

Habitats Regulations Assessment

May 2016

Introduction

1. The Habitats Regulations Assessment as required under the European Directive 92/43/EEC and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 require that Local Plans undergo an assessment to determine whether or not the Local Plan will have a significant effect on sites of European importance for nature conservation.

Part 1 Local Plan

2. The Part 1 Local Plan, the Aligned Core Strategy adopted September 2014, was the subject of a Habitats Regulations Assessment in light of the information available to indicate that the Sherwood Forest area may be formally proposed as a Special Protection Area in the near future, in recognition of the internationally important populations of woodlark and nightjar in this locality. A summary of the key stages of this appraisal are outlined below in **Appendix 1**. This concluded that any significant effects were capable of mitigation through changes to the Aligned Core Strategy which were subsequently made.

Part 2 Local Plan

3. Since the adoption of the Aligned Core Strategy in September 2014 work has been ongoing with the development of the Part 2 Local Plan, the Local Planning Document. This work confirms that there has not been any significant change in policy to housing distribution. The HRA process has been able to inform and influence the policy options and preferred sites as they have been considered. The screening of the 70 Part 2 Local Planning Document policies has been undertaken as shown in **Appendix 2**. The screening exercise as it relates to the prospective Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area is effectively a 'shadow' HRA given that the area is not yet a designated site. The LPD policies cover the following areas:

- Climate change, flood risk and water management;
- Environmental protection;
- Natural environment;
- Open space and recreational facilities;
- Historic environment;
- Design;
- Homes;
- Employment;
- Retail and community facilities; and
- Transport.

4. However, as the Local Planning Document is in general conformity with the Core Strategy no significant impact has been revealed. The majority of the policies have been ruled out as they will not have a Likely Significant Effect on the prospective Sherwood SPA (or other European sites) and therefore will not need to be taken forward to the next stage of assessment.

5. A review of the 24 proposed housing allocations and 2 employment allocations in the LPD is shown in **Appendix 3** also confirms that there are no significant effects. Table 1 below highlights that there have been changes in the housing distribution for the Local Planning Document when compared with the Aligned Core Strategy with a reduction in all areas apart from within and adjoining the urban area (being the area with least impact on the pSPA).

	Aligned Core Strategy (adopted Sept 2014)	Draft Local Planning Document
In or adjoining the main built up area of Nottingham	Approx. 4,045	4,330
Hucknall	Up to 1,300 homes	1,265
Bestwood village	Up to 560 homes	525
Calverton	Up to 1,055 homes	720
Ravenshead	Up to 330 homes	250
Other villages	Up to 260 homes	160

6. The proposed housing distribution in the Local Planning Document highlights that in the more sensitive areas with respect to pSPA the actual numbers have been reduced. One site in Calverton, Park Road, has a significantly fewer number of dwellings when compared with what was proposed in the ACS. However, mitigation measures will still be required including green infrastructure and visitor management which should help avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the prospective SPA. The need for a further assessment of potential effects will be included within policy.
7. Natural England has confirmed in March 2016 that the HRA of the LPD provides an appropriate record of the HRA process to date and an appropriate screening of the proposed policies, in light of Natural England's Advice Note (updated March 2014) which recommends that authorities dealing with plans or projects in the Sherwood area take a risk based approach and future proof any plans adopted or development decisions made.
8. Natural England recognises that the housing distribution in the LPD has remained the same as the ACS, but with some of the housing figures being significantly reduced. The reduction in housing numbers for sites H15 Main Street and H16 Park Road (both in Calverton) is welcomed, being adjacent to sites identified as important for nightjar and woodlark. The lower housing figures would reduce the potential recreational impact on these sites.

SPA classification

9. If the SPA classification is formalised, then any allocations and/or any permissions given would need to be reviewed, and may be modified or revoked in order to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.

