



HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT SCREENING REPORT



Newport City Council
Newport Local Development
Plan (LDP) 2011-2026

Adoption Version – January 2015



Produced by Newport City Council in
conjunction with Atkins Limited

Template provided by Enfusion



South East Wales
Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG)

enfusion 

HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT SCREENING REPORT

Newport City Council
Local Development Plan 2011- 2026

<i>date:</i>	
<i>issue no.:</i>	
<i>prepared by:</i>	
<i>quality assurance:</i>	

This toolkit was developed to provide information and analysis to support the South East Wales Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG) authorities with the process of Habitats Regulations Assessment as required by the Habitats Directive.

The approach outlined is complementary to, but does not replace, official Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) guidance and Countryside Council for Wales (Natural Resources Wales) advice, which should inform all HRA work. The approach and views expressed in this guidance are those of the consultants and do not have official status.

***Enfusion Ltd does not accept liability for use of the toolkit or decisions that are made based upon it.
(March 2011, Update)***

Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 INTRODUCTION

Requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment
Guidance for Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment
Consultation
Purpose & Structure of Report

2 METHOD

Screening

3 SCREENING

Task 1: Identification of European Sites
Task 2: Plan Review, Policy Screening and Identification of likely impacts
Task 3: Consideration of other plans, programmes and projects
Task 4: Screening Assessment

4 REVISED DEPOSIT LDP

5 INSPECTOR'S CHANGES AND MATTERS ARISING CHANGES

6 CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY

TABLES

1. Habitats Regulations Assessment: Key Stages
2. HRA Screening Stage: Key Tasks
3. Policy Screening: Categorising the Potential Effects of the Plan
4. Designated sites within the influence of the Newport City Council LDP

APPENDICES

- A. Details of the European Sites
- B. Assessment of Policies with No Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects 'Alone'
- C. Assessment of Policies including Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects 'Alone'
- D. Assessment of Other projects, Programmes and Plans for 'In Combination' Effects
- E. E1-Response to consultation December 2012
E2-Existing commitments
E3-Mitigation Measures
- F. Assessment summary of Revised June 2013 LDP and proposed changes to HRA and LDP

- G. G1-Assessment summary of MAC changes June 2014**
G2 – Assessment of MAC changes September - December 2014
- H. H1- Assessment Schedule of Inspector's Changes**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of spatial, development plans is a requirement of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) as set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. This report details the HRA Screening for **Newport City Council Adopted LDP Plan**. It sets out the methods, findings and the conclusions of the Screening Assessment.

Screening

An initial screening was carried out on the Newport City Council Deposit LDP in January 2010 (Initial Screening Report, produced by Atkins Limited in January 2010). This initial screening considered the likely significant effects of the Deposit LDP proposals on European Protected Sites. This initial screening identified two Internationally designated sites within the boundary of Newport:

- The River Usk Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- The Severn Estuary Special Protected Area (SPA), SAC and Ramsar site

In addition to these, a 15 km search from the boundary of Newport was carried out and a further five internationally designated sites were identified. These include:

- Cardiff Beechwoods SAC
- River Wye SAC
- Wye Valley Woodland SAC
- Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC
- Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC.

The initial screening report concluded that the Deposit LDP has the potential for likely significant effects on European and international sites through several pathways. Recommendations were made at this point including amendment of the policy wording and the addition of text to the Policies.

In January 2012 further screening of the revised Deposit LDP was carried out by Newport City Council's Ecology Officer. The 2012 screening identified thirteen policies that would require further research to determine if any likely significant effect on European/International sites.

To address the issues raised during the screening process, a number of recommendations including additional text into the Plan, were made to ensure that the policies would not cause likely significant effects on the designated sites.

Other Projects and Plans

In accordance with the Habitats Regulations, the potential for likely significant effects on the Plan 'in combination' with other projects and plans has also been considered. These individual projects and plans may not have an effect individually, but combined with other projects and plans can lead to likely significant effects.

Results

The Matters Arising Changes LDP puts forward 97 policies that are divided into eight chapters. This includes 21 strategic policies (SP1 to SP21) that set out the overall spatial strategy of the plan and eight general policies (GP1 to GP7) that could apply to any form of development. The subsequent chapters of the Plan provide detailed policies and proposals, with a separate chapter for each of the topic areas including Environment, Housing, Employment, Transport, Retailing and the City Centre, Community Facilities and other infrastructure, Minerals and Waste.

An assessment of each of the 97 policies (and associated monitoring proposals) has been completed to determine if there are any likely significant effects on the European sites alone that were identified in the initial screening report carried out by Atkins. The assessment found that none of the policies and proposals outlined in the Plan would lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the seven European sites alone.

A detailed assessment was carried out on those policies and proposals that had the potential to affect the European sites within the Newport boundary (including the River Usk SAC and the Severn Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar site) and those within 15 km (including the Cardiff Beechwoods SAC, River Wye SAC, Wye Valley Woodland SAC, Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC and Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC). The details of these assessments are provided in Appendix B and C of this report.

An assessment of in combination effects has also been completed. A total of 14 other projects, programmes and plans were identified. None of these were found to lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the seven European sites when considered 'in combination' with the Deposit Plan. The details of these assessments are provided in Appendix D of this report.

Conclusion at Deposit Plan Stage

The HRA concluded that with mitigation, (this includes various policies and caveats found within the plan), there would be no likely significant effect of the Newport Deposit LDP on any of the internationally designated sites within Newport or within a 15km radius of the Newport boundary

Further Work

As a result of public consultation several changes were proposed to both the Deposit LDP and the HRA in December 2012. These can be seen in Appendix E, Table E1.

Revised Deposit LDP

The LDP was revised reflecting the proposed changes and a Revised LDP June 2013 has been compiled.

This revised LDP has been re-assessed to determine whether any of the changes within the Revised LDP are likely to result in significant effects on the internationally designated sites identified during the screening process. Where there have been no changes, or minimal changes, the original assessment remains.

A summary of the changes to the Revised LDP is shown in Appendix F, Table F1.

Subsequently, a small number of additional minor changes have been made. Significantly, Appendix Table E2 has been amended to include all allocations carried over from the UDP.

Matters Arising Changes June - December 2014

The matters arising changes do not change the overall LDP strategy they are proposed changes by the Council in response to the Planning Inspector's recommendations.

Appendix G1 & G2 outlines the proposed changes and in response the changes that have been made to the HRA Screening Assessment from June to December 2014.

Appendix H1 outlines the assessment of the Inspector's changes in response the proposed changes of the HRA

Final Conclusions

Following this assessment the HRA concluded that with mitigation, there would be no likely significant effects of the Matters Arising Changes Newport LDP on any of the internationally designated sites within Newport or within a 15km radius.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Newport City Council is currently developing a Local Development Plan and is undertaking Habitats Regulations Assessment in line with the requirements set by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010¹ [The Habitats Regulations].
- 1.2 Atkins Limited (Atkins) produced an Initial Screening report of the LDP Deposit Plan in January 2010 on behalf of Newport City Council. The findings of the initial assessment helped inform the development of this Habitat Regulation Assessment.
- 1.3 This HRA report addresses the likely significant effect[s] on designated European Site[s] of implementing the policies and proposals of the Revised Newport City Council Deposit LDP
- 1.5 Habitats Regulations Assessment is also commonly referred to as Appropriate Assessment (AA) although the requirement for AA is first determined by an initial 'screening' stage undertaken as part of the full HRA. This report addresses the Screening phase of the HRA; it outlines the screening tasks and the key findings emerging from the assessment.

Requirement for Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.6 The European Directive (92/43/EEC) on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna (the Habitats Directive) protects habitats and species of European nature conservation importance. The Habitats Directive establishes a network of internationally important sites designated for their ecological status. These are referred to as Natura 2000 (N2K) sites or European Sites, and comprise Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) [which are classified under the Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds, the 'Birds Directive'].
- 1.7 Articles 6 (3) and 6 (4) of the Habitats Directive require HRA to be undertaken on proposed plans or projects which are not necessary for the management of the site but which are likely to have a significant effect on one or more European sites either individually, or in combination with other plans and projects.² This requirement is set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 which require the application of HRA to all land use plans. Welsh Government (WG) guidance also requires that Ramsar sites (which support internationally important wetland habitats) and are listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention 1971) are included within HRA and that candidate SACs (cSAC) and proposed SPAs (pSPA) are treated as 'designated' sites in the context of HRA. In this report the term 'European sites' will be used when referring to SACs, cSACs, SPAs, pSPAs and Ramsar sites. For the purpose of this HRA European sites will consider Ramsar sites.
- 1.8 The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of a land-use plan, in combination with the effects of other plans and projects, against the conservation objectives of a European Site and to ascertain whether it has likely significant effects (Stage 1 – Screening). If likely significant effects are identified Stage 2 – AA is completed to

¹ The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 consolidate all the various amendments made to the 1994 Regulations in respect of England and Wales.

² Determining whether an effect is 'significant' is undertaken in relation to the designated interest features and conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 sites. If an impact on any conservation objective is assessed as being adverse then it should be treated as significant. Where information is limited the precautionary principle applies and significant effects should be assumed until evidence exists to the contrary.

determine if the plan would adversely affect the integrity³ of that European site(s). Where significant negative effects are identified, alternative options or mitigation measures should be examined to avoid any potential damaging effects (Stage 3 of the HRA process). Where effects are unavoidable, imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI) must be demonstrated and compensation measures must be provided. This is so long as there are no viable, less damaging, alternatives to the proposals available. (Regulation 104)”

- 1.9 The scope of the HRA is dependent on the location, size and significance of the proposed plan or project and the sensitivities and nature of the interest features of the European sites under consideration.

Guidance for Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.9 Guidance for HRA is contained in WG’s Technical Advice Note 5: Nature Conservation and Planning, Annex 6 ‘The Appraisal of Development Plans in Wales under the Provisions of the Habitats Regulations’ (Sept 2009). The Countryside Council for Wales (Natural Resources Wales) has also produced Draft guidance⁴ to assist plan making authorities to comply with the requirements of the Habitats Directive.
- 1.10 The methods and approach used for this screening are based on the formal Welsh guidance currently available and emergent practice, which recommends that HRA is approached in three main stages - outlined in Table 1. This report outlines the method and findings for stage 1 of the HRA process.

³ Integrity is described as the sites’ coherence, ecological structure and function across the whole area that enables it to sustain the habitat, complex of habitats and/or levels of populations of species for which it was classified, (ODPM, 2005).

⁴ Tyldesley, D., 2009, Draft Guidance for Plan Making Authorities in Wales: The Appraisal of Plans under the Habitats Directive for Countryside Council for Wales Bangor.

Table 1	
Habitats Regulations Assessment: Key Stages	
Stage 1	
Screening for likely significant effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify international sites in and around the plan/ strategy area in a search area agreed with the Statutory Body the Countryside Council for Wales Examine conservation objectives of the interest feature(s)(where available) Review plan policies and proposals and consider potential effects on European sites (magnitude, duration, location, extent) Examine other plans and programmes that could contribute to 'in combination' effects Consider opportunities to avoid, cancel and reduce any likely significant effects identified Produce Screening Assessment <p><i>If no effects likely, or effects can be avoided, cancelled or reduced through the introduction of appropriate measures – - report no significant effect (taking advice from Natural Resources Wales as necessary).</i></p> <p><i>If effects are judged likely or uncertainty exists - the precautionary principle applies proceed to stage 2</i></p>
Stage 2	
Appropriate Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete additional scoping work including the collation of further information on sites as necessary to evaluate impact in light of conservation objectives Agree scope and method of AA with Natural Resources Wales Consider how plan 'in combination' with other plans and programmes will interact when implemented (the Appropriate Assessment) Consider how effect on integrity of site could be avoided by changes to plan and the consideration of alternatives Develop mitigation measures (including timescale and mechanisms) Report outcomes of AA including mitigation measures, consult with Natural Resources Wales and wider [public] stakeholders as necessary If plan will not significantly effect European site proceed without further reference to Habitats Regs <p><i>If effects or uncertainty remain following the consideration of alternatives and development of mitigations proceed to stage 3</i></p>
Stage 3	
Procedures where significant effect on integrity of international site remains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider alternative solutions, delete from plan or modify Consider if priority species/ habitats affected Identify 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (IROPI) economic, social, environmental, human health, public safety Notify Assembly Government Develop and secure compensatory measures

Consultation

- 1.9 The Habitats Regulations require the plan making/competent authority to consult the appropriate nature conservation statutory body [in this case Natural Resources Wales].
- 1.10 Consultation on the approach to this HRA, including advice on which European sites should be considered within the area of search, has been undertaken with Natural Resources Wales as required. An inception meeting was held on 8th January 2009 between Newport City Council (including Biodiversity Officer), Atkins, the Countryside Council for Wales and the Environment Agency (now Natural Resources Wales at the time of consultation they were CCW/EA therefore they shall be referred to as CCW/EA if at the time they had not merged). Representatives from each organisation were able to identify key vulnerabilities of the European sites and to identify those allocation sites that would likely have a significant effect upon European designated sites. Following this, the Countryside Council for Wales commented on the Initial Screening Report findings⁵ and provided recommendations and comments which have been taken forward in the iterative HRA work documented in this report.
- 1.11 Following the finding of the initial screening, Countryside Council for Wales has been consulted throughout the HRA process. A meeting with the Countryside Council for Wales was held on 18th January 2012, and the key vulnerabilities of each of the European sites were discussed. It was agreed that there would be some amendments to the initial key vulnerabilities identified in 2009. The Countryside Council for Wales were also asked to provide any additional information⁶ regarding other plans or policies that may have been produced since the initial screening, as a result of which two further plans were added to the list for consideration of in combination effects. A further meeting⁷ was held on Monday 13th February 2012 with the Countryside Council for Wales to discuss site specific policies (Policies SP18; EM1 ii,iv,v; EM2 v,vi,vii) and the potential for likely significant effects as a result of these policies. It was agreed that additional wording in the supportive text of the Plan should prevent any likely significant effects from these policies.
- 1.12 The Habitats Regulations leave consultation with other bodies and the public to the discretion of the plan making authority. The WG guidance notes that it is good practice to make information on HRA available to the public at each formal development plan consultation stage. Therefore, in addition to the statutory consultation undertaken with Natural Resources Wales (formerly Countryside Council for Wales and Environment Agency Wales) this report is being made available for wider public consultation.
- 1.13 The Revised LDP has been re-assessed to determine if there are any likely significant effects. The proposed changes can be found in Appendix F, Table F1.
- 1.14 Following the submission of the June 2013, additional changes were made in response to comments from NRW. Notably; Appendix Table E1 has been amended to include all allocations carried forward from the UDP.

Purpose & Structure of Report

- 1.15 This report documents the process and the findings from the Screening stages of the HRA for Newport City Council Deposit, Revised Deposit LDP and the Matters Arising

⁵ Email received from CCW on 5th March 2010 Containing comments and recommendations for the Initial Screening Report carried out by Atkins.

⁶ Email from Sue Howard. CCW. Dated 7th February. Other Projects and Plans.

⁷ Meeting held with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-coordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 13th February 2012. to discuss specific policies and allocations within the Plan.

Changes. Following this introductory section the document is organised into a further three sections:

- **Section 2** - outlines the method used for the Screening process and includes reference to the key information sources used.
- **Section 3** - outlines the process and summary findings of the Screening Process and the assessment.
- **Section 4** - outlines the conclusions, including the consultation commentary and how the plan should proceed with reference to the Habitats Regulations.

2.0 METHOD

Screening

- 2.1 In accordance with the official Welsh guidance and current practice, conducting the screening stage of the HRA for Newport City Council LDP employed the method outlined below. This approach combines both a plan focus and a European site focus.
- The plan focus first screens out those elements of the plan unlikely to affect European site integrity and then considers the impacts of the remaining elements on European sites, including the potential for 'in-combination' impacts.
 - The European site focus considers the environmental conditions of the site and the factors required to maintain site integrity, and looks at the potential impacts the plan may have.
- 2.2 HRA experience to date has indicated that maintaining a site based approach as core to the HRA method more closely reflects the intent of the Habitats Directive. This means that subsequent mitigation measures [developed if/as required during the Stage 2 - AA] seek to focus on the conditions necessary to maintain site integrity (e.g. avoiding specific types of development/ activity at or near sensitive areas). This is considered to be a more robust and defensible approach than adding policy caveats at a strategic level and devolving decisions about impacts on site integrity to lower level planning documents. Although, this approach does recognise that some decisions on avoidance and mitigation can only be made when site level detail becomes available.
- 2.3 The key tasks employed for the HRA Screening are set out in Table 2.

Table 2	
HRA Screening Stage 1: Key Tasks	
Task 1 Identification of Natura 2000 sites & characterisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Identification of European sites both within the plan/proposal boundaries and in an area of search extending to 15 km [as recommended by extant guidance] around the plan/proposal area. Although 15 km is considered a relatively precautionary approach to identifying European sites that may be affected by the plan, following Natural Resources Wales advice (18th January 2012), European sites over 15 km away were also identified. During the review of the Plan the need to include these sites was considered and where possible ruled out. ■ This includes considering hydrological connectivity and the catchments of watercourses relating to identified designations ■ Information was obtained for each European site, based on publicly available information and consultation with Natural Resources Wales where appropriate.⁸ ■ This included information relating to the sites' qualifying features; conservation objectives; vulnerabilities/ sensitivities, current conditions, trends and geographical boundaries.
Task 2 Plan review and identification of likely impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Screening of the plan/proposal and the identification of likely significant effects (including a review of the plan/proposal's aims, objectives, strategic policies, including spatial implications where identified to determine likely impacts).
Task 3 Consideration of other plans and programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Consideration, where appropriate of other plans and programmes that may have in-combination effects with the plan/proposal.
Task 4 Screening Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Assessment of the potential for identified likely significant effects to affect the designated interest features of European sites, including the consideration of avoidance, cancellation or reduction measures. ■ Summary of screening outcomes and recommendations.

2.4 As part of this screening, consideration was given to the related Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) work which has, or is currently being undertaken by neighboring authorities and statutory organizations.

2.5 The following documentation was reviewed for the purpose of 'in-combination' effects:

- Caerphilly County Borough Council-Strategic Environmental Assessment-Document 5. Habitat Regulation Assessment of the Local Development Plan.
- Cardiff City Council- Background Technical Paper No.4 Habitats Regulation Report of the County Council of the City and Borough of Cardiff Local Development Plan Preferred Strategy (2012)

⁸ Key Information Sources: Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) web resource www.jncc.gov.uk including site details/ character contained on Natura 2000 Standard Data Form. Conservation Objectives, management plan information, Countryside Council for Wales web resource <http://www.NaturalResourcesWales.gov.uk/>

- Monmouthshire County Council-Habitat Regulations Assessment of Monmouthshire Deposit Local Development Plan (2012)
- Torfaen County Borough Council-Torfaen County Borough Council Local Development Plan 2006-2021 Habitat Regulations Assessment (2008)
- Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council-Appropriate Assessment of the Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council's Local Development Plan (2006-2021)(2007)
- Newport City Council-Habitat Regulation Assessment Newport City Council River Usk Strategy.
- Countryside Council for Wales- HRA of a proposal for a continuous coastal path between Cardiff and Chepstow (May 2011)
- Veolia Environmental Services-Llanwern Steelworks Energy Recovery Facility: Environmental Statement Appendix 10.2 HRA (December 2011)
- Welsh Water-Final Water Resources Management Plan (September 2012)
- Newport City Council-HRA for Newport City Council Supplementary Planning Guidance: Crindau Development (September 2009)
- Planning Application 07/0540-HRA of Land to the rear of Whitehead works Cardiff Road Newport (2007)
- Severn Estuary Coastal Group-Shoreline Management Plan (2000)
- Newport City Council Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011

2.6 The following additional documents to be considered with in-combination effects have been agreed with Natural Resources Wales (7th February 2012)⁶ :

- Severn Estuary Coastal Group Shoreline Management Plan Review Draft Report (2009)
- Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan-Appendix 1: Strategic EA Report.

