall Moors Nature Reserve, over 10km from the BDBC boundary, although access into the water for swimming is not permitted at this site[15]. The closest point of the SAC is >2km from the BDBC boundary (and further still from the nearest allocations) where the River Itchen flows south through private land. As such no credible effect pathways for visitor pressure are identified for the SAC.	
River Test Compensatory SAC	No SIP is available for the compensatory habitat along the River Test, although Natural England have stated in their communications to LPAs[16] that "*There are no immediate plans to share guidance on the impacts to be considered, our advice on this matter would be to include anything you would typically consider for the River Itchen SAC.*" The relevant qualifying features for this compensatory SAC are noted by Natural England to be H3260 Water Courses of plain to montane levels with *R. fluitantis* chalk stream habitat, and southern damselfly *Coenagrion mercurial*, which could be impacted by habitat degradation from heavy visitor pressure. However, public access to the compensatory SAC habitat parcels along River Test (including the River Dever, the River Dun, Middle River Test between Wherwell and Kimbridge/Mottisfont and the Bourne Rivulet) is limited with footpaths only crossing or adjacent to the rivers at a small number of areas along their extents. The closest parcels of compensatory SAC habitats along the River Dever are 3.5km from the nearest site allocation (SPS5.8) within the BDBC boundary for the River Test sites, and so no credible effect pathways for visitor pressure are identified on these sections of river.	No
River Meon Compensatory SAC	No SIP is available for the compensatory habitat along the River Meon, although as per the River Test Compensatory SAC, these impacts should be considered as similar to those for the River Itchen following Natural England's advice. The qualifying features are noted by Natural England to be H3260 Water Courses of plain to montane levels with *R. fluitantis* chalk stream habitat, and Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar*, and such features may be sensitive to habitat degradation from heavy recreational pressure including in channel access. There is access to the River Meon compensatory SAC, although this is particularly associated with Titchfield Haven Nature Reserve at the far southern extent of the river. The closest parcels of compensatory SAC habitats are 22km for the River Meon from the	No

[15] Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust – Winnall Moors Nature Reserve. Available at: https://www.hiwwt.org.uk/nature-reserves/winnall-moors-nature-reserve [Accessed November 2025]

[16] Natural England (2025) Compensatory measures on the River Test and the River Meon – Questions and Answers.

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	nearest allocations and so no credible effect pathways are identified with respect of visitor pressure.	
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	Visitor pressure is not identified as a pressure or threat for this site within the SIP. Existing footpaths are present within the SAC (with connecting routes from Jubilee Lakes car park and Thatcham Station car park. However, the supporting habitats of the qualifying feature are wetland habitats which are unlikely to be accessed by members of the public (instead of the existing footpaths present along the river front areas). The closest point of the SAC is >3km from the BDBC boundary (3.8km from the nearest allocated site, SPS5.14 Oakley Farm, Wash Water) and so no credible effect pathways are identified with respect of visitor pressure.	No
Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC	Visitor pressure is not identified as a pressure or threat for this site within the SIP and public access to the site units is limited with no footpaths in the Ryott's plantation woodland, and limited public footpaths in the Wilderness site parcel. There are no formal car parks associated with these parcels The closest point of the SAC is over 3km from the nearest allocated site (SPS5.14 Oakley Farm, Wash, 3.4km away) and so no credible effect pathways are identified relating to visitor pressure.	No
River Lambourn SAC	Visitor pressure is not identified as a pressure or threat for this site within the SIP. Public access to the river is limited away from the urban footpaths through Newbury, with no formal car parks outside of urban centres. The closest point of the SAC is >3km from the nearest allocations (the nearest allocation being SPS5.14 Oakley Farm, Wash 4.72km away) and so significant effects (alone or in combination) will not occur.	No
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Public access and disturbance are identified as a pressure and threat within the SIP which notes that "*parts of Thames Basin Heaths…are subject to high levels of recreational use and dog walkers make up a large proportion of visitors. This is likely to be affecting the distribution and overall numbers of ground nesting Annex 1 birds (and breeding success)*". The most recent visitor surveys indicate that the zone of influence for visitors by car to the SPA could extend up to c. 16km for certain locations (based on 75% of visitors), although on average 75% of local visitors lived within 5km[17]. The updated Draft Spatial Strategy will increase the number of homes within the borough during the plan period, including provision of new dwellings within 8km of the SPA at SPS5.4 Land at Whitmarsh Lane (1,500 homes) and SPS5.5 Redlands (70 homes), and within 10km at SPS5.12 Land West of Upper Cufaude Farm (220 homes) and SPS5.15 Land at West End Farm, Mortimer (350 homes). Likely Significant Effects cannot be ruled out. Therefore, further consideration will need to be given, as part of an appropriate assessment, to whether adverse effects on	Yes

[17] Footprint Ecology (2023) Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area 2023 Visitor Survey. Available at: https://www.tbhpartnership.org.uk/content/uploads/2024/04/TBH-visitor-survey-2023-Final.pdf [Accessed November 2025]

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	site integrity can be ruled out alone or in-combination. This will include the assessment of any mitigation which may avoid adverse effects of this increased recreation at a plan level and needs to be considered through appropriate assessment.	
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	Visitor pressure is not identified as a pressure or threat for this site within the SIP, although the supplementary advice on conservation objectives notes that "*activities such as construction, forestry management and trampling by grazing livestock and human feet during recreational activity may all contribute to excessive soil compaction around ancient trees".* Public access to the woodlands and grassland parcels is possible via public rights of way but the closest point of the SAC is >7km from the BDBC area (further from the nearest allocations) with no formal car parks in the vicinity and so no credible effect pathways are identified for recreational pressure.	No
Shortheath Common SAC	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat within the SIP, which also notes that "*the site is common land and open access, and is regularly used for recreation"*. Visitor survey data for Shortheath[18] indicate that 75% of visitors to the Common live within 5.3km (80% within 6.8km) and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area (>9.5km from the site, further still to the nearest allocations) would not be expected.	No
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat within the SIP, which notes that "*Visitor access provision is not currently coordinated between sites or managed so as to reduce impacts on ground nesting birds".* Visitor survey data[20] indicate that the greatest '75% distance' for visitors to this site is 6.9km for visitors to the Kingsley Heath component (also the closest site unit to the BDBC area), and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area (>9.5km from the site, further still to the nearest allocations) would not be expected.	No
Hartslock Wood SAC	Small site on steep slopes with a single footpath, and no formal parking within the vicinity. Visitor pressure is not identified as a pressure or threat for this site within the SIP. The site is over 12km from the BDBC area (further still to the nearest allocations) so credible effect pathways are not identified for this SAC.	No
Woolmer Forest SAC	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat within the SIP (shared within Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA). Visitor survey data[20] indicates that the '75% distance' for visitors to this site is 3.19km, and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area (>13km from the site, further still to the nearest allocations) would not be expected.	No

[18] Panter, C. (2018). Wealden Heaths and Shortheath Common 2018 Visitor Surveys [online]. Report for East Hants Council. Footprint Ecology, Dorset. Available at: https://cdn.easthants.gov.uk/public/documents/Wealden%20visitor%20survey%20final%20report.pdf [Accessed November 2025]

Site	Notes	Screen In?
Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat within the Thames Basin SIP with "*high levels of recreational use and dog walkers*". However, the site is over 13km from the BDBC area (further still to the nearest allocations) and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area would not be expected.	No
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat within the Thames Basin SIP (site includes common land / access land with nearby parking facilities). However, the site is over 13km from the BDBC area and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area would not be expected.	No
Salisbury Plain SPA	Public access / disturbance is not identified as a threat or pressure at the site within the SIP. Unpublished visitor surveys completed in 2021 indicate that 75% of all visitors to the SPA lived within 6.1km[19]. The site is over 13km from the BDBC area and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area would not be expected.	No
Salisbury Plain SAC	Public access / disturbance is not identified as a threat or pressure at the site within the SIP. Unpublished visitor surveys completed in 2021 indicate that 75% of all visitors to the site lived within 6.1km (as per Salisbury Plain SPA). The site is over 13km from the BDBC area and so significant effects due to visitors originating from new development in the BDBC area would not be expected.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat in the Solent SIP. The Solent sites are subject to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy[20] which sets developer contribution buffers at 5.6km; significant effects as a result of the Local Plan Update will not occur due to distance from the BDBC area.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat in the Solent SIP. The Solent sites are subject to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy[20] which sets developer contribution buffers at 5.6km; significant effects as a result of the Local Plan Update will not occur.	No
Solent Maritime SAC	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat in the Solent SIP. The Solent sites are subject to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy[20] which sets developer contribution buffers at 5.6km;	No

[19] Wiltshire Council (2024) HRA and Mitigation Strategy for Salisbury Plain SPA (in relation to recreational pressure from residential development). Available from: https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/media/994/Salisbury-Plain-SPA-HRA-and-mitigation-strategy/pdf/Salisbury_Plain_SPA_HRA_and_mitigation_strategy_June_2024_review_FINAL.pdf?m=1721133017827 [Accessed November 2025]

[20] Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Available at: https://cdn.havant.gov.uk/public/documents/EB17%20Solent%20Recreation%20Mitigation%20Strategy.pdf [Accessed November 2025]

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	significant effects as a result of the Local Plan Update will not occur.	
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA	Public access / disturbance is identified as a threat in the Solent SIP. The Solent sites are subject to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy[20] which sets developer contribution buffers at 5.6km; significant effects as a result of the Local Plan Update will not occur.	No

URBANISATION

4.3.13. As set out in the 2023 HRA, urbanisation is generally used as a collective term covering a suite of often disparate risks and impacts that occur due to increases in human populations near protected sites. Typically, this would include aspects such as fly-tipping or vandalism, although the effects of these aspects again depend on the interest features of the sites: for example, predation of some species by cats can be potentially significant for some European sites. Recreational pressure is arguably one type of effect associated with urbanisation, although this is usually considered separately as it is less closely associated with proximity; as a broad guide, urbanisation effects are more likely when developments (etc.) are within a few hundred metres of a designated site, whereas people will typically travel further for recreation.

4.3.14. Where sensitive sites are involved, development buffers of around 400m are typically used to minimise the effects of urbanisation: for example, Natural England has identified a 400m zone around the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA within which housing development should not be located due to the potential effects of urbanisation (particularly, the risk of chick predation by cats, which cannot be mitigated). Similarly, LPAs near the Thames Basin Heaths SPA have adopted a 400m zone around the SPA boundary where there is a presumption against new residential development as adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA cannot be ruled out.

4.3.15. The 2023 HRA concluded that urbanisation effects as a result of Local Plan update will not occur for the any of the European sites due to the separation distances. The draft updated spatial strategy includes seven new site allocations, which are all separated from the European sites by a minimum of 3.4km (based on the distance of the closest allocated site, SPS5.14 Oakley Farm, Wash Water to a European site – Kent Valley Alderwoods SAC). As such, urbanisation effects as a result of the updated spatial strategy can be ruled out.

ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION

4.3.16. As noted in paragraph 3.16, a number of pollutants have a negative effect on air quality. The most significant and relevant to habitats and species (particularly plant species) are SO2. NOx, and NH3, which (together with secondary aerosol pollutants[21]) are deposited as wet or dry deposits. These pollutants affect habitats and species mainly through acidification, and eutrophication.

[21] Secondary pollutants are not emitted but are formed following further reactions in the atmosphere; for example, SO_2 and NO_x are oxidised to form SO_4^{2-} and NO_2^- compounds; ozone is formed by the reaction of other pollutants (e.g. NOx or volatile organic compounds) with UV light; ammonia reacts with SO_4^{2-} and NO_2^- to form ammonium (NH_4^+).

4.3.17. Acidification increases the acidity of soils, which can directly affect some organisms and which also promotes leaching of some important base chemicals (e.g. calcium), and mobilisation and uptake by plants of toxins (especially metals such as aluminium).

4.3.18. Air pollution contributes to eutrophication within ecosystems by increasing the amounts of available nitrogen (N) [22]. This is a particular problem in low-nutrient habitats, where available nitrogen is frequently the limiting factor on plant growth, and results in slow-growing low-nutrient species being out-competed by faster growing species that can take advantage of the increased amounts of available N.

4.3.19. Overall, in the UK, there has been a significant decline in SOx and NOx emissions in recent decades and a consequential decrease in acid deposition. SOx and NOx emissions from industry have decreased by 87% and 67% respectively between 2013 and 2023. Furthermore, emissions of NOx from road transport have reduced by 51% over the same time period[23]. These reductions are primarily the result of a switch from coal to gas, nuclear and renewables for energy generation, the reduction in coal for domestic heating, and increased efficiency and emissions standards for cars. These emissions are expected to decline further in future years with the transition to electric vehicles. In addition, emissions of ammonia have decreased by 14% since 1990, with most of the reductions occurring between 1990 and 2008. Emissions then remained largely unchanged/stable between 2008 and 2013, but since then they have started to increase slightly, although they still remain well below mid-2000 levels. The main driver for trends in emissions of ammonia is changes in farming practices / herd sizes. Ammonia is also emitted from vehicle exhausts, although the contribution to total concentrations is small by comparison. According to Defra's latest report on emissions trends[23], whilst transport related emissions of ammonia increased up to 2000, they have started to reduce in response to new vehicle emission standards, such that in 2002 they made up 7% of total ammonia emissions and 2% in 2023.

4.3.20. The effect of SOx and NOx decreases on ecosystems has been marked, particularly in respect of acidification; the key contributor to acidification is now thought to be deposited nitrogen. Indeed, eutrophication from N-deposition (primarily from ammonia) is now considered the most significant air quality issue for many habitats.

4.3.21. The principal source of air pollution impacts associated with the Updated Spatial Strategy will be related to changing patterns of vehicle use due to new development (since the Updated Spatial Strategy does not provide for any new significant point-sources). This may include increases in traffic, due to the generation of new / additional vehicle movements on the local road network, changes in the distribution of (new and / or existing) traffic on the road network, or changes in traffic composition.

4.3.22. Published guidance from Natural England (2018) and the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) (2020) sets out an approach to assessing the effect of emissions from road traffic on designated sites. Essentially, potentially significant effects requiring further assessment may arise where a European site (with air quality sensitive features / habitats) is located within 200m of a road

[22] Nitrogen that is in a form that can be absorbed and used by plants.

[23] Defra (March 2025) Emissions of air pollutants in the UK. Summary available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/emissions-of-air-pollutants/emissions-of-air-pollutants-in-the-uk-summary#long-term-trends-in-emissions-of-air-pollutants [Accessed November 2025]

affected by development traffic and the predicted change in annual average daily traffic (AADT) flows is over 1,000 AADT, either alone or 'in-combination' with other plans or projects (as per case law). Where a European Site is located more than 200m from an affected road and / or there are no qualifying / sensitive features present within 200m, it can be assumed that the contribution of vehicle emissions to pollutant levels is unlikely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the European site and further assessment is not required. Modelled traffic data (inclusive of the additional site allocations) is not yet available for the Local Plan Update to enable detailed screening of the changes in traffic flows against the 1,000 AADT criteria. However, the 200m distance threshold has been adopted to identify which of those European Sites within the 15km ZoI are also located within 200m of a main road and therefore have the potential to be impacted by development related traffic.

4.3.23. GIS analysis suggests that the following European sites identified within the ZoI also have component units within 200m of a main road:

Table 4-6 - European Sites (and component SSSIs) within 15km of the BDBC Area with A-roads within 200m

European site(s)	Relevant SSSIs and A roads	**Notable B Roads**
River Test Compensatory SAC Habitat	▪ For River Dever • A33 and M3 (east Statton) • A30, A34, A303 (West Meon) ▪ For Bourne Rivulet • A343(Hurstbourne Tarrant) ▪ For Middle River Test • A3057 and A30Stockbridge	• B3420 (Sutton Scotney / Wherwell) • B3048 (Hurstbourne Tarrant / Hurstbourne Priors)
River Meon Compensatory SAC Habitat	• A32 (West Meon)	N/A
Salisbury Plain SPA / Salisbury Plain SAC	▪ Salisbury Plain SSSI • A338 (Tidworth)	N/A
Woolmer Forest SAC	▪ Woolmer Forest SSSI • A3, A325 (Bordon)	N/A
River Itchen SAC	▪ River Itchen SSSI • A34 / A33 / M3 (Winchester) • A272 (Cheriton) • A31 (New Alresford)	• B3047 and B3330 (Winchester) • B3046 (Cheriton) • B3047 (New Alresford)
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	▪ Broxhead and Kingsley Commons SSSI • A325 (Bordon)	• B3004 (Bordon)

European site(s)	Relevant SSSIs and A roads	**Notable B Roads**
	■ Woolmer Forest SSSI • A325 (Bordon)	
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	■ Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SSSI / River Kennett SSSI • A4 / A338 (Hungerford) • A34 (Newbury)	• B4192 (Hungerford)
River Lambourn SAC	■ River Lambourn SSSI • A4 / A34 / A339 (Newbury) • M4 (Easton) • A338(Great Shefford)	• B4009, B4494 (Newbury)
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC / **Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA**	■ Thursley, Hankley & Frensham Commons SSSI ■ A287 (Frensham)	N/A
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	■ Castle Bottom to Yateley and Hawley Commons SSSI • A30 / A327 (west of Blackwater) ■ Bramshill SSSI • A30 / A327 (west of Blackwater) ■ Sandhurst to Owlsmoor Bogs and Heaths SSSI • A3095 (Sandhurst) ■ Broadmoor to Bagshot Woods and Heaths SSSI • A3095 (Sandhurst) ■ Bourley and Long Valley SSSI • A323 (Fleet) • A325 (Aldershot) • A287/A3016 (Upper Hale) ■ Eelmoor Marsh SSSI • A323 (Fleet) ■ Heath Brow SSSI ■ A287 (Hale)	• B3272, B3013, B3016 (Blackwater) • B3016 (nr Blackwater) • B3430, B3348 (Sandhurst) • B3013 (Hale)

European site(s)	Relevant SSSIs and A roads	**Notable B Roads**
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	▪ No Trunk / A Roads ▪ Selborne Common SSSI ▪ Upper Greensand Hangers: Empshott to Hawkley SSSI ▪ Coombe Wood and the Lythe SSSI ▪ Upper Greensand Hangers: Wyck to Wheatley SSSI ▪ Wick Wood and Worldham Hangers SSSI	• B3006(Selborne) • B3006 (Selborne) • B3006 (Selborne) • B3004 (East Worldham)

4.3.24. **The Solent and Southampton Water SPA, the Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar, Solent Maritime SAC, and Solent and Dorset Coast SPA** (as identified for consideration in Table 3-2) are all located more than 25km from BDBC's administrative boundary. The **River Dun component of the River Test Compensatory SAC** is also located more than 15km from BDBC's area. Furthermore, **Shortheath Common SAC, Hartslock Wood SAC,** and **Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC** are all located more than 200m from a main road. As such, these sites are **screened out** from further assessment as they will not be exposed to significant effects from air quality changes associated with traffic growth from the Local Plan Update on the basis of the 15km ZoI / 200m screening criteria.