Appendix 1

Summary of Key Stages of Habitats Regulations Appraisal for the Aligned Core Strategy

Habitats Regulations Appraisal Screening Record (Sept 2010)

This report rigorously tested the proposed Aligned Core Strategies for its potential effects on European sites in accordance with the legislation, Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. **Natural England confirmed in November 2010**, that they considered it consistent with government guidance on HRA of development plans. The advocated risk based approach was followed on a “precautionary basis” and treated the prospective Sherwood SPA as if it was a pSPA.

However, Natural England noted that it was not possible to rule out the likelihood of a significant effect on the Park Forest part of the prospective Sherwood Forest SPA. This was as a result of increased nitrogen deposition affecting the habitats of birds for which the site may be classified, arising from the Top Wighay Farm allocation in the Aligned Core Strategies, in combination with other plans or projects. The recommendation concluded that an “appropriate assessment” may be required.

Habitats Regulations Appraisal for Further Assessment (September 2010)

The scoping report explained that due to the potential effect of Top Wighay Farm allocation on Park Forest a further assessment would be required in order to ascertain no likely significant effect and to future proof the plan and ensure its soundness. However as the prospective SPA is not formally classified this assessment was not a formal requirement.

In the case with the Top Wighay Farm allocation the potential effects were associated with air pollution. The scope of the detailed assessment was recommended to consider the current levels of pollution and the likely effects of further potential increases, either alone, cumulatively or in combination with other activities, on the composition of those habitats likely to support breeding nightjar and woodlark.

A Screening Assessment of Additional Nitrogen Deposition from the Development at Top Wighay Farm, Hucknall on the Proposed Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) for Birds and the Integrity of the Habitat for Woodlark and Nightjar (August 2011)

A Screening Assessment of Additional Noise from the Development at Top Wighay Farm, Hucknall on the Proposed Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) for Birds and the Integrity of the Habitat for Woodlark and Nightjar (September 2011)

These reports considered the potential of increase in nitrogen deposition and noise from traffic generated from proposed development at Top Wighay Farm of 500 dwellings, 34000sqm business space and a primary school. The reports both

concluded that there would be no likely significant effects on the pSPA from additional nitrogen deposition or change in traffic noise levels.

Natural England confirmed on 1st December 2011 that the air pollution and additional noise impact assessments concluded no significant effect.

A Screening Assessment of Additional Nitrogen Deposition from the Development of 500 to 1,500 Houses at Top Wighay Farm, Hucknall on the Proposed Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) for Birds and the Integrity of the Habitat for Woodlark and Nightjar (January 2012)

A Screening Assessment of Additional Noise from the Development of 500 to 1,500 Houses at Top Wighay Farm, Hucknall on the Proposed Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) for Birds and the Integrity of the Habitat for Woodlark and Nightjar (January 2012)

The assessments were repeated based on different housing options. Both the air pollution and noise impacts assessments concluded no significant effect and this was confirmed by **Natural England on 8th February 2012**.

Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Supplementary Information (Additional SHLAA Sites) Habitats Regulations Appraisal Screening Record (February 2012)

This report provided supplementary information to the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) screening record for the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies (GNACS), September 2010.

The original HRA assessed general information on the development locations for the allocation of 52,050 new homes. Information available at the time of the assessment was given in policy 2 of the spatial strategy which provided for:

- a. 25,320 homes in the Principal Urban Area of Nottingham
- b. 4,200 new homes in each of two SUEs East of Gamston and South of Clifton
- c. 1,480 new homes in one or more SUE in Broxtowe yet to be determined
- d. 4,090 homes in or adjoining Hucknall Sub Regional Centre including SUEs at Top Wighay Farm and north of Papplewick Lane in Gedling
- e. 4,420 new homes in or adjoining Ilkeston Sub-Regional Centre (including a SUE at Stanton)
- f. Up to 8,340 new homes elsewhere in Greater Nottingham

It was recommended that, in the absence of more detailed analysis, a precautionary approach should be adopted and Policy 2 of the ACS should preclude urban extensions north of the B6386 north of Calverton, and west of the A60 and north of Ricket Lane at Ravenshead.