Screening

- 2.7 The Newport City Council LDP was - for the purposes of the HRA - subject to an initial screening process. The aim of this screening is to identify at a broad level those policies that will not have a likely significant effect on European sites and those that have the potential to have a likely significant effect both alone and in combination on the European sites identified at Task 1.
- 2.8 Following consultation with CCW⁹ (via email and telephone) the vulnerabilities of each site were discussed and agreed. The vulnerabilities of each of the designated sites within a 15 km radius of the Newport boundary can be found in Appendix A.
- 2.9 This screening approach is in accordance with Countryside Council for Wales draft guidance for the appraisal of plans under the Habitats Directive (Tyldesley, D. 2009). There are four categories of potential effects, which are then sub-divided to provide further information, they are as follows in Table 3:

⁹ The list of vulnerabilities that the policies have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-coordinator for the Environment Policy Group) at CCW (26/01/2012)

Table 3- Policy Screening: Categorising the Potential Effects of the Plan (Tyldesley, 2009)	
Criteria Category	Rationale
Category A: No negative effect	
A1	Options/ policies that will not themselves lead to development e.g. because they relate to design or other qualitative criteria for development, or they are not a land use planning policy.
A2	Options/ policies intended to protect the natural environment, including biodiversity.
A3	Options/ policies intended to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site.
A4	Options/ policies that positively steer development away from European sites and associated sensitive areas.
A5	Options/ policies that would have no effect because no development could occur through the policy itself, the development being implemented through later policies in the same plan, which are more specific and therefore more appropriate to assess for their effects on European Sites and associated sensitive areas.
Category B: No significant effect	
B	Options/ policies that could have an effect but would not be likely to have a significant (negative) effect on a European site (alone or in-combination with other plans or projects) because the effects are trivial or 'de minimis' even if combined with other effects.
Category C: Likely significant effect alone	
C1	The option, policy could directly affect a European site because it provides for, or steers, a quantity or type of development onto a European site, or adjacent to it.
C2	The option, policy could indirectly affect a European site e.g. because it provides for, or steers, a quantity or type of development that may be very close to it, or ecologically, hydrologically or physically connected to it or it may increase disturbance as a result of increased recreational pressure.
C3	Proposals for a magnitude of development that, no matter where it is located, the development would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site.
C4	An option, or policy that makes provision for a quantity/ type of development (and may indicate one or more broad locations e.g. a particular part of the plan area), but the effects are uncertain because the detailed location of the development is to be selected following consideration of options in a later, more specific plan . The consideration of options in the later plan will assess potential effects on European Sites, but because the development could possibly affect a European site a significant effect cannot be ruled out on the basis of objective information
C5	Options, policies or proposals for developments or infrastructure projects that could block options or alternatives for the provision of other development or projects in the future, which will be required in the public interest, that may lead to adverse effects on European sites, which would otherwise be avoided.
C6	Options, policies or proposals which depend on how the policies etc are implemented in due course, for example, through the development management process. There is a theoretical possibility that if implemented in one or more particular ways, the proposal could possibly have a significant effect on a European site

Table 3- Policy Screening: Categorising the Potential Effects of the Plan (Tyldesley, 2009)	
Criteria Category	Rationale
C7	Any other options, policies or proposals that would be vulnerable to failure under the Habitats Regulations at project assessment stage; to include them in the plan would be regarded by the EC as 'faulty planning'.
C8	Any other proposal that may have an adverse effect on a European site, which might try to pass the tests of the Habitats Regulations at project assessment stage by arguing that the plan provides the imperative reasons of overriding public interest to justify its consent despite a negative assessment.
Category D: Likely significant effects in combination	
D1	The option, policy or proposal alone would not be likely to have significant effects but if its effects are combined with the effects of other policies or proposals provided for or coordinated by the Local Development Document (internally) the cumulative effects would be likely to be significant.
D2	Options, policies or proposals that alone would not be likely to have significant effects but if their effects are combined with the effects of other plans and projects and possibly the effects of other developments provided for in the Local Development Document as well, the combined effects are likely to be significant.
D3	Options or proposals that are, or could be, part of a programme or sequence of development delivered over a period, where the implementation of the early stages would not have a significant effect on European sites, but which would dictate the nature, scale, duration, location, timing of the whole project, the later stages of which could have adverse effects on such sites.

- 2.10 Categories A, C and D are sub-divided so that the specific reason why a policy has been allocated to a particular category is clear. .

3.0 SCREENING

Task 1: Identification of European Sites & Characterisation within Newport Boundary

- 3.1 Approximately 70% of Newport is rural. The remaining 30% is urban and is concentrated around the centre of the city, and around the River Usk. There are two European sites that fall within the Newport boundary. The first is the River Usk SAC and the second is the Severn Estuary Ramsar site/SPA/SAC. There are also an additional five European sites within 15 km of city boundary.
- 3.2 The urban environment is separated from the Severn Estuary by the Gwent Levels Site of Special Scientific interest (SSSI) which span from the eastern part of Wales in Monmouthshire to the west in Cardiff. As a result of historic anthropogenic interference, including land reclamation, a mosaic of habitats including alluvial wetlands and intertidal mudflats has been created within the SSSI. As a result of this, the Gwent Levels not only provides habitats for nationally rare aquatic invertebrates (the feature of the designation), it also provides roosting and breeding sites for those birds listed as qualifying features for the Severn Estuary SPA and Ramsar site (therefore habitats on the Gwent Levels form a functional part of the SPA/Ramsar site outside of the European site boundaries). For this reason when considering the vulnerabilities of the Severn Estuary SPA/Ramsar sites it is critical to consider both the aquatic and terrestrial habitats (including those outside of the European site boundary).
- 3.3 The River Usk flows through the centre of Newport and is developed on either side in certain areas with housing and employment, as well as industry. The River Usk SAC shares several of its qualifying features with the Severn Estuary SAC, including sea lamprey, river lamprey and twaite shad. These species use the River Usk as a migratory route to spawn; therefore any effects upon the River Usk such as creating barriers to movement would ultimately have a significant effect on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC.
- 3.4 Otters are a qualifying features of the River Usk SAC and rely upon the riparian habitats located either side of the river, therefore it is essential to consider loss of suitable riparian habitat when assessing the likely significant effects of the Plan.
- 3.5 Plans and proposals can have spatial implications that extend beyond the intended plan boundaries. In particular, it is recognised that distance in itself is not a definitive guide to the likelihood or severity of an impact [inaccessibility and remoteness are typically more relevant] as factors such as the prevailing wind direction, river flow direction, and ground water flow direction will all have a bearing on the relative distance at which an impact can occur. This means that a plan directing development some distance away from a European site could still have effects on the site and needs to be considered as part of the screening process.
- 3.6 Taking into account the potential for transboundary impacts the screening has identified seven European Sites that lie within 15 km of the influence of the Newport City Council's LDP. These sites are outlined in Table 4 and detailed information for the European sites is provided in Appendix A.

Table 4		
European Sites within the influence of the Newport City Council plan	Designation	Distance from NCC Boundary
■ River Usk	SAC	Within boundary
■ Severn Estuary	Ramsar, SAC, SPA	Within Newport boundary, to the south
■ Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC	SAC	4.7 km east
■ Cardiff Beechwoods	SAC	8 km west
■ Wye Valley Woodlands	SAC	9 km east
■ River Wye	SAC	10 km east
■ Aberbargoed Grasslands	SAC	12 km north west

- 3.7 The River Usk Bat SAC is located approximately 25 km from Newport. This site is designated for its Internationally important habitats (including blanket bog and European dry heaths) and its population of lesser horseshoe bats. The need to include this European site in this HRA has been considered due to potential for bat populations to be using the River Usk corridor as a flight path and for foraging purposes. However it is considered due to distance that there would be not likely be significant effects on the habitats within the SAC from the Plan. Following discussions with Natural Resources Wales, the need to include the River Usk Bat SAC has been ruled out due to the understanding that lesser horseshoe bats from the SAC are unlikely to travel the distances into the boundary of Newport.
- 3.8 There are no other European sites that need to be included in the assessment (as agreed with CCW¹⁰).

¹⁰ A meeting between Newport City Council and Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) was held on January 18th 2012. It was agreed that the seven European sites that identified in the initial screening are to be used.

Task 2: Plan/Strategy review, policy screening and identification of likely significant effects

Newport City Council Matters Arising Changes Plan: Summary Review

- 3.9 The purpose of the LDP is to guide the development of Newport over the next 15 years.
- 3.10 There are ten objectives within the Plan. These are:
- Objective 1 - Sustainable Use of Land;
 - Objective 2 - Climate Change;
 - Objective 3 - Economic Growth;
 - Objective 4 – Housing;
 - Objective 5 - Conservation and the Environment;
 - Objective 6 - Conservation and the Environment;
 - Objective 7 - Community Facilities and Infrastructure;
 - Objective 8 - Culture and Accessibility; and,
 - Objective 9 -Health and Wellbeing,
 - Objective 10-Waste
- 3.11 The Plan is divided into eight parts including a total of 99 policies. This includes 21 strategic policies (SP1 to SP21) that set out the overall spatial strategy of the Plan and general policies (GP1 to GP7) that apply to any form of development.
- 3.12 The subsequent chapters of the Plan provide detailed policies and proposals, with a separate chapter for each of the topic areas, including:
- Chapter 4 - Environment: Policies CE1 to CE11;
 - Chapter 5 - Housing: Policies H1 to H18;
 - Chapter 6 -Employment: Policies EM1 to EM3;
 - Chapter 7 -Transport: PoliciesT1 to T8;
 - Chapter 8 - Retailing and the City Centre: Policies R1 to R11;
 - Chapter 9 - Community Facilities and other infrastructure: Policies CF1 to CF13;
 - Chapter 10 - Minerals: Policies M1 to M4; and,
 - Chapter 11 - Waste: Policies W1 to W3.
- 3.13 The Plan also contains a section on monitoring. The proposals for monitoring have also been assessed (see Appendix B).

Newport City Councils: The vision of what the plan seeks to achieve;

As a gateway to Wales, Newport will be a centre of regeneration that celebrates its culture and heritage, while being a focus for varied economic growth that will strengthen its contribution to the region. It will be a place that people recognise as a lively, dynamic, growing City, with communities living in harmony in a unique natural environment

- 3.14 The key theme within the Plan is sustainability; as a result of this an iterative approach has been taken throughout the development stages with a full Sustainability Appraisal incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA). Biodiversity

has been recognised as something that needs to be addressed within the Plan and Objective 6, Conservation and the Environment states that the plan must “*protect and enhance the quality of the natural environment, including protected and non-protected species and habitats*”.

- 3.15 In support of this, General Policy 5 (GP5 - Natural Environment) aims to protect and enhance biodiversity and to ensure that there are no adverse effects on nature conservation interest including international, European, national and local sites. The supporting text, 3.23 and 3.28 draws attention to the fact that the onus is on the developer to consider effects on wildlife at pre-application stage. Section 3.23 states that the competent authority will be required to undertake a HRA of proposals that have the potential to affect European designated sites.
- 3.16 The Plan aims to meet the housing requirement of 11,623 additional dwellings (Policy H1) with a major development proposed at the former Llanwern Steelworks.
- 3.17 Major redevelopment sites are located either side of the River Usk in the centre of Newport, Rogerstone, Cardiff Road as well as the former Llanwern Steelworks.

Summary of the Screening Assessment

- 3.18 The Newport City Council Deposit LDP has the potential to impact upon European sites in several ways. These can be broadly be categorised as:
 - **Urbanisation Impacts and Recreational:** Resulting from an expanding population within and around the Eastern Expansion Area, issues including disturbance from construction and an increased population, pollution (water, air, noise, light);
 - **Land take:** From proximal and adjacent development to European sites, including impacts on surrounding ‘buffer’ habitats/ green space areas not designated for European interest but part of wider habitats connectivity supporting site integrity (important when considering the features of the designated sites, e.g. otters require riparian habitat, bird features of the SPA and Ramsar require terrestrial habitat;
 - **Water Resources and Water Quality:** Resulting from increased demand for water consumption and discharge requirements arising from new/ expanded housing and commercial developments and the potential for increased point source pollution, changes to surface water/ run-off which may have implications for water dependant sites; and,
 - **Atmospheric Pollution:** Arising from a growth in traffic and transport and general development (emissions from construction/ building). Policies that lead to development could result in an increase of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and sulphur dioxide (SO_x)

Task 3: Consideration of Other Plans, Programmes and Projects

- 3.19 It is a requirement of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive that HRA examines the potential for plans and projects to have a significant effect either individually or ‘in combination’ with other plans, programmes and projects (PPPs). Undertaking an assessment of other PPPs for the Newport City Council Deposit LDP has required a pragmatic approach given the extensive range of PPPs underway in the surrounding region. The approach taken was cognisant of the emphasis in the forthcoming WG

guidance that considering the potential for in-combination effects is core to delivering robust / precautionary HRA.¹¹

- 3.20 When considering other PPPs attention was focused on those aimed at delivering planned spatial growth with the most significant being those that seek to provide, housing, employment and infrastructure. The review considered the most relevant plans including which are listed in Appendix D. An assessment of existing housing commitments was also undertaken, Appendix E2 .
- 3.21 The potential effects of these plans are reviewed in and the potential for these effects to act 'in-combination' with effects identified from Newport City Council LDP are considered in Appendix D.
- 3.22 This assessment found no likely significant effects from the Plan 'in combination' with any other projects, programmes and plans.

Task 4: Screening Assessment

- 3.23 In line with the screening requirement of the Habitats Regulations, an assessment was undertaken to determine the potential significant effects of the Newport City Council Deposit LDP on the seven European sites that lie within the influence of the plan. The screening decision was informed by:
 - The information gathered on the European sites (see Appendix A);
 - The review of the Plan policies and their likely effects (see Appendices B and C) which included an analysis of the potential environmental effects generated by the development activities directed by the LDP;
 - The review of other relevant plans and programmes (see Appendix D);
 - The opportunities to introduce avoidance, cancellation or reduction measures to address the potential likely significant effects identified; and,
 - WG and Natural Resources Wales guidance which indicates that HRA for plans is typically broader and more strategic than project level HRA and that it is proportionate to the available detail of the plan.
- 3.24 Policies that have no development proposals within them have been assessed separately to policies that contain allocations or proposals for development. Likely significant effects 'alone' of the non development related proposals are considered for all seven European sites together (see Table B-1 in Appendix B). As these policies relate to design or protection/enhancement of biodiversity features, the historic and built environment no development can occur through these policies. Alternatively, if these policies were to result in development, there is not sufficient detail within the plan to make a full assessment of likely significant effects and the information for suitable assessment is provided in other policies contained within the Plan. Having said that, these Policies have also been considered in combination with other Plans and Policies see Appendix D Table D-1. Furthermore, where sufficient information does not exist on a certain policy (and no further detail has been provided in other policies) there are a number of policies contained within the plan that will ensure that any development that has the potential to impact upon a European site must undergo a HRA to determine whether the proposal will have likely significant effects.
- 3.25 Likely significant effects 'alone' of the development related proposals are considered for each of the seven European sites independently (see Table C-1 to C-4 in Appendix C).

¹¹ The review also draws on work being undertaken on behalf of the South East Wales Strategic Planning Group (SEWSPG) to build a resource kit of information and analysis to support HRA in the region.

- 3.26 During the screening process recommendations were made to Newport City Council with regards to additional text within the plan to ensure that any policies/proposals will not have likely significant effect upon the European designated sites. As a result of this, sections of the Plan have been altered and the screening outcomes reflect these changes.
- 3.27 Following from the public consultation in 2012, several changes have been made to the Deposit Newport LDP. In June 2013 a revised LDP was completed and re-assessed for any likely significant effects following the same procedure as the initial screening. Following the hearing sessions of the LDP Examination a series of Matters Arising Changes have been proposed. These are the subject of this assessment.

Screening Assessment Summary

- 3.28 The detail of the main screening exercise is set out in **Appendices B and C** and the result of the assessment is summarised in the paragraphs below.

River Usk SAC

- 3.29 Several of the Policies and site allocations have the potential to affect the River Usk SAC, these include:
- SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i) Motorway Junction 28 Tredegar Park, ii) Western extension SDR, ,;
 - H1 - Housing Sites: Allocations (, Whiteheads Works and Old Town Dock);
 - EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposals i), ii), iv) (Duffryn, Queensway Meadows, Solutia,);
 - EM2 – Newport Docks;
 - T5 - Walkways and Cycle routes.
- 3.30 These policies were identified as having the most potential to result in likely significant effects on the River Usk SAC through disturbance, barriers to movement and habitat loss. However, after consultation with Natural Resources Wales¹² it was considered that with mitigation these policies and proposals could be delivered without likely significant effects on the River Usk SAC. An outline of the mitigation measures required has been included in the Plan in relation to each of these policies and Policy GP5 states that there is a requirement for the developer to complete HRA at the planning permission stage (see Table C1 Appendix C).
- 3.31 As such none of the policies will lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC, alone or in combination.

Severn Estuary SAC

- 3.32 Several of the Policies and site allocations have the potential to affect the Severn Estuary SAC, these include:
- SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i) Motorway Junction 2 Tredegar Park, ii) Western extension SDR, ,;
 - H1 - Housing Sites: Allocations (, Whiteheads Works and Old Town Dock);
 - EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposals i), ii), iv) (Duffryn, Queensway Meadows Solutia,);

¹² Meeting with Kerry Roger CCW on Monday 13th February 2012.

- EM2 – Newport Docks;
- T5 - Walkways and Cycle routes.

- 3.33 These policies were identified as having the most potential to result in likely significant effects on the Severn Estuary SAC through disturbance and barriers to movement, (in particular Allis Shad). However, after consultation with Natural Resources Wales¹³ it was considered that with mitigation these policies and proposals could be delivered without likely significant effects on the Severn Estuary SAC. An outline of the mitigation measure required has been included in the Plan in relation to each of these policies and Policy GP5 states that there is a requirement for the developer to complete HRA at the planning permission stage (see Table C-2 in Appendix C).
- 3.34 As such none of the policies will lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC, alone or in combination.

Severn Estuary Ramsar and SPA

- 3.35 Several of the Policies and site allocations have the potential to effect the Severn Estuary Ramsar and SPA these include:
- SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i)Motorway Junction 2 Tredegar Park, ii)Western extension SDR, ,;
 - H1 - Housing Sites: Allocations (, Whiteheads Works and Old Town Dock);
 - EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposals i), ii),iv) (Duffryn, Queensway Meadows, Solutia,);
 - EM2 – Newport Docks;T5 - Walkways and Cycle routes.

- 3.36 These policies were identified as having the most potential to result in likely significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA and Ramsar site through disturbance, barriers to movement and habitat loss. However, after consultation with Natural Resources Wales¹⁴ it was considered that with mitigation these policies and proposals could be delivered without likely significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA and Ramsar site. An outline of the mitigation measure required has been included in the Plan in relation to each of these policies and Policy GP5 states that there is a requirement for the developer to complete HRA at the planning permission stage (see Tables C-3 and C-4 in Appendix C).
- 3.37 As such none of the policies will lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA and Ramsar site, alone or in combination.