4.3.25. To inform the original 2023 HRA Report, preliminary traffic data was available for some of the roads identified in Table 4-7 based on the emerging Transport Model being prepared for the Local Plan at that time. Although a revised Transport Model, which includes the seven new site allocations, is not yet available, for the purposes of the assessment it has been assumed that those road links identified within the 2023 HRA Report as likely to experience an increase in traffic flows of >1,000 AADT (either due to the Local Plan 'alone' and / or in-combination with other plans and projects) remain valid. They include:

- The A34 relevant to **Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC / River Lambourn SAC**;
- Roads within 200m of the **Thames Basin Heaths SPA** (including A30 / A327 west of Blackwater, A3095 at Sandhurst, A323 at Fleet, A325 at Aldershot, A287 at Hale); and
- The A33, relevant to the River Itchen SAC.

4.3.26. For all other locations, in the absence of detailed traffic data, the following qualitative observations are made:

- Although the following European Sites are located within 15km of the BDBC administrative boundary, they are all located more than 15km from the boundaries of the proposed site allocations themselves: Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA; Woolmer Forest SAC; Thursley, Ash, Pirbright, and Chobham SAC; Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC; Salisbury Plain SPA; and Salisbury Plain SAC. Taking into consideration the findings of the 2024 National Transport

Survey (NTS)[24], which indicates that in 2024 the average distance travelled for all modes of transport was 10.6km and the average distance travelled by car or van (as either a driver or passenger) was 13.7km, it is reasonable to assume that the roads within 200m of these sites would not be expected to experience a significant increase in traffic flows due to the Local Plan update. These sites are screened out from further assessment.

- Furthermore, Woolmer Forest SAC, Shortheath Common SAC, Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC, East Hampshire Hangers SAC, and Wealden Heaths Phase2 SPA are all located to the southeast of borough and those roads within 200m are orientated such that they do not provide key commuting routes directly into or out of BDBC's area. For East Hampshire Hangers SAC, the roads within 200m are only B-Roads / minor roads (no trunk / main roads). They are therefore less likely to be used by traffic originating from the BDBC area. Given the distance and orientation of these sites to BDBC's area, any changes in traffic flows would therefore be expected to fall below the screening criteria (although this will be confirmed at Regulation 19, once appropriate traffic data is available).
- Similarly, the **River Meon Compensatory SAC Habitat** is located approximately 14.5km from the BDBC boundary (as the crow flies) and 22.4km from the nearest site allocation. Whilst the A32 does lie within 200m of the River, its orientation is such that it connects with the A272 and the A31, leading to Winchester in the west and Guildford in the east, and does not present a direct route into BDBC's area. Any on-road journey into BDBC's area is likely to be greater than 15km. As such, this site is **screened out** from further assessment.

4.3.27. With regard to the sensitivity of the sites to air quality changes associated with traffic, as reported in the 2023 HRA, for most aquatic sites (notably, in this case, the **River Lambourn SAC**, **River Itchen SAC** and **Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC**) eutrophication via agricultural run-off and flood water is overwhelmingly more significant than air pollution, and available-N is rarely a limiting factor in these ecosystems, and the Air Pollution Information Service (APIS) does not always provide critical loads for habitats where available-N is not a limiting factor. Consequently, the aquatic habitats and species of these sites are considered to have a low sensitivity to eutrophication from air pollution, and so any changes associated with increased traffic volumes would not significantly affect these sites. Indeed, the SIPs for **Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC / River Lambourn SAC**, do not identify air pollution as a threat or pressure.

4.3.28. It should be noted that, for the **River Itchen SAC**, the supporting habitats for the **Southern damselfly** feature (old water meadow ditch systems) are considered sensitive, but these habitats are not present within 200m of the A roads noted above (based on NE data on the distribution of interest features within the SSSI units). These sites are therefore **screened out** from further assessment.

[24] Available to download from: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-travel-survey-statistics

Table 4-7 - Summary of European Site Issues in Relation to Air Quality

Site	Notes	Screen In?
River Test Compensatory SAC Habitat	The River Dever, Bourne Rivulet, and Middle River Test components of the compensatory SAC are located within the 15km ZoI and within 200m of a main road. Agriculture, especially through the long-term and widespread application of inorganic fertilisers, is considered to be more significant to Compensatory SAC habitat than changes in air quality due to vehicle trips associated with the proposed allocations, and such would not be expected to appreciably alter the nitrogen content of the watercourse.	No
River Meon Compensatory SAC Habitat	Located more 14.5km from BDBC's administrative boundary and at least 22.4km from the nearest allocated site. Any roads within 200m of the site do not offer a direct route into BDBC's area.	No
River Itchen SAC	Eutrophication via agricultural run-off and flood water is overwhelmingly more significant than air pollution, and available-N is rarely a limiting factor in river ecosystems. The aquatic habitats and species of this river are considered to have a low sensitivity to eutrophication or acidification from air pollution, and so any changes associated with increased traffic volumes would not significantly affect this site. For the River Itchen SAC, the supporting habitats for the Southern damselfly feature (old water meadow ditch systems) are considered sensitive, but these habitats are not present within 200m of the A roads noted above (based on NE data on the distribution of interest features within the SSSI units).	No
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	Eutrophication via agricultural run-off and flood water is overwhelmingly more significant than air pollution, and available-N is not thought to be a limiting factor for these floodplain ecosystems. The 'supplementary advice' suggests that the supporting habitat for the feature is sensitive to changes in air quality, although critical loads and levels are not provided for the site habitats and in practice the sensitivity to eutrophication from air pollution is low (any increase or decrease in N-inputs from air would be negligible relative to the inputs from the river and agricultural sources), and so any changes associated with increased traffic volumes would not significantly affect this site.	No
Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
River Lambourn SAC	Eutrophication via agricultural run-off and flood water is overwhelmingly more significant than air pollution, and available-N is rarely a limiting factor in river ecosystems. Consequently, the aquatic habitats and species of this river are considered to have a low sensitivity to eutrophication or acidification from air pollution, and so any changes associated with increased traffic volumes would not significantly affect this site.	No
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Supporting habitats for the qualifying features are considered sensitive; site units within 200m of a road likely subject to an AADT increase of >1000 in combination.	Yes

Site	Notes	Screen In?
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
Shortheath Common SAC	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	The distance and / or connectivity and orientation of the relevant road relative to the BDBC area indicate that BDBC's contribution to any 'in combination' increases in AADT over 1,000 are likely to be negligible.	No
Hartslock Wood SAC	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
Woolmer Forest SAC	The distance and / or connectivity and orientation of the relevant road relative to the BDBC area will ensure that BDBC's contribution to any 'in combination' increases in AADT over 1000 will be negligible in relative and absolute terms.	No
Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA	The distance and / or connectivity and orientation of the relevant road relative to the BDBC area indicate that BDBC's contribution to any 'in combination' increases in AADT over 1,000 are likely to be negligible.	No
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	The distance and / or connectivity and orientation of the relevant road relative to the BDBC area indicate that BDBC's contribution to any 'in combination' increases in AADT over 1,000 are likely to be negligible.	No
Salisbury Plain SPA	The distance and / or connectivity and orientation of the relevant road relative to the BDBC area will ensure that BDBC's contribution to any 'in combination' increases in AADT over 1000 will be negligible in relative and absolute terms.	No
Salisbury Plain SAC	The distance and / or connectivity and orientation of the relevant road relative to the BDBC area will ensure that BDBC's contribution to any 'in combination' increases in AADT over 1000 will be negligible in relative and absolute terms.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
Solent Maritime SAC	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA	Site units not within 15km / 200m of an A-road.	No

4.3.29. For information, current baseline air quality data relevant to the sites expected to be taken forward for further assessment (i.e. the Thames Basin SPA) is provided in Appendix A. The data for the Thames Basin SPA, show that existing NOx and NH3 levels relevant to the broad supporting

habitats (dwarf heath/ scrub and coniferous woodland) are not expected to the exceed the respective Critical Levels but rates of nitrogen deposition are already exceeding both the lower and upper Critical Loads.

WATER RESOURCES

4.3.30. The exploitation and management of water resources is connected to a range of activities, most of which are not directly controlled or influenced by the Local Plan; for example, agriculture, flood defence, recreation, power generation, fisheries and nature conservation. Much of the water supply to water-resource sensitive European sites is managed through specific consenting regimes that are independent of the Local Plan Update.

4.3.31. Development supported or managed by the Updated Spatial Strategy, including site allocations detailed in in the draft updated spatial strategy, is likely to increase demand for water, which could indirectly affect some European sites in the study area. When assessing the potential effects of increased water demand it is important to understand how the public water supply (PWS) system operates and how it is regulated with other water resource consents.

4.3.32. Potable water in the BDBC area is supplied predominantly by South East Water and Southern Water, with small parts within the Thames Water supply area. The broad characteristics of the supply areas that coincide with BDBC are summarised in **Table 4-8**.

Table 4-8 - BDBC Water Resource Zones

Supplier	Water Resource Zone	Supply Summary
Thames Water	Kennet Valley WRZ	Predominantly supplied by groundwater abstractions (60%) with some support from local rivers (notably the River Kennet in Reading). There is minor interconnectivity with both South East Water and Southern Water to the south and east of the zone.
Southern Water	Hampshire Kingsclere WRZ	The northern part of this WRZ is supplied from groundwater, with minor interconnectivity with Thames water.
South East Water	WRZ4 (Bracknell)	The zone is comprised of a mixture of surface water (principally from the River Thames at Bray), groundwater (various boreholes) and bulk transfers (from the River Thames via Affinity Water).

4.3.33. However, the supply network is complex and so direct and specific supply relationships cannot necessarily be made; it is rarely possible or appropriate to identify a particular ‘source’ for water supply to a specific area. Consequently, direct effects on specific European sites as a result of development within the BDBC area cannot necessarily be identified or quantified.

4.3.34. More importantly, the water resources planning process helps to ensure that growth in water demand does not affect European sites. The Water Industry Act 1991, as amended by the Water Act 2003 and Water Act 2014, requires that all water companies must publish a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) that sets out their strategy for managing water resources across their supply areas over the next 25 years and beyond. WRMPs use calculations of Deployable Output (DO) to establish supply/demand balances; this enables water companies to identify those WRZs with potential supply deficits over the planning period[25]. The calculations account for any reductions in abstraction that are required to safeguard European sites[26] and so the WRMP process (with other regulations) helps ensure (as far as is achievable) that future changes in demand will not affect any European sites[27].

4.3.35. The water companies accounted for the growth predicted by BDBC and other LPAs available at the time in forecasting for their current (2024 for South East Water and Thames Water, 2019 for Southern Water) WRMPs. The 2024 adopted and draft WRMPs were subject to HRA, which concluded that they would have no adverse effects on any European sites, including those water-resource sensitive sites and features within the Local Plan Update HRA study area.

4.3.36. However, the most recent adopted and draft WRMPs within the district will not have accounted for the updated growth forecast to meet government housing targets as set out within the draft updated spatial strategy. An updated Water Cycle Study has been completed in 2025 to assess the impact of increased projected growth on water resources within the borough. The findings regarding water supply suggest that updated forecast growth targets is higher than accounted for within the WRMPs for the current period (to 2029). As a result, it is likely that water companies will need to set out how the required growth can be accommodated to avoid adverse effects. The Local Plan can also help manage demand and promote water efficiency measures through its policy controls.

4.3.37. As it is not possible to identify specific effects on specific sites that are directly related to growth supported by the Updated Spatial Strategy (due to the integrated nature of the water network), the screening conclusion is not completed on a site-by-site basis.

[25] Forecasts are completed in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Guidelines (published by the Environment Agency) and take into account (inter alia) economic factors (economic growth, metering, pricing), behavioural factors (patterns of water use), demographic factors (population growth, inward and outward migration, changes in occupancy rate), planning policy (LPA land use plans), company policies (e.g. on leakage control and water efficiency measures) and environmental factors, including climate change. The WRMP therefore accounts for these demand forecasts based on historical trends, an established growth forecast model and through review of local and regional planning documents.

[26] For example, sustainability reductions required by the Review of Consents (RoC) or the Environment Agency's Restoring Sustainable Abstractions (RSA) programme. It should be noted that, under the WRMP process, the RoC changes (and non- changes to licences) are considered to be valid over the planning period. This means that the WRMP (and its underlying assumptions regarding the availability of water and sustainability of existing consents) is compliant with the RoC and so the WRMP can only affect European sites through any new resource and production-side options it advocates to resolves deficits, and not through the existing permissions regime.

[27] Calculations of DO include for Target Headroom (precautionary 'over-capacity' in available water) to buffer any unforeseen variation in predicted future demand; the WRMP is also reviewed on a five-yearly cycle to ensure it is performing as expected and to account for any variations between predicted and actual demand.

Table 4-9 - Summary of European Site Issues in Relation to Water Resources

Site	Notes	Screen In?
River Itchen SAC	The SIP for the River Itchen SAC identifies water abstraction as a pressure. Direct linkages with the Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
River Test Compensatory SAC	There is no SIP for the River Test Compensatory SAC. However, the River Itchen SAC (which Natural England has advised local authorities to treat as a proxy for the compensatory SACs) does identify water abstraction as a pressure. Direct linkages with the Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
River Meon Compensatory SAC	There is no Site Improvement Plan for the River Meon Compensatory SAC. However, the River Itchen SAC (which Natural England has advised local authorities to treat as a proximity for the compensatory SACs) does identify water abstraction as a pressure. Direct linkages with the Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	Water abstraction is not raised a pressure or threat in SIP, although inappropriate water levels and hydrological changes are noted as a pressure and threat respectively. As such, the site / features are considered sensitive to water resource permissions but direct linkages with Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands. Note, abstractions from the Kennet do not comprise a significant component of the water supplied to the BDBC area.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC	Water abstraction is not raised a pressure or threat in the SIP, although inappropriate water levels is noted as a threat. As such, the site / features are considered sensitive to water resource permissions but direct linkages with updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands. Note, abstractions from the Kennet do not comprise a significant component of the water supplied to the BDBC area.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
River Lambourn SAC	Water abstraction is not raised a pressure or threat in SIP, although inappropriate water levels and hydrological changes are noted as a pressure and threat respectively. As such, the site / features are considered sensitive to water resource permissions but direct linkages with Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands. Note, abstractions from the Lambourne do not comprise a significant component of the water supplied to the BDBC area.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Shortheath Common SAC	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Hartslock Wood SAC	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Woolmer Forest SAC	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Salisbury Plain SPA	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Salisbury Plain SAC	Water abstraction is not identified as a pressure or threat in the SIP. Site / features not considered sensitive to water resource permissions.	No
Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Site / features considered sensitive to water resource permissions, with the Solent site improvement plan identifying hydrological changes as a threat and noting that "*Titchfield Haven has a high level of water abstraction licences – if all were used then water levels would be too low*". Direct linkages with Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar	Site / features considered sensitive to water resource permissions, with the Solent site improvement plan identifying hydrological changes as a threat and noting that "*Titchfield Haven has a high level of water abstraction licences – if all were used then water levels would be too low*". Direct linkages with Updated Spatial Strategy cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)

Site	Notes	Screen In?
Solent Maritime SAC	Site / features considered sensitive to water resource permissions, with the Solent site improvement plan identifying hydrological changes as a threat and noting that "*Titchfield Haven has a high level of water abstraction licences – if all were used then water levels would be too low*". Direct linkages with Local Plan Update cannot be identified; consideration of impacts must therefore reflect the context of the WRMP and regional water resource demands.	Yes (taking into account the WRMPs)
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA	No site improvement plan is available, however the features (open water habitats for tern foraging) are located a significant distance from the BDBC boundary.	No

4.3.38. The final conclusions of the updated Water Cycle Study and any updates to the WRMPs will be considered appropriately when available to inform the final plan level HRA appropriate assessments.