Following the completion of the original HRA, Gedling Borough Council considered specific development locations which would be in conformity with the ACS and as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. David Tyldesley

Associates were appointed to undertake a screening of the emerging development locations to help inform Gedling Borough's final allocation selection.

The specific locations screened for the ACS included:

- a) Sites around Bestwood Village: around 800 dwellings; primarily to the north of the village.
- b) Sites around Calverton: around 1700 dwellings; mainly to the north-west and south-west of the village, but none north of the B6386.
- c) Sites around Ravenshead: around 450 dwellings; mainly to the south of the village, but none west of the A60 or north of Ricket Lane

The report concluded that the proposed development locations around Bestwood village and Ravenshead would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development.

For Calverton, it was concluded that the proposed allocation of land for 1700 dwellings would be likely to have a significant effect on the prospective Sherwood Forest SPA in the absence of mitigation measures. The report identified a number of detailed mitigation measures and it was noted that if these were implemented in a planned and systematic way, it should avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the prospective SPA by the development at Calverton, alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

The response received from **Natural England on 22nd March 2012** to this further screening record confirmed that the Aligned Core Strategies should highlight that any development proposal coming forward at that location would need to include an appropriate mitigation package that would meet the requirements of the measures outlined in the HRA Screening Record. In addition, it was recommended that policy or supporting text may include an outline of principles of the mitigation strategy which would aim to prevent additional recreational pressure and disturbance as a result of development on nearby sensitive habitats.

Subsequent revisions were made to the Publication Draft of the Aligned Core Strategies.

In January 2013 a further assessment was undertaken to consider the 'in combination effects' of sites identified within Gedling Borough set out in the Aligned Core Strategies and Ashfield District Council's Local Plan Preferred Approach. The assessment concluded that the proposals within Ashfield District Council's Preferred Approach in combination with Gedling Borough Council's proposals resulted in no 'in combination' effects.

In February 2014 it was considered that no additional effects would arise and impact on the prospective Special Protection Area as a result of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies.

Following the examination of the Aligned Core Strategies, the Inspector's Report was received in July 2014 and the Report concluded that "the requirements for appropriate assessment of the Habitats Regulations have been met".

Appendix 2

Scoping of Local Planning Document Proposed Policies

Policy	What will policy do	Relevance to HRA	Further Screening of Policy
LPD 1 – Wind Turbines	Set out the factors that will be used to assess proposals for wind turbines.	Potential impact on pSPA by possible nuisance factors such as noise.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 2 – Other Renewable Energy Schemes	Set out the factors that will be used to assess proposals for renewable energy schemes other than wind turbines (e.g. solar panels, anaerobic digesters, geo-thermal).	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 3 – Managing Flood Risk	Provide further guidance on the application of the sequential and exceptions tests and information requirements in support of proposals.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 4 – Surface Water Management	Provide guidance on the inclusion of measures to control surface water runoff.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 5 – Managing Water Quality	Protect the quality of water courses in the Borough.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 6 – Aquifer Protection	Protect the quality of ground water held in the aquifer.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 7 – Contaminated Land	Ensure that contaminated land is suitable for development and contamination is treated, contained or controlled appropriately.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 8 – Unstable Land	Ensure that appropriate action is taken to ensure that land is stable and safe for development.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 9 – Hazardous Substances	Ensure that new development that involves hazardous substances or is close to existing sites is safe and	No relevance.	Not required.