Designated Sites Outside of the Boundary of Newport

- 3.38 Five European sites were identified outside of Newport's boundary: Cardiff Beechwoods SAC, River Wye SAC, Wye Valley Woodland SAC, Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC and Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC.
- 3.39 None of the policies or proposals within the plan would lead to direct or indirect effects on these European sites, based upon the agreed vulnerabilities of each site. These include disturbance and barriers to movement, habitat loss, inappropriate management, loss of foraging habitat, anti-social behavior and disturbance.

¹³ Meeting with Kerry Roger CCW on Monday 13th February 2012.

¹⁴ Meeting with Kerry Roger CCW on Monday 13th February 2012.

- 3.40 Having assessed each European site against the policies and proposals contained with the Plan it is considered extremely unlikely that the policies and proposals would have a likely significant effect on any of these European site.
- 3.41 As such none of the policies will lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the Cardiff Beechwoods SAC, River Wye SAC, Wye Valley Woodland SAC, Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC and Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC, alone or in combination.

4.0 Matters Arising Changes LDP

- 4.1 This report outlines the methods used and the findings arising from the screening stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment undertaken for the Newport City Council Local Development Plan
- 4.2 A screening report has been prepared for each stage of the LDP process and this report has been updated to reflect changes within the Plan.
- 4.3 The HRA considered seven European Sites within the influence of the Newport City Council Revised Deposit LDP including:
- River Usk SAC;
 - Severn Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar site;
 - River Wye SAC
 - Cardiff Beechwoods SAC,
 - Wye Valley Woodland SAC,
 - Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC; and,
 - Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC
- 4.4 A detailed assessment of each policy contained within the Revised Deposit June 2013 (and associated monitoring proposals) has been completed to determine if there are any likely significant effects on these European sites alone. The assessment found that none of the policies and proposals outlined in the Plan would lead to likely significant effects on the qualifying features of these seven European sites alone. The details of these assessments are provided in Appendix B and C of this report, which have been subsequently updated in line with the Matters Arising Changes in June 2014 (see section 5 below for full details)
- 4.5 An assessment of 'in combination' effects has also been completed. A total of 14 other projects, programmes and plans were identified. None of these were found to lead to likely significant effects on these seven European sites when considered 'in combination' with the Revised Deposit Plan. The details of these assessments are provided in Appendix D of this report.
All Policies and Allocations contained within the Plan have been assessed individually as well as in combination with other Plans and Policies outlined in Section 2, Method.

5.0 Inspector's Changes and Matters Arising Changes December 2014

- 5.1 During the LDP examination a number of Matters Arising Changes were made and the assessment of these changes are set out in appendices G1&G2 of this report. In addition to the MACs the Inspector has recommended 4 changes to the Plan, the assessment of which is set out in appendix H1 of this report. It should be noted that the LDP which is to be adopted by Newport City Council is the submitted LDP (December 2013) in addition with all the MACs and the four Inspector Changes.
- 5.2 The assessment of the LDP found that none of the changes to the Policies/Allocations from MACs or identified by the Inspector would lead to significant effects on the qualifying features of the European sites alone, and in combination.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 In conclusion, the findings of the assessment indicate that the Newport City Council LDP, consisting of the submitted LDP (December 2013), all MACs (June-December 2014) and the Inspector's Changes, in implementation will not have a likely significant effect on the European site[s] considered as part of the HRA screening alone or in combination and will not require full AA under the Habitats Regulations.
- 6.2 This conclusion has been reached following consultation with Natural Resources Wales and the subsequent incorporation of minor changes into the HRA Screening Report.

REFERENCES/ BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *Newport Urban Otter Survey*. Just Mammals on behalf of NCC. August 2006
- *Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP)* Produced by Welsh Water (2011)
- Caerphilly County Borough Council Local Development Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment Report. (Incorporating Appropriate Assessment) October 2008
- Monmouthshire County Council. Deposit Local Development Plan Habitat Regulation Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) Report June 2011
- Newport City Council Local Development Plan Habitat Regulations Assessment Initial Screening Report. Carried out by Atkins Ltd. January 2010
- The County Council of the City and County of Cardiff. Deposit Local Development Plan 2006-2021. March 2009
- Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Cardiff Beech Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (underpinned by Garth Woods SSSI, Castell Coch Woodlands and Road Section SSSI, Fforestganol a Chwm Mofydd SSSI), produced by Natural Resources Wales on 12th December 2008
- Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Gwy a Fforest Y Ddena/ Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC, produced by Natural Resources Wales on 22nd January 2008
- Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Wye Valley Woodlands/Coetiroedd Dryffyn Gwy Special Area of Conservation, produced by Natural Resources Wales on 14th April 2008.
- Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for River Wye Special Area of Conservation, produced by Natural Resources Wales on 7th March 2008
- Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Aberbargoed Grasslands, produced by Natural Resources Wales on 1st March 2008
- Core Management Plan (including Conservation Objectives) for River Usk Special Area of Conservation, produced by Natural Resources Wales on 7th March 2008
- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: Volume 11, Section 3 Highways Agency, 2007,
- *2011 Air Quality Progress Report* Newport City Council In fulfilment of Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 Local Air Quality Management. April 2011
- *Draft Guidance for Plan Making Authorities in Wales. The Appraisal of Plans under the Habitats Directive*. David Tyldesley and Associates for Natural Resources Wales. November 2009 (revised April 2010)
- Air Pollution Information System. www.apis.ac.uk
- Countryside Council for Wales. www.NaturalResourcesWales.gov.uk
- Joint Nature Conservation Committee. www.jncc.gov.uk

enfusion

environmental planning and management for sustainability



© Enfusion Ltd
Treenwood House
Rowden Lane
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2AU
T: 01225 867112
F: 01225 867115
michelle@enfusion.co.uk
www.enfusion.co.uk

APPENDIX A:
DETAILS OF THE EUROPEAN SITES

Table A-1: Details of the European designated sites located within 15 km of the Newport City Council boundary

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
River Usk SAC	UK0013007	1007.71ha	<p>Qualifying habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water courses to plain and montane levels with the <i>Ranunculan fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitricho-Batrachion</i> vegetation. <p>Qualifying species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sea lamprey; Brook lamprey; River lamprey; Twaite shad; Atlantic salmon; Bullhead; and, Otter. 	<p>Please refer to the <i>Core Management Plan (including Conservation Objectives) for River Usk Special Area of Conservation</i> produced by CCW on 7th March 2008.</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the <i>Core Management Plan (including Conservation Objectives) for River Usk Special Area of Conservation</i> produced by CCW on 7th March 2008. The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers to Migration/movement: Impassable obstacles between suitable spawning areas and the sea can eliminate breeding populations of certain fish species. There are no known barriers within Newport. Other barriers to migration include inappropriate lighting, noise or vibrations that may deter fish species from swimming up/downstream. Otters are also deterred/prevented from movement by physical barriers e.g. roads, as well as disturbance through lighting, noise, vibration. Flow depletion/abstraction: Extraction of water from the river can result in changes and loss to important fluvial habitats, consequently affecting the animal species for which the site is designated. Fish entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates. Entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on fish population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates; Habitat Loss: The River Usk provides a key movement corridor for otters between mid Wales and the Severn Estuary. Otters require riparian habitat that is found on either side of the River Usk. Newport is a historical industrial town and the docks, which are situated on the River Usk, have played an important role in Newport's history. As a result of this development has occurred either side of the river, with pockets of suitable otter habitat being found in the urban area. Failing to ensure that adequate otter habitat is located along the river could result in the decline of otters using the river;. The River Usk is also designated for its <i>Ranunculan fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitricho-Batrachion</i> vegetation, therefore loss of the habitat both directly and indirectly would be have adverse effects on the site; little is known about the habitat requirements of migratory Shad spp. Disturbance: Disturbances includes recreation, noise, lighting and vibration which can have significant effects upon the qualifying features of the SAC. The fish species are sensitive to noise, vibration and lighting, as are otters. Recreation including dog walking and boating can cause disturbance. This could result in fish species and otters being deterred from the Usk; Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution: The most significant sources of diffuse pollution and siltation are from agriculture, including fertiliser run-off, livestock manure, silage effluent and soil erosion from ploughed land. Discharges from sewage treatment works, urban drainage, engineering works such as road improvement schemes, contaminated land, and other domestic and industrial sources can also be significant causes of pollution. Pollution of rivers with toxic chemicals, such as PCBs, was one of the major factors identified in the widespread decline of otters and fish e.g. salmon, during the last century. The qualifying fish species are sensitive to pollution; therefore a deterioration water quality could prove detrimental to

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
					<p>migrating fish populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in suspended solids: Increased suspended solids in the water column as a result of surface run-off from urban areas for example, can impact upon both migratory and spawning fish that are qualifying features of the River Usk SAC. Increased suspended solids in the water column can result in choking and feeding disruption of fish, as well affecting spawning sites¹; • Aerial pollution²: There are no identified limits with regards to aerial pollution on the River Usk. Therefore the effects of aerial pollution are uncertain. It is possible that the riparian habitat that supports otter populations could be adversely effected, or the <i>Ranuncolian fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitricho-Batrachion</i> vegetation could be affected by aerial pollution. However there is currently no data available to support this; • Coastal squeeze: The Shoreline Management Plan³ states that the position of the Council is to “hold the line” with regards to sea level rise up to Caerleon, which is the northern end of the borough. If sea levels were to rise, then this could result in loss of riparian habitat for otters and potentially lead to pollution in the River itself, thus effecting migrating fish. Any development that would reduce the availability of floodplain upstream for the River Usk could negatively effect upon the availability of otter habitat.
Severn Estuary SAC	UK0013030	73715.4 ha	<p>Qualifying habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time; • Salt meadows; • Mudflats; • Estuaries; • Reefs; and, • Atlantic salt meadows. <p>Qualifying species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sea lamprey; • River lamprey; and, • Twait shad. 	<p>Please refer to conservation objectives produced by Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales. Severn Estuary European Marine Site comprising of the Severn Estuary SAC, Severn Estuary SPA and Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. June 2009</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the document produced by Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales. Severn Estuary European Marine Site comprising of the Severn Estuary SAC, Severn Estuary SPA and Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. June 2009. The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12: (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barriers to Migration: Impassable obstacles between suitable spawning areas and the sea can eliminate breeding populations of certain fish species. There are no known barriers within Newport. Other barriers to migration include inappropriate lighting, noise or vibrations that may deter fish species from swimming up/downstream; • Flow depletion/abstraction: Extraction of water from the estuary can result in changes and loss to important fluvial habitats, consequently affecting the animal species for which the site is designated. Fish entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates. Entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates; • Habitat loss: Loss of habitats that are qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC, both indirectly and directly could effect the conservation status for the site. Developments potentially resulting with habitat loss include barrages; • Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution: The most significant sources of diffuse

¹ APEM Aquatic Scientists on behalf of WWF. *Review of the UKTAG Proposed standards for suspended solids*. August 2007

² All aerial pollution information was taken from the APIS website.

³ *Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan-Non technical Summary*. Produced in December 2000 by the Severn Estuary Coastal Group.

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
					<p>pollution and siltation are from agriculture, including fertiliser run-off, livestock manure, silage effluent and soil erosion from ploughed land. Discharges from sewage treatment works, urban drainage, engineering works such as road improvement schemes, contaminated land, and other domestic and industrial sources can also be significant causes of pollution; Pollution of rivers with toxic chemicals, such as PCBs, was one of the major factors identified in the widespread decline of fish during the last century. The qualifying fish species are sensitive to pollution; therefore a deterioration water quality could prove detrimental to migrating fish populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in suspended solids: Increased suspended solids in the water column as a result of surface run-off from urban areas for example, can impact upon both migratory and spawning fish that are qualifying features of the River Usk SAC. Increased suspended solids in the water column can result in choking and feeding disruption of fish, as well affecting spawning sites⁴;. An increase in suspended solids could also effect the qualifying habitats of the SAC by altering species assemblages.. • Aerial pollution³: The salt meadows which are one of the features of the SAC site are sensitive to nitrogen oxides therefore any increase could deteriorate the condition of the habitat. There is no comparable data for mudflats with regards to nitrogen oxides however they are not sensitive to acid deposition; • Coastal squeeze: The Shoreline Management Plan⁴ states that it is the position within Newport to “hold the line” with regards to sea level rise. In doing so the habitats that play a functional role in supporting the qualifying features of the SAC should be maintained.
Severn Estuary SPA	UK9015022	24662.98ha	Qualifying species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gadwall; • White-fronted goose; • Dunlin; • Shelduck; • Redshank; and, • Bewick swan. 	<p>Please refer to conservation objectives produced by Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales. Severn Estuary European Marine Site comprising of the Severn Estuary SAC, Severn Estuary SPA and Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. June 2009</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the document produced by Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales. Severn Estuary European Marine Site comprising of the Severn Estuary SAC, Severn Estuary SPA and Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. June 2009. The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12: (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disturbance of feeding/roosting sites: Some of the qualifying bird species are particularly sensitive to disturbance including recreational disturbance, noise, lighting and vibration. When assessing the potential effects of the policies in the plan it is imperative to consider the habitat outside the SPA boundary that may play a functioning role in supporting the bird assemblages. For example, the Gwent Levels and River Usk SAC provide feeding and roosting sites for the qualifying bird species, therefore disturbance of sites within and outside of the SPA could deter bird species and could effect the conservation status of the European site; • Habitat loss within estuary and surrounding area: When assessing the potential effects of the policies in the plan it is imperative to consider the habitat outside the SPA boundary that may play a functioning role in supporting the bird assemblages. For example, the Gwent Levels provides feeding and roosting sites for the qualifying bird species, therefore loss of these sites could effect the conservation status of the SPA; • Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution: The most significant sources of diffuse pollution and siltation are from agriculture, including fertiliser run-off,

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
					<p>livestock manure, silage effluent and soil erosion from ploughed land. Discharges from sewage treatment works, urban drainage, engineering works such as road improvement schemes, contaminated land, and other domestic and industrial sources can also be significant causes of pollution;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in nutrient loading/organic loading: Changes could impact upon the invertebrate and floral communities that the qualifying bird species are reliant upon, as well as eutrophication which could potentially be harmful to the bird species; • Loss of sight lines: The qualifying bird features of the SPA require vast sightlines in order to detect predators. Any development that could result in loss of sightlines could deter the species and therefore effect the conservation of the site; • Aerial pollution: The habitats associated with the qualifying bird features of the SPA are sensitive to aerial pollution. These habitats play a functional role in supporting SPA bird assemblages; and therefore are essential for the maintenance of sustaining bird populations. • Coastal squeeze: The Shoreline Management Plan⁴ states that it is the position within Newport to “hold the line” with regards to sea level rise. In doing so the habitats that play a functional role in supporting the qualifying bird features of the SPA should be maintained.
Severn Estuary Ramsar	UK11081	24662.98ha	<p>Qualifying habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time; • Estuaries; • Reefs; and, • Atlantic salt meadows. <p>Qualifying species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salmon; • Sea trout; • Sea lamprey; • River lamprey; • Allis shad; • Twaite shad; • Eel; • Gadwall; • White-fronted Goose; • Shelduck; and, • Redshank. 	<p>Please refer to conservation objectives produced by Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales. Severn Estuary European Marine Site comprising of the Severn Estuary SAC, Severn Estuary SPA and Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. June 2009</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the document produced by Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales. Severn Estuary European Marine Site comprising of the Severn Estuary SAC, Severn Estuary SPA and Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. June 2009. The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12: (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat loss: When assessing the potential effects of the policies in the plan it is imperative to consider the habitat outside the Ramsar boundary that may play a functioning role in supporting the bird assemblages. For example, the Gwent Levels provides feeding and roosting sites for the qualifying bird species, therefore disturbance of these sites, that would deter bird species, could effect the conservation status of the Ramsar site. Loss of habitats that are qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site, both indirectly and directly could effect the conservation status for the site; • Flow depletion/abstraction: Extraction of water from the river can result in changes and loss to important fluvial habitats, consequently affecting the animal species for which the site is designated. Fish entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates. Entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates. • Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution: The most significant sources of diffuse pollution and siltation are from agriculture, including fertiliser run-off, livestock manure, silage effluent and soil erosion from ploughed land. Discharges from sewage treatment works, urban drainage, engineering works such as road improvement schemes, contaminated land, and other domestic and industrial sources can also be significant causes of pollution;

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
					<p>Pollution of rivers with toxic chemicals, such as PCBs, was one of the major factors identified in the widespread decline of fish e.g. Salmon , during the last century. The qualifying fish species are sensitive to pollution; therefore a deterioration water quality could prove detrimental to migrating fish populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barriers to Migration: Impassable obstacles between suitable spawning areas and the sea can eliminate breeding populations of certain fish species. There are no known barriers within Newport. Other barriers to migration include inappropriate lighting, noise or vibrations that may deter fish species from swimming up/downstream; Tall obstacles for example wind turbines could prevent a barrier to the qualifying bird species of the site both inland and off shore. • Aerial pollution³: The salt meadows which are one of the qualifying features of the Ramsar site are sensitive to nitrogen oxides. Therefore any increase could deteriorate the condition of the habitat. There is no comparable data for mudflats with regards to nitrogen oxides however they are not sensitive to acid deposition; and, • Coastal squeeze: The Shoreline Management Plan⁴ states that it is the position within Newport to “hold the line” with regards to sea level rise. In doing so the habitats that play a functional role in supporting the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site should be maintained.
Cardiff Beechwoods SAC	UK0030109	115.62ha	Qualifying habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Asperulo-Fagetum</i> beech forests 	<p>Please refer to the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Cardiff Beech Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (underpinned by Garth Woods SSSI, Castell Coch Woodlands and Road Section SSSI, Fforestganol a Chwm Mofydd SSSI)</i>, produced by CCW on 12th December 2008.</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Cardiff Beech Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (underpinned by Garth Woods SSSI, Castell Coch Woodlands and Road Section SSSI, Fforestganol a Chwm Mofydd SSSI)</i>, produced by CCW on 12th December 2008. The list of vulnerabilities that the policies have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) at CCW (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational Pressure: All component SSSIs of the SAC are used to a greater or lesser extent for recreation purposes. Castell Coch Woodlands and Fforestganol a Chwm Nofydd experience the most recreational pressure, and are popular for walking, climbing and mountain biking. There is pressure to open up additional areas for access, with potential adverse implications for the ground flora and, depending on the scale of the proposals, the trees themselves; • Aerial Pollution: The location of the woodland in industrialised South Wales, together with the presence of nearby quarrying and associated activities, means that there is the potential for localised atmospheric pollution that could impact upon the species assemblages of the site; • Quarrying: There are a number of active and disused limestone quarries in the area. Garth Wood surrounds Taff's Well Quarry but there are other, smaller quarries in and around all component SSSIs of the SAC. Quarrying can lead to direct loss of the feature together with indirect impacts from issues such as access; • Inappropriate management: This can result in loss of species and species assemblages. It can arise from illegal felling, or encouraging use in a particular sensitive area; and, • Habitat loss: The loss of the beech forests either directly or indirectly will