WATER QUALITY

4.3.39. Approximately 52% of the BDBC area drains to the River Thames, mainly via watercourses in the River Kennet or River Loddon catchments, with ~40% within the River Test catchment and the remainder (~8%) within the River Itchen catchment. It should be noted the European sites associated with the Thames Estuary (Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar) have not been identified as sites that are in unfavourable condition due to excessive nutrients (such that 'nutrient neutrality' is being deployed or considered as mitigation) in recent NE advice to LPAs[28]). The Test and Itchen both ultimately discharge into Southampton Water and the Solent Catchment. Natural England have identified the Solent nature conservation sites as being in an unfavourable condition due to excessive nitrogen levels. The River Itchen is identified by Natural England as being in an unfavourable condition due to excessive phosphorous levels. Water quality pressures for the River Test SSSI are identified by Natural England as including pollution from water company discharges and agricultural sources).

4.3.40. Most waterbodies and watercourses in the county are affected to some extent by point or diffuse sources of pollutants, notably nitrates and phosphates from agriculture. Point sources are usually discrete discharge points, such as wastewater treatment works (WwTW) outfalls, which are generally managed through specific consenting regimes that are independent of the Local Plan Update. Diffuse pollution is derived from a range of sources (e.g. agricultural run-off; road run-off) that cannot always be easily traced or quantified.

4.3.41. Development promoted or supported by the Local Plan Update, including the additional site allocations considered within the draft updated spatial strategy, is likely to increase demand on wastewater treatment works and potentially increase non-agricultural run-off.

4.3.42. Sewerage and wastewater treatment for the BDBC area is provided by Southern Water and Thames Water. Wastewater from the BDBC area is treated at 17 WwTW located in the Thames and Test catchments; none are located within the Itchen catchment.

[28] Letter from NE to LPA Chief Executives and Heads of Planning, 16 March 2022; Re. Advice for development proposals with the potential to affect water quality resulting in adverse nutrient impacts on habitats sites.

4.3.43. BDBC updated its Water Cycle Study in May 2022 (AECOM 2022), prior to the identification of additional housing targets detailed within the draft updated spatial strategy; this concluded that:

- Twelve of the 17 WwTWs are likely to receive additional wastewater as a result of housing growth within the BDBC area (seven within the Thames catchment and five within the Test catchment).
- Four of the 12 WwTWs do not currently have capacity to treat the predicted additional wastewater flows from BDBC and (where applicable) neighbouring authorities (one within the Thames catchment and three within the Test catchment).

4.3.44. A further updated Water Cycle Study was commissioned in 2025 with a remit to assess the impacts of the increased housing targets within the borough against wastewater infrastructure capacity. This study identifies that 16 of the 22 WwTWs serving BDBC are expected to experience growth during the Local Plan period to 2042. The majority of growth would need to be served by Basingstoke WwTW, which discharges into the River Loddon and, subsequently, the Thames.

4.3.45. Five of the 16 WwTWs expected to experience growth in the 2025 Water Cycle Study discharge into the River Test catchment (Whitchurch, Overton, Oakley, North Waltham and Barton Stacey). Of these, Whitchurch, Overton, North Waltham and Barton Stacey have been assessed with capacity "*likely to be close to or exceed*" permitted flows during the plan period as a result of the predicted growth, with upgrades and/or a change to permit limits likely to be required.

4.3.46. These increased growth targets will only be factored into the next cycle of DWMPs in 2028 at the earliest.

4.3.47. In addition to wastewater discharges, run-off from impermeable surfaces can have considerable effects on waterbodies and watercourses, and is a notable issue in both urban and rural areas. Development has traditionally sought to capture and divert rain and run-off to the nearest watercourse or treatment facility as quickly as possible, and extensive drainage networks have been developed to facilitate this. However, as developed areas have increased so have the total volumes and flow rates of run-off. This has two principal effects: firstly, impermeable surfaces provide very little resistance to the mobilisation and transport of pollutants within run-off; and secondly, flow rates and volumes often exceed the capacity of the receiving drains or watercourses, causing localised flooding or the operation of combined sewer overflows (CSOs) [29]. The effect of run-off from developed areas can be mitigated or reduced by the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and by increasing the area of permeable surfaces (both natural and artificial) within developed areas. These measures offer effective attenuation by reducing the volumes of surface run-off. They also increase the retention of pollutants and, in the case of some SuDS, can allow for treatment of pollutants.

4.3.48. With regard to European sites, the principal water quality concerns relate to the River Itchen SAC and the sites associated with Southampton Water, which have been identified sites where 'nutrient neutrality' is required for developments within the catchments. The associated compensatory SAC sites along the River Test are also likely to be subjected to water quality pressures according to Natural England's advice. However, it should also be recognised that the water quality effects of the

[29] All sewerage pipes have a certain capacity, determined by the size of the pipe and the receiving water treatment works. At times of high rainfall, this capacity can be exceeded, with the risk of uncontrolled bursts. CSOs provide a mechanism to prevent this, by allowing untreated sewerage to mix with surface water run-off when certain volumes are exceeded. This is then discharged to the nearest watercourse.

Local Plan Update are ultimately either controlled by existing consents regimes (which must undergo HRA) or have diffuse 'in combination' effects that are difficult to quantify, and so the HRA process typically aims to ensure that suitable mitigating policy that will minimise the impacts of plan-supported development on water quality generally is provided.

Table 4-10 - Summary of European Site Issues in Relation to Water Quality

Site	Notes	Screen In?
River Itchen SAC	Site / features considered sensitive to eutrophication associated with development pressure, with water pollution noted as a pressure in the site improvement plan. Supplementary advice on the conservation objectives notes that "*the River Itchen suffers from growth of filamentous algae, believed to be caused by excessive levels of phosphates from a variety of sources".* The exposure of the SAC to development in BDBC will be small, with no allocations within the Itchen catchment. The size of the catchment within the BDBC area is largely rural; none of the WwTWs within the BDBC area discharge to this catchment. However, a small number of properties may be served by WwTWs outside the BDBC area that discharge to the Itchen.	Yes
River Test Compensatory SAC	As with River Itchen SAC, the qualifying features (chalk river habitat) are considered sensitive to eutrophication associated with development pressure. The most recent Water Cycle Study completed (2025) identifies that four of the WwTW which service the borough and discharge into the River Test (including the River Test Chalk via ground water, and the River Dever which are constituent parts of the River Test Compensatory Habitat SAC) were expected to exceed their capacity and would be likely to be close to or exceed their permitted flow levels during the plan period because of the increased growth. Increased housing growth as a result of the draft updated spatial strategy is therefore likely to result in further discharges into these WwTW and thereby increase nutrient loads within the River Test Compensatory SAC (albeit there is a requirement for nutrient neutrality (nitrogen) in the Test catchment and some of the Wwtw's will be upgraded to TAL under the LURB by 2030). Additionally, three allocations (SPS5.1 Northern Manydown, SPS5.3 Southern Manydown, and SPS5.8 Popham Garden Village) fall fully or partially within the River Test catchment. As such, development of these sites may contribute to increased run-off pollution to the River Test in the absence of mitigation.	Yes
River Meon Compensatory SAC	As with River Itchen SAC, the qualifying features (chalk river habitat) are considered sensitive to eutrophication associated with development pressure. However, as per the most recent Water Cycle Study (2025), none of the WwTW which service the borough discharge into the River Meon. Similarly, the River Meon is separated from the nearest allocation by a minimum distance of 22km, with the catchment falling entirely outside the borough, and as such is unlikely to experience increased nutrient loading from surface water run-off. Therefore, increased housing growth within the borough will not result in increased nutrient output within the River Meon Compensatory SAC.	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	The site improvement plan lists water pollution as a pressure for the qualifying features, and a threat with regards to Desmoulin's whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana* specifically. The SIP notes in particular that both "*sediment and nutrient input are of concern"* and that ongoing "*pollution results also results from overflowing sewers…with ongoing/recurring incidents at numerous locations on the River Lambourn*". The SAC is not exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan as all site units are hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area (confluence of River Enbourne with the Kennet is downstream of this site).	No
Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat in the site improvement plan, although supplementary advice on the conservation objectives of the SAC includes a target to maintain water quality and quantity to a standard which provides the necessary conditions of the target feature, and notes that "*poor water quality and inadequate quantities of water can adversely affect the structure and function of this habitat type".* The SAC will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan as all site units are hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area (confluence of River Enbourne with the Kennet is downstream of this site).	No
River Lambourn SAC	The site improvement plan lists water pollution as a pressure for the qualifying features, and a threat with regards to Desmoulin's whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana* specifically. The SIP notes in particular that both "*sediment and nutrient input are of concern"* and that ongoing "*pollution results also results from overflowing sewers…with ongoing/recurring incidents at numerous locations on the River Lambourn*". BDBC falls outside of the River Lambourn catchment, with all SAC site units hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area (confluence of River Enbourne with the Kennet is downstream of this site) and as such impacts of run-off are not anticipated. The 2022 and 2025 Water Cycle Study work did not identify any of the housing allocations as being treated by WwTW discharging into the River Lambourn.	No
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the SIP. The SPA will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the SIP. The SAC will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Shortheath Common SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SAC will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SPA will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Hartslock Wood SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SAC will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Woolmer Forest SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SAC will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SPA will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SPA will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Salisbury Plain SPA	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SPA will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
Salisbury Plain SAC	Water quality is not listed as a pressure or a threat within the site improvement plan. The SAC will not be exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Water pollution is listed a threat in the site improvement plan, and the site is a downstream receptor for which 'nutrient neutrality' has been advocated by NE. Potential increases in wastewater discharge and surface water run-off resulting from increased growth identified for the River Itchen SAC and River Test Compensatory SAC may therefore impact water quality downstream in the Solent.	Yes
The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar	Water pollution is listed a threat in the site improvement plan, and the site is a downstream receptor for which 'nutrient neutrality' has been advocated by NE. Potential increases in wastewater discharge and surface water run-off resulting from increased growth identified for the River Itchen SAC and River Test Compensatory SAC may therefore impact water quality downstream in the Solent.	Yes
Solent Maritime SAC	Water pollution is listed a threat in the site improvement plan, and the site is a downstream receptor for which 'nutrient neutrality' has been advocated by NE. Potential increases in wastewater discharge and surface water run-off resulting from increased growth identified for the River Itchen SAC and River Test Compensatory SAC may therefore impact water quality downstream in the Solent.	Yes

Site	Notes	Screen In?
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA	Water pollution is listed a threat in the site improvement plan, and the site is a downstream receptor for which 'nutrient neutrality' has been advocated by NE. Potential increases in wastewater discharge and surface water run-off resulting from increased growth identified for the River Itchen SAC and River Test Compensatory SAC may therefore impact water quality downstream in the Solent.	Yes

FLOODING / WATER LEVEL MANAGEMENT

4.3.49. The implementation of the European Floods Directive (Directive 2007/60/EC) in England and Wales is being co-ordinated with the Water Framework Directive. Catchment Flood Management Plans (prepared by the EA), Shoreline Management Plans (prepared by coastal local authorities and the EA), River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plans (prepared by the EA) and Local Flood Risk Management Strategies set out long term policies for flood risk management. The delivery of the policies from these long-term plans will help to achieve the objectives of these plans and the RBMPs.

4.3.50. Development supported by the Local Plan Update is unlikely to significantly alter regional flood risk levels, but may exacerbate the effects of local flooding. Run-off from impermeable surfaces can have considerable effects on waterbodies and watercourses, meaning that flow rates and volumes often exceed the capacity of the receiving drains or watercourses. This can lead to local water quality impacts on European sites. The effect of run-off from developed areas can be mitigated or reduced by the use of SuDS and by increasing the area of permeable surfaces (both natural and artificial) within developed areas. However, no European sites are considered to be exposed to potential changes in flood risk that may result from the Local Plan Update.

EFFECTS ON FUNCTIONAL HABITATS OR SPECIES AWAY FROM EUROPEAN SITES

4.3.51. The provisions of the Habitats Regulations ensure that 'direct' (encroachment) effects on European sites as a result of land use change (i.e. the partial or complete destruction of a European site) are extremely unlikely under normal circumstances, and this will not occur as a result of the Local Plan Update. However, many European interest features (particularly more mobile animal species) may use or be reliant on non-designated habitats outside of a European site during their life-cycle. Developments some distance from a European site can therefore have an effect on the site if its population of interest features is reliant on the habitats being affected by a development and sufficient numbers are exposed to the environmental changes. All of the above aspects (recreation, water resources, etc.) can therefore also affect European site integrity indirectly through effects on functional habitats outside of the designated site boundary.

4.3.52. With regard to the European sites within the study area, this is only a potential issue for the **River Itchen SAC**, **River Test Compensatory SAC** and the **Meon Compensatory SAC** which support species that may utilise habitats outside the boundaries of the European sites. However, the effects of this can be addressed through the water quality assessments for these SACs (i.e. if the plan has no adverse effects on water quality, then no other pathways are likely to be realised).

Table 4-11 - Summary of Issues in Relation to Effects on Functional Habitats or Species Away from European Sites

Site	Notes	Screen In?
River Itchen SAC	The qualifying features of the SAC comprise populations of mobile species including brook lamprey, Atlantic salmon, bullhead, southern damselfly, white-clawed crayfish and otter. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives includes targets for these qualifying features which state that "*Habitats beyond the site boundary upon which characteristic biological communities of the site depend should be maintained in a state that does not impact the full expression of the characteristic biota of the site.*" There is specific reference to headwater areas and tributaries of the River Itchen outside of the SAC boundary upon which the qualifying features are dependent on for their lifecycle. Development which therefore impacts connected but non-designated sections of the River Itchen (for example through direct loss of river habitat, or indirect impacts of water quality pollution from excessive nutrient loading or run-off) must be considered. None of the site allocations fall directly within the catchment of the River Itchen, and no WwTW within the borough discharge directly into the Itchen catchment. However, there is the small potential for indirect water quality impacts to functionally linked land (considered to be headwaters and tributaries of the River Itchen) resulting from a small number of properties within the borough serviced by WwTW outside of the borough which discharge into Itchen.	Yes (to be assessed as part of water quality impact pathways).
River Test Compensatory SAC	The qualifying features of the SAC comprise watercourse habitats and populations of mobile species including southern damselfly. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives for the River Itchen SAC (assumed in the absence of further guidance from NE to apply for the River Test Compensatory SAC) includes targets for these qualifying features which state	Yes (to be assessed as part of water quality impact pathways).