	appropriately protected.		
LPD 10 – Pollution	Ensure that the impacts of pollution are appropriately managed reducing the impact on the natural environment and existing development near to sources of pollution.	Potential impact on pSPA by possible nuisance factors such as noise.	Policy would require measures to minimise pollution to protect environmental quality and should have a positive benefit. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 11 – Air Quality	Ensure that, if required, development takes steps to mitigate or offset emissions.	Potential impact on pSPA through nitrogen dioxide emissions.	Policy requires emissions to be mitigated or offset; which may improve air quality and lessen risk of impact on pSPA Continue with the Policy.
LPD 12 – Reuse of Buildings within the Green Belt	Sets out the occasions when the reuse of buildings within the Green Belt is considered to be not inappropriate.	Potential impact if reuse of buildings are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 13 – Extensions to Buildings within the Green Belt	Sets out the occasions when extensions to buildings within the Green Belt are considered to be not inappropriate.	Potential impact if extensions of buildings are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 14 – Replacement of Buildings within the Green Belt	Sets out the occasions when the replacement of buildings within the Green Belt is considered to be not inappropriate.	Potential impact if replacement of buildings are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the

			Policy.
LPD 15 – Infill Development within the Green Belt	Sets out the occasions when the infill development in villages or previously developed sites is considered to be not inappropriate.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 16 – Safeguarded Land	Allocates safeguarded land and sets policy to assess proposals for its development during the plan period.	Potential impact on pSPA as land protected to meet long term development needs.	Land is not allocated for development at the present time and its permanent development should only be granted following a review of the LPD. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 17 – Homes for Rural Workers	Sets out the tests for assessing proposals for new homes in association with rural businesses.	Potential impact if replacement of buildings are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 18 – Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity	Sets out how sites of importance for nature conservation (LWS, SSSIs etc.) will be protected.	Potential impact on pSPA if development needs outweigh the nature conservation value.	Policy requires clear justification that development need outweighs the value of the site and should have a positive benefit. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 19 – Landscape Character and Visual Impact	Protects landscapes and ensure development does not have an significant visual impact.	Policy seeks to protect landscapes and provides added security.	Not required.
LPD 20 – Protection of Open Space	Ensure the protection of existing open space of different types. Includes exceptions where development may be acceptable.	Potential impact on pSPA if development needs outweigh the open space requirement.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 21 –	Require that new residential	Potential impact if	The provision of new

Provision of New Open Space	development provides a minimum of 10% open space. Provision to be made on site or via a financial contribution.	proposals are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	open space may focus recreational activity in that location and lessen risk of impact on pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 22 – Local Green Space	Identifies and protects sites due to their value to local communities.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 23 – Greenwood Community Forest and Sherwood Forest Regional Park	Provide support for development which helps achieve the aims and objectives of the named organisations/initiatives.	Potential impact if proposals are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 24 – Tourist Accommodation	Set out how proposals for new tourist accommodation will be assessed.	Potential impact if accommodation is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 25 – Equestrian Development	Set out how proposals for stables and related development will be assessed.	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 26 – Heritage Assets	Set out the tests to be applied to development proposals which impact on all types of heritage assets.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 27 – Listed Buildings	Set out the tests to be applied to development proposals which impact on Listed Buildings.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 28 – Conservation	Set out the tests to be applied to development proposals which	No relevance.	Not required.

Areas	are within or impact on Conservation Areas.		
LPD 29 – Historic Landscapes, Parks and Gardens	Set out the tests to be applied to development proposals which impact on historic landscapes or registered parks & gardens	Policy seeks to safeguard the historic environment and provides added protection.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 30 – Archaeology	Set out the tests to be applied to development proposals which impact on Scheduled Monuments or areas of high archaeological potential.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 31 – Locally Important Heritage Assets	Set out the tests to be applied to development proposals which impact on heritage assets which are not formally designated.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 32 – Amenity	Ensure that the amenity of nearby properties is not significantly affected by new development.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 33 – Residential Density	Set out the approach to density across the Borough with different minimum densities in different areas.	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead	Policy reduces the density of new development in the key settlements including Calverton and may lessen risk of impact on pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 34 – Residential Gardens	Protect local character by protecting residential gardens from inappropriate development.	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead	Policy restricts the development of residential gardens from inappropriate development and may lessen the risk of impact on pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 35 – Safe, Accessible and Inclusive Development	Provide details of how new development, especially large scale new development, should be designed. The policy provides detail on matters such layout, connectivity and massing.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 36 –	Require new residential	No relevance.	Not required.