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
					result in changes to the conservation status of the site. This can arise from inappropriate management.
River Wye SAC	UK9015022	2234.89ha	<p>Qualifying habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculion fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitriche-Batrachion</i> vegetation; and, Transition mires and quaking bogs. <p>Qualifying species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sea lamprey; Brook lamprey; River lamprey; Twaite shad; Allis shad; Atlantic salmon; Bullhead; and, Otter. 	<p>Please refer to the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for River Wye Special Area of Conservation</i>, produced by CCW on 7th March 2008.</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for River Wye Special Area of Conservation</i>, produced by CCW on 7th March 2008. The list of vulnerabilities that the policies have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) at CCW (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers to Migration: Impassable obstacles between suitable spawning areas and the sea can eliminate breeding populations of certain fish species. Other barriers to migration include inappropriate lighting, noise or vibrations that may deter fish species from swimming up/downstream; Otters are also deterred/prevented to move by physical barriers e.g. roads, as well as disturbance through lighting, noise, vibration. Flow depletion/abstraction: Extraction of water from the river can result in changes and loss to important fluvial habitats, consequently affecting the animal species for which the site is designated. Fish entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates. Entrainment in water abstractions directly impacts on population dynamics through reduced recruitment and survival rates; Habitat Loss: This River Wye provides a key movement corridor for otters between mid Wales and the Severn Estuary. Otters require riparian habitat that is found on around the River Wye. Failing to ensure that adequate otter habitat is located along the river could result in the decline of otters using the river; Disturbance: Disturbances include recreation, noise, lighting and vibration which can have significant effects upon the features of the SAC. The fish species are sensitive to noise, vibration and lighting as are otters. Recreation including dog walking and boating can cause disturbance. This could result in fish species and otters being deterred from the Wye Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution: The most significant sources of diffuse pollution and siltation are from agriculture, including fertiliser run-off, livestock manure, silage effluent and soil erosion from ploughed land. Discharges from sewage treatment works, urban drainage, engineering works such as road improvement schemes, contaminated land, and other domestic and industrial sources can also be significant causes of pollution. Pollution of rivers with toxic chemicals, such as PCBs, was one of the major factors identified in the widespread decline of otters and salmon during the last century; An increase in suspended solids could also affect the qualifying habitats of the SAC by altering species assemblages. Increase in suspended solids: Increased suspended solids in the water column resulting from surface run off in urban areas for example, can impact upon both migratory and spawning fish that are features of the River Wye SAC. Increased suspended solids in the water column can result in choking and feeding disruption of fish, as well affecting spawning sites⁴;

⁴ APEM Aquatic Scientists on behalf of WWF. *Review of the UKTAG Proposed standards for suspended solids*. August 2007

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aerial pollution⁵: There are no identified limits with regards to aerial pollution on the River Wye. Therefore the effects of aerial pollution are uncertain. It is possible that the riparian habitat that supports otter populations could be adversely effected, or the <i>Ranunculan fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitricho-Batrachion</i> vegetation could be effected by aerial pollution. However there is no data available to support this. Bogs and mires are affected by NO_x emission and acidification. • Coastal squeeze: The Shoreline Management Plan⁶ states that the position of the Council is to “hold the line” with regards to sea level rise up to Caerleon, which is the northern end of the borough. If sea levels were to rise, and the position of the Council was managed retreat then this could result in loss of riparian habitat for otters. Any development that would reduced the availability of floodplain upstream for the River Wye could negatively effect upon the availability of otter habitat.
Wye Valley Woodlands SAC	UK0012727	(916.24ha)	Qualifying Habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Asperulo-Fagetum</i> beech forests; • <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines; and, • <i>Taxus baccata</i> woods of the British Isles. Qualifying Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesser horseshoe bat. 	<p>Please refer to the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Wye Valley Woodlands/Coetiroedd Dyffryn Gwy Special Area of Conservation</i>, produced by CCW on 14th April 2008.</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Wye Valley Woodlands/Coetiroedd Dyffryn Gwy Special Area of Conservation</i>, produced by CCW on 14th April 2008. The list of vulnerabilities that the policies have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) at CCW (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate Management e.g. grazing: Woodland regeneration is frequently recorded as unfavourable, largely because of the extensive deer grazing throughout the Wye Valley; • Quarrying: The effects of the releases of quarry dust into the atmosphere from the works adjacent to the Blackcliff–Wyndcliff SSSI (a component part of the SAC) are not known. These emissions are subject to the authorisation of other competent authorities, particularly the Environment Agency; • Habitat loss: The loss of beech forests would adversely affect the conservation status of the site. This could arise from inappropriate management. The SAC supports lesser horseshoe bats therefore habitat loss within the boundary of the SAC could lead to the loss of foraging and roosting habitat, adversely effecting the population of the lesser horseshoe bats. • Disturbance to roost sites: Any development that would result in disturbance to the SAC, for example lighting, could impact upon the lesser horseshoe bats. • Aerial Pollution: The location of the woodland in industrialised South Wales, together with the presence of nearby quarrying and associated activities, means that there is the potential for localised atmospheric pollution that could impact upon the floral species assemblages of the site.
Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC	UK 0014794	142.7ha	Qualifying species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesser horseshoe bat; and, • Greater horseshoe bat. 	<p>Please refer to the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Gwy a Fforest Y Ddena/ Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC</i>, produced by CCW on 22nd January 2008.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Gwy a Fforest Y Ddena/ Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat SAC</i>, produced by CCW on 22nd January 2008. The list of vulnerabilities that the policies have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) at</p>

⁵ All aerial pollution information was taken from the APIS website.

⁶ *Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan-Non technical Summary*. Produced in December 2000 by the Severn Estuary Coastal Group.

European Site	JNCC number	Size	Reason for Designation	Conservation Objectives	Key Vulnerabilities
				This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.	<p>CCW (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate management to known roost sites: Any development/activity that effects a known roost site will negatively effect the populations of lesser and greater horseshoe bats. This can arise from tree felling; • Disturbance to roost sites: Disturbances such as noise/lighting could deter bats from using the roost sites therefore effecting the population distribution of the bats; • Loss of feeding and foraging habitat: This can be as a result of loss of linear features e.g. hedgerows, changes in land management and direct loss of suitable foraging habitat. If the foraging habitat around the known roosts sites is lost this will deter the bats. • Loss of flight lines: Bats use linear features (e.g. hedgerows) to forage for food and for navigation. Loss of these flight lines could decrease the population of bats and deter from the area; • Aerial pollution: Aerial pollution can indirectly affect bats by impacting upon the habitats that the species use to forage/roost.
Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC	UK0030071	39.78ha	<p>Qualifying Habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Molinia</i> meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils <p>Qualifying species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marsh fritillary butterflies 	<p>Please refer to the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Aberbargoed Grasslands</i>, produced by CCW on 1st March 2008.</p> <p>This HRA has been completed using these conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Vulnerabilities taken from the <i>Core Management Plan (Including Conservation Objectives) for Aberbargoed Grasslands</i>, produced by CCW on 1st March 2008. The list of vulnerabilities that the policies have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) at CCW (26/01/2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate Management: The <i>eu-Molinion</i> grassland needs to be maintained through traditional farming practices. Without an appropriate grazing regime, the grassland will continue to become rank and eventually turn to scrub and woodland; • Anti-social behaviours: In previous years anti-social behaviour such as off-roading and burning have occurred at Aberbargoed grasslands and have caused damage to the grassland in previous years; • Aerial Pollution: Poor air quality represents a conservation threat to grassland habitats such as this SAC. However, there is no current evidence to show that aerial pollutants are having an adverse impact on the <i>eu-Molinion</i> grasslands; and, • Habitat loss: Indirect and direct habitat loss would effect upon the qualifying features of the site, the marsh fritillary butterfly and the <i>eu-Molinion</i> grassland.

APPENDIX B:

**ASSESSMENT OF MATTERS ARISING CHANGES LDP WITH NO
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ON
THE EUROPEAN SITES 'ALONE'**

Table B-1: Assessment of Matters Arising Changes June 2014 with No Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects on All European Sites

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
Strategic Policies					
SP1 Sustainability	This policy states that proposals will be required to make a positive contribution to Sustainable Development. The policy outlines how proposals will be assessed as to the contribution to various criteria e.g. Efficient Land Use, Re-using previously developed land, providing integrated transport, protecting and enhancing the built and natural environment.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development and provides a design criteria.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP2 Health	This policy states that development proposals should seek to maximize positive contribution to health and well being and minimise any negative effects.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development and provides general criteria for development proposals.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP3 Flood Risk	This policy states that development should be directed away from areas where a flood risk has been identified as a constraint and ensure that the risk of flooding is not increased elsewhere.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP4 Water Resources	This policy states that development should reduce water consumption, protect water quality and result in no net increase in surface water run-off. It describes the Sustainable management of water resources including the use of sustainable drainage systems, re-use of water and appropriate location of development.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it states criteria to ensure sustainable use of water and the maintaining water quality.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP5 Countryside	This policy states that development in the countryside will only be permitted where the use is appropriate in the countryside, respects the character of the surrounding area and is appropriate in scale and design.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it refers to design. The intention of the policy is to protect the countryside.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP6 Green Belt	This policy states that the existing Green Belt is maintained along the Newport and Cardiff and extended northwards to the M4 Motorway	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development. The intention of the policy to maintain the existing green belt.	No recommendations specific to this policy.	X
SP7 Green Wedges	This policy states that Green Wedges have been identified in order to prevent coalescence between settlements in Newport. The policy states that development that may prejudices the open nature of the land will not be permitted.	A1 / A2	The policy itself will not lead to development. The overall aim of the policy is to protect green wedges and prevent coalescence.	No recommendations specific to this policy.	X
SP8 Special Landscape Areas	This policy states the Special Landscape Areas that are designated; North of Bettws, West of Rhiwderin, Wentlooge Levels, River Usk, Caldicot Levels, Wentwood and Tredegar Park. The policy states that any proposals will be required to positively contribute the area through high quality design, materials and management schemes that demonstrate a clear appreciation of the areas species features.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development and the overall aim of the policy is to protect the landscape by safeguarding certain areas.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP9 Conservation of the Natural, Historic and Built Environment	This policy states that conservation, enhancement and management of the natural, historic and built environment will be sought in all proposals.	A1 / A2	The policy itself will not lead to development. The policy seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP10 House Building Requirement	This policy states that sufficient land will be made available to meet the housing target of 11,623 between 2011 and 2016. The policy states that each period is to be regarded as self contained, with excesses or deficits of house building not being carried over into	A5	This policy identifies that a total of 8,750 additional dwellings will be provided in Newport by 2026. However this policy will have no effect on European sites and associated areas as no development can occur through the policy itself. Development will be implemented through Policies H1 and SP11 (see Appendix C for assessment of	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
	the next period. The policy states that the developments will primarily be on previously developed land.		these policies).		
SP11 Eastern Expansion Area	This policy states that land situated to the east of city that is centered on the redundant part of Llanwern Steelworks is identified as a mixed use, sustainable urban expansion area.	A5	The policy itself would not lead to development. Development will be implemented through Policies SP16 (Paragraph 2.59), SP18, H1, EM2, CF15 and W1 (see Appendix C for an assessment of these policies).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP12 Community Facilities	This policy states that new community facilities such as places of worship, museum, libraries, cinemas and allotments will be encouraged. The policy also states that development that affects existing community facilities should be designed to retain or enhance those facilities.	B	This policy may lead to development in the long term. However the policy does not provide any information about where or when the development will take place. The Plan seeks to protect European sites. One of the Plan's objectives is the Conservation of the Natural Environment (Objective 6). The Plan also commits to the conservation, enhancement and management of the natural environment (Policy SP9). Policy GP5 and its supporting text states that where proposals have the potential to impact on a European site(s) there will be a need for HRA and development will only be permitted where no significant adverse effects on European sites can be demonstrated. Therefore any development arising from this policy will have to, where necessary, complete the HRA process and prove to the Competent Authority and CCW that there would be no likely significant effects/adverse effects on integrity of European sites (or that effects can be adequately mitigated, or if necessary, compensated for). This approach to the HRA process will not affect the deliverability of this policy or the Plan. Therefore this policy will not lead to likely significant effects on European sites.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP13 Planning Obligations	This policy states that development will be required to help deliver more sustainable communities.	A1	The policy itself would not lead to development. The policy aims to ensure that developments contribute to a more sustainable community.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP14 Transport Proposals	This policy states that transport proposals will be supported if they meet the criteria stated within the policy. These include traffic free walking, assisting the local economy and relieving traffic congestion.	A1	The policy itself would not lead to development. The policy states that it will favour transport proposals that enhance biodiversity.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP15 Integrated Transport	This policy states that integrated transport will be implemented in line with a regional plan through measures such as implementing a cycle strategy, sustainable transport measure for urban villages and providing facilities for public transport in new major developments	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP17 Employment Requirement	This policy states that provision will be made fore 168 hectares of employment land.	A5	The policy itself would not lead to development as there is no specific location or scale of development included in the text. Delivery of this policy will be achieved by other policies in the Plan, through policies SP18 and EM1 to EM3 (see Appendix C for assessment of these policies).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP18 Urban Regeneration	This policy states that proposals that assist with the regeneration of the area will be favored.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP19 Assessment of Retail Need	This policy states that proposals for retail development will be subject to the application of the sequential test, and if not in a defined centre, to an assessment of need.	A1	The policy itself would not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP20 Waste Management	This policy states that the sustainable management of waste arisings in Newport will be promoted and additional treatment facilities will be supported.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
SP21 Minerals	This policy states that the Plan will fulfill its contribution to regional demand of minerals	A5	The policy itself will not lead to development. The development will be implemented through later policies in the Plan, policies M1-M4 (see Appendix C for assessment of	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
			these policies).		
GENERAL POLICIES					
GP1 General Development Principle (GDP)- Climate Change	This policy states that development proposals should be designed to reduce the risk of flooding, minimise energy consumption, to recycle or re-use existing construction materials and meet the relevant BREEAM code for sustainable homes.	A1	This policy will not lead to development as it relates to design. The policy aims to promote sustainability.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
GP2 GDP-General Amenity	This policy states that development will be permitted where there will not be a significant adverse effect on amenity including air quality, the development will not be detrimental to visual amenities and an inclusive design is included.	A1	This policy will not lead to development as it relates to design. The policy aims to maintain amenity areas around Newport.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
GP3 GDP-Infrastructure	This policy states that development will be permitted where there is appropriate infrastructure is available.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design. The policy aims to ensure that new developments do not have an unacceptable impact on the proposed or existing level of service infrastructure provision.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
GP4 GDP-Highways and Accessibility	This policy states that development proposals should be accessible by various means of transport, and be designed to reduce or avoid transport noise and air pollution.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design. The policy aims to encourage other means of transport on new developments including cycling and walking.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
GP5 GDP-Natural Environment	This policy states that development will only be permitted where proposals aim to manage and encourage biodiversity, practice avoidance and mitigation measures, there is no unacceptable impact upon water quality, landscape and tree planting schemes are included and there is no loss of high value agricultural land.	A2	This policy aims to protect and enhance the aquatic and terrestrial environment by informing developers to consider wildlife pre application. Furthermore this policy states that any development likely to have effects on European sites will be required to undertake a HRA.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
GP6 GDP-Quality Of Design	This policy states that good quality design will be sought in order to create a safe, accessible, attractive and convenient environment.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design. The policy aims to achieve high quality design on new developments.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
GP7 GDP-Environmental Protection and Public Health	This policy states that development which could result in unacceptable harm to health as a result of land contamination, dust, instability, dust, water pollution or any other risk identified to the environment will not be permitted,	A2	The policy aims to protect the natural environment through conservation and enhancement. The policy states that an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required so that implications of developments can be considered.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
ENVIRONMENT					
CE1 – Removed from the Plan.	This policy states that development in the Countryside will not be permitted but it may be necessary in certain circumstance for example rural enterprises, outdoor recreation etc.				
CE2 Route ways, Corridors and Gateways	This policy states that development proposals should protect and enhance the appearance and connectivity of existing and future main route corridors and gateways into the City.	A3	The policy itself relates to design however Paragraph 4.3 and 4.4 in the supporting text refers to the creation of wildlife corridors and enhancement of biodiversity.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE3 Waterfront Developments	This policy states that development along the water front should integrate with the waterway and should take into account the interests of regeneration, leisure, navigation and nature conservation	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design. The policy states that any development should take into account nature conservation.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE4 Environmental Spaces and Corridors	This policy states that development in “environmental spaces” will only be permitted if the existing environmental features of the site can be improved, the site is not significantly important in terms of nature conservation and that there is not a loss without appropriate replacement.	A1 / A2	The policy itself will not lead to development. The policy intends to protect the natural environment and Newport’s green infrastructure provision.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
CE5 Historic Landscapes, Parks, Gardens and Battlefields	This policy states that sites included in the register of landscape, parks and gardens of special historic interest and battlefields should be protected, conserved and enhanced.	A3	The policy itself is intended to conserve and enhance the built or historic environment.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE6 Locally Listed Building and Sites	This policy states that buildings and sites of local significance for their architectural or historic interest will be included on a local list and should be protected from demolition or inappropriate development.	A3	The policy itself is intended to protect the built or historic environment.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE7 Archaeologically Sensitive Areas	This policy states that development proposals within archaeologically sensitive areas of Caerleon, the Levels, Lower Machen and the City Centre will be required to undertake an archaeological impact assessment before proposal is determined.	A3	The policy itself aims to protect and conserve the built and historic environment.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE8 Conservation Areas	This policy states that development within or adjacent to conservation areas will be required to be designed to preserve or enhance the recognized character, avoid removal of existing historic features, use appropriate materials, complement the architecture, and adverse impact on any significant views within, towards and outwards from the conservation area.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE9 Locally Designated Nature Conservation and Geological Sites	This policy states that proposals affecting locally designated sites will only be permitted where there will be no overall loss of the nature conservation for which the site has been designated, there will be no significant adverse effects on the geological interest of the site and that it can be demonstrated that there is no alternative site.	A1 / A2	The policy itself will not lead to development. The policy aims to protect and conserve the natural environment. The additional text states that any proposal that is likely to effect a locally designated site should in the first instance seek to find an alternative location.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE10 Coastal Zone	This policy states that development will not be permitted in the coastal area or adjoining the tidal river unless the development is as such that it requires being located on the coast and there is not alternative and the area itself is not at risk from flooding.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CE11 Renewable Energy	This policy states that renewable energy schemes will be favored considerably subject to there being no over riding environment and amenity considerations and the special qualities of the Gwent Levels are not compromised.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
HOUSING					
H2 Housing Standards	This policy states that residential housing should be built to high environmental standards.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H3 Housing Mix and Density	This policy states that residential development should be designed to provide a mix of housing types and densities to meet a range of needs.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H4 Affordable Housing	This policy states that residential developments of 10 or more dwellings or of 0.33 hectares in the urban area, or 3 or more dwellings or 0.2 hectares in the village areas will be required to include up to 30% affordable housing.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H5 Affordable Housing Exceptions	This policy states that proposals for the provision of affordable housing on sites in or adjoining settlements will be favoured provided that there is a genuine need.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H6	This policy states that the sub-division of residential curtilages, infill within existing residential areas, and the development of backland to	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
Sub-division of Curtilages, Infill and Backland Development	existing residential properties will only be permitted where this does not represent an overdevelopment of land.			specific to this policy	
H7 Annexes to Residential Dwellings	This policy states that annexes to residential dwellings that are capable of occupation as self-contained accommodation will be considered as if they were new dwellings.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H8 Flat Conversions	This policy states that within defined settlement boundaries, proposals to subdivide a property into self contained accommodation will only be permitted if the scale and character is compatible with surrounding area, the stock of family housing would not be reduced, parking provisions can be made, privacy of adjacent occupiers is not compromised and adequate noise insulation is provided.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H9 Housing Regeneration Estate	This policy states that proposals for the regeneration or improvement of housing areas will be favorably considered where they are undertaken in a considerate manner, protect and enhance open space and widen tenure options.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H10 Conversions in the Countryside	This policy states that beyond defined settlement boundaries proposals for the conversion or rehabilitation of buildings to residential use will be permitted if the applicant has made attempts to secure a more suitable business re-use, the building dates pre 1980, a detailed structural survey has been carried out, conditions are attached to the planning permission to prevent further extensions and the proposal should not conflict with agricultural interests of the area. This policy also states the interests of protected wildlife species inhabiting the structure are safeguarded.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H11 Extensions conversions to	This policy states that beyond settlement boundaries extensions will not be permitted to building that have been converted to residential use.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H12 Replacement dwellings in the Countryside	This policy states that beyond defined settlement boundaries proposals to replace a dwelling with a new dwelling will only be permitted if the volume of the new dwelling is not more 30% of original size, conditions are attached to planning permission to prevent subsequent extensions, the existing dwelling has lawful residential use and the new dwelling will replace the existing dwelling.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H13 Extensions Dwellings in the Countryside to	This policy states that beyond settlement boundaries proposals to extend existing dwellings will only be permitted provided that the volume of the extension is not more 30% of original dwelling and the existing dwelling has lawful residential use.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H14 Caravans	This policy states that proposals for static caravans, mobile homes and park homes will be treated as for any other application for residential use.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
H17 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Proposals	This policy states that proposals for gypsy and traveler caravan sites including on land outside the defined settlement boundary will be permitted if the site is well related to suitable community facilities ad service, the site is capable of being served by utilities, the site is not within high risk flooding areas and the site complies with other environmental and general policies.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it related to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
EMPLOYMENT					
EM3 Alternative uses of Employment Land	This policy states proposals for alternative sites of employment land will be assessed against the likely employment level of the alternative proposal, the remaining supply of employment land and the availability of other land or buildings.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
TRANSPORT					
T2 Heavy Commercial Vehicle Movements	This policy states that developments which generate heavy commercial vehicle movements will be favoured in those locations which allow access to a railway line, wharf or dock.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
T3 Road Hierarchy	The policy states that in order to facilitate and safe use of the highway network a hierarchy of roads will be established. The policy states that this road hierarchy will be used to determine the principle of access for new developments. The policy states that the road hierarchy consists of the strategic routes, principle routes, local roads and access routes.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
T4 Car Parking	This policy states that car parking in development proposals shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the regionally based supplementary planning guidance.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
T6 Public Rights of Way Improvement	This policy states that proposals to improve and extend the public rights of way network are encouraged with an emphasis on sustainable access for all.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
T7 Public Rights of Way and New Development	This policy states that any public footpath, bridleway or cycleway affected by development proposals will require retention or the provision suitable alternative routes. The policy states that provision of alternative routes will be sought in new developments, with linkages to the existing network.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
T8 Coastal Path	This policy states that development proposals should protect and enhance the all Wales Coastal path. The policy states that provision of additional routes to the link to the coastal path will be encouraged	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
EMPLOYMENT					
SP17 Employment Land	This policy states that provision will be made for approximately 160 hectares of employment land for the period 2011-2026	A5	The policy itself would not lead to development, the development would be implemented through later policies in the same plan.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
RETAILING AND THE CITY CENTRE					
R1 City Centre Schemes	This policy states that redevelopment schemes or other proposals to enhance the provision of retail facilities within the city centre will be favoured providing that the scale, design and layout are compatible with the overall functioning of the city centre and its architecture.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R2 Primary Shopping Frontage	This policy states that within the primary shopping areas proposals for the change of use of ground floor retail to non-retail will only be permitted if the proposal doesn't result in the breakage in the retail frontage, the proposal is not adjacent to the another non-retail unit, 80%	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
	of total length of frontage is maintained for retail use, the proposal doesn't involve a corner design, design aspects are acceptable and any environmental disturbance can be controlled through the use of planning conditions.				
R3 Non-Retail Uses in Secondary City Centre Shopping Areas	This policy states that proposals for ground floor, non-retail uses within the city centre in the secondary frontages will be permitted if the proposal does not result in a break or gap of retail frontage, at least 60% of frontage length is maintained for retail, the proposal doesn't involve a corner design, there would be no adverse effects on local amenity, the development is accessible in term of public transport and any environmental disturbance can be controlled through the use of planning conditions	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R4 Non-Retail Users in Other City Centre Shopping Areas	This policy states that proposals for non-retail uses outside the city centre's designated primary and secondary shopping frontage areas will be permitted providing that the proposal would not affect local residential amenity, any environmental disturbance can be controlled through the use of planning conditions and the development is accessible in terms of public transport.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R5 Café Quarter	This Policy states that food and drink uses will be encouraged within the area defined as the Café Quarter.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R7 Non-Retail Uses in District Centres	This policy states that activities in classes A2 and A3 and various other leisure and community uses will be permitted only where the concentration of such uses at ground floor level would not prejudice the viability of the city centres retailing role, satisfactory parking and access can be arranged and there would be no unacceptable effect on local residential amenities.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R8 Small Scale Retail Proposals	This policy states that proposals for new local retail facilitates, extension of floor space of existing retail outlets or the change of use in existing retailing outside the town and district centres will only be permitted where new residential development would be served, the proposal is of a scale appropriate to the location, there would be no adverse effects on the viability of any defined centre and there would be no unacceptable effect on the local residential amenities.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to designs.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R9 Change of Use to Non- Retail Uses Outside City and District Centres	This policy states that proposals for changes of use if existing shop premises to financial and professional services , food and rink and leisure and community uses outside the town and district centre will only be permitted where the concentration of such uses at ground floor level would prejudice the viability of the centre's retailing role, there would no unacceptable adverse effects on the highway network and there would be no adverse effects on the viability of any defined centre and there would be no unacceptable effect on the local residential amenities	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
R10 New Out of Town Centre Retail Sites	This policy states that proposals for large scale retail development on the sites outside the city or district centres will not be permitted unless the need is identified, the proposal would not have adverse effects on the traditional retail centres, the location is acceptable in sequential terms, the surrounding highway and transportation network has the capacity to serve the development and the development is fully accessible by foot or bicycle.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
R11 Development of Existing Out-Of-Centre Retail Sales	This proposal states that outside the district and city centres, proposals for extensions to large retail outlets, refurbishments, redevelopment of existing stores and extensions to existing stores will only be permitted if need is identified, the proposal would not have adverse effects on the traditional retail centres, the location is acceptable in sequential terms, the surrounding highway and transportation network has the capacity to serve the development and the development is fully accessible by foot or bicycle.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development as it relates to design.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE					
CF1 Protection of Playing Fields, Land and buildings used for Sport and Recreation and Areas of Play	This policy states that redevelopment for other purposes other than land used for sport, recreation and areas of play will only be permitted if an alternative provision is available within the vicinity and the land is surplus to long term requirements.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF2 Outdoor Play Space requirements	This policy states that the provision of open space in accordance with the fields in trust standard will be sought on al new housing developments, and the developer will be required to pay a commuted sum to cover future maintenance.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF3 Water Based Recreation	This policy states that the provision and enhancement of water based activities, especially with the Monmouthshire Brecon canal will be encouraged.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above). Furthermore the Policy's supporting text states (9.19) that any proposals arising from this plan must adhere to the other policies within the plan, namely GP5.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF4 Riverfront Access	This policy states that access to the Riverfront in the form of managed footpaths and cycle routes will be encouraged were practicable.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above). Furthermore the Policy's supporting text states (9.23) that any proposals arising from this plan must adhere to the other policies within the plan, namely GP5.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF5 Usk and Sirhowy Valley Walks	This policy states that development proposals that would effect the routes of the Usk Valley and Sirhowy Valley walks, or developments which would reduce their recreationally value will not be permitted.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF6 Allotments	This policy states that the development of allotments for other uses will not be permitted unless alternative provision can be made within the vicinity or it can be demonstrated that the allotments are surplus to the requirement of the residents.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF7 Horse Related Developments	This policy states that horse related developments, both recreational and commercial, including riding schools, shelter and stables will be permitted if the scale, design and materials do not detract form the character of the locality, the proposal does not result in an excessive number of buildings, a new dwelling will not be required and the proposal does not require the provision of an unsightly infrastructure.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF8 Tourism	This policy states that new and improved tourism related developments, including hotel and other visitor accommodation, conference and exhibition facilities, and heritage interpretation facilities will be permitted, particular where regeneration objectives will be complemented.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF10 Commercial Leisure Developments	This policy states that proposals for commercial leisure developments outside the city and district centres will be considered if there are no suitable city, district or edge sites, the proposal does not undermine the viability of the city and district centre and the proposal does not have an	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