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	that "*Habitats beyond the site boundary upon which characteristic biological communities of the site depend should be maintained in a state that does not impact the full expression of the characteristic biota of the site.*" The qualifying features of the River Test Compensatory SAC are also dependent on non-designated stretches of the headwaters and tributaries of the river. Development which therefore impacts connected but non-designated sections of the River Test (for example through direct loss of river habitat, or indirect impacts of water quality pollution from excessive nutrient loading or run-off) must be considered. Four of the WwTWs which service the borough and discharge into the River Test (including the River Test Chalk via ground water, and the River Dever which are constituent parts of the River Test Compensatory Habitat SAC) are expected to exceed their capacity and would be likely to be close to or exceed their permitted flow levels during the plan period because of the increased growth. Increased housing growth as a result of the draft updated spatial strategy is therefore likely to result in further discharges into these WwTW and thereby increase nutrient loads within the non-designated areas of the River Test outside of the Compensatory SAC. Additionally, three allocations (SPS5.1 Northern Manydown, SPS5.3 Southern Manydown, and SPS5.8 Popham Garden Village) fall fully or partially within the River Test catchment. As such, development of these sites may contribute to increased run-off pollution to the non-designated areas of River Test in the absence of mitigation.	
River Meon Compensatory SAC	The qualifying features of the SAC comprise watercourse habitats and populations of Atlantic salmon. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives for the River Itchen SAC (assumed in the absence of further guidance from NE to apply for the River Meon Compensatory SAC) includes targets for	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	these qualifying features which state that "*Habitats beyond the site boundary upon which characteristic biological communities of the site depend should be maintained in a state that does not impact the full expression of the characteristic biota of the site.*" There is specific reference to headwater areas and tributaries of the River Itchen outside of the SAC boundary upon which the qualifying features are dependent on for their lifecycle. Development which therefore impacts connected but non-designated sections of the River Meon (for example through direct loss of river habitat, or indirect impacts of water quality pollution from excessive nutrient loading or run-off). None of the WwTW which service the borough discharge into the River Meon. Similarly, the River Meon is separated from the nearest allocation by a minimum distance of 22km, with the catchment falling entirely outside the borough, and as such is unlikely to experience increased nutrient loading from surface water run-off. Therefore, increased housing growth within the borough will affect non-designated supporting habitat associated within the River Meon Compensatory SAC.	
Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC	The qualifying feature of the site, Desmoulin's whorl snail, is largely restricted to calcareous wetlands, usually bordering lakes or rivers, or in fens, as set out in the supplementary advice on conservation objectives. In particular, this advice also notes that "*Desmoulin's whorl snail is widely distributed along the valleys of both the River Kennet between just downstream of Malborough and to the east of Newbury, and on the River Lambourn between Welford and Newbury*". The supplementary advice does not refer specifically to supporting habitat outside of the SAC boundary. The majority of allocated sites brought forward comprise agricultural land or otherwise urban areas with no suitability to support Desmoulin's whorl snail outside of the SAC boundary. SPS5.4 Land at Whitmarsh Lane supports wet meadow habitat	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	associated with the River Loddon, which is not hydrologically linked with the River Kennet or Lambourn. The SAC is not exposed to water quality changes associated with the plan as all site units are hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area (confluence of River Enbourne with the Kennet is downstream of this site).	
Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC	The qualifying feature of the site is alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior*. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives includes a target to "*maintain the overall extent and function of any supporting features within the local landscape which provide a critical functional connection with the site."* In particular the supplementary advice notes that "*these connections may take the form of landscape features such as habitat patches, hedges, river banks and watercourses outside of the designated site boundary which are important for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange with those typical species closely associated with the alder woodland feature".* As such, there is the potential that development within BDBC which impacts on suitable connecting habitat could adversely impact the SAC. The SAC is situated 3.4km from the nearest site allocation (SPS5.14 – Oakley Farm, Wash Water which borders the River Enbourne downstream of the SAC) and is otherwise a minimum distance of 16km away from all other site allocations. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that development within BDBC will significantly impact on important connecting habitats within the wider landscape of the SAC.	No
River Lambourn SAC	The qualifying features of the SAC comprise watercourse habitats and populations of brook lamprey and bullhead. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives includes targets for these qualifying features which state that "*Habitats*	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	beyond the site boundary upon which characteristic biological communities of the site depend should be maintained in a state that does not impact the full expression of the characteristic biota of the site." There is specific reference to associated river corridor habitats and tributaries outside of the SAC boundary upon which the qualifying features are dependent on for their lifecycle, including terrestrial floodplain habitats. Development could therefore impact connected but non-designated sections of the River Lambourn (for example through direct loss of river habitat, or indirect impacts of water quality pollution from excessive nutrient loading or run-off). BDBC falls outside of the River Lambourn catchment, with all SAC site units hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area (confluence of River Enbourne with the Kennet is downstream of this site) and as such impacts of run-off are not anticipated. The 2022 and 2025 Water Cycle Study work did not identify any of the housing allocations as being treated by WwTW discharging into the River Lambourn. Therefore, the supporting habitats of the River Lambourne (considered to be riparian and floodplain habitats within the wider catchment) will not be affected by the local plan update.	
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	The site is designated for breeding populations of woodlark, nightjar and Dartford warbler which are strongly associated with heathland habitats, and therefore functional habitats outside of the designated site boundary will comprise those heathland areas which will also support the qualifying species during their breeding cycle, as well as areas of grassland and arable land for foraging. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives notes that "*nightjars are known to forage several kilometres away from their nesting territory"* and that "*woodlark often utilise land adjacent to heathland which is outside the SPA boundary for feeding…Woodlark will also utilise open areas, wide rides*	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	and fire breaks in plantations as well as bare areas in quarry sites". Given that the distance of the nearest allocated site from the Thames Basin Heaths is over 7km, and that the allocated sites and the land within the wider locale of these lacks the heathland and plantation woodland characteristics present within the SPA, it is considered unlikely that allocated land assessed within this updated draft spatial strategy will comprise functionally linked land for the qualifying features.	
East Hampshire Hangers SAC	The SAC is designated for qualifying woodland and grassland habitats. Supplementary advice on the conservation objectives includes a target for grassland to "*maintain the extent, quality and spatial configuration of land or habitat surrounding or adjacent to the site which is known to support the feature".* The supplementary advice goes on to say that "*additional areas of calcareous grassland and calcareous scrub occur nearby outside of the SAC boundary".* Further reference to habitats adjacent to the SAC are also raised with regards to woodland habitats. Given that that the SAC is c. 7km from the BDBC boundary (and further still from the nearest allocation), it is considered unlikely that development within the borough will impact upon identified supporting habitat in the vicinity of the SAC.	No
Shortheath Common SAC	The SAC is designated for qualifying dry heath, bog and bog woodland habitats. Supplementary advice on the conservation objectives includes a target for heathland and bog woodland to "*maintain the extent, quality and function of any supporting features within the local landscape which provide a critical functional connection within the site".* Given that that the SAC is c. 9.5km from the BDBC boundary (and further still from the nearest allocation), it is considered	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	unlikely that development within the borough will impact upon suitable supporting habitat in the vicinity of the SAC.	
Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA	The SPA is designated for breeding populations of woodlark, nightjar and Dartford warbler which are strongly associated with heathland habitats, and therefore functional habitats outside of the designated site boundary will comprise those heathland areas which will also support the qualifying species during their breeding cycle, as well as areas of grassland and arable land for foraging. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives notes that "*nightjars are known to forage several kilometres away from their nesting territory".* Given that the distance of the nearest allocated site from the SPA is over 17km, and that the allocated and the land within the wider locale of these lacks the heathland characteristics present within the SPA, it is considered unlikely that allocated land assessed within this updated draft spatial strategy will comprise functionally linked land for the qualifying features.	No
Hartslock Wood SAC	The SAC is designated for qualifying woodland and grassland habitats. Supplementary advice on the conservation objectives includes a target for grassland to "*maintain and, where necessary, restore the extent, quality and spatial configuration of land or habitat surrounding or adjacent to the site which is known to support the feature including the neighbouring SSSI unit 4 which is not included in the SAC designation"*. There is a separate target for the woodland feature to "*maintain the overall extent, quality and function of any supporting features within the local landscape which provide a critical functional connection with the site".* Given that that the SAC is c. 12km from the BDBC boundary (and further still from the nearest allocation), it is considered	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	unlikely that development within the borough will impact upon identified supporting habitat in the vicinity of the SAC.	
Woolmer Forest SAC	The SAC is designated for qualifying waterbody, bog and heathland habitats. Supplementary advice on the conservation objectives includes targets for the heathland and habitats to "*maintain the overall extent, quality and function of any supporting features within the local landscape which provide a critical functional connection with the site".* There is also a similar target for the designated bog habitats relating to "*habitats surrounding or adjacent to the site which is known to support the H7140 feature".* Given that that the SAC is c. 13km from the BDBC boundary (and further still from the nearest allocation), it is considered unlikely that development within the borough will impact upon identified supporting habitat in the vicinity of the SAC.	No
Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA	The site is designated for breeding populations of woodlark, nightjar and Dartford warbler which are strongly associated with heathland habitats, and therefore functional habitats outside of the designated site boundary will comprise those heathland areas which will also support the qualifying species during their breeding cycle, as well as areas of grassland and arable land for foraging. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives notes that "*nightjars are known to forage several kilometres away from their nesting territory"* and that "*woodlark often utilise land adjacent to heathland which is outside the SPA boundary for feeding…Woodlark will also utilise open areas, wide rides and fire breaks in plantations as well as bare areas in quarry sites".* Given that the distance of the nearest allocated site from the Thames Basin Heaths is over 7km, and that the allocated and the land within the wider locale of these lacks the heathland	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	characteristics present within the SPA, it is considered unlikely that allocated land assessed within this updated draft spatial strategy will comprise functionally linked land for the qualifying features.	
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	The qualifying features of the site are dry heaths, depressions on peat substrates, and wet heaths. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives includes a target to "*maintain the overall extent and function of any supporting features within the local landscape which provide a critical functional connection with the site."* In particular the supplementary advice notes that "*these connections may take the form of landscape features such as habitat patches, hedges, river banks and watercourses outside of the designated site boundary which are important for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange with those typical species closely associated with the alder woodland feature".* As such, there is the potential that development within BDBC which impacts on suitable connecting habitat could adversely impact the SAC. The SAC is situated a minimum distance of 20km from the nearest site allocation, and therefore it is considered unlikely that development within BDBC will significantly impact on important connecting habitats within the wider landscape of the SAC.	No
Salisbury Plain SPA	The SAC is designated for its non-breeding populations of hen harrier *Circus cyaneus* and breeding populations of stone curlew *Burhinus oedicnemus* and quail *Coturnix coturnix*. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives includes targets to "*maintain the extent, distribution and availability"* of the relevant suitable breeding and non-breeding supporting habitat both within and outside the SPA extent. The SPA is situated c. 14.6km from the BDBC boundary, but is over 24km from the nearest allocated site. Therefore, the	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
	supporting habitat for the qualifying features of SAC will not be exposed to impacts as a result of the local plan.	
Salisbury Plain SAC	The SAC is designated for its qualifying grassland habitats, and populations of Marsh fritillary butterfly *Euphydryas (Euodrya, Hypodryas) aurinia*. The supplementary advice on conservation objectives includes a target to "*maintain the connectivity of the marsh fritillary SAC population to its associated meta-populations (either within or outside of the SAC).*" The advice also notes that dispersal for marsh fritillary can be up to 15-20km away. The SAC is situated c. 14.6km from the BDBC boundary, but is over 24km from the nearest allocated site. Therefore, the supporting habitat of the SAC will not be exposed to impacts as a result of the local plan.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water SPA	The SPA is designated for its populations of breeding and non-breeding waterbirds which are strongly linked to coastal habitats and nearby grassland/arable land for their feeding, foraging and roosting. The SPA is situated a significant distance (>35km) from the nearest site allocations, and it is not anticipated that arable land within the borough would form a core part of supporting habitat for these populations at this distance.	No
The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar	The Ramsar is in part designated for its populations of breeding and non-breeding population of waterbirds which are strongly linked to coastal habitats and nearby grassland/arable land for their feeding, foraging and roosting. The Ramsar is situated a significant distance (>35km) from the nearest site allocations and it is not anticipated that arable land within the borough would form a core part of supporting habitat for these populations at this distance.	No

Site	Notes	Screen In?
Solent Maritime SAC	The SAC is designated for its coastal habitats and populations of Desmoulin's whorl snail. Given the significant distances between the SAC and the nearest allocations (>35km) is not expected that the Local Plan will impact core supporting habitats for the qualifying features.	No
Solent and Dorset Coast SPA	The SPA is designated for its populations of terns which are strongly linked to coastal and open water habitats. The SPA is situated a significant distance (>35km) from the nearest site allocations, and the borough lacks the suitable habitat present to support the qualifying features.	No

4.4 SCREENING SUMMARY

4.4.1. It is anticipated (based on the available data and the plan as currently conceived) that a formal screening would conclude that there will be either no effects or no significant effects alone or in combination on the interest features of the following sites:

- East Hampshire Hangers SAC
- Shortheath Common SAC
- Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA
- Hartslock Wood SAC
- Woolmer Forest SAC
- Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA
- Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC
- Salisbury Plain SPA
- Salisbury Plain SAC

4.4.2. The interest features of the following European sites may be exposed and sensitive to effects from the Local Plan Update alone or 'in combination' with other plans and projects:

- River Itchen SAC (water resources, water quality and nutrient neutrality);
- River Test Compensatory SAC (water resources, water quality and nutrient neutrality);
- River Meon Compensatory SAC (water resources)
- Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC (water resources)
- Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC (water resources)
- River Lambourn SAC (water resources)
- Solent and Southampton Water SPA (water resources, water quality and nutrient neutrality);
- Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar (water resources, water quality and nutrient neutrality);
- Solent Maritime SAC (water resources, water quality and nutrient neutrality);
- Solent and Dorset Coast SPA (water resources, water quality and nutrient neutrality);
- Thames Basin Heaths SPA (visitor pressure and air quality).

4.4.3. Although future actions will depend on the outcome of various ongoing studies, as things stand these potential impacts will require appropriate assessment in the HRA that will accompany the publication of the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

4.4.4. A high-level discussion of the findings of the updated draft spatial strategy screening assessment for each of the identified impact pathways, in the context of the findings from the 2023 HRA is presented below in Section 5.

5 SCREENING ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION

5.1 VISITOR PRESSURE

5.1.1. Screening within the 2023 HRA identified that the interest features of **Thames Basin Heaths SPA** may be vulnerable (i.e. exposed and sensitive) to environmental changes associated with the implementation of the Local Plan resulting from increased **visitor pressure** affecting the SPA itself, from both individual allocations / specific policies as well as the overall quantum of development leading to 'in-combination' effects.

5.1.2. The appropriate assessment within the 2023 HRA for visitor pressure at this site reviewed the proposed mitigation included within the draft Local Plan, namely Policy EN3 which set out mitigation in line with the Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Framework, including the provision of, or financial contributions, towards suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) and contributions towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) payments. Natural England provided the following comment on Policy EN3 as part of the Regulation 18 consultation: "*We would note that Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council are not currently signatories under the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board and therefore cannot deliver mitigation strictly in line with the Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Framework, specifically the Council cannot accept Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) contributions*".

5.1.3. The updated screening assessment presented within this report only assesses the updated spatial strategy for the Local Plan. This screening assessment included consideration of two new European sites (the River Test Compensatory SAC and the River Meon Compensatory SAC), but no additional European sites have been screened in for recreational pressure effects, largely due to distance of these sites from the proposed allocations, and limited public access to these sites.

5.1.4. Prior to the Regulation 19 Local Plan, it is recommended that the Council work with Natural England to devise a suitable framework for mitigation at a plan level to ensure that new development within the borough will not lead to adverse effects on the site integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA through recreational pressures. Without the agreement of an effective framework, the Council may not be able to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Any updates to the relevant policies to facilitate this will be assessed through appropriate assessment during the Regulation 19 stage.

5.2 ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION

5.2.1. Screening within the 2023 HRA identified that the interest features of **Thames Basin Heaths SPA** may be vulnerable (i.e. exposed and sensitive) to environmental changes associated with the implementation of the Local Plan resulting from increased **air pollution** affecting the SPA itself, from both individual allocations / specific policies as well as the overall quantum of development leading to 'in-combination' effects.

5.2.2. The appropriate assessment within the 2023 HRA for air quality at this site reviewed traffic modelling data presented within neighbouring borough local plans, and proposed mitigation included within the draft Local Plan, namely Policies CLC1, SPS3, COM2 and ENV14. However, as at the time of writing no bespoke traffic and air quality modelling for the roads adjacent to the SPA had been undertaken for the Local Plan Update, conclusions on the impacts of the Local Plan Update with regards to air quality could not be made within the 2023 HRA.

5.2.3. The updated screening assessment presented within this report only assesses the Updated Spatial Strategy for the Local Plan. This screening assessment included consideration of two new European sites (the River Test Compensatory SAC and the River Meon Compensatory SAC). However, no additional European sites have been screened in for air quality effects, based on application of the 15km ZoI and/or the 200m distance criteria.

5.2.4. It remains the case that bespoke traffic modelling will be completed for the Local Plan update but is not yet available. This modelling will incorporate the changes within the updated spatial strategy and the additional allocated sites. Once the transport modelling is complete and suitable traffic data is available for the local road network (within the 15km ZoI), this will be formally screened against the 1,000 AADT criteria, for both the 'alone' and 'in-combination' scenarios, to determine the affected road network and to confirm the findings of this initial screening assessment (i.e. that those sites screened out in Table 4-8 on a traffic-related basis are correct. Those sites scoped out by distance or non-traffic related reasons will not be reassessed). At this time, it is anticipated only the Thames Basin SPA will be taken forward for further assessment. This will involve the use of a suitable detailed dispersion model (such as ADMS-Roads) and appropriate meteorological data to assess the impact of road traffic on pollutant levels (including annual mean NOx and ammonia concentrations, as appropriate, and on N deposition levels). The results of this bespoke air quality modelling will be considered as part of an appropriate assessment for the Regulation 19 Local Plan, in addition to the development policies within the Local Plan, to determine if adverse effects of the Local Plan both alone and in-combination can be suitably mitigated at a plan level.

5.3 WATER RESOURCES AND WATER QUALITY

5.3.1. Screening within the 2023 HRA identified that the interest features of **The River Itchen SAC** and the Southampton Water sites (**Solent and Southampton Water SPA, Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar, Solent Maritime SAC** and **Solent and Dorset Coast SPA**) may be vulnerable (i.e. exposed and sensitive) to environmental changes associated with the implementation of the Local Plan in relation to water quality, specifically with regard to the need for nutrient neutrality.

5.3.2. The appropriate assessment for water quality within the 2023 HRA reviewed the nutrient budget calculated for the borough (accurate to the predicted housing growth at the time of the assessment) as well as the policies within the Local Plan designed to prevent or moderate impacts on receptors due to changes in water quality, including Policies ENV4, ENV9, and relevant wording associated with allocations SPS5.5 (Popham Garden Village) and SPS5.10 (Overton Mill). It was concluded that the incorporated mitigation was appropriate for effects which could not be precisely determined at plan level.

5.3.3. Natural England provided the following comment as part of the Regulation 18 consultation regarding Policy ENV4: "*It is welcomed that the draft local plan includes policy ENV4 (Nutrient Neutrality) which requires new development resulting in a net increase in population in the relevant catchments to demonstrate nutrient neutrality. Natural England strongly recommends that the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council HRA includes a nutrient management plan or similar strategy to offset the delivery of increased nutrients from local plan development and to achieve nutrient neutrality. We recommend that the plan demonstrates that mitigation can be provided to offset development within the local plan, particularly within the first five year period.*"

5.3.4. Since the 2023 HRA, the River Test Compensatory SAC and River Meon Compensatory SAC areas have been put forward by Natural England for local authorities to consider as part of their functions

owing to the potential for a drought order to be enacted on the River Itchen SAC. As a result, the River Test Compensatory SAC has been screened in within this assessment for water quality effects associated within the spatial strategy allocations (including increased wastewater discharges and surface water run-off).

5.3.5. Natural England have recently (September 2025) issued updated condition assessments for the River Itchen SSSI and the River Test SSSI which indicate that phosphate levels are currently at levels likely to cause impacts on the river ecology and therefore that nutrient levels remain a pressure to these sites. Resolving these issues will require a coordinated approach (beyond the level of a single local plan), but mitigation provided within the borough can contribute to a solution.

5.3.6. The nutrient load calculations have been revised to reflect the proposed local plan allocations and build out trajectory. The calculations were based on:

- Published WWTW permit limits before and following upgrade to Technically Achievable Limits by 1 April 2030 (mg/TN/litre & mg/TP/litre) taken from the Itchen and Solent nutrient budget calculators;
- An average occupancy of 2.4 residents per dwelling (the standard Natural England value); and
- An assumed water usage of 120 litres/person/day.

5.3.7. As it is not possible at plan level to quantify the nutrient loads associated with land use change, the calculations exclude this component. However, this is typically a relatively small proportion of the overall load, which is primarily driven by the foul flow load treated through wastewater treatment works.