Affordable Housing	development of more than 15 dwellings to provide a contribution to the supply of affordable housing. The exact contribution will vary on location. Detail to be included in SPD.		
LPD 37 – Housing Type, Size and Tenure	Require new residential development to ensure an appropriate mix of homes to be provided. Policy to be enforced through monitoring in AMR.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 38 – Specialist Accommodation	Set out the tests that proposals for residential institutions will need to meet.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 39 – Housing Development on Unallocated Sites	Set out the tests that proposals for new dwellings on sites that are not specifically allocated will need to meet.	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD40 - Live-Work Units	Set out how proposals for buildings which will provide both living accommodation and business space will be assessed.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 41 – Self Build and Custom Homes	Set out that a proportion of large sites will be required for self/custom build. The policy also provides tests for proposals for self/custom build homes. Detail to be included in SPD.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 42 – Extensions to Dwellings Not in the Green Belt	Set out the tests for residential extensions to dwellings that are not within the Green Belt.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 43 – Retention of Employment and Employment Uses	Protect sites for employment use (and other appropriate purposes).	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 44 – Employment Development on Unallocated Sites	Permit new employment development where it meets the identified tests.	Potential impact if replacement of buildings are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA.

			Continue with the Policy.
LPD 45 – Expansion of Existing Employment Uses Not in the Green Belt	Permit extensions to existing employment development where they meet the identified tests.	Potential impact if proposals are to expand the existing uses at Calverton colliery.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 46 – Agricultural and Rural Diversification	Permit development which diversifies farms and other rural business where it meets the identified tests.	Potential impact if replacement of buildings are north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 47 – Local Labour Agreements	Enables the Borough Council to negotiate planning agreements which secure jobs and/or training to local residents	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 48 – Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Boundaries	Confirms the network and hierarchy of town centres.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 49 – Development within Town and Local Centres	Establish the tests as to when new development would negatively affect the vitality and viability of town centres	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 50 – Upper Floors	Set out the uses permitted above units in town and local centres and parades of shops	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 51 – Impact Assessment Threshold	Set the size of retail stores that will be required to submit impact assessments	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 52 – Markets	Provide details on how developments which propose new markets or enhancements to existing markets will be assessed.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 53 – Development within Small Parades	Set the tests which proposals for new retail development within small parades of shops will have to meet.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 54 – Fast Food Takeaways	Ensure that new A5 uses do not open within 400m of existing secondary schools.	No relevance.	Not required.

LPD 55 – Security Shutters	Sets out how proposals for security shutters will be assessed.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 56 – Protection of Community Facilities	Protects community facilities from unnecessary loss.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 57 – Parking Standards	Ensure the provision of an appropriate level of car parking in residential and non-residential development. Detail to be included in SPD.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 58 – Cycle Routes, Recreational Routes and Public Rights of Way	Protect identified routes from development.	Potential impact on pSPA by possible nuisance factors such as noise along the Calverton Mineral Line.	Long established policy that is being rolled forward from the 2005 Replacement Local Plan but will require monitoring to establish whether there could be a potential impact on the pSPA. The existing waymarked route should limit numbers of cyclists straying into more sensitive areas. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 59 – Park and Ride	Set the tests for assessing proposals for park and ride schemes.	Potential impact if rdevelopment is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 60 – Local Transport Schemes	Identify and safeguarded the route/location of the specified transport schemes.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 61 – Highway Safety	Ensure that development does not adversely affect highway safety or the access needs of all people.	No relevance.	Not required.
LPD 62 – Comprehensive Development	Ensures that development does not adversely affect the ability of larger sites to be developed in the most sustainable way.	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane,	Determination of planning applications can take into consideration

		Ravenshead.	whether there would be a potential impact on the pSPA. Continue with the Policy.
LPD 63 – Housing Distribution	Sets out the broad distribution between the different settlements in the Borough using the ACS Policy 2 (The Spatial Strategy) as a base.	Potential impact if development is north of B6386 Calverton or west of A60 or north of Ricket Lane, Ravenshead.	The scoping of the individual development sites as to the impact on the pSPA is shown in Appendix 3. Continue with the Policy.