Policy Number and Title	Policy Description	Potential effects (Category A - D, see key)	Rationale	Recommendations/ Avoidance, Cancellation and/or Reduction Measures	Likely Significant Effect (LSE) No X Yes ✓ Uncertain?
	adverse effect on the supply of employment land.				
CF11 Outdoor Leisure Developments	This policy states that proposals that have a significant outdoor element will be permitted provided that existing g building are re-used and in the countryside ancillary building are directly related to their primary use.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
CF12 Protection of Existing Community Facilities	This policy states that proposals that would result in loss or change of use of buildings currently used for community facilities will only be permitted if alternative provision can be made and it can be demonstrated that the existing provision is surplus to requirement of the community.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
MINERALS					
M1 Safeguarding Mineral Resource	This policy states that development that would sterilize or hinder extraction mineral resources will not be permitted.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
M2 Mineral Development	This policy states that proposals for mineral extraction or similar development will be conserved against a criteria that includes evidence of local, regional or national need, the priority of secondary material and the potential to achieve a high standard of restoration and aftercare.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
M3 Oil and Gas	This policy states that proposals for exploration of oil and gas will be considered against a criteria to include any adverse effects. The policy states that exploration proposals will normally be subject to a one year time limit.	B	Rationale as for Policy SP12 (see above).	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
M4 Wharves and Rail	This policy states that the sustainable transportation of aggregate will be favored. The policy states that existing wharves and rail infrastructure will be safeguarded.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
WASTE					
W2 Waste Management Proposals	This policy states that development proposals for sustainable waste management facilities will be permitted so long as they meet National Planning Policy considerations and the need for disposing of the type, quantity and source of waste is assessed against local and regional requirement.	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X
W3 Provision for Waste Management Facilities in Development	This policy states that provision will be sought in all new development for facilities for the storage, recycling and other management of waste where appropriate	A1	The policy itself will not lead to development.	No recommendations specific to this policy	X

APPENDIX C:

**ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES INCLUDING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS
FOR LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ON THE EUROPEAN SITES 'ALONE'**

Table C-1: Assessment of Policies Including Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects on the River Usk SAC

<div><div>Vulnerability of European Site¹</div><div>Policy Reference</div></div>	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i) M4 Motorway Junction 28 Tredegar Park	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3.5km west of the River Usk SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works (road works) no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works, will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal ii) Western extension of Southern Distributor road as the Duffryn Link Road.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3 km west of the River Usk SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal has a hydrological connection to the SAC via the Percoed Reen and River Ebbw. However, Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such the developer will have to ensure that there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids on the SAC during the works. The works will result in Percoed Reen being crossed. This is a known commuting otter habitat connecting to the River Usk SAC (and also the Severn Estuary SAC). As such, as stated in the supporting text of this Policy, any works affecting the Percoed Reed must be completed in a sensitive manner for otters. The Reen must be maintained in situ (this watercourse must not be culverted) with a minimum of 5 m of bank side habitat retained on either side. Developers will be required to complete an otter survey to determine levels of otter activity in the affected area. A sensitive working programme must be compiled to minimise disturbance to this species (this may include obtaining relevant licenses from CCW). Furthermore, should the Percoed Reen need to be crossed, the crossing will be designed to ensure continued otter movement up and downstream (even in flood conditions). In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted. Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal iii) North South Link Llanwern	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4.5 km east of the River Usk SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not hydrologically connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.
H1 – Housing Sites: All allocations not assessed in this table	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	These allocations have already received planning permission and/or currently under construction. See Appendix E2.
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H51 - Whiteheads Works	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 0.75 km west of the River Usk SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. However, the additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure on the Usk. It is considered very unlikely that this development would have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, near by that new residents can use. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be

¹ Vulnerabilities taken from the *Core Management Plan (including Conservation Objectives) for River Usk Special Area of Conservation*, produced by CCW on 7th March 2008. The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12.

² Welsh Water produced a *Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP)* in October 2011. This document included the results of a HRA completed of the WRMP. This concluded that it will be possible to provide a supply of water to the Welsh Water supply area (including Newport and most of Wales) for the lifetime of the WRMP (25 years) without having any significant adverse effects on any European sites alone in combination (with certain mitigation measures in place). As this WRMP included all development within Newport and the rest of the Welsh Water supply area it is concluded that the proposals outlined in the policies can be delivered (i.e. water can be supplied to these developments) without causing significant effects on this European Site.

³ Highways Agency, 2007, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: Volume 11, Section 3 – Part 1 states that air quality deterioration generally occurs within 200 m of a roadside (returning to background levels after this distance). As this development is over 200 m from the SAC there are no changes in air quality at the SAC anticipated.

⁴ The Newport Draft Deposit Plan includes a number of policies to help minimise the impact of proposed development on climate change. This includes policies that are likely to lead to improved air quality levels (including Policy GP1 which states that proposals will be required to make a positive contribution to reduce car usage and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, Policy GP2 states that development will not be permitted where the proposals may have a significant effect on air quality, Policy GP4 states that development proposals should be designed to avoid or reduce air pollution, Policy CE14 commits to the promotion of renewable energy and Policy T5 which commits to improving/providing new, safe walking and cycling). Policy GP1 states that development proposals must minimise the risk of and from flood risk, sea level rise and the impact of climate change. These policies will help to minimise any input to climate change, and thus minimise the contribution of Newport's proposed development on coastal squeeze. Therefore, no likely significant effects on the SAC are anticipated from coastal squeeze as a result of this policy.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference									
									<p>undertaken as part of the planning process</p> <p>Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated through measures described in the supporting text, the development will not be permitted..</p> <p>A HRA⁵ was carried out on the site directly adjacent to this proposal and found that with the inclusion of appropriate conditions any adverse effects on the SAC associated with the development can be avoided. Furthermore the HRA states that “<i>When considered alongside other developments in the vicinity of the River Usk through Newport it is considered that with the imposition of appropriate conditions the proposed development would not combine with other developments to have significant adverse effects on the River Usk SAC.</i>”</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H52: Old Town Dock remainder	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk SAC. A HRA⁶ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy⁷ which outlines potential development along the River Usk, including Old Town Dock. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the River Usk. An Appropriate Assessment was carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the European Sites, therefore providing the mitigation is adhered to, there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H53 - Bideford Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 1.5 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H56 - Woodland Site Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H61- Postal Exchange	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk. Due to the location of the proposed development adjacent to the River Usk, the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner as stated in the supporting text. This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SAC including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC. Furthermore, it is considered very unlikely that this development would have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, near by that new residents can use. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process</p> <p>Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated through measures described in the supporting text, the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴ and Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction (as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works). Due to the nature of the works there will be no abstraction from the River.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.</p>
H2 Housing Sites Allocation H62- Queens Hill	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>

⁵ Planning application 07/0540. *Land to the rear of Whitehead works Cardiff Road Newport.* 2007

⁶ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy.* June 2009.

⁷ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy.* July 2009.

<div> <div>Vulnerability of European Site¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div> </div>	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H63-Telford Depot	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 200m east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H64-Uskside Paint Mill	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk. Due to the location of the proposed development adjacent to the River Usk, the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner as stated in the supporting text. This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SAC including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC. Furthermore, it is considered very unlikely that this development would have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, nearby that new residents can use. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process</p> <p>Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated though measures described in the supporting text, the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴ and Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction (as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works). Due to the nature of the works there will be no abstraction from the River.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.</p>
H15 - Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation: Proposal site at Former Ringland Allotments	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H16 - Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation: Proposal Hartridge Farm Road Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3.5 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy,</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal i) Duffryn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km west of the River Usk SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the nature of the works there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from abstraction² and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. employment, will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>The proposal in west Newport is likely to result in the Percoed Reen being crossed. This is a known commuting otter habitat connecting to the River Usk SAC (otters are a qualifying feature of this European site). Any works affecting the Percoed Reed must be completed in a sensitive manner for otters. The Reen must be maintained in situ (this watercourse must not be culverted) with a minimum of 5m of bank side habitat retained on either side. Developers will be required to complete an otter survey to determine levels of otter activity in the affected area. A sensitive working programme must be compiled to minimise disturbance to this species (this may include obtaining relevant licenses from CCW). Furthermore, should the Percoed Reen need to be crossed, the crossing will be designed to ensure continued otter movement up and downstream (even in flood conditions). In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process</p> <p>Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal ii) East of Queensway Meadows	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, diffuse pollution, increased sediment loading in the water column, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. Furthermore due to the nature of the proposal e.g. employment, it is unlikely that there will be an increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p>

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference									
									<p>However, this proposal may result in the loss of habitat (and disturbance of adjacent habitats) used by otters, a qualifying feature of the River Usk SAC. Developers will be required to complete an appropriate level of otter surveys to inform a HRA. Should this HRA determine that mitigation is required; measures should include suitable measures such as visual screening and sensitive lighting design. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iii) Celtic Springs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iv) Solutia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, abstraction³ and aerial pollution⁴. Furthermore due to the nature of the proposal e.g. employment, it is unlikely that there will be an increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>However, this proposal may result in the loss of habitat (and disturbance of adjacent habitats) used by otters, a qualifying feature of the River Usk SAC. Developers will be required to complete an appropriate level of otter surveys to inform a HRA. Should this HRA determine that mitigation is required; measures should include suitable measures such as visual screening and sensitive lighting design. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal v) Gwent Europark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 8 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal vi) Land of Chartist Drive Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 6 km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy,</p>
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal vi i) Llanwern Former Steelworks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2.5 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is connected to the SAC/SPA/Ramsar via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Site: Proposal v iii) Phoenix Park (Pirelli)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Planning permission has already been granted for this proposal. See Appendix E2 .
EM1 - Employment site: Proposal ix) Godfrey Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 0.5 km east of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p>

Policy Reference	Vulnerability of European Site ¹								Justification
	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	
									Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
EM1 – Employment Sites: Proposal x) Cardiff Road (Mon Bank)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Planning permission has already been granted for this proposal. See Appendix E2
EM2 – Newport Docks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk. Due to the location of the proposed development adjacent to the River Usk, the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner as stated in the supporting text. This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SAC including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC. The works will result in loss of suitable otter habitat. As such, in accordance with the additional text in the Policy, 5 m of bank side habitat must be maintained. An otter survey within the proposed development site must be completed prior to construction, and appropriate mitigation put in place, this may include obtaining a licence from CCW. The additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure on the Usk. Furthermore, it is considered very unlikely that this development would have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, near by that new residents can use. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process</p> <p>Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated through measures described in the supporting text, the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴ and Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction (as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works). Due to the nature of the works there will be no abstraction from the River.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC.</p>
T1 – Railways: Proposal i) Promotion of services using the Ebbw Valley line	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the River Usk SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
T1 – Railways: Proposal ii) Promotion of electrification of London-South Wales Line	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the River Usk SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the River Usk SAC protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
T1 – Railways: Proposal iii) Protection of disused lines	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).
T1 – Railways: Proposal v) Docks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk SAC, and as such has the potential to result in likely significant effects on SAC features through disturbance (through the creation of barriers to movement through vibrations/noise/lighting particularly affecting fish species and otters). However, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the River Usk SAC protected.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
T1 – Railways: Proposal vi) Supporting new rail facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).
T1 – Railways: Proposal vii) Supporting park	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).