5.3.8. The calculations take account of the total net gain in dwellings detailed in **Table 5-1.**

Table 5-1 - Total Net Gain Dwellings Used in Calculations

ADDRESS	NET GAIN DWELLINGS
ALLOCATIONS	
SPS5.8 Popham	1800
SPS6 requirement – Overton	410
SPS6 requirement – Whitchurch	185
SPS6 requirement – Oakley	0
SPS6 requirement - North Waltham	10
SPS6 requirement - Dummer (North Waltham WWTW)	10
SPS6 requirement - Preston Candover (Itchen)	20
SPS6 requirement - St Mary Bourne (Barton Stacey WWTW)	25
EXISTING NP ALLOCATIONS	
Sainfoin Lane, Oakley	32

ADDRESS	NET GAIN DWELLINGS
Northwest of Overton Primary School	11
East of Court Drove, Overton	13
Dances Lane, Whitchurch	15
57 Winchester Road /Whitchurch Car Centre	10
WINDFALL (estimated allowance)	
Windfall (Barton Stacey WWTW)	57
Windfall (North Waltham WWTW)	30
Windfall (Oakley WWTW)	74
Windfall (Overton WWTW)	29
Windfall (Whitchurch WWTW)	69
Windfall (Itchen)	68

5.3.9. The phasing of the net gains is provided in **Table 5-4** and **Table 5-5**. The windfall in the Itchen catchment is calculated based on 4 dwellings per year. All other windfall values are based on the totals for the whole of the plan period, pro-rated across the plan period, derived from historic trends.

5.3.10. While Popham has been included in the table above, the developer is proposing to deliver nutrient neutrality through on-site measures and so the nutrient load from this site has been excluded from consideration.

5.3.11. Two alternative nutrient load calculations have been provided for Preston Candover (which is in the Itchen catchment), as it is currently unclear what type of foul flow treatment system the proposed dwellings will discharge to. Values have therefore been provided for the 'default STP' (septic tank) option in the budget calculator (which is conservative) and for discharge to a PTP (package treatment plant), which have a better nutrient removal performance. The STP values are reported below as they are the most conservative.

5.3.12. The Solent wastewater treatment works nitrogen discharge consent limits / concentrations are detailed

5.3.13. **Table** 5-2, together with the resulting nitrogen loads per dwelling[30].

[30] Natural England's calculation method permits the deduction of an 'acceptable loading' of 2.00mgTN/l from these values if potable water supplied to the developments is abstracted from the Solent catchment. To provide a conservative assessment, the acceptable loading has not been deducted.

Table 5-2 - Solent Wastewater Treatment Works Nitrogen Discharge Consent Limits/Concentrations and Resulting Nitrogen Loads

	Discharge Consent Limit / Concentration (mg/l)		Nitrogen Load (kg/yr/dwelling)	
	TN Pre-2030	**TN Post-2030**	**TN Pre-2030**	**TN Post-2030**
Barton Stacey	27	10	2.84	0.95
North Waltham	20	20	1.89	1.89
Oakley	35	10	3.31	0.95
Overton	27	10	2.84	0.95
Whitchurch	32	10	3.03	0.95

5.3.14. The septic tank and package treatment plant nutrient discharge consent concentrations (for Preston Candover in the Itchen catchment) are detailed in **Table 5-3**, together with the resulting nutrient loads per dwelling.

Table 5-3 - Septic Tank and Package Treatment Plant Nutrient Discharge Consent Concentrations (Preston Candover) and Resulting Nutrient Loads

	Discharge Concentration (mg/l)		Nutrient Load (kg/yr/dwelling)	
	TN	**TP**	**TN**	**TP**
PTP	73	10	7.67	1.02
STP	96	12	10.13	1.22

5.3.15. The total nutrient loads have been calculated by multiplying the number of dwellings in each year by the per-dwelling nutrient load. The phosphorus and nitrogen loads in the Itchen catchment are estimated in **Table 5-4**, while the nitrogen load in the Solent catchment (only) is estimated in **Table 5-5**. As the Itchen catchment discharges to the Solent, the combined nitrogen load received by the Solent consists of the loads calculated for both the Solent and Itchen catchments – these are estimated in **Table 5-6.**

Table 5-4 - Total Nitrogen and Phosphorus Loads – Itchen Catchment (note STP and PTP values are alternatives and not additive)

ADDRESS	NETGAIN DWELLINGS	2024/ 25	2025/ 26	2026/ 27	2027/ 28	2028/ 29	2029/ 30	2030/ 31	2031/ 32	2032/ 33	2033/ 34	2034/ 35	2035/ 36	2036/ 37	2037/ 38	2038/ 39	2039/ 40	2040/ 41	2041/ 42	Total
ITCHEN CATCHMENT																				
SPS6 requirement - Preston Candover (STP or PTP)	20									5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00							20.00
PTP - Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)										38.34	38.34	38.34	38.34							153.37
STP - Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)										50.65	50.65	50.65	50.65							202.60
PTP - Credit Demand (Kg/TP/Yr)										5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10							20.41
STP - Credit Demand (Kg/TP/Yr)										6.10	6.10	6.10	6.10							24.40
Windfall (Itchen)	68		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	68.00
PTP - Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)			30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	30.67	521.46
STP - Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)			40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	688.84
PTP - Credit Demand (Kg/TP/Yr)			4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	4.08	69.38
STP - Credit Demand (Kg/TP/Yr)			4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	82.98
CONSERVATIVE TOTAL CREDIT DEMAND - ITCHEN CATCHMENT (Kg/TN/Yr)			40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	91.17	91.17	91.17	91.17	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	40.52	891.44
CONSERVATIVE TOTAL CREDIT DEMAND - ITCHEN CATCHMENT (Kg/TP/Yr)			4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	10.98	10.98	10.98	10.98	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	107.38

Table 5-5 - Total Nitrogen Loads – Solent Catchment

ADDRESS	NETGAIN DWELLINGS	2024/ 25	2025/ 26	2026/ 27	2027/ 28	2028/ 29	2029/ 30	2030/ 31	2031/ 32	2032/ 33	2033/ 34	2034/ 35	2035/ 36	2036/ 37	2037/ 38	2038/ 39	2039/ 40	2040/ 41	2041/ 42	Total
SOLENT CATCHMENT																				
ALLOCATIONS																				
SPS5.8 Popham	1800									80	120	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	1800.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)		Nutrient neutrality delivered on-site																		
SPS6 requirement - Overton	410					40.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	10.00							410.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)						113.61	170.41	56.80	56.80	56.80	56.80	56.80	9.47							577.50
SPS6 requirement - Whitchurch	185					20.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	15.00										185.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)						56.80	142.01	47.34	47.34	14.20										307.69
SPS6 requirement - Oakley	0																			0.00

ADDRESS	NETGAIN DWELLINGS	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37	2037/38	2038/39	2039/40	2040/41	2041/42	Total
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)																				0.00
SPS6 requirement - North Waltham	10									5.00	5.00									10.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)										9.47	9.47									18.93
SPS6 requirement - Dummer (North Waltham)	10									5.00	5.00									10.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)										9.47	9.47									18.93
SPS6 requirement - St Mary Bourne (Barton Stacey)	25									5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00						25.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)										4.73	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.73						23.67
EXISTING NP ALLOCATIONS																				
Sainfoin Lane, Oakley	32				10.00	22.00														32.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)					33.14	72.90														106.03
North West of Overton Primary School	11							11.00												11.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)								10.41												10.41
East of Court Drove, Overton	13				8.00										5.0					13.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)					22.72										4.7					27.46
Dances Lane, Whitchurch	15						15.00								5.0	5.0	5.0			30.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)							42.60								4.7	4.7	4.7			56.80
57 Winchester Road /Whitchurch Car Centre	10									10.00										10.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)										9.47										9.47
WINDFALL																				
Windfall (Barton Stacey)	57	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	3.35	57.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)		9.52	9.52	9.52	9.52	9.52	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.17	85.71
Windfall (North Waltham)	30	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	30.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)		3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	3.34	56.80
Windfall (Oakley)	74	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.35	74.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)		14.42	14.42	14.42	14.42	14.42	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12	121.57
Windfall (Overton)	29	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	29.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)		4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	43.61
Windfall (Whitchurch)	69	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	69.00
Credit Demand (Kg/TN/Yr)		12.30	12.30	12.30	12.30	12.30	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	3.84	107.59

ADDRESS	NETGAIN DWELLINGS	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37	2037/38	2038/39	2039/40	2040/41	2041/42	Total
TOTAL CREDIT DEMAND - SOLENT CATCHMENT (Kg/TN/Yr)			44.43	44.43	100.29	287.74	399.45	130.65	120.23	120.23	96.57	77.63	30.30	20.83	25.56	20.83	20.83	16.09	16.09	1572.18

Table 5-6 – Combined Nitrogen Loads – Solent and Itchen Catchments

ADDRESS	NETGAIN DWELLINGS	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37	2037/38	2038/39	2039/40	2040/41	2041/42	Total
TOTAL CREDIT DEMAND - SOLENT + ITCHEN CATCHMENTS (Kg/TN/Yr)			84.95	84.95	140.81	328.26	439.97	171.17	160.75	211.40	187.74	168.80	121.47	61.35	66.08	61.35	61.35	56.61	56.61	2463.62

5.3.16. The nutrient loads in each catchment for the first five years of the plan period (2025/26 to 2029/30) and total plan period (2025/26 to 2041/42) are set out in **Table 5-7**.

Table 5-7 - Nutrient Loads in the Itchen and Solent Catchments, 2025/26 - 2029/30 and 2025/26 - 2041/42

	2025/6 – 2029/30		2025/6 – 2041/42	
	TN (kg/yr)	TP (kg/yr)	TN (kg/yr)	TP (kg/yr)
Itchen	202.60	24.40	688.84	82.98
Solent	876.34	N/A	1,572.18	N/A
Solent (including Itchen)	1,078.94	N/A	2,463.62	N/A

The total phosphorus load generated in the Itchen catchment must be mitigated at or upstream of the treated effluent discharge location.

5.3.17. The total nitrogen load within the Itchen and Solent catchments can be mitigated at any point in the catchment upstream of the Solent estuary. Multiple nitrogen mitigation schemes are available to offset developments in these catchments – as detailed on the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) website[31] - with others available through the Solent Mitigation Partnership[32] supported by the Solent Local Nutrient Mitigation Fund.

5.3.18. The latest PfSH nutrient mitigation supply and demand analysis[33] indicates that:

- The current and emerging supply of total nitrogen mitigation credits in the Itchen catchment will provide a 5-year supply of mitigation up to 2029.
- The current supply of total phosphorus mitigation credits in the Itchen catchment is highly constrained, although emerging schemes are forecast to come to market in 2026 and will ensure a 5-year supply until 2030.

5.3.19. Further mitigation schemes will be required to deliver sufficient nitrogen and phosphorus mitigation credits for the remainder of the Plan period.

5.3.20. While mitigation for TP is more difficult and costly to generate than for TN, there will be opportunities in the Itchen catchment to provide bespoke mitigation for both nitrogen and phosphorus if required. Such options may include the replacement of poorly performing septic tanks with new package treatment plants at existing properties, land management measures or the construction of treatment wetlands.

5.3.21. It is expected that the proposed local plan allocation at Popham will be nutrient neutral and in any event this will be a requirement for all new housing in the River Test and Itchen catchments in accordance with Policy ENV4 of the proposed LP.

5.3.22. s the evidence base for the final Regulation 19 Local Plan progresses, it is recommended that the Council works with Natural England and water service providers to formulate a nutrient strategy for

[31] https://www.push.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Nutrient-Mitigation-Suppliers-Operational-April-2025.pdf

[32] https://solentmitigationpartnership.co.uk/

[33] https://www.push.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/ITEM101.pdf

the borough, in line with Natural England recommendations, including strategic plan-level mitigation and recommended measures for individual development. Such mitigation and measures from this strategy could then be used to update the Regulation 19 HRA, existing development management policies and allocated site policies, to ensure that the local plan contributes as far as practicable to achieving nutrient neutrality within the borough.

5.3.23. Additionally, in-combination effects relating to water abstraction were identified for the **River Itchen SAC, Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC, Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC, River Lambourn SAC** and the Southampton Water sites, when taking into account the relevant WRMPs and will be considered further in the Regulation 19 HRA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HWT (2020). *Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy*. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust, Curdridge, Hants.

AECOM (2022). *Basingstoke and Deane Water Cycle Study*. Report for BDBC, AECOM, Basingstoke.

NE (2005). *Visitor Access Patterns on the Thames Basin Heaths* [online]. English Nature Research Report ENRR682. [Available at: http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4037618].

NE (2014). *Results of the 2012/13 visitor survey on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA)* [online]. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR136. [Available at: http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4514481614880768].

AECOM (2018). *Hart Local Plan: Proposed Submission Version 2016 – 2032. Habitats Regulations Assessment* [online]. Report by AECOM for Hart District Council. [Available at: https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Policies_and_published_documents/Planning_policy/Local_Plan/Habitats%20Regulations%20Assessment%202018.pdf]

IAQM (2020). *A guide to the assessment of air quality impacts on designated nature conservation sites* [online]. Institute of Air Quality Management, London. [Available at: https://iaqm.co.uk/text/guidance/air-quality-impacts-on-nature-sites-2020.pdf]

NE (2018). *Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations*
Version: June 2018. [Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5431868963160064]

Appendix A

EUROPEAN SITE SUMMARIES

APPENDIX A – EUROPEAN SITE SUMMARIES

Notes

The following proformas provide a summary of the European sites in the scope and/or provide hyperlinks to these data where publicly available.

These data are derived from (where available / relevant):

- the most recent JNCC-hosted GIS datasets;
- the Standard Data forms for SACs and SPAs and Information Sheets for Ramsar sites;
- Article 12 and 17 reporting;
- the published site Conservation Objectives;
- Supplementary Advice to the conservation objectives (SACO) where available;
- Site Improvement Plans (SIPs);
- the supporting Site of Special Scientific Interest's favourable condition tables where relevant and where no SACOs applicable to the features are available.

Note:

- For SPAs, the qualifying features are taken as those identified on the most recent JNCC datasets and citations or NE conservation objectives sheets, where these post-date the 2nd SPA Review (i.e. it will be assumed that any amendments suggested by the SPA review have been made) unless otherwise identified to us by NE; any site-specific issues relating to the SPA Review can be addressed in the screening and appropriate assessment of the preferred options (see below).
- The conservation objectives for Ramsar sites are taken to be the same as for the corresponding SACs / SPAs (where sites overlap); SSSI Definition of Favourable Condition (FCTs) are used for those Ramsar features not covered by SAC/SPA designations.

Note also that SPA feature lists are derived from the JNCC datasets and so may include species that are only designated as part of the assemblage; the qualifying species identified by the Natural England conservation objective documents are in **bold**.

Where possible the site data is used to identify other features that may be relevant to site integrity, particularly '**typical species'** (for SACs), **within-site supporting habitats**, and designated or non-designated **'functional habitats'** where these are identified in the available documentation (or otherwise well-known), although it should be noted that the tables are intended to provide an overview of these aspects only and not a detailed or exhaustive account for the site or all features.

At the time of writing, no formal standard data forms, conservation objectives or site improvement plans have been produced for the compensatory SAC habitat to be created along the River Test and the River Meon. Natural England[34] have confirmed that the qualifying features of the River Meon Compensatory SAC comprise S1106 Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* and H3260 Water courses of plan to montane levels with *R. fluitantis* (chalk stream habitat) – river habitat.

[34] Natural England (2024) River Itchen SAC Compensatory Habitat. Email to local authorities dated 22nd November 2024.

The qualifying features of the River Test Compensatory SAC comprise H3260 Water courses of plan to montane levels with *R. fluitantis* (chalk stream habitat) – headwaters (for the River Dever, River Dun and Bourne Rivulet sections), and H3260 Water courses of plan to montane levels with *R. fluitantis* (chalk stream habitat) – river habitat and S1044 Southern damselfly *Coenagrion mercurial* (for the Middle River Test between Wherwell and Kimbridge Mottisfont reach).

For the purposes of this report, it is assumed that the associated threats, pressures, functional land and typical species mirror those reported for the River Itchen SAC.

RIVER ITCHEN SAC	
Site Code	UK0013599
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0012599.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5130124110331904
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5130124110331904
Supplementary advice	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0012599.pdf
Associated SSSIs	River Itchen SSSI
Site Overview	The River Itchen is a significant chalk river in southern England, supporting an abundant and rich river flora and associated riparian corridor habitats including wet woodland, fen meadow, flood pasture and swamp habitats. The river is mainly spring-fed from the chalk aquifer, and there is only a narrow range of seasonal variation in physical and chemical characteristics. The water is of high quality, being naturally base-rich and of great clarity; and its temperature is relatively constant, with dissolved oxygen levels at or near saturation. However, there is evidence of nutrient enrichment and parts of the site are identified as being in in unfavourable condition due to excessive nutrients in recent NE advice to LPAs35 (such that 'nutrient neutrality'36 is being deployed or considered as mitigation). Approximately 8% of the BDBC area is covered by a WFD waterbody catchment that relates to the Itchen, although it should be noted that there are few surface watercourses in this area due to the nature of the geology. Exposure is therefore likely to be limited within the BDBC area.

[35] Letter from NE to LPA Chief Executives and Heads of Planning, 16 March 2022; Re. Advice for development proposals with the potential to affect water quality resulting in adverse nutrient impacts on habitats sites.