Appendix 3

Scoping of the Local Planning Document Proposed Sites

LPD Ref	Housing Allocation Name	Site Area (ha)	Housing Units	Locality	Impact on pSPA
Urban Area					
H1	Rolleston Drive	3.64	90	Arnold	No impact as within urban area.
H2	Brookfields Garden Centre	3.52	105	Arnold	No impact as on edge of urban area.
H3	Willow Farm	4.17	110	Carlton	No impact as on edge of urban area.
H4	Linden Grove	3.84	115	Carlton	No impact as within urban area.
H5	Lodge Farm Lane	7.31	150	Arnold	No impact as on edge of urban area.
H6	Spring Lane	9.68	150	Carlton	No impact as on edge of urban area.
H7	Howbeck Road / Mapperley Plains	9.73	205	Arnold	No impact as on edge of urban area.
H8	Killisick Lane	9.81	215	Arnold	No impact as within urban area.
H9	Gedling Colliery/ Chase Farm	42.53	660	Carlton	Submitted application for 1,050 homes but anticipate 660 to be delivered within plan period. No impact as on edge of urban area.
Edge of Hucknall					
H10	Hayden Lane	4.8	120	Hucknall	No impact as significant distance from pSPA.
Key Settlements					
H11	The Sycamores	0.62	25	Bestwood Village	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result

					of the scale and location of proposed development.
H12	Westhouse Farm	10.23	210	Bestwood Village	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development. Screening record of emerging sites in the ACS considered the potential impact of 800 dwellings to the north of the village and was not viewed to have a significant effect.
H13	Bestwood Business Park	6.01	220	Bestwood Village	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development.
H14	Dark Lane	2.65	70	Calverton	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development.
H15	Main Street	2.98	75	Calverton	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale which has significantly reduced from the numbers identified in the emerging sites in the Aligned Core Strategy and location of proposed development. Mitigation measures including green infrastructure and visitor management will be

					required and should help avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the pSPA. The need for a further assessment of potential effects will be included within policy.
H16	Park Road	14.3	390	Calverton	<p>Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale which has significantly reduced from the numbers identified in the emerging sites in the Aligned Core Strategy and location of proposed development.</p> <p>Mitigation measures including green infrastructure and visitor management will be required and should help avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the pSPA. The need for a further assessment of potential effects will be included within policy.</p>
H17	Longdale Lane A	1.36	30	Ravenshead	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development.
H18	Longdale Lane B	1.24	30	Ravenshead	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development.
H19	Longdale	2.29	70	Ravenshead	Would not be likely to have a significant effect,

	Lane C				either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development.
Other Villages					
H20	Millfield Close	0.78	20	Burton Joyce	No impact as significant distance from pSPA.
H21	Orchard Close	0.74	15	Burton Joyce	No impact as significant distance from pSPA.
H22	Station Road	1.85	40	Newstead	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and location of proposed development within the village.
H23	Ash Grove	0.88	10	Woodboroug h	No impact as significant distance from pSPA.
H24	Broad Close	0.75	15	Woodboroug h	No impact as significant distance from pSPA.

LPD Ref	Employment Allocation Name	Site Area (ha)	Locality	
E1	Gedling Colliery	4.69 ha	Carlton	No impact as significant distance from pSPA.
E2	Hillcrest Park	0.85 ha	Calverton	Would not be likely to have a significant effect, either alone or in-combination, on any European site as a result of the scale and potential use of proposed development. The Replacement Local Plan allocated three ha for employment purposes, two ha has been developed leaving one ha. Site is adjacent to existing industrial estate and employment premises.