<div> <div>Vulnerability of European Site¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div> </div>	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
and ride schemes.									
T5 – Walkways and Cycle ways: Proposal i) National Cycle Route 47 Cwmcam to Newport Proposal ii) National Cycle Route 4-Caerphilly to Newport Proposal iii) National Cycle Route 88-Caerloen to Newport.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).
R6 - Retail in District Centres: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the River Usk SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provide no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the River Usk SAC protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
CF9 - Celtic Manor: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the River Usk SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the River Usk SAC protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal i) Whiteheads Works	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 0.75 km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. It is unlikely, given the proximity to the SAC that this proposal will result in increased disturbance through increased recreation. Furthermore, schools hours do not coincide with the times when the qualifying features of the SAC (e.g. otters) are most active. A HRA ⁷ was carried out on the site directly adjacent to this proposal and found that with the inclusion of appropriate conditions any adverse effects on the SAC associated with the development can be avoided. Furthermore the HRA states that “ <i>When considered alongside other developments in the vicinity of the River Usk through Newport it is considered that with the imposition of appropriate conditions the proposed development would not combine with other developments to have significant adverse effects on the River Usk SAC.</i> ” Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal ii) Novelis Site Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5 km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, disturbance, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is connected to the River Usk through the River Ebbw that is a tributary of the River Usk, however due to the distance it is unlikely that this proposal will cause likely significant effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids.. Due to the distance no disturbance from recreation, noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during and after construction. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iii) Glan Llyn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3 km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, disturbance, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is connected to the SAC via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Due to the distance no disturbance from recreation, noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during and

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement	Flow Depletion/ Abstraction ³	Habitat Loss	Disturbance	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	suspended solids in water column	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference									
									after construction. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iv) Llanwern Village	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4 km west of the River Usk SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, disturbance, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Due to the distance no disturbance from recreation, noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during and after construction. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.
W1 - Sites for Waste Management Facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the River Usk SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the River Usk SAC protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC as a result of this policy.

Table C-2: Assessment of all Policies within the Plan including Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects on the Severn Estuary SAC

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement- lighting, noise, vibration	Flow Depletion/Abstr action	Habitat Loss	Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution	Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i) M4 Motorway Junction 28 Tredegar Park	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works (road works) there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal ii) Northern extension of Southern Distributor road as the Duffryn Link Road.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal iii) North South Link Llanwern	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC there are no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocations not assessed to in this table	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	These allocations have already received planning permission and/or currently under construction. See Appendix E2
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H51 - Whiteheads Works	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the work no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. However, the additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure, although this is not likely to have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, located close to this proposal. Having said that, Policy GP5 states that a precautionary approach be adopted and a HRA carried out if the potential impacts of the development are not known. The site is connected to the SPA via the River Usk SAC. However Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution, changes in nutrient loading or increased suspended solids as a result of the works. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H52 - Old Town Dock remainder	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying features of the SAC site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SAC .). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any

¹ The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12.

² Welsh Water produced a *Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan* (WRMP) in October 201. This document included the results of a HRA completed of the WRMP. This concluded that it will be possible to provide a supply of water to the Welsh Water supply area (including Newport and most of Wales) for the lifetime of the WRMP (25 years) without having any significant adverse effects on any European sites alone in combination (with certain mitigation measures in place) . As this WRMP included all development within Newport and the rest of the Welsh Water supply area it is concluded that the proposals outlined in the policies can be delivered (i.e. water can be supplied to these developments) without causing significant effects on this European Site.

³ Highways Agency, 2007, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: Volume 11, Section 3 – Part 1 states that air quality deterioration generally occurs within 200 m of a roadside (returning to background levels after this distance). As this development is over 200 m from the SAC there are no changes in air quality at the SAC anticipated.

⁴ The Newport Draft Deposit Plan includes a number of policies to help minimise the impact of proposed development on climate change. This includes policies that are likely to lead to improved air quality levels (including Policy GP1 which states that proposals will be required to make a positive contribution to reduce car usage and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, Policy GP2 states that development will not be permitted where the proposals may have a significant effect on air quality, Policy GP4 states that development proposals should be designed to avoid or reduce air pollution, Policy CE14 commits to the promotion of renewable energy and Policy T5 which commits to improving/providing new, safe walking and cycling). Policy GP1 states that development proposals must minimise the risk of and from flood risk, sea level rise and the impact of climate change. These policies will help to minimise any input to climate change, and thus minimise the contribution of Newport's proposed development on coastal squeeze. Therefore, no likely significant effects on the SAC are anticipated from coastal squeeze as a result of this policy.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement- lighting, noise, vibration	Flow Depletion/Abstr action	Habitat Loss	Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution	Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
								<p>effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, a HRA⁵ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy ⁶ which outlines potential development along the River Usk, that as outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying features of the SAC and as such the Severn Estuary SAC was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary SAC. An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary SAC and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC site as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H53 - Bideford Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H56 - Woodland Site Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 6 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green Space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H61- Postal Exchange	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H2 Housing Sites Allocation H62- Queens Hill	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H63-Telford Depot	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H64-Uskside Paint	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 8km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the</p>

⁵ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

⁶ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹ Policy Reference	Barriers to movement- lighting, noise, vibration	Flow Depletion/Abstr action	Habitat Loss	Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution	Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Mill								SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
H16 - Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation: Proposal Hartridge Farm Road Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal i) Duffryn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from habitat loss, barriers to movement, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal ii) North of Queensway Meadows	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iii) Celtic Springs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
EM1 -Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iv) Solutia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works there are no likely significant effects anticipated on the European site from abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal v) Gwent Europark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal vi) Land of Chartist Drive Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement- lighting, noise, vibration	Flow Depletion/Abstr action	Habitat Loss	Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution	Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
EM1 vii) – Employment Sites: Proposal i) Llanwern Former Steelworks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is connected to the SAC via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal v iii) Phoenix Park (Pirelli)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Planning permission has already been granted for this proposal. See Appendix E2.
EM1 – Employment Sites: Proposal ix) Godfrey Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal x) Cardiff Road (Mon Bank)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Planning permission has already been granted for this proposal. See Appendix E2.
EM2 Newport Docks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC including Allis shad. Due to the location of the proposed development adjacent to the River Usk, the supportive text in this Policy states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner. This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC). In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted. Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works. Due to the nature of the works there will be no abstraction from the Severn Estuary SAC. ⁵ . Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy. A HRA ⁷ was carried out on this proposal in September 2008 and agreed with CCW. The appropriate assessment carried out identified the likely significant effects that this proposal would have on the Severn Estuary SAC, however, as stated within the report, the mitigation measures described should result in the proposal having no significant effects on the integrity of the SAC. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy..
T1 – Railways: Proposal i) Promotion of services using the Ebbw Valley line	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 6km of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
T1 – Railways Proposal ii) Promotion of electrification of London-South Wales Line	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary SAC protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.

⁷ Habitat Regulations Assessment Newport City Council Supplementary Planning Guidance Draft Crindau Development Brief. September 2008

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement- lighting, noise, vibration	Flow Depletion/Abstr action	Habitat Loss	Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution	Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
T1 – Railways: Proposal iii) Protection of disused lines	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal ii) (see above).
T1 – Railways: Proposal iv) Docks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying features of the SAC site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SAC .). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, a HRA⁸ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy⁹ which outlines potential development along the River Usk, that as outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying features of the SAC and as such the Severn Estuary SAC was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary SAC. An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary SAC and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC site as a result of this policy</p>
T1 – Railways: Proposal v) Supporting new rail facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).
T1 – Railways: Proposal vi) Supporting park and ride schemes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).
T5 – Walkways and Cycle ways Proposal i) National Cycle Route 47 Cwmcaron to Newport Proposal ii) National Cycle Route 4-Caerphilly to Newport Proposal iii) National Cycle Route 88-Caerloen to Newport.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).
R6 Retail in District Centres: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary SAC protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.</p>
CF9 Celtic Manor: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made.</p>

⁸ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

⁹ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Barriers to movement- lighting, noise, vibration	Flow Depletion/Abstr action	Habitat Loss	Water Quality/Diffuse Pollution	Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
								Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the SAC protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal i) Whiteheads Works	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. However, the additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure, although this is not likely to have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, close to this proposal. The site is connected to the SPA via the River Usk SAC. However Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution, changes in nutrient loading or increased suspended solids as a result of the works. Furthermore, Policy GP5 states that a precautionary approach be adopted and a HRA carried out if the potential impacts of the development are not known. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal ii) Novelis Site Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iii) Glan Llyn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . “The proposal is connected to the SAC via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iv) Llanwern Village	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5 km north of the Severn Estuary SAC. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. employment will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.
W1 - Sites for Waste Management Facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SAC. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SAC cannot accurately be made. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the SAC protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC as a result of this policy.

Table C-3: Assessment of Policies contained within the Plan Including Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects on the Severn Estuary SPA

Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA ¹	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i) M4 Motorway Junction 28 Tredegar Park	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. This proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale/nature of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² , and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses and thus there are no anticipated effects from diffuse pollution or changes in nutrient loading. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the SPA and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal ii) Northern extension of Southern Distributor road as the Duffryn Link Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² , changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁵ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal iii) North South Link Llanwern	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² , changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.
H1 – Housing Sites: All allocations not assessed in this table	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	These allocations have already received planning permission and/or currently under construction. See Appendix E2.
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H51 - Whiteheads Works	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² and aerial pollution ³ . Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. However, the additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure, although this is not likely to have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces. Furthermore, Policy GP5 states that a precautionary approach be adopted and a HRA carried out if the potential impacts of the development are not known. The site is connected to the SPA via the River Usk SAC. However Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution, changes in nutrient loading or increased suspended solids as a result of the works. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H52 - Old Town Dock remainder	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying bird features of the SPA site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner. This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SPA.). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SPA. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless

¹ The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12.

² The works will not lead to the loss of habitat within the SPA. Furthermore, the land to be affected by the proposed works are unsuitable to support the qualifying features of the SPA and as such do not form a functional part of the European site.

³ Highways Agency, 2007, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: Volume 11, Section 3 – Part 1 states that air quality deterioration generally occurs within 200 m of a roadside (returning to background levels after this distance). As this development is over 200 m from the SPA there are no changes in air quality at the SPA anticipated.

⁴ The Newport Draft Deposit Plan includes a number of policies to help minimise the impact of proposed development on climate change. This includes policies that are likely to lead to improved air quality levels (including Policy GP1 which states that proposals will be required to make a positive contribution to reduce car usage and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, Policy GP2 states that development will not be permitted where the proposals may have a significant effect on air quality, Policy GP4 states that development proposals should be designed to avoid or reduce air pollution, Policy CE14 commits to the promotion of renewable energy and Policy T5 which commits to improving/providing new, safe walking and cycling). Policy GP1 states that development proposals must minimise the risk of and from flood risk, sea level rise and the impact of climate change. These policies will help to minimise any input to climate change, and thus minimise the contribution of Newport's proposed development on coastal squeeze. Therefore, no likely significant effects on the SPA are anticipated from coastal squeeze as a result of this policy.

Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA ¹	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
								<p>the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SPA can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, a HRA⁵ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy⁶ which outlines potential development along the River Usk. „As outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying bird features of the SPA and as such the Severn Estuary SPA was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary SPA. An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary SPA and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA site as a result of this policy</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H53 - Bideford Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H56 - Woodland Site Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 6 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H61- Postal Exchange	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any</p>
H2 Housing Sites Allocation H62- Queens Hill	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H63-Telford Depot	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no</p>

⁵ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

⁶ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

<div> <div>Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div> </div>	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Allocation H64-Uskside Paint Mill								likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
H15 - Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation: Proposal site at Former Ringland Allotments	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
H16 - Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation: Proposal Hartridge Farm Road Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction ² and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SAC by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SAC and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal i) Duffryn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2 km north from the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal has potential to result in significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA qualifying features through the loss of habitat and disturbance of adjacent habitats. However, through discussions with Gwent Ornithological Society (10 th Feb 2012) it is understood that the habitats within this proposal are not known as important roosting/breeding sites for the qualifying bird species. Therefore based upon this evidence it is unlikely that this proposal will have likely significant effects on the features of the SPA through aerial pollution ³ , disturbance, loss of sight lines and habitat loss ² . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . As stated in the supportive text of this policy, any development that is likely to affect the bird features of the SPA will be required to complete an adequate bird survey to inform a HRA . It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The Plan provides an outline of the potential mitigation that the developer, if necessary, may need to provide (see supporting text of Policy EM1).Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal ii) East of Queensway meadows	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3 km north from the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal has potential to result in significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA qualifying features through the loss of habitat and disturbance of adjacent habitats. However, through discussions with Gwent Ornithological Society (10 th Feb 2012) it is understood that the habitats within this proposal are not known as important roosting/breeding sites for the qualifying bird species. Therefore based upon this evidence it is unlikely that this proposal will have likely significant effects on the features of the SPA through aerial pollution ³ , disturbance, loss of sight lines and habitat loss ² . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . As stated in the supportive text of this policy, any development that is likely to affect the bird features of the SPA will be required to complete an adequate bird survey to inform a HRA . It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The Plan provides an outline of the potential mitigation that the developer, if necessary, may need to provide (see supporting text of Policy EM1).Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iii) Celtic Springs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² , changes in nutrient loading, and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.
EM1 -Employment Land Allocations:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2 km north from the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal has potential to result in significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA qualifying features through the loss of habitat and disturbance of adjacent habitats. However, through discussions with Gwent Ornithological Society (10 th Feb 2012) it is understood that the habitats within this proposal are not known as important roosting/breeding sites for the qualifying bird species. Therefore based upon this

<div> <div>Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div> </div>	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Proposal iv) Solutia								<p>evidence it is unlikely that this proposal will have likely significant effects on the features of the SPA through aerial pollution³, disturbance, loss of sight lines and habitat loss². The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴</p> <p>As stated in the supportive text of this policy, any development that is likely to effect the bird features of the SPA will be required to complete an adequate bird survey to inform a HRA . It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The Plan provides an outline of the potential mitigation that the developer, if necessary, may need to provide (see supporting text of Policy EM1).</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal v) Gwent Europark	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading, and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal vi) Land of Chartist Drive Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading, and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.</p>
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal vii) Llanwern Former Steelworks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2 km north from the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal has potential to result in significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA qualifying features through the loss of habitat and disturbance of adjacent habitats. However, through discussions with Gwent Ornithological Society (10th Feb 2012) it is understood that the habitats within this proposal are not known as important roosting/breeding sites for the qualifying bird species. Therefore based upon this evidence it is unlikely that this proposal will have likely significant effects on the features of the SPA through aerial pollution³, disturbance, loss of sight lines and habitat loss² The proposal is connected to the Severn Estuary via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Nd changes to nutrient loading Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>As stated in the supportive text of this policy, any development that is likely to effect the bird features of the SPA will be required to complete an adequate bird survey to inform a HRA . It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The Plan provides an outline of the potential mitigation that the developer, if necessary, may need to provide (see supporting text of Policy EM1).Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal vii) Phoenix Park (Pirelli)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	This allocation has already received planning permission. See Appendix E2.
EM1 – Employment Sites: Proposal vi) Godfrey Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading, and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the SPA. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features Severn Estuary SPA.</p>
EM1 - Employment Sites Proposal x) Cardiff Road (Mon Bank)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	This allocation has already received planning permission. See Appendix E2.
EM2 – Newport Docks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying bird features of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the location of the proposed development, the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SPA can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>A HRA was carried out on this proposal in September 2008 and agreed with CCW. The appropriate assessment carried out identified the likely significant effects that this proposal would have on the qualifying bird features of the Severn Estuary SPA, however, as stated within the report, the mitigation measures described should result in the proposal having no significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary SPA..</p>

Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA ¹	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
								<p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA site as a result of this policy</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal i) Promotion of services using the Ebbw Valley line</p>	x	x	x	x		x	x	<p>The proposal is located 6 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively small scale. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading, disturbance, loss of habitat, and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids.. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the Severn Estuary SPA.</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal ii) Promotion of electrification of London-South Wales Line</p>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SPA. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SPA cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting Severn Estuary SPAs and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a Severn Estuary SPA (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary SPA protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p> <p>This policy could result in development and could have an affect upon the Severn Estuary SPA. However there are no specific details regarding location, nature and scale of development therefore an assessment cannot be made at this point. Policy GP5 states that a HRA will be required if any development is likely to have significant effect on the SPA.</p>
<p>T1 – Railways</p> <p>Proposal iii) Protection of disused lines</p>	x	x	x	x		x	x	Justification as for T1 proposal iii)
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal iv) Docks</p>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying bird features of the SPA site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SPA .). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SPA. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SPA can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, a HRA⁷ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy⁸ which outlines potential development along the River Usk. ,As outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying bird features of the SPA and as such the Severn Estuary SPA was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary SPA. An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary SPA and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA site as a result of this</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal v) Supporting new rail facilities</p>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Justification as for T1 proposal iii)
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal vi) Supporting park</p>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Justification as for T1 proposal iii)

⁷ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

⁸ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

<div> <div>Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div> </div>	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
and ride schemes.								
T5 – Walkways and Cycle ways Proposal i) National Cycle Route 47 Cwmcam to Newport Proposal ii) National Cycle Route 4-Caerphilly to Newport Proposal iii) National Cycle Route 88-Caerloen to Newport.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Justification as for T1 proposal iii)
R6 - Retail in District Centres: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SPA. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SPA cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting Severn Estuary SPAs and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a Severn Estuary SPA (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary SPA protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
CF9 Celtic Manor: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SPA. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SPA cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting Severn Estuary SPAs and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a Severn Estuary SPA (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary SPA protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
CF13 – Schools: Proposal i) Whiteheads Works	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution³. Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. However, the additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure, although this is not likely to have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Furthermore, Policy GP5 states that a precautionary approach be adopted and a HRA carried out if the potential impacts of the development are not known. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SPA can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
CF13 – Schools: Proposal ii) Novelis Site Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. schools, will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, and lighting are anticipated. . The proposal is connected to the River Usk through the River Ebbw that is a tributary of the River Usk, however due to the distance it is unlikely that this proposal will cause likely significant effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.</p>
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iii) Glan Llyn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss², changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. schools will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, and lighting are anticipated. The proposal is connected to the Severn Estuary via an outfall pipe, however given the</p>

Vulnerability of Severn Estuary SPA ¹	Disturbance at feeding roosting sites	Habitat Loss within estuary and surrounding areas	Water Quality/ Diffuse Pollution	Changes in nutrient and/or organic loading	Loss of sight lines	Aerial pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference								
								distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids.. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iv) Llanwern Village	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5 km north of the Severn Estuary SPA. Due to the distance of the proposal from the SPA and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary SPA from loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² , changes in nutrient loading and aerial pollution ³ . Furthermore the nature of the proposal, i.e. schools will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary SPA and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, and lighting are anticipated. The proposal is not connected to the SPA by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.
W1 - Sites for Waste Management Facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary SPA. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the SPA cannot accurately be made. Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting Severn Estuary SPAs and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a Severn Estuary SPA (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary SPA protected. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SPA as a result of this policy.