[36] Poor water quality due to nutrient enrichment from elevated nitrogen and phosphorus levels is one of the primary reasons for European sites being in unfavourable condition, and substantial reductions are needed to achieve favourable conservation status. 'Nutrient neutrality' is a mitigation approach that potentially allows new developments to be approved provided that there is no net increase in nutrient loading within the catchments of the affected European site.

RIVER ITCHEN SAC	
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SAC has the following qualifying features: ■ Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation ■ Brook lamprey Lampetra planeri ■ Atlantic salmon Salmo salar ■ Bullhead Cottus gobio ■ Southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale ■ White-clawed (or Atlantic stream) crayfish Austropotamobius pallipes ■ Otter Lutra lutra
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice' indicates that the 'typical species' of the site include: ■ plant communities characterised by pond water crowfoot Ranunculus peltatus and associated aquatic herbs and grasses; and ■ populations of fish species.
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although a wide and functional river corridor with a mosaic of natural and semi-natural riparian vegetation types is identified as being important to the integrity of the site and qualifying features.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI underpinning the SAC is predominantly in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition (~42% based on NE data37), with 21.05% in 'unfavourable – no change' condition and 15.79% in 'unfavourable – declining' condition. The SIP identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, the following of which may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update: water pollution (eutrophication from wastewater treatment); and water abstraction (indirectly, through regional water resource requirements). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan Update (overgrazing, scrub control, ditch management, etc.) and the SSSI condition assessment38 indicates that most of the units that are in 'unfavourable no change' or 'unfavourable declining' condition have this status due to local land management issues.

[37] River Itchen SSSI Condition Summary

[38] Condition of SSSI units for River Itchen

KENNET AND LAMBOURN FLOODPLAIN SAC	
Site Code	UK0030044
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030044.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6261183967395840
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6261183967395840
Supplementary advice	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030044.pdf
Associated SSSIs	Boxford Water Meadows SSSI, Chilton Foliat Meadows SSSI, Kennet and Lambourne Floodplain SSSI, Thatcham Reed Beds SSSI
Site Overview	This SAC comprises several units of floodplain fen or swamp associated with the Kennet and Lambourn rivers, which support the rare Desmoulin's whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana*. Parts of the SAC are former water-meadows managed by extensive cattle grazing but most areas are fringing, riverside or ditch-side vegetation which receive little management. The closest SAC units are approximately 2.4km from the BDBC boundary, along the River Kennet; however, all of the site units are hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area as surface water from BDBC flows to the River Enborne, which joins the Kennet at Woolhampton over 8km downstream of this SAC.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	■ Desmoulin's whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana*
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The supporting habitats for this feature are the calcareous wetlands and fens supported by surface and/or ground water. The 'supplementary advice' does not identify any specific 'typical species' considered to be associated with the site, but notes that the species is commonly associated with reed sweet-grass *Glyceria maxima*, greater pond-sedge *Carex riparia* and lesser pond-sedge *C. acutiformis* and that the supporting habitats are mostly dominated by these species.

KENNET AND LAMBOURN FLOODPLAIN SAC	
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although a wide and functional river corridor with a mosaic of natural and semi-natural riparian vegetation types is identified as being important to the integrity of the site and qualifying features
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI underpinning the SAC is predominantly in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition (~83% based on NE data39). The SIP40 identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, although most of these are local habitat and land management issues, and the absence of hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area ensures that water quality impacts will not occur. The SSSI condition assessment41 indicates that most of the units that are in 'unfavourable no change' or 'unfavourable declining' condition have this status due to local land management issues.

[39] Kennet and Lambourne Floodplain SSSI Condition Summary

[40] http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5702742270017536

[41] Condition of SSSI units for River Itchen

KENNET VALLEY ALDERWOODS SAC	
Site Code	UK0030175
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030175.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4608485786386432
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4608485786386432
Supplementary advice	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030175.pdf
Associated SSSIs	Kennet Valley Alderwoods SSSI
Site Overview	This SAC comprises two areas of wet woodland in the Kennet Floodplain. Both are situated on alluvium, overlain by a shallow layer of moderately calcareous peat through most of the woodland. The water table is relatively high, giving a range of soil moisture conditions from open water and swamp through to relatively dry woodland which is an important characteristic of the site. The closest SAC units are approximately 3.2km from the BDBC boundary, along the River Kennet; however, all of the site units are hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area as surface water from BDBC flows to the River Enborne, which joins the Kennet at Woolhampton over 8km downstream of this SAC.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	■ Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae*)
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice' identifies that the '**typical species**' of the site are those that are characteristic of the following National Vegetation Classification (NVC) communities: ■ W6a *Alnus glutinosa – Urtica dioica* woodland, typical subcommunity; ■ W7b *Alnus glutinosa* - Fraxinus excelsior - *Lysimachia nemorum* woodland, *Carex remota -Cirsium palustre* sub-community; ■ W8a *Fraxinus excelsior-Acer campestre - Mercurialis perennis* woodland, *Glechoma hederacea - Primula vulgaris* sub-community. Specific plant species are also identified, including several bryophytes.

KENNET VALLEY ALDERWOODS SAC	
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although a wide and functional river corridor with a mosaic of natural and semi-natural riparian vegetation types is identified as being important to the integrity of the site and qualifying features.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI underpinning the SAC is in 'favourable' condition (~100% based on NE data[42]). The SIP identifies two threats to site integrity (inappropriate water levels and game management), although these are local habitat and land management issues that will not be influence by the Local Plan; the absence of hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area ensures that water quality impacts will not occur.

[42] Kennet Valley Alderwoods SSSI Condition Summary

RIVER LAMBOURN SAC	
Site Code	UK0030257
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030257.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5757637085888512
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5757637085888512
Supplementary advice	River Lambourn
Associated SSSIs	River Lambourn SSSI
Site Overview	The River Lambourn SAC Itchen is a typical chalk river in southern England, fed from the north Wessex Downs chalk aquifer. It is relatively unmodified with near-natural flow characteristics (including a seasonally dry winterbourne section) and supports a characteristic range of *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion* aquatic plant communities. However, there is evidence of nutrient enrichment and parts of the site are identified as being in in unfavourable condition due to excessive nutrients in recent NE advice to LPAs[43] (such that 'nutrient neutrality'[44] is being deployed or considered as mitigation). The closest part of the SAC is approximately 3.4km from the BDBC boundary; however, all of the site units are hydrologically upstream of the BDBC area as surface water from BDBC flows to the River Enborne, which joins the Kennet at Woolhampton downstream of this SAC.

[43] Letter from NE to LPA Chief Executives and Heads of Planning, 16 March 2022; Re. Advice for development proposals with the potential to affect water quality resulting in adverse nutrient impacts on habitats sites.

[44] Poor water quality due to nutrient enrichment from elevated nitrogen and phosphorus levels is one of the primary reasons for European sites being in unfavourable condition, and substantial reductions are needed to achieve favourable conservation status. 'Nutrient neutrality' is a mitigation approach that potentially allows new developments to be approved provided that there is no net increase in nutrient loading within the catchments of the affected European site.

Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SAC has the following **qualifying features**: ■ Water courses of plain to montane levels with the *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion* vegetation ■ Brook lamprey *Lampetra planeri* ■ Bullhead *Cottus gobio*
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice' provides some guidance on the '**typical species**' considered to be associated with the site; these include: ■ In-channel species: River water-crowfoot *Ranunculus penicillatus* subsp. *pseudofluitans*; Pond water-crowfoot *Ranunculus peltatus*; Water parsnip *Berula erecta*; Water starwort *Callitriche stagnalis*. ■ Fish and lamprey: Brook lamprey *Lampetra planeri*; Bullhead *Cottus gobio*; Brown trout *Salmo trutta*; Grayling *Thymallus thymallus*. ■ Mammals: Water vole *Arvicola amphibious*; Otter *Lutra lutra.*
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although a wide and functional river corridor with a mosaic of natural and semi-natural riparian vegetation types is identified as being important to the integrity of the site and qualifying features.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI underpinning the SAC is in 'unfavourable recovering' condition (100% based on NE data[45]). However, the SIP identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, although most of these are local habitat and land management issues, and the absence of hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area ensures that water quality impacts will not occur (note, the SIP is shared with the Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC).

[45] River Lambourn SSSI Condition Summary

THAMES BASIN HEATHS COMPLEX	
Site Code	Thames Basin Heaths SPA UK9012141 Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA
Standard data form	Thames Basin Heaths SPA Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SPA-N2K/uk9012141.pdf Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC Available at: Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA Available at:
Conservation Objectives	Available at: http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5635542456729600?category=6528471664689152
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5635542456729600?category=6528471664689152
Supplementary advice	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0013697.pdf
Associated SSSIs	Collectively, the three sites are underpinned by a network for 14 SSSIs. The component SSSIs within 5km of the BDBC boundary (Bramshill SSSI, Hazeley Heath SSSI, and Castle Bottom to Yateley and Hawley Commons SSSI) underpin the **Thames Basin Heaths SPA only**. The other component SSSI are over 13km from the BDBC boundary.
Site Overview	The Thames Basin Heaths Complex includes three European sites which are addressed together for clarity and consistency with Natural England's SIP: Thames Basin Heaths SPA, Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC, and Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SAC. These sites comprise lowland heathland, acid grassland, mire and commercial conifer plantations that support characteristic heathland birds.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	**Thames Basin Heaths SPA** and **Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA** both have the following qualifying features: ■ European nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ■ Wood lark *Lullula arborea*

	■ Dartford warbler *Sylvia undata* **Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC** has the following qualifying features: ■ Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* ■ European dry heaths ■ Depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion*
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	For **Thames Basin Heaths SPA** and **Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase 1) SPA,** the supplementary advice documents indicate that the within-site **supporting habitats** for the qualifying features include: ■ Nightjar: bare patches or areas of very short or sparse vegetation with scattered trees on open heath, in patchy scrub, heath / woodland interfaces and woodland clearings. ■ Woodlark: bare ground or sparsely vegetated areas, with scattered trees or large bushes for song posts. ■ Dartford warbler: structurally diverse gorse and/or tall, mature heather in a predominantly open landscape. For Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC, the supplementary advice identifies that the **typical species** of the site are those that are characteristic of the relevant National Vegetation Classification (NVC) communities; in addition: ■ For the **Depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion*** feature: • Flora: Heather *Calluna vulgaris*, crossleaved heath *Erica tetralix*, purple moor-grass *Molinia caerulea*, common cotton-grass *Eriophorum angustifolium*, bog asphodel *Narthecium ossifragum*, white beak-sedge *Rhynchospora alba*, meadow thistle *Cirsium dissectum*, roundleaved sundew *Drosera rotundifolia*, intermediate sundew D. *intermedia*, bog *myrtle Myrica gale*, cranberry *Vaccinium oxycoccos*, royal fern *Osmunda regalis*, black bog-rush *Schoenus nigricans*, lesser bladderwort *Utricularia minor*. • Mosses: *Calypogeia sphagnicola, Cephalozia macrostachya, Sphagnum auriculatum, S. cuspidatum, S. capillifolium, S. papillosum, S. magellanicum, S.tenellum*. • Fauna: Raft spider *Dolomedes fimbriatus*, small red damselfly *Ceriagrion tenellum*, curlew *Numenius arquata*, the reptile assemblage including smooth snake *Coronella austriaca*.

THAMES BASIN HEATHS COMPLEX	
	■ For the **European dry heaths** feature • Flora: Heather, bell heather *Erica cinerea*, dwarf gorse *Ulex minor*, bilberry *Vaccinium myrtillus*, petty whin *Genista anglica*, sand sedge *Carex arenaria*, • Mosses and lichens: *Hypnum jutlandicum, Dicranum scoparium, Polytrichum juniperinum, Cladonia floerkeana, C. fimbriata, C. furcata, C. portentosa*. • Fauna: Reptile assemblage including smooth snake *Coronella austriaca* and sand lizard *Lacerta agilis*; Silver-studded blue *Plebejus argus*, heath tiger-beetle *Cicindela sylvatica*, mottled beefly *Thyridanthrax fenestratus*, heath grasper *Haplodrassus dalmatensis*. ■ For the **Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix*** feature: • Flora: Heather, bell heather, creeping willow *Salix repens*, dwarf gorse, sedges *Carex spp*., common cotton-grass, purple moor-grass, marsh clubmoss *Lycopodiella inundatum*, brown beak-sedge *Rhynchospora fusca*, deer grass *Trichophorum cespitosum*, round-leaved sundew, intermediate sundew, marsh gentian *Gentiana pneumonanthe*. • Mosses: *Aulocomnium palustre, Sphagnum capillifolium, S. compactum*. • Fauna: reptile assemblage including smooth snake.
Functional Land	With regards to **Functional Habitats** for the **Thames Basin Heaths SPA** and the **Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons SPA**, no specific areas of functional land are identified; however, the foraging range of nightjar is known to extend up to several kilometres from their nest site. In addition, woodlark will often utilise areas adjacent to heathland for feeding, including areas of short grassland, stubble fields or weedy margins of arable fields, golf courses and bare areas in quarry sites; these may be particularly important in the winter. A permeable landscape and habitat linkages to facilitate movement of birds between the SPA and any offsite supporting habitat is considered critical to the breeding success and to adult fitness and survival. Therefore, land-use in the areas outside and (particularly) between the SPA units is important to site integrity. For **Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC,** no specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of SAC integrity, although the importance of habitat 'corridors' and habitat patches to the overall functional integrity of the site is noted.

THAMES BASIN HEATHS COMPLEX	
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSIs underpinning the SPAs and SAC are almost entirely in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition; however, the SIP[46] identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, the following of which may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update: ■ public access / disturbance (recreational use and dog walkers); ■ wildfire / arson (associated with recreational use); ■ air pollution (atmospheric nitrogen deposition); and ■ habitat fragmentation (predominantly an issue between SSSI units, but potentially associated with wider functionally associated land for SPA species). ■ water abstraction (indirectly, through regional water resource requirements). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan Update (overgrazing, scrub control, ditch management, etc.) and the SSSI condition assessments indicates that most of the units that are in 'unfavourable no change' condition have this status due to local land management issues.

Information on the air quality baseline for the Thames Basin SPA can be obtained from the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) website47 in the absence of site-specific monitoring data. The APIS critical load and critical level data for the site habitats are provided in the tables below, where available, although it should be noted that APIS uses proxies for some habitats.

46 http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5946121331408896

47 https://www.apis.ac.uk/app

Summary of N-deposition and critical loads for Thames Basin Heaths SPA, based on APIS

SPA Habitat	APIS Broad Habitat Class	Critical Loads (kg N/ha/yr)	Current N-deposition (kg N/ha/yr)		
			Max	Min	Mean
Open heath and scrub	Dry heath / dwarf shrub heath	5-15	13.4	11.1	12.2
Coniferous woodland	Coniferous woodland	5-15	24.3	20.8	22.6

Summary of baseline NOx and NH_3 concentrations and relevant critical levels for broad habitats at Thames Basin Heaths SPA, based on APIS

SPA / Ramsar Habitat	APIS Broad Habitat Class	NOx Critical Level ($\mu g/m^3$)	NOx concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)			NH_3 Critical Level ($\mu g/m^3$)	NH_3 Concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)		
			Max	Min	Mean		Max	Min	Mean
Open heath and scrub	Dry heath / dwarf shrub heath	30 (annual); 75 (24hr)	22.8	10.2	13.4	3 (annual)	1.1	0.8	0.9
Coniferous woodland	Coniferous woodland	30 (annual)	22.8	10.2	13.4	3 (annual)	1.1	0.8	0.9

With regard to exposure, all of these habitats occur within 200m of an A-road. However, it should be noted that concentrations and deposition of traffic-generated pollutants do not decline linearly with distance from the road; typically, air pollution levels fall sharply within the first 20 – 30m before declining more slowly with increased distance. Concentrations and deposition will also be affected by physical parameters, such as local topography or vegetation structure.

It should also be noted that the background rate of N-deposition from vehicles has been declining for some years and is expected to decrease over the plan period with the shift to electric vehicles, based on the UK Air Quality Plan for Nitrogen Dioxide and government predictions[48]; incorporating allowances for expected background air quality improvements into any assessments is in accordance with IAQM guidance (IAQM 2020)[49] .