Table C-4: Assessment of Policies within the Plan Including Development Proposals for Likely Significant Effects on the Severn Estuary Ramsar Site

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference							
SP16 - Major Road Schemes: Proposal i) M4 Motorway Junction 28 Tredegar Park	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. This proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale/nature of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar Site from barriers to movement, habitat loss ² , and aerial pollution ³ . The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar Site by any watercourses and thus there are no anticipated effects from diffuse pollution. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Ramsar site and due to distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal ii): Northern Extension of the Southern Distributor Road Duffryn	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2 km north from the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. The proposal has potential to result in significant effects on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site qualifying features through the loss of habitat and disturbance of adjacent habitats. However, through discussions with Gwent Ornithological Society (10 th Feb 2012) it is understood that the habitats within this proposal are not known as important roosting/breeding sites for the qualifying bird species. Therefore based upon this evidence it is unlikely that this proposal will have likely significant effects on the features of the Ramsar site through aerial pollution ³ , barriers to movement, disturbance and habitat loss ² . In accordance with the supporting text, The supporting text states that should likely significant effects be identified then sufficient bird surveys must be carried out to inform a HRA. It is considered that a HRA will be required if any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. Example mechanisms for mitigation could include visual screening and as the proposal has the potential to lead to likely significant effects. The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
SP16 -Major Road Schemes: Proposal iii) North South Link Road Llanwern	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. The proposals are relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from, habitat loss ² , barriers to movement and aerial pollution. The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
H1 – Housing Sites: All allocations not assessed in this table	-	-	-	-	-	-	These allocations have already received planning permission and/or currently under construction. See Appendix E2.
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H51 - Whitehead works	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar Site. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss ² and aerial pollution ³ . Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. However, the additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure, although this is not likely to have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces. Furthermore, Policy GP5 states that a precautionary approach be adopted and a HRA carried out if the potential impacts of the development are not known. The site is connected to the Ramsar site via the River Usk SAC. However Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution, changes in nutrient loading or increased suspended solids as a result of the works. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy. The proposal is located 2.5 km

¹ Vulnerabilities taken from the *Core Management Plan (including Conservation Objectives) for River Usk Special Area of Conservation*, produced by CCW on 7th March 2008. The list of vulnerabilities against which each of the proposals have been assessed against has been agreed with Kerry Rogers at CCW (Land Use Plan Assessment Co-ordinator for the Environment Policy Group) on 26/01/12.

² The works will not lead to the loss of habitat within the Ramsar site. Furthermore, the land to be affected by the proposed works are unsuitable to support the qualifying features of the Ramsar site and as such do not form a function part of the European site.

³ Highways Agency, 2007, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: Volume 11, Section 3 – Part 1 states that air quality deterioration generally occurs within 200 m of a roadside (returning to background levels after this distance). As this development is over 200 m from the Ramsar site there are no changes in air quality at the Ramsar site anticipated.

⁴ The Newport Draft Deposit Plan includes a number of policies to help minimise the impact of proposed development on climate change. This includes policies that are likely to lead to improved air quality levels (including Policy GP1 which states that proposals will be required to make a positive contribution to reduce car usage and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, Policy GP2 states that development will not be permitted where the proposals may have a significant effect on air quality, Policy GP4 states that development proposals should be designed to avoid or reduce air pollution, Policy CE14 commits to the promotion of renewable energy and Policy T5 which commits to improving/providing new, safe walking and cycling). Policy GP1 states that development proposals must minimise the risk of and from flood risk, sea level rise and the impact of climate change. These policies will help to minimise any input to climate change, and thus minimise the contribution of Newport's proposed development on coastal squeeze. Therefore, no likely significant effects on the Ramsar site are anticipated from coastal squeeze as a result of this policy.

⁵ Welsh Water produced a *Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP)* in October 201. This document included the results of a HRA completed of the WRMP. This concluded that it will be possible to provide a supply of water to the Welsh Water supply area (including Newport and most of Wales) for the lifetime of the WRMP (25 years) without having any significant adverse effects on any European sites alone in combination (with certain mitigation measures in place). As this WRMP included all development within Newport and the rest of the Welsh Water supply area it is concluded that the proposals outlined in the policies can be delivered (i.e. water can be supplied to these developments) without causing significant effects on this European Site.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference							
							north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the Severn
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H52 - Old Town Dock	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the Ramsar site including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the Ramsar site. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the Ramsar site can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, Having said that a HRA⁶ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy⁷ which outlines potential development along the River Usk. , which as outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site and as such the Severn Estuary Ramsar site was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H53 -Bideford Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance of the proposal from the Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², abstraction⁵ and aerial pollution⁴. . The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 – Housing Sites: Allocation H56 -Woodland Site Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	x	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance of the proposal from the Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site from barriers to movement, loss of sight lines, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids or changes in nutrient loading are likely to occur. Furthermore the proposal is surrounded by accessible green space and countryside therefore will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H61-Postal exchange	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H62 Queens Hills	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites: Allocation H63 Telford Depot	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H1 Housing Sites:	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the

⁶ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

⁷ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

<div> <div>Vulnerability of European Site¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div> </div>	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Allocation H64 Uskside Paint Mill							<p>Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H15 - Gypsy and Traveller Transit Accommodation: Proposal site at Former Ringland Allotments	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
H16 - Gypsy and Traveller Residential Accommodation: Proposal Hartridge Farm Road Ringland	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 5.5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal i) Duffryn	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2 km north from the Severn Estuary Ramsar site.</p> <p>The proposal has potential to result in significant effects on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site qualifying features through the loss of habitat and disturbance of adjacent habitats. However, through discussions with Gwent Ornithological Society (10th Feb 2012) it is understood that the habitats within this proposal are not known as important roosting/breeding sites for the qualifying bird species. Therefore based upon this evidence it is unlikely that this proposal will have likely significant effects on the features of the Ramsar site through aerial pollution³, disturbance and habitat loss². The supporting text in Policy SP18 states that should likely significant effects be identified then sufficient bird surveys must be carried out to inform a HRA. The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids are likely to occur. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The supporting text states that should likely significant effects be identified then sufficient bird surveys must be carried out to inform a HRA It is considered that A HRA will be required if any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. Example mechanisms for mitigation could include visual screening and s the proposal has the potential to lead to likely significant effects.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal ii) Queensway Meadow	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. They proposals are relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from changes in barriers to movement, and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>However, given the suitable terrestrial and aquatic habitats found within this proposal it is possible that the bird features of the Ramsar site may use this area. As such, in accordance with the supporting text, a HRA will be required by the developer to ascertain the effect of the proposal with particular reference to habitat loss and loss of sight lines. The text the policy states that should likely significant effects be identified then sufficient bird surveys must be carried out to inform a HRA Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the Ramsar site can be mitigated the development will not be permitted. It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The supporting text in the policy provides some example mechanisms for mitigation.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iii) Celtic Springs	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss² and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. employment will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
EM1 -Employment Land Allocations: Proposal iv) Solutia	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from changes in barriers to movement and aerial pollution³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>However, given the suitable terrestrial and aquatic habitats found within this proposal it is possible that the bird features of the Ramsar site may use this area. As such, in accordance with the supporting text, a HRA will be required by the developer to ascertain the effect of the proposal with particular reference to habitat loss and loss of sight lines. The text in the policy states that should likely significant effects be identified then sufficient bird surveys must be carried out to inform a HRA Unless the HRA</p>

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference							
							can demonstrate that any effects on the Ramsar site can be mitigated the development will not be permitted. It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The supporting text in the policy provides some example mechanisms for mitigation. Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal v) Gwent Europark	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. They proposals are relatively large scale but due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss ² and aerial pollution ³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. employment will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Land Allocations: Proposal vi) Chartist Drive Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss ² and aerial pollution ³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. employment will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal vii) Llanwern former steelworks	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 3 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement and aerial pollution ³ The proposal is connected to the Severn Estuary via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . However, given the suitable terrestrial and aquatic habitats found adjacent to this proposal it is possible that the bird features of the Ramsar site may use this area. As such, in accordance with the supportive text, a HRA will be required by the developer to ascertain the effect of the proposal with particular reference to habitat loss and loss of sight lines. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the Ramsar site can be mitigated the development will not be permitted. It is considered that should any effects be identified at project level HRA they could be mitigated. The supporting text in the policy provides some example mechanisms for mitigation. Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Sites Proposal viii) Phoenix Park (Pirelli)	-	-	-	-	-	-	This allocation has already received planning permission a. See Appendix E2.
EM1 -Employment Sites: Proposal ix) Godfrey Road	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located 4.5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss ² and aerial pollution ³ The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore the type of proposal e.g. road works will not lead to any disturbance along the Ramsar site. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ . There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction ⁵ . Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.
EM1 - Employment Sites: Proposal x) Cardiff Road (Mon Bank)	-	-	-	-	-	-	This allocation has already received planning permission a. See Appendix E2
EM2 – Newport Docks	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the Ramsar site including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the Ramsar site. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the Ramsar site can be mitigated the development will not be permitted. Furthermore, a HRA ⁸ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy ⁹ which outlines potential development along the River Usk. . As outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site and as such the Severn Estuary Ramsar site was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze ⁴ .

⁸ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

⁹ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

<div>Vulnerability of European Site¹</div> <div>Policy Reference</div>	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
							<p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal i) Promotion of train services between Ebbw Vale and Newport</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 6 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. They proposals are relatively small scale. Due to the distance and the localised scale of the proposal there are no predicted effects on the Ramsar site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², disturbance and aerial pollution³. The proposal is not connected to the Ramsar site by any watercourses thus there are no effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴. There are also no effects anticipated from abstraction⁵.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal ii) Promotion of electrification of London-South Wales mainline</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Severn Estuary Ramsar site protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal iii) Protection of disused lines from development</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal iv) Protecting and encouraging rail access to the Docks</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk which is a migratory route for some of the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site. Due to the location of the proposed developments the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the Ramsar site including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the Ramsar site. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the Ramsar site can be mitigated the development will not be permitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, a HRA¹⁰ was carried out on the River Usk Strategy¹¹ which outlines potential development along the River Usk. . As outlined above, is a migratory route for the qualifying bird features of the Ramsar site and as such the Severn Estuary Ramsar site was considered in this HRA. The conclusion was that the Strategy alone, and/or in combination could have significant effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. An Appropriate Assessment was then carried out and identified measures to avoid adverse effects on the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and this therefore concluded that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of this European site as a result.</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy</p>
<p>T1 – Railways</p> <p>Proposal v) Supporting new rail facilities</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).</p>
<p>T1 – Railways:</p> <p>Proposal vi) Supporting park and ride schemes.</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).</p>
<p>T5 – Walkways and Cycleways:</p> <p>Proposal i) National Cycle Route 47 Cwmcarn to</p>	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>Justification as for T1 proposal iii) (see above).</p>

¹⁰ Habitat Regulation Assessment, *Newport City Council. River Usk Strategy*. June 2009.

¹¹ Newport City Council. *River Usk Strategy*. July 2009.

Vulnerability of European Site ¹	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
Policy Reference							
Newport Proposal ii) National Cycle Route 4-Caerphilly to Newport Proposal iii) National Cycle Route 88-Caerloen to Newport							
R6 - Retail in District Centres: Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the Ramsar site cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Ramsar site protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
CF9 - Celtic Manor : Proposals i) to iv)	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the Ramsar site cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Ramsar site protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
CF135 – Schools: Proposal i) Whitehead works	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 2.5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², abstraction⁵ and aerial pollution³. Due to the distance no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated during construction. The proposal connected to the Severn Estuary Ramsar site via the River Usk. Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction and as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works</p> <p>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
CF13 – Schools: Proposal ii) Novelis site Rogerstone	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 8 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance of the proposal from the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², abstraction⁵ and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. The proposal is connected to the River Usk through the River Ebbw that is a tributary of the River Usk, however due to the distance it is unlikely that this proposal will cause likely significant effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iii) Glan Llyn	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 4 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance of the proposal from the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², abstraction⁵ and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. The proposal is connected to the Severn Estuary via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>
CF13 – Schools: Proposal iv) Llanwern Village	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The proposal is located 5 km north of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. Due to the distance of the proposal from the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss², abstraction⁵ and aerial pollution³. Furthermore the nature of the proposal, will not lead to any increase in disturbance from recreational pressure along the Severn Estuary Ramsar site and due to distance, no disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipated. The proposal is not connected to the Severn Estuary Ramsar site therefore no effects from diffuse pollution are anticipated.</p> <p>Due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴.</p> <p>Therefore no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>

Vulnerability of European Site ¹ Policy Reference	Habitat loss	Flow depletion/ abstraction	Water quality/Diffuse pollution	Barriers to movement	Aerial Pollution	Coastal Squeeze	Justification
W1 - Sites for Waste Management Facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>This policy may result in development and without mitigation this could have likely significant effects upon the Severn Estuary Ramsar site. However, the policy and its supporting text provides no specific details regarding the location, nature and/or scale of development. Therefore an assessment of effects of this policy on the Ramsar site cannot accurately be made.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan commits to protecting European sites and Policy GP5 states that any proposed development that could have significant effects on a European site (alone or in combination with other projects or plans) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the legislative provisions to protect these sites can be fully met. Therefore if any additional development arises from this Policy, the Plan ensures that the HRA process will be followed and the Ramsar site protected.</p> <p>Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary Ramsar site as a result of this policy.</p>

APPENDIX D:

ASSESSMENT OF OTHER PROJECTS, PROGRAMMES AND PLANS FOR 'IN COMBINATION' EFFECTS

Table D-1: Assessment of Other Projects and Plans for 'In Combination' Effects

Statutory Body / Organisation	Report Reference	Findings of HRA (Potential sources of impacts on European Sites)	In Combination Effects
Caerphilly County Borough Council	Strategic Environment Assessment/ Sustainability Appraisal - Document 5: HRA of the LDP (October 2008)	<p>This plan sets out proposals for 8,625 new homes, extensive new employment land and provisions for mineral extraction and waste facilities.</p> <p>The HRA looked at the Aberbargoed SAC only. The HRA identified a number of policies in the Plan that had the potential to lead to likely significant effects on the Aberbargoed SAC. However, a Stage 2 - Appropriate Assessment was carried out and it was found that the Plan alone and in combination would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of this European site.</p>	None: The appropriate assessment carried concluded that predicted impacts arising from the Plan, alone and in combination with other Plans and Projects would result in no adverse effects on the integrity. This assessment was informed by an analysis of key conditions supporting the site's integrity, existing environmental trend data, the assessed impacts of surrounding plans and projects and the effectiveness of the management regime at the site itself. The assessment also took into account the nature and range of policies included in the Deposit LDP that will act to mitigate identified impacts arising from the implementation of development.
Cardiff City Council	Background Technical Paper No. 4 Habitats Regulations Report, Habitat Regulations Appraisal Screening Report of the County Council of the City and County of Cardiff Local Development Plan Preferred Strategy (2012)	<p>This Cardiff Council Preferred Strategy sets out a strategy for the future development of Cardiff, capital city of Wales and economic driver of the wider city-region to 2026.</p> <p>This Plan sets out proposals for 45,400 new homes, extensive new employment land, provisions for mineral extraction and waste facilities.</p> <p>The HRA Screening for Cardiff's Preferred Strategy has identified potential effects on five European sites: Cardiff Beechwoods SAC, Severn Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar, Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC, River Usk SAC and Blackmill Woodlands SAC.</p> <p>The main routes through which likely significant effects are anticipated are via increased air emissions and recreational pressures.</p> <p>Recommendations include changes to the LDP wording and potentially further appropriate assessment work.</p>	<p>None: The Cardiff City Council LDP has been withdrawn. The HRA process will need to be repeated of any new versions of the LDP that are produced.</p> <p>The HRA of the Newport Deposit Plan has concluded that there will be no likely significant effects from this Plan 'alone'. Cardiff City Council will have to determine through the HRA process whether their revised LDP will have any 'in combination' effects with the Newport City Council LDP on European sites.</p>
Monmouthshire County Council	Habitats Regulations Assessment of Monmouthshire Deposit Local Development Plan – (October 2012)	<p>This Plan sets out proposals for 5,300 new homes and new employment land.</p> <p>The HRA Screening of the Plan identified the potential for significant effects on several European sites in Monmouthshire County including the River Usk SAC and River Wye SAC through water pollution and reduced flow due to water abstraction.</p> <p>Recommendations include changes to the LDP wording and potentially further appropriate assessment work.</p>	None: The HRA of the Newport Deposit Plan has concluded that there will be no likely significant effects from this Plan 'alone' from water abstraction and effects on water quality. As such there are no 'on combination' effects anticipated with the Monmouthshire County Council LDP.. The AA assessed that the Deposit LDP contains suitable mitigation measures to address the potential in combination effects on European sites that could occur through changes to air quality, water quality, water resources and recreational disturbance. Specifically, the Deposit LDP contains policies that protect biodiversity and minimise the impacts of development on the wider environment, such as air quality, supporting habitats and the water environment
Torfaen County Borough Council	Torfaen County Borough Council Local Development Plan 2006 – 2021 Habitats Regulations Assessment (2008)	<p>This Plan sets out proposals for 6,600-7,000 new homes and new employment land.</p> <p>Taking a precautionary approach, the HRA of the LDP has identified the potential for effects on five European sites: Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC, Usk Valley Bat Sites SAC, Cwm Clydach Woodlands SAC, the River Usk SAC and the Severn Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar.</p> <p>The Council intends to appoint independent consultants to carry out Stage 2 of the HRA to ensure that it satisfies the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. It will also allow for an independent appraisal to be carried out of the implications for European sites.</p>	<p>None: In order for the Torfaen County Borough Council LPD to be adopted it will be necessary for the Plan to be assessed against the further stages of the Habitat Regulations. This will require the Plan to be subject to the relevant stages of the HRA process including Stage 2 – Appropriate Assessment and then potentially Stage 3 – Assessment of Alternative Solutions and Stage 4 - IROPI if necessary. This will require Torfaen County Borough Council to work closely with CCW.</p> <p>Where necessary, appropriate mitigation measures for the Plan (and the proposals within it) will need to be agreed with CCW (to ensure adverse effects on integrity of the European sites do not occur). Should the Plan progress to Stage 4 of the HRA process it will be necessary for Torfaen County Borough Council to agree suitable compensatory measures to offset the negative effects with the Secretary of State and CCW. Only once the mitigation measures or compensatory measures have been agreed with the relevant bodies will the Plan be adopted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the HRA of the Newport Deposit Plan has concluded that there will be no likely significant effects from this Plan 'alone' on the European sites. Torfaen County Borough Council will have to determine through the HRA process whether their LDP will have any 'in combination' effects with the Newport LDP on the European sites.</p>
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough	Assessment of the Rhondda Cynon Taf	The Plan sets out proposals for appropriately 14,850 new homes and extensive new employment land.	None: No likely significant effects from the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's LDP were identified on the European sites considered in the Newport HRA