[48] Air quality plan for nitrogen dioxide (NO2) in UK (2017): https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/air-quality-plan-for-nitrogen-dioxide-no2-in-uk-2017

[49] This notes that "*To assume no improvement over a 15 or 20 year period, would effectively ignore the more stringent legal requirements for vehicle NOx emission standards to be achieved under real world driving conditions, trends in new vehicle registrations and ongoing government and international initiatives to improve air quality through reductions in emissions*"

EAST HAMPSHIRE HANGERS SAC	
Site Code	UK0012723
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0012723.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6500658190483456
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6500658190483456
Supplementary advice	East Hampshire Hangers
Associated SSSIs	Coombe Wood and The Lythe SSSI; Noar Hill SSSI; Selborne Common SSSI; Upper Greensand Hangers: Empshott to Hawkley SSSI; Upper Greensand Hangers: Wyck to Wheatley SSSI; Wealden Edge Hangers SSSI; and Wick Wood and Worldham Hangers SSSI
Site Overview	This large site comprises seven SSSIs (the closest of which is Upper Greensand Hangers: Wyck to Wheatley SSSI, ~7km from the BDBC boundary) on slopes and escarpments supporting beech and mixed woodlands, with areas of chalk grassland. The site has no hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SAC has the following **qualifying features**: ■ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (* important orchid sites) ■ *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests ■ *Tilio-Acerion* forests of slopes, screes and ravines ■ *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles ■ Early gentian *Gentianella anglica*

EAST HAMPSHIRE HANGERS SAC	
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice' indicates that the '**typical species**' of the site include: ■ The constant and preferential plant species associated with the relevant NVC communities. ■ For the grassland features: • Flora: Musk orchid *Herminium monorchis*, Chalk Eyebright Euphrasia pseudokerneri, Frog Orchid *Coeloglossum viride*, Fly Orchid, *Ophrys insectifera*, Juniper *Juniperis communis*. • Fauna: Brown Hairstreak *Thecla betulae*, Duke of Burgundy *Hamearis lucina*, Fairy Shrimp *Chirocephalus diaphanous*. ■ For the woodland features: • Flora: Small-leaved lime *Tilia cordata*, Bent Moss *Campylostelium Saxicola*, Curve-stalked Feather-moss *Rhynchostegiella curviseta*, White helleborine *Cephalanthera damasonium*, Violet helleborine *Epipactis purpurata*, Green-flowered helleborine *Epipactis purpurata*, Narrow-leaved helleborine *Cephalanthera longifolia*, Red Helleborine *Cephalanthera rubra*, Birds nest *Neottia nidus-avis*, Yellow bird's-nest *Monotropa hypopitys*, Fly Orchid *Ophrys insectifera*, Lesser Butterfly orchid *Platanthera bifolia* and Italian Lords and Ladies *Arum italicum* ssp. *Neglectum.* • Lichens: *Varicellaria hemisphaerica* and Eagle's claws *Anaptychia ciliaris* subsp. *ciliaris*. • Fauna: Brown Hairstreak *Thecla betulae*.
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although the need to maintain or restore the connectivity of the site to its wider landscape through features such as habitat patches, hedges, watercourses and verges is noted.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSIs underpinning the SAC are predominantly in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition. Units in 'unfavourable no change or 'unfavourable declining' condition are categorised as such primarily due to local land management issues (undergrazing of grasslands or the need for woodland thinning). The SIP identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, the following of which may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update: ■ air pollution (atmospheric nitrogen deposition; threat). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan (forestry and woodland management, invasive species).

SHORTHEATH COMMON SAC	
Site Code	UK0030275
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030275.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030275.pdf
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030275.pdf
Supplementary advice	Shortheath Common
Associated SSSIs	Shortheath Common SSSI
Site Overview	This site comprises one SSSI (Shortheath Common SSSI, ~9.5km from the BDBC boundary) supporting a range of open heathland and woodland habitats; a key feature of the site is a large valley mire. The site has no hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SAC has the following **qualifying features**: ■ European dry heaths ■ Transition mires and quaking bogs ■ Bog woodland
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice' indicates that the '**typical species**' of the site include: ■ The constant and preferential plant species associated with the relevant NVC communities. ■ For the European dry heaths feature: • Flora: Heather, bell heather, dwarf gorse, sand sedge, wavy-hair grass *Deschampsia flexuosa*, and lichens *Cladonia* spp. • Fauna: Assemblage of Orthoptera species including field cricket *Gryllus campestris*. ■ For the Transition mires and quaking bogs feature: • Flora: *Sphagnum recurvum, S.capillifolium, S. papillosum*, Cranberry *Vaccinium oxycoccus*, common cottongrass, marsh cinquefoil *Potentilla palustris*, cross-leaved heath, round-leaved sundew, sedges *Carex rostrata* and *Carex canescens*, sharp-flowered rush *Juncus acutiflora*.

SHORTHEATH COMMON SAC	
	• Fauna: Bog bush cricket *Metrioptera brachyptera*. ■ For the Bog woodland feature: • Flora: Downy birch *Betula pubescens*, common sallow *Salix cinerea*, bottle sedge *Carex rostrata*, *Sphagnum recurvum*.
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although the need to maintain or restore the connectivity of the site to its wider landscape through features such as habitat patches, hedges, watercourses and verges is noted. In addition, the 'supplementary advice' notes that "*Shortheath Common is part of a chain of important lowland heathland sites around Bordon, some of which are components of the Wealden Heaths II Special Protection Area (SPA)*" and so it is assumed that other heathland sites in the area (including those not covered by European designations) may have some functional associations with the SAC.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI units underpinning the SAC are in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition (100% based on NE data). The SIP[50] identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, the following of which may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update: ■ air pollution (atmospheric nitrogen deposition; pressure); ■ public access / disturbance (threat; site is common land with nearby parking facilities). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan (scrub control, direct encroachment by local householders).

[50] http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5069207664328704

WEALDEN HEATHS PHASE 2 SPA	
Site Code	UK9012132
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SPA-N2K/UK9012132.pdf Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SPA-N2K/UK9012132.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK9012132.pdf Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK9012132.pdf
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK9012132.pdf Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK9012132.pdf
Supplementary advice	Wealden Heaths
Associated SSSIs	Bramshott and Ludshott Commons SSSI; Broxhead and Kingsley Commons SSSI; Devil's Punch Bowl SSSI and Woolmer Forest SSSI.
Site Overview	This site comprises four SSSIs (the closest of which is Broxhead and Kingsley Commons SSSI, ~9.5km from the BDBC boundary) on sandstone hills supporting extensive areas of lowland heath (similar to that found in the Thames Basin Heaths complex, see above), with local areas of impeded drainage forming streams and wetland habitats. The site is designated for its characteristic heathland birds. The site has no hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SPA has the following **qualifying features**: ■ European nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus* ■ Wood lark *Lullula arborea* ■ Dartford warbler *Sylvia undata*
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	For the SPA, the supplementary advice document indicate that the within-site **supporting habitats** for the qualifying features include: ■ Nightjar: bare patches or areas of very short or sparse vegetation with scattered trees on open heath, in patchy scrub, heath / woodland interfaces and woodland clearings.

WEALDEN HEATHS PHASE 2 SPA	
	■ Woodlark: bare ground or sparsely vegetated areas, especially where adjacent to structurally diverse vegetation and short heather, with scattered trees or large bushes for song posts. ■ Dartford warbler: structurally diverse gorse and/or tall, mature heather in a predominantly open landscape.
Functional Land	With regard to '**functional habitats'**, no specific areas of functional land are identified; however: ■ The foraging range of nightjar is known to extend up to several kilometres from their nest sites. ■ Woodlark will often utilise areas adjacent to heathland for feeding, including areas of short grassland, stubble fields or weedy margins of arable fields, golf courses and bare areas in quarry sites; these may be particularly important in the winter. ■ A permeable landscape and habitat linkages to facilitate movement of birds between the SPA and any off-site supporting habitat is considered critical to the breeding success and to adult fitness and survival. There are areas of deciduous woodland, good quality semi-improved grassland and ancient woodland adjacent to the SAC. The importance of habitat 'corridors' and habitat patches to the overall functional integrity of this feature is noted. Therefore, land-use in the areas outside and (particularly) between the SPA units is important to site integrity.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSIs units underpinning the SPA are all in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition. The SIP identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, the following of which may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update: ■ public access / disturbance (recreational use and dog walkers); ■ wildfire / arson (associated with recreational use); and ■ air pollution (atmospheric nitrogen deposition, particularly at Woolmer Forest SSSI). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan (land management, invasive species, local hydrology / ditch management, etc.).

HARTSLOCK WOOD SAC	
Site Code	UK0030164
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030164.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030164.pdf
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030164.pdf
Supplementary advice	Hartslock Wood
Associated SSSIs	Hartslock Wood SSSI
Site Overview	This small site comprises one SSSI (Hartslock Wood SSSI, ~12.5km from the BDBC boundary) on chalk slopes above the River Thames, supporting a mosaic of chalk grassland, scrub and broadleaved woodland. The site borders the River Thames and includes areas of riverine fen.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SAC has the following **qualifying features**: ■ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (* important orchid sites) ■ *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice' indicates that the **'typical species'** of the site include: ■ The constant and preferential plant species associated with the relevant NVC communities. ■ In addition, for the grassland features: • Flora: Bastard toad-flax *Thesium humifusum*, Downy-fruited sedge *Carex tomentosa*, Monkey orchid. • Fauna: Assemblage of invertebrates including brown argus *Aricia agestis*, green hairstreak *Callophrys rubi*, small heath *Coenonympha pamphilus*, chalkhill blue *Polyommatus coridon* and grizzled skipper *Pyrgus malvae*
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of site integrity, although the need to maintain or restore the connectivity of the site to its wider landscape through features such as habitat patches, hedges, watercourses and verges is noted.

HARTSLOCK WOOD SAC	
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSIs units underpinning the SAC are in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition. The SIP identifies air pollution as the only threat to site integrity (principally in relation to the chalk grassland).

WOOLMER FOREST SAC	
Site Code	UK0030304
Standard data form	Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030304.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030304.pdf
Site Improvement Plan	Available at: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/TerrestrialAdvicePDFs/UK0030304.pdf
Supplementary advice	Woolmer Forest
Associated SSSIs	Woolmer Forest SSSI
Site Overview	This site comprises one SSSI (Woolmer Forest SSSI, ~13.4km from the BDBC boundary) on sandstone hills supporting extensive areas of lowland heath (similar to that found in the Thames Basin Heaths complex, see above), with associated habitats including valley mire, oligotrophic ponds, wet woodland, secondary woodland, acid grassland, scrub and conifer plantations. The site is unique in the UK in supporting natural populations of all 12 British amphibians and reptiles. The site partly coincides with the Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA, and has no hydrological connectivity with the BDBC area.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The SAC has the following **qualifying features**: ■ Natural dystrophic lakes and ponds ■ Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* ■ European dry heaths ■ Transition mires and quaking bogs ■ Depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion*

WOOLMER FOREST SAC	
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	The 'supplementary advice'[51] indicates that the '**typical species'** of the site include: ■ The constant and preferential plant species associated with the relevant NVC communities. ■ The assemblage of native reptiles and amphibians including smooth snake, sand lizard and natterjack toad *Epidalea calamita*. ■ The assemblage nationally-rare and scarce heathland invertebrates. ■ Spangled diving beetle *Graphoderus zonatus*.
Functional Land	No specific non-designated areas of land outside the site boundary are identified as being functionally important to the maintenance of SAC integrity, although the importance of habitat 'corridors' and habitat patches to the overall functional integrity of the site is noted. The 'supplementary advice' notes that "*Woolmer Forest SAC is an important component of the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA). Maintaining the functionality of heathland and other supporting semi-natural habitats within the local landscape is essential for the conservation objectives of the SPA.*"
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI units underpinning the SAC are all in 'favourable' condition; the SIP (which also relates to the Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA) identifies several pressures and threats to site integrity, the following of which may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update: ■ public access / disturbance (recreational use and dog walkers); ■ wildfire / arson (associated with recreational use); and ■ air pollution (atmospheric nitrogen deposition, particularly at Woolmer Forest SSSI). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan (land management, invasive species, local hydrology / ditch management, etc.).

[51] http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/4519224966119424

SALISBURY PLAIN SITES	
Site Code	Salisbury Plain SPA UK9011102 Salisbury Plain SAC UK0012683
Standard data form	Salisbury Plain SPA Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SPA-N2K/UK9011102.pdf Salisbury Plain SAC Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0012683.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Salisbury Plain SPA Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5745803545018368 Salisbury Plain SAC Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4786217489006592
Site Improvement Plan	Salisbury Plain SIP Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5384236060114944
Supplementary advice	Salisbury Plain SAC Salisbury Plain SPA
Associated SSSIs	Salisbury Plain SSSI [underpinning Salisbury Plain SPA and SAC]; Parsonage Downs SSSI and Porton Down SSSI [Salisbury Plain SAC only].
Site Overview	Salisbury Plain has three European sites associated with it, although only two are within 15km of the BDBC area; the baseline for these two sites is addressed together for clarity and consistency with NE's SIP; the sites are: ■ **Salisbury Plain SPA** ■ **Salisbury Plain SAC** ■ **Porton Down SPA** (note, this site is over 15km from the BDBC area and is not explicitly considered further, although a 'no adverse effects' conclusion for the Salisbury Plain SPA or SAC will ensure the same conclusion for this site). Salisbury Plain is the largest surviving semi-natural dry grassland in north-west Europe, supporting orchid-rich and calcareous grassland on a chalk plateau. The closest point of the SPA/SAC is ~14.5km from the BDBC area and there is no surface water hydrological connectivity.

SALISBURY PLAIN SITES	
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	**Salisbury Plain SPA** has the following qualifying features: ■ Stone-curlew *Burhinus oedicnemus* (breeding) ■ Eurasian hobby *Falco subbuteo* (over winter) ■ Common quail *Coturnix coturnix* (breeding) ■ Hen harrier *Circus cyaneus* (breeding) **Salisbury Plain SAC** has the following qualifying features: ■ *Juniperus communis* formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands ■ Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (* important orchid sites) ■ Marsh fritillary butterfly *Euphydryas (Eurodryas, Hypodryas) aurinia*
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	For **the SPA**, the supplementary advice indicates that the within-site **supporting habitats** for the qualifying features are principally the lowland calcareous grassland, semi-improved and improved grassland, and arable land. For **the SAC**, the supplementary advice identifies that the '**typical species'** of the site include: ■ The constant and preferential plant species associated with the relevant NVC communities. ■ Fauna: the assemblage of chalk grassland invertebrates; the assemblage of invertebrates associated with juniper (~27 species); fungi species fully or partially dependent on juniper (~40 species); population of fairy shrimp *Chirocephalus diaphanous*; population of European rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus*

SALISBURY PLAIN SITES	
Functional Land	For **the SPA** with regard to '**functional habitats'**, all of the features periodically use habitats outside the SPA boundary, with the following areas specifically noted: ■ Stone curlew: breeding also occurs at grassland sites outside the SPA, particularly to the south and east (including RSPB reserves in these areas), and within the wider military training area; autumn roosts are located within the wider training area, at locations including Upavon Down. ■ Hobby: nests in small woods including Everleigh Ashes, outside of the SPA. Therefore, land-use in the areas outside and (particularly) between the SPA units is important to site integrity. For **the SAC** with regard to **functional land**, other designated sites locally may support the marsh fritillary butterfly feature or provide 'grassland ecological networks' (including various grassland SSSIs near the SAC, Parsonage Down SSSI/NNR, Porton Down, Winterbourne Downs RSPB reserve, various County Wildlife Sites) that support the meta-population and dispersal between habitat patches. The importance of habitat 'corridors' and habitat patches to the overall functional integrity of this feature is noted.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSI units underpinning the SPAs and SAC are almost entirely in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition (over 98%, based on NE data), other than one unit that has been 'partially destroyed' (reasons not stated); the SIP identifies one pressure or threat that may be potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update (air pollution (atmospheric nitrogen deposition)). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan.

SOUTHAMPTON WATER SITES	
Site Code	Solent and Southampton Water SPA UK9011061 Solent Maritime SAC UK0030059 Solent and Dorset Coast SPA UK9020330 Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar UK11063
Standard data form	Solent and Southampton Water SPA Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SPA-N2K/uk9011061.pdf Solent Maritime SAC Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SAC-N2K/UK0030059.pdf Solent and Dorset Coast SPA Available at: https://jncc.gov.uk/jncc-assets/SPA-N2K/UK9020330.pdf Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar [Ramsar Information Sheet] Available at: https://rsis.ramsar.org/RISapp/files/RISrep/GB965RIS.pdf
Conservation Objectives	Solent and Southampton Water SPA Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6567218288525312 Solent Maritime SAC Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5762436174970880 Solent and Dorset Coast SPA Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5294923917033472 Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar N/A
Site Improvement Plan	Solent SIP Available at: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4692013588938752
Supplementary advice	Solent and Southampton Water SPA Solent Maritime SAC Solent and Dorset Coast SPA
Associated SSSIs	**Solent and Dorset Coast SPA:** Avon Valley (Bickton to Christchurch SSSI), Christchurch Harbour SSSI, River Avon System SSSI **Solent Maritime SAC:** Bouldnor and Hamstead Cliffs SSSI, Chichester Harbour SSSI, Eling and Bury Marshes SSSI, Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary SSSI ,Hythe to Calshot Marshes SSSI, King's Quay Shore SSSI, Langstone Harbour SSSI, Lee-on-The Solent to Itchen Estuary SSSI, Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI, Lower Test Valley SSSI, Medina Estuary SSSI, Newtown Harbour SSSI, North Solent SSSI, Thorness Bay SSSI, Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods SSSI , Yar Estuary SSSI

SOUTHAMPTON WATER SITES	
	Solent and Southampton Water SPA: Brading Marshes to St. Helen's Ledges SSSI, Eling and Bury Marshes SSSI, Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary SSSI, Hythe to Calshot Marshes SSSI, King's Quay Shore SSSI, Lee-on-The Solent to Itchen Estuary SSSI, Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI, Lower Test Valley SSSI, Lymington River Reedbeds SSSI, Medina Estuary SSSI, Newtown Harbour SSSI, North Solent SSSI, River Test SSSI, Ryde Sands and Wootton Creek SSSI, Sowley Pond SSSI, The New Forest SSSI, Thorness Bay SSSI, Titchfield Haven SSSI, Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods SSSI, Whitecliff Bay and Bembridge Ledges SSSI, Yar Estuary SSSI
Site Overview	Southampton Water is the ultimate downstream receptor for surface water drainage from approximately half of the BDBC area via the River Test and (to a lesser extent) the River Itchen. Four European sites are associated with Southampton Water: ■ **Solent and Southampton Water SPA** ■ **Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar** ■ **Solent Maritime SAC** ■ **Solent and Dorset Coast SPA** The interest features of these sites are partially coincident or co-dependent, and are only exposed to the outcomes of the Local Plan Update through water quality issues, and so the site baselines are considered together in this section. In addition, although these sites extend substantially beyond Southampton Water to include areas on the Isle of Wight and the harbours to the east, the effects of water quality changes will not be distinguishable outside of Southampton Water and so the baseline focuses on the habitats in this area and those species most reliant on them.
Qualifying Features / Ramsar criteria	The qualifying features of the **Solent and Southampton Water SPA** are: ■ Ringed plover *Charadrius hiaticula* (non-breeding) ■ Mediterranean gull *Larus melanocephalus* (breeding) ■ Black-tailed godwit *Limosa limosa islandica* (non-breeding) ■ Little tern *Sterna albifrons* (breeding) ■ Roseate tern *Sterna dougallii* (breeding) ■ Dark-bellied brent goose *Branta bernicla bernicla* (non-breeding) ■ Sandwich tern *Sterna sandvicensis* (breeding) ■ Eurasian teal *Anas crecca* (non-breeding) ■ Common tern *Sterna hirundo* (breeding)

- Waterbird assemblage

The **Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar** site meets the following **Ramsar criteria**:

- Criterion 1 (Sites containing representative, rare or unique wetland types):
  - Sheltered channel with unusual double tide.
- Criterion 2 (Supports vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species or threatened ecological communities):
  - Assemblage of rare plants and invertebrates (33 British Red Data Book (BRDB) invertebrates; 8 BRDB plants).
- Criterion 5 (Assemblages of international importance):
  - Species with peak counts in winter: 51343 waterfowl (5-year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003).
- Criterion 6 (Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance):
  - Ringed plover *Charadrius hiaticula* (spring/autumn);
  - Dark-bellied brent goose *Branta bernicla bernicla* (winter);
  - Black-tailed godwit *Limosa limosa islandica* (winter)
  - Eurasian teal *Anas crecca* (winter)

The **Solent and Dorset Coast SPA** protects the waters surrounding existing tern colonies associated with Poole Harbour SPA, Solent & Southampton Water SPA, Chichester & Langstone Harbours SPA and Pagham Harbour SPA, as these marine areas are used by the terns for foraging and maintenance activities, such as bathing and preening. The **qualifying features** are:

- Sandwich tern *Sterna sandvicensis* (breeding)
- Common tern *Sterna hirundo* (breeding)
- Little tern *Sterna albifrons* (breeding)

The **Solent Maritime SAC** is a unique suite of functionally linked estuaries and dynamic marine and estuarine habitats. The **qualifying features** are:

- Annual vegetation of drift lines
- Atlantic salt meadows *Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae*
- Coastal lagoons
- Desmoulin's whorl snail Estuaries *Vertigo moulinsiana*
- Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide

SOUTHAMPTON WATER SITES	
	■ Perennial vegetation of stony banks ■ Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand ■ Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time ■ Shifting dunes along the shoreline with *Ammophila arenaria* ("White dunes") ■ Spartina swards *Spartinion maritimae*
Other interest features (SAC typical species, SPA supporting habitats, etc.)	For **the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar**, the supplementary advice does not identify specific within-site **supporting habitats** for the qualifying features of the SPA / Ramsar but these are assumed to be the key habitats of the site, i.e. extensive intertidal mudflats and sandbanks, intertidal and subtidal rock, areas of saltmarsh, coastal lagoons, coastal reed beds, shingle banks, and grazing marsh. For the **Solent and Dorset Coast SPA**, the supplementary advice does not identify specific within-site **supporting habitats** for the qualifying features of the SPA but these are assumed to be the marine habitats covered by the SPA. For the **Solent Maritime SAC**, the supplementary advice identifies the '**typical species**' associated with the qualifying habitats; these are generally those species that are constants and/or characteristic of the relevant National Vegetation Classification (NVC) communities; no specific fauna are identified as typical species.
Functional Land	For **the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar,** specific areas of non-designated '**functional habitat**' are identified in the *Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy* (HWT, 2020) and associated online GIS[52]. For **the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA,** specific areas of non-designated '**functional habitat'** are not identified (although these are likely to be limited as (a) most breeding sites are covered by existing SPAs and (b) the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA covers the core foraging areas. For **the Solent Maritime SAC,** the supplementary advice notes the importance of habitat 'corridors' and habitat patches to the overall functional integrity of the site; in addition, specific areas of '**functional habitat**' are noted in relation sediment supply to the Shifting dunes and Perennial vegetation of stony banks features.
Condition, Pressures, Threats	The SSSIs underpinning the terrestrial components of the SPA and SAC that are associated with Southampton Water are almost entirely in 'favourable' or 'unfavourable recovering' condition; however, the SIP identifies several pressures and threats to

[52] Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy - Online Mapping

SOUTHAMPTON WATER SITES	
	integrity, although the only one potentially influenced by the Local Plan Update is 'water pollution' (eutrophication and toxicity, principally from local sources (the SIP predates the recent NE advice to LPAs regarding 'nutrient neutrality')). The remaining pressures and threats typically relate to local land management issues that will not be influenced by the Local Plan (overgrazing, scrub control, ditch management, etc.) and the SSSI condition assessments indicates that most of the units that are in 'unfavourable no change' condition have this status due to local land management issues.

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF DRAFT POLICIES WITHIN UPDATED SPATIAL STRATEGY

Key

	No effect or no LSE – policy will not or cannot affect any European sites and can therefore be screened out (subject to a brief review of the final policy prior to adoption).
	Policies with mitigating/moderating elements that do not have significant effects but which are relied on (at least in part) to ensure that significant or significant adverse effects from specific pathways do not occur; are examined through AA.
	Policies that have potential pathways for effects that require examination through appropriate assessment; note, this does not imply such policies will have adverse effects or even (potentially) significant effects; rather it is an assessment flag.

LP policy ref.	LP Policy Name	Adopted Local Plan policy ref*	HRA Summary	Notes
	Delivery of strategy and allocations			
SPS1	Scale and Distribution of Development	SS1	No LSE	The policy will set the overall scale of housing to be provided within the period 2021 to 2040 and provides general criterial relating to the distribution of development and its location.
SPS2	Neighbourhood Renewal	SS2	No LSE	The policy supports regeneration of existing areas where they would result in a demonstrable benefit to the local community, providing new homes and an improved local environment with enhanced facilities to meet local needs.
SPS2a	Buckskin and South Ham Neighbourhoods	N/A	No LSE	The policy supports regeneration of existing areas where they would result in a demonstrable benefit to the local community, providing new homes and an improved local environment with enhanced facilities to meet local needs.
SPS3	Delivering the Basingstoke Town Centre Masterplan	N/A	No LSE	The policy sets out objectives that development within Basingstoke town centre should be consistent with and criteria for development, including the Masterplan for Basingstoke Town Centre (December 2022). General statement of policy / General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development.
SPS4	Basingstoke Town Centre Areas of Change	N/A	No LSE	The policy identifies Areas of Change within the town centre and criteria for development that support the wider objectives for the town centre. General statement of policy / General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development.

LP policy ref.	LP Policy Name	Adopted Local Plan policy ref*	HRA Summary	Notes
SPS5	Sites Allocated for Housing Led Development	SS3	Uncertain (i/c)	The policy identifies the sites that are proposed for allocation and provides general criteria relating to how sites will come forward, including the use of design codes. The examination of individual allocations is underway; however, none are likely to have adverse effects alone due to scale and location relative to the nearest European sites; however, there are 'in combination' issues in relation to nutrient neutrality, air quality and recreational pressure which are being examined through appropriate assessment.
SPS5.1	Northern Manydown	SS3.10	As for SPS5	The site is allocated in the ALP but the allocation is being carried forward into the LP. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.2	Land north of Pack Lane	SS3.10	As for SPS5	The site is allocated in the ALP (as part of Northern Manydown allocation) but a separate allocation is being carried forward into the LP.
SPS5.3	Southern Manydown	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.4	Land at Whitmarsh Lane	N/A	As for SPS5	Part of the site is allocated in the ALP but the allocation is being extended and carried forward into the LP. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.5	Redlands (Phase 4)	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.6	Redlands Lodge	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.7	Sherfield Hill Farm	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.

LP policy ref.	LP Policy Name	Adopted Local Plan policy ref*	HRA Summary	Notes
SPS5.8	Popham Garden Village	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.9	Upper Swallick	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.10	Land West of Marnel Park	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.11	Weybrook Park Golf Course	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.12	Land west of Upper Cufaude Farm	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.13	65 New Road	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.14	Oakley Farm, Wash Water	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.15	Land at West End Farm, Mortimer	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS5.16	Skates Lane, Tadley	N/A	As for SPS5	Proposed allocation. The policy sets out criteria for development of the site.
SPS7	Ensuring a supply of deliverable Sites	SS4	No LSE	The policy sets out the intention of maintain a five year land supply. It includes a criterion setting out measures to ensure water quality is protected. General statement of policy / General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development.

LP policy ref.	LP Policy Name	Adopted Local Plan policy ref*	HRA Summary	Notes
SPS6	Neighbourhood Planning	SS5	No LSE	The policy sets out the overall requirement for new homes at identified settlements and supports the neighbourhood planning process. Neighbourhood Plans would be subject to screening under the Habitats Regulations. General statement of policy / General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development.
SPS8	Nuclear Installations - Aldermaston and Burghfield	SS7	No LSE	The policy sets out the approach to the management of proposals for development within the land use planning consultation zones for the two nuclear installations. General statement of policy / General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development.
SPS9	Basing View	SS8	No LSE	The policy sets out criteria to guide development in order to ensure that Basing View will continue to be regenerated as a 21st century business location and will be protected as a high-quality strategic employment site. General statement of policy / General design / guidance criteria or policies that cannot lead to or trigger development.
ENV2	Strategic Gaps	EM2	No LSE	The policy sets out general criteria for the protection of strategic gaps between settlements. Safeguarding policy that cannot lead to or trigger development. General design / guidance criteria.

Appendix C

‘IN COMBINATION’ REVIEW OF PLANS

Table C-1 – In Combination Plans and Programmes

Plan	Summary	Plan HRA conclusions*	Potential for i/c effects?	Notes / Assessment
Hart Local Plan 2032 (Adopted April 2020)	Sets out the development strategy, policies and proposals, including site allocations, which will guide land use and development in the District up to 2032. Includes provision for over 7,000 homes.	Nitrogen depositions potentially affecting the TBHSPA. No significant effects	Yes	The Hart District Local Plan identifies potential adverse effects on the TBHSPA due to an increase in nitrogen deposition over the lifetime of the plan causing a loss of species diversity. The HRA does further state that the recreational impacts of development on European sites can be avoided and mitigated. General air quality is not expected to decrease over the lifetime of the plan and would certainly not reach levels that would hard important SPA and other assets.
Wokingham Emerging Local Plan Update2036	Sets out the development strategy, policies and proposals, including site allocations, which will guide land use and development in the Borough up to 2036 (though not yet adopted). Currently includes provision for 13,901 homes between 2018-2036.	No adverse effects but identifies a need for further information regarding two European sites	Yes	Recreational pressure from the 4,465 homes proposed within 5km of the TBHSPA are deemed to not culminate into adverse effects on the TBHSPA due to mitigation being required through the use of Suitable Alternate Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management & Monitoring (SAMM). The HRA notes that further air quality data and monitoring is needed for two European sites that are within 10km of the Wokingham Borough, as these sites lie in close proximity to key commuter routes in the area that would see increased use following any development.

Plan	Summary	Plan HRA conclusions*	Potential for i/c effects?	Notes / Assessment
East Hampshire Emerging Local Plan 2036	East Hampshire District Council had produced a replacement plan for consultation in 2019. However, following this consultation and further consideration the Council determined to reproduce a replacement Local Plan. The Draft Local Plan 2017-2036 (now withdrawn) set out the development strategy, policies and proposals, including site allocations, which would guide land use and development in the District up to 2036, with the provision for 10,456 homes (this plan is being reconsidered/potentially significantly changed). A HRA exists for the 2019 draft Local Plan and a HRA has also been produced for the Issues & Priorities stage for the latest local plan (Regulation 18).	2019 – No significant effects 2022 Issues & Priorities -	Yes	2019 – Identified the Local Plan had the potential for adverse effects on the integrities of Shortheath Common SAC, Solent European sites, Thames Basin Heaths SPA and associated heathland European sites (including Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons (Wealden Heaths Phase I) SPA and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC), Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and Woolmer Forest SAC. This is due to recreation pressures. Further effects could be generated due to urbanisation, especially with regard to the integrity of Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. Potential effects due to air quality, resulting from increased emissions from increased road usage, was also identified as problematic, especially for the European sites within and close to East Hampshire. 2022 – Identifies recreational pressures from development on the Wealden Heaths complex, Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the Solent European sites, but noted any effects could be mitigated and for the emerging Local Plan to contain policies securing such mitigation. Potential affects from atmospheric pollution was also highlighted as needing to be mitigated.

Plan	Summary	Plan HRA conclusions*	Potential for i/c effects?	Notes / Assessment
Winchester Local Plan 2019-2039 (adopted)	Sets out the development strategy, policies and proposals, including site allocations, which will guide land use and development in the District up to 2039. Includes provision for 11,000 homes.	No significant effects	Yes	The HRA concluded that safeguards within the local plan were sufficient to rule out adverse effects on Habitats Sites or their functionally linked land relating to: ■ Physical damage and loss of habitat (effects on FLL) ■ Non-physical disturbance ■ Air pollution ■ Changes in water quantity due to run-off from development ■ Changes in water quality relating to wastewater and nitrogen/phosphorous (pending details of strategic mitigation); and ■ Recreational pressure.
Test Valley Draft Emerging Local Plan 2040 (Regulation 18)	Sets out the development strategy, policies and proposals, including site allocations, which will guide land use and development in the Borough up to 2040. Includes provision for 10,820 homes.	No adverse effects if recommendations for further investigations and policy amendments are followed	Yes	Adverse effects relating to water quality or recreational pressure could not be excluded without further ongoing investigation.
West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039 (adopted)	Sets out the development strategy, policies and proposals, including site allocations, which will guide land use and development in the District up to 2039. Includes provision for 8,721 to 9,146 homes.	No adverse effects	Yes	The HRA identified that any potential adverse effects resulting from the Local Plan would be mitigated due to the Plan's policies. Of particular importance are the policies relating to nutrient neutrality and water quality.

Plan	Summary	Plan HRA conclusions*	Potential for i/c effects?	Notes / Assessment
Southern Water Final Draft Water Resources Management Plan 2024	The WRMP identifies how Southern Water will manage its water resources to ensure people have sufficient access to water. Southern Water provides water supplies to just over 2.4 million customers across an area of 4,450 square kilometres, extending from East Kent, through parts of Sussex, to Hampshire and the Isle of Wight in the west.	No adverse effects	Yes	The HRA identified that so long as the mitigation proposed within the WRMP is applied correctly, there would be no adverse effects upon the integrity of any SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites or European sites. The HRA does note that as the proposed schemes of the WRMP are taken forward and undergo more detailed design, monitoring and reviewing of potential affects are needed to ensure no adverse effects occur. In combination effects with the Local Plan are arguably not possible in relation to water resources, as the WRMP accounts for predicted growth in Local Plan areas as part of its development. However, the most recent WRMP was drafted before the updated housing growth targets required of BDBC.

Plan	Summary	Plan HRA conclusions*	Potential for i/c effects?	Notes / Assessment
South East Water Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2025 to 2075)	The WRMP identifies how South East Water will manage its water resources to ensure people have sufficient access to water. The WRMP identifies that by 2050, it is estimated that South East Water's supply area will have increased its population to 2.79 million people. This population growth, continued effects of climate change and legislative changes (reduction in extraction allowances) means the supply area could suffer supply shortfalls of 188 million litres a day by 2075.	No adverse effects	Yes	The HRA identified that so long as the mitigation proposed within the WRMP is applied correctly, there would be no adverse effects upon the integrity of any SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites or European sites. The HRA does note that as the proposed schemes of the WRMP are taken forward and undergo more detailed design, monitoring and reviewing of potential affects are needed to ensure no adverse effects occur. In combination effects with the Local Plan are arguably not possible in relation to water resources, as the WRMP accounts for predicted growth in Local Plan areas as part of its development. However, the most recent WRMP was drafted before the updated housing growth targets required of BDBC.
Thames River Basin Management Plan: updated 2022	The RBMP focuses on the protection, improvement and sustainable use of the water environment. The overall objective is to ensure sufficient water supplies for future generations especially in the face of climate change, housing growth and an increase in individual water use.	No significant effects	Yes	The HRA identifies that in-combination effects of the updated RBMP with other plans at a strategic scale and determined that there is a prescribed degree of mutual compatibility and collaboration aimed at securing environmental protection and improvement. The HRA is limited as the RBMP does not specify where or how measures should be implemented.

Plan	Summary	Plan HRA conclusions*	Potential for i/c effects?	Notes / Assessment
South East River Basin District - River Basin Management Plan 2022	The RBMP focuses on the protection, improvement and sustainable use of the water environment. The overall objective is to ensure sufficient water supplies for future generations especially in the face of climate change, housing growth and an increase in individual water use.	No significant effects	Yes	The HRA identifies that in-combination effects of the updated RBMP with other plans at a strategic scale and determined that there is a prescribed degree of mutual compatibility and collaboration aimed at securing environmental protection and improvement. The HRA is limited as the RBMP does not specify where or how measures should be implemented.
South East River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2021 to 2027	The plan seeks to ensure flood risk within the South East River Basin District is appropriately managed to protect both the built and natural environment.	No adverse effects	No	FRMP determined with reference to anticipated growth within region.

Kings Orchard
1 Queen Street
Bristol
BS2 0HQ

wsp.com

PUBLIC