Statutory Body / Organisation	Report Reference	Findings of HRA (Potential sources of impacts on European Sites)	In Combination Effects
Council	County Borough Council's Local Development Plan (2006-2021) (2007)	The HRA Screening for Rhondda Cynon Taf's LDP identified potential significant effects on the Blaen Cynon SAC. Recommendations include changes to the LDP wording and potentially further appropriate assessment work employment land.	(only Blaen Cynon SAC). Furthermore, The HRA of the Newport Deposit Plan has concluded that there will be no likely significant effects from this Plan 'alone'.
Newport City Council	Habitats Regulation Assessment of Newport City Council's River Usk Strategy (2009)	The HRA of this strategy identified key impacts from reduced flow, disturbance to fish and otters and pollution from numerous developments planned along the River Usk SAC. Numerous avoidance methods were recommended including the introduction of new byelaws by Newport Harbour Commissioners to assist the control and regulation of the river and good practice guidelines. When implemented these were deemed sufficient to avoid likely significant effects on any of the interest features, presuming NCC are able to enforce such methods, along with organisations such as the Environment Agency.	None: No likely significant effects identified once mitigation is in place.
Severn Estuary Coastal Group	HRA of Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan (2000)	This Management Plan provides the basis for sustainable coastal defence policies within the Severn Estuary and sets objectives for the future management of the shoreline. The preferred coastal defence policy for the River Usk and Severn Estuary in the short term (30 years) is to maintain the defence line. The HRA therefore concluded that in the short term, there are no significant impacts on the River Usk SAC and Severn Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar site.	None: No likely significant effects identified.
Environment Agency	Draft Severn Estuary Flood Risk Management Strategy (2011)	There is a possibility that some of the FRMS strategic options, if adopted, may bring about adverse impact on European designated conservation sites In order to assess the impacts a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be carried out and will be identified clearly within the SEA. A test of likely significant effect will be undertaken and if necessary an Appropriate Assessment for each of the sites potentially affected by the SMP2 and FRMS, with the process documented within a standalone document and within the SEA Report.	None: In order for the FRMS to be adopted it will be necessary for the Plan to be assessed against the Habitat Regulations. This will require the Plan to be subject to the relevant stages of the HRA process including Stage 1 – Screening, Stage 2 – Appropriate Assessment and then potentially Stage 3 – Assessment of Alternative Solutions and Stage 4 - IROPI if necessary. This will require the Environment Agency to work closely with CCW. Where necessary, appropriate mitigation measures for the Plan (and the proposals within it) will need to be agreed with CCW (to ensure adverse effects on integrity of the European sites do not occur). Should the Plan progress to Stage 4 of the HRA process it will be necessary for the Environment Agency to agree suitable compensatory measures to offset the negative effects with the Secretary of State and CCW. Only once the mitigation measures or compensatory measures have been agreed with the relevant bodies will the Plan be adopted. Furthermore, the HRA of the Newport Deposit Plan has concluded that there will be no likely significant effects from this Plan 'alone' on the European sites. The Environment Agency will have to determine through the HRA process whether their LDP will have any 'in combination' effects with the Newport LDP on the European sites.
Severn Estuary Coastal Group	HRA of Severn Estuary Shoreline Management Plan (SMP2) (2011)	The HRA concluded that some of the policies within the SMP2 will inevitably affect European sites. The report states that the only European sites potentially affected by the implementation of the SMP2 are the Severn SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites and the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA. The Environment Agency are developing a Habitat Delivery Plan which will identify sites across the estuary which can potentially be secured to provide compensation for habitat loss. It is not possible to state with certainty that a sufficient quantity of compensatory habitat or the required type / types will be provided with the Severn Estuary. As such Stage 2 - Appropriate Assessment will be carried out.	None: In order for the SMP2 to be adopted it will be necessary for the Plan to be assessed against the further stages of the Habitat Regulations. This will require the Plan to be subject to the relevant stages of the HRA process including Stage 2 – Appropriate Assessment and then potentially Stage 3 – Assessment of Alternative Solutions and Stage 4 - IROPI if necessary. This will require the Severn Estuary Coastal Group to work closely with CCW. Where necessary, appropriate mitigation measures for the Plan (and the proposals within it) will need to be agreed with CCW (to ensure adverse effects on integrity of the European sites do not occur). Should the Plan progress to Stage 4 of the HRA process it will be necessary for the Severn Estuary Coastal Group to agree suitable compensatory measures to offset the negative effects with the Secretary of State and CCW. Only once the mitigation measures or compensatory measures have been

Statutory Body / Organisation	Report Reference	Findings of HRA (Potential sources of impacts on European Sites)	In Combination Effects
			agreed with the relevant bodies will the Plan be adopted. Furthermore, the HRA of the Newport Deposit Plan has concluded that there will be no likely significant effects from this Plan 'alone' on the European sites. The Severn Estuary Coastal Group will have to determine through the HRA process whether their LDP will have any 'in combination' effects on the European sites.
Planning application 07/0540	HRA of Land to the rear of Whitehead works Cardiff Road Newport (2007)	The proposed works at this site are for residential development. The HRA found that the development is likely to have significant effects on water quality of the River Usk SAC. However the HRA concluded that with mitigation these can be avoided. Therefore no likely significant effects were identified from this development.	None: No likely significant effects identified once mitigation is in place.
Newport City Council	Habitat Regulation Assessment Newport City Council Supplementary Planning Guidance: Crindau Development Brief (September 2008)	The HRA considered the following International sites: River Usk SAC, Aberbargoed Grasslands SAC, Wye Valley Woodlands SAC, Cardiff Beechwoods SAC, Severn Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar site and River Wye SAC. The HRA concluded that the plan alone and or in combination as proposed is likely to have an effect on the integrity of three of the European sites. Mitigation measures have been recommended and with these measures in place the HRA concluded that this development would lead to no likely significant effects on the European Sites.	None: No likely significant effects identified once mitigation is in place.
Veolia Environmental Services	Llanwern Steelworks Energy Recovery Facility: Environmental Statement: Appendix 10.2 – HRA (December 2011)	A incinerator is proposed at the Llanwern Steelworks site. The HRA considered the following European Sites: River Usk SAC, Severn Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar site and the Wye Valley Bat SAC. The HRA concluded that the proposal would lead to no likely significant effects on the European sites.	None: No likely significant effects identified.
Welsh Water	Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) (August 2012)	This document included the results of a HRA completed of the WRMP. This concluded that it will be possible to provide a supply of water to the Welsh Water supply area (including Newport and most of Wales) for the lifetime of the WRMP (25 years) without having any significant adverse effects on any European sites alone in combination (with certain mitigation measures in place).	None: No likely significant effects identified.
CCW	HRA of a Proposal for a continuous coastal path between Cardiff and Chepstow. (May 2011)	A HRA was carried out for the All Wales Coastal Path. The conclusion of the HRA was that the <i>“Project will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites (Severn Estuary Ramsar, SPA and SAC) and that effect can be reduced to de minimis, provided all proposed mitigation measure are fully implemented.”</i>	None: No likely significant effects identified.

APPENDIX E:

E1 - RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

E2 - SITES WITH EXISTING COMMITMENTS

E3 - MITIGATION MEASURES

E1 - HRA Response December 2012

RESPONDANT	REFERENCE	REPRESENTATION SUMMARY	COUNCIL RESPONSE
Countryside Council Wales for	54.E1	Welcome the precautionary approach adopted by the assessment.	NOTED
	54.E2	Need to produce a summary table of mitigation measures and further clarification of potential cumulative/ in combination effects,	Summary table has produced and inputted into the HRA (Appendix E – E1)
	54.E3	Clarify the assessment undertaken on extant planning permission allocations within the plan	Additional text to Conclusions and Future Work 4. 4 of the HRA: <i>“All Policies and Allocations contained within the Plan have been assessed individually as well as in combination with other Plans and Policies outlined in Section 2, Method.”</i> An additional table has been put into the HRA (Appendix E –E2) with all the proposals that have previously received planning permission. These have been assessed individually and in combination with the proposals of the LDP.
	54.E4	Detailed comments sit out in accompanying letter	NOTED
	54.E5	Seek clarification that no significant effects after mitigation incorporated into the plan.	Additional text added to the HRA Executive Summary, Conclusions: <i>“The HRA concluded that with mitigation, (this includes various policies and caveats found within the plan), there would be no likely significant effect of the Newport Deposit LDP on any of the internationally designated sites within Newport or within a 15km radius of the Newport boundary”</i>
	54.E6	For clarity reference could be made to Regulation 104 and need to set out IROPI tests.	Additional text added to section 1.8 of HRA: <i>“Where effects are unavoidable, imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI) must be demonstrated and compensation measures must be provided. This is so long as there are no viable, less damaging, alternatives to the proposals available. (Regulation 104)”</i>
	54.E7	Commend the iterative approach	NOTED
	54.E8	Support the list of sites considered is reasonable	NOTED

	54.E9	Accept the screening out of the Usk bat SAC	NOTED
	54.E10	Agree the list of potential impact categories for the assessment	NOTED
	54.E11	Further check may be required to ensure policies in combination effects	Those Policies identified as B categories are non specific and provide no details of where and when development may take place. The other policies within the Plan, namely GP5 state that a HRA will be required and this must demonstrate that the development will not have LSE on the Internationally designated sites. Additional text to be added to paragraph 3.24 Task 4 Screening: <i>"These Policies have also been considered in combination with other Plans and Policies see Appendix D Table D-1"</i>
	54.E12	Clarification that allocations previously in the UDP have been considered for their possible in combination effects	See comments 54.E3
	54.E13	For clarity the production of a summary table outlining mitigation measures should be added which would assist monitoring	See comments 54.E2
	54.E14	Need to develop a specific monitoring indicator for potential water resource demand.	Support noted. A water resource monitoring indicator is to be included within the plan.
	54.E15	Further clarification relation to assessment for water quality, disturbance and potential loss of habitat impacts	The need for development to consider their impact upon water quality issues is clearly covered in the plan as the representation reflects. A monitoring indicator will be included in the plan.
	54.E16	Policy text should recognise the requirement for mitigation for potential water quality impacts on the Severn Estuary sites and development of a monitoring indicator	The need for development to consider their impact upon water quality issues is clearly covered in the plan as the representation reflects. A monitoring indicator will be included in the plan.
	54.E17	HRA to recognise the impact of drainage and discharges through the seawall	Additional text to LDP Policy GP 1 3.4 <i>"Flood mitigation and ancillary works associated with managing flood risk will be required to consider their impact upon sensitive environments as set out in Policy GP5 of the Plan."</i>

	54.E18	Need to acknowledge Coastal Squeeze and its impacts within the plan.	Additional text to be added to LDP Policy CE13 supportive text 4.53 <i>"The policy option to Hold the Line at the coast means that the impact of coastal squeeze and the potential loss of coastal habitat has been accounted for within the development of SMP2, however, this is an area where potential alternative actions may be considered in the future."</i>
	54.E19	The need to produce a summary table of mitigation measures for clarity	See comments 54.E2 and 54.E5
	54.E20	Need to identify project level HRA for renewable energy developments near the Severn Estuary	Additional text to be added to LDP Policy CE14 supportive text 4.56: <i>"Proposals which affect the special qualities of the Gwent Levels, or any other protected site will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effects."</i>
	54.E21	Clarification of mitigation measures and additional monitoring indicators	See comments 54.E2
	54.E22	Correction as to location description set out in the table	Change of text in HRA Appendix C SP16 ii from 'west' to 'east' of Usk
	54.E23	Correction as to location description set out in the table	Change of text in HRA Appendix C SP16 iii from 'east' to 'west' of Usk
	54.E24	Clarification as to how surface water will be dealt with by the Old Green Junction remodelling proposal	Email correspondence received from Streetscene 02/01/2013 stating that the impermeable area will decrease and that the assumption would be that the existing highway drainage infrastructure would be used. Appendix C SP16 iv
	54.E25	Need to consider the in combination effects of these proposals	Additional table created Appendix D D-2 "in combination with other Housing proposals/plans"
	54.E26	Support the commitment to project level HRA at housing allocation at Herbert Road and Enterprise House	NOTED
	54.E27	Need to reference mitigation measures in supporting text for housing allocation at Old Town Dock	Consider that the River Usk Strategy as well as other appropriate pieces of Supplementary Planning Guidance will need to be readopted by the Council. As part of this process the documents will need to be assessed against the appropriate assessments including Habitat Regulations Assessment. To ensure that any mitigation measures identified at this

			<p>stage are reflected within the LDP additional text will be set out in Para.4.4 to read:</p> <p>‘However, effects can be minimised/avoided through appropriate mitigation measures. Please note that mitigations measures might have been identified within Habitat Regulation Assessment of associated documentation including Supplementary Planning Guidance.....’</p>
	54.E28	Need to recognise the potential for affecting Natura 2000 sites by the housing allocation at the former Alcan site.	<p>Additional text added to the HRA:</p> <p>Appendix C: H1 H5, EM2 xii), CF15 iii), <i>“The proposal is connected to the River Usk through the River Ebbw that is a tributary of the River Usk, however due to the distance it is unlikely that this proposal will cause likely significant effects from diffuse pollution or suspended solids.”</i></p>
	54.E29	Need to reference the mitigation measures in the supporting text for the housing allocation at Crindau	<p>Additional text to LDP paragraph 4.53:</p> <p><i>“In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a HRA as part of the planning process.”</i></p>
	54.E30	Strong recommendation to provide information as to how surface water will be dealt with at the housing allocation at Glan Llyn.	<p>Additional text to HRA Appendix C H1 47, Glan Llyn Former Llanwern</p> <p>Additional housing site allocation (H47) assessed-</p> <p><i>“The proposal is located 4km from the Severn Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar. The proposal is relatively large scale but due to the distance of the proposal from the SAC/SPA/Ramsar and the localised scale/nature of the works no likely significant effects are anticipated on the European site from barriers to movement, habitat loss, abstraction and aerial pollution. Due to the distance, disturbance from noise, vibration and lighting are anticipate during construction. The proposal is connected to the SAC/SPA/Ramsar via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids. Furthermore the proposal is surrounding by accessible natural green space and open countryside therefore will not lead to an increase in disturbance from recreational pressure. Due to policies within the Plan this development proposal is not anticipated to</i></p>

			<i>contribute to coastal squeeze. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated on the qualifying features of the Severn Estuary SAC/SP/Ramsar"</i>
	54.E31	Support the approach especially the need for project level HRA as detailed proposals come forward	NOTED
	54.E32	Strong recommendation to provide information as to how surface water will be dealt with at the housing allocation at Glan Llyn	See comments 54.E30
	54.E33	Strong recommendation to provide information as to how surface water will be dealt with at the housing allocation at Llanwern Former Steelworks	See comments 54.E30
	54.E34	Strong recommendation to provide information as to how surface water will be dealt with at the housing allocation at Llanwern former tipping area	See comments 54.E30
	54.E35	Need to reference the mitigation measures in the supporting text for the proposal at Lower Dock Street	Following a review of employment land this allocation is to be deleted from the plan, therefore the proposed text is not considered appropriate.
	54.E36	Require clarification as to the location of the employment allocation at the Riverfront EM2 vii	<p>Map provided by Planning Policy.</p> <p>This allocation has been re-assessed in light of map provided. Change of text to Appendix C EM 2 vii) Riverfront:</p> <p><i>"The proposal is located adjacent to the River Usk. Due to the location of the proposed development adjacent to the River Usk, the Plan states that work must be completed in an environmentally sensitive manner as stated in the supporting text. This will include employing construction methods that minimise vibration (as to not disturb, or prevent a barrier to the movement of qualifying features of the SAC including allis and twaite shad). If night time working is required then a lighting scheme and specific design will be required to prevent light spill onto the Usk. Timings of works must be sensitive to qualifying features of the SAC.</i></p>

			<p><i>The works will result in loss of suitable otter habitat. As such, in accordance with the additional text in the Policy, 5 m of bank side habitat must be maintained. An otter survey within the proposed development site must be completed prior to construction, and appropriate mitigation put in place, this may include obtaining a licence from CCW. The additional dwellings could lead to an increase in disturbance through recreational pressure on the Usk. Furthermore, it is considered very unlikely that this development would have a significant effect as there are other accessible green spaces, e.g. Newport Wetlands, near by that new residents can use. In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process. Unless the HRA can demonstrate that any effects on the SAC can be mitigated through measures described in the supporting text, the development will not be permitted.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, due to policies within the Plan, this development proposal is not anticipated to contribute to coastal squeeze⁴ and Policy SP4 states that water quality will be protected during construction (as such there will be no effects from diffuse pollution or increased suspended solids as a result of the works). Due to the nature of the works there will be no abstraction from the River.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore this policy proposal will not lead to any likely significant effects on the qualifying features of the River Usk SAC."</i></p>
	54.E37	Need to reference mitigation measures in the supporting text for the employment proposals at Crindau	<p>Additional text added to LDP Policy EM2 supportive text 6.34:</p> <p><i>"In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a HRA as part of the planning process."</i></p>
	54.E38	Require the precautionary approach will be applied to mobile species when considering the Novelis site	<p>Additional text added to the LDP paragraph 6.37:</p> <p><i>"Any development adjacent to the River Ebbw must ensure that the Riparian habitat is to be maintained."</i></p>
	54.E39	Further clarification required as to the location of the proposal within policy T1 (v)	<p>Clarification sought from Planning Policy.</p> <p>T1 (v) aims to protect existing routes and encourage rail access, there is no specific demarcation.</p>

E1 - HRA Response December 2012

	54.E40	Support the approach taken in particular the need for project level HRA with more detailed proposals	Amended text in LDP CF10 Celtic Manor within supportive text 9.39: <i>'Attention is also drawn to the nature conservation interests of the area and particularly of the River Usk, which is of European significance as a Special Area of Conservation under the Habitats Directive, which is covered in Policy GP5 of the plan.....'</i>
	54.E41	Further check may be required to ensure policies in combination effects	See comments 54.E3 No further assessment required as this has been assessed in combination with other plans and policies.
	54.E42	Strong recommendation to provide information as to how surface water will be dealt with at Glan Llyn site	Additional text added to HRA, Appendix C CF15 iv Glan Llyn School <i>"The proposal is connected to the SAC/SPA/Ramsar via an outfall pipe, however given the distance from the European site this proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the European site through diffuse pollution or increase suspended solids."</i>
	54.E43	Need to reference mitigation measures in text for allocation of the Waste site south of Llanwern and provide information as to how surface water will be dealt with	Waste Allocation W1i) South of Llanwern Steelworks, is to be removed from Appendix C Tables and added to Appendix B "No Development Proposals" At present the application for the Incinerator has been refused planning permission and in the process of Appeal. The policy is currently written with no specific technology allocation, however the appeal is running in parallel to the LDP process, as a result of this then the Policy would be assessed as a B policy. A reference will be made to the existing HRA that found that the application would not lead to any LSE on any of the internationally Designated sites.
	54.E44	Confirmation that the proposed unmarked regeneration site has been assessed	The site in question is part of allocation EM2(v) which has been assessed as part of the HRA.
Environment Agency	103.E1	Support the undertaking of a water cycle study	NOTED
EVOCATI	2339.E1	Considered unnecessary to provide a	NOTED

E1 - HRA Response December 2012

Limited		separate HRA response form as it is part of the EIA/SEA mechanism, giving an ecological bias to governance,	
Mr John Griffiths	2474.E1	Question how air pollution monitoring has been considered.	<p>Aerial pollution has been considered based upon the conservation objectives of each of the Internationally designated sites. The assessment is based upon the likely significant effects of the proposal on the qualifying features of each of the designated sites. This assessment has also considered the in combination with other plans and policies based upon the likely significant effects.</p> <p>Policies within the plan and the monitoring targets outlined will further ensure that there are no significant effects on the qualifying features, this includes aerial pollution.</p> <p>There are also additional caveats throughout the plan that ensure that any development would need to consider the effects on the Internationally important sites.</p> <p>The LDP should be read as a whole and there are several policies which aim to prevent/reduce air pollution for example GP2(i).</p>

Appendix E- E2
Sites with existing commitments

<u>LDP Reference</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Planning Application Reference</u>	<u>Habitat Regulations Assessment</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>
H1	Adj McReadys, Ponthir Road	08/1333	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination
H3	Llanwern Village	06/0845	No	Given the distance from the Internationally designated sites, accessibility of surrounding natural green spaces and the conditions attached to the planning permission for example Green Travel Strategy, ecological management plan, surface water regulation system, surface water interceptors etc it is unlikely that this development alone or in combination would result in LSE.
H4	Phoenix Park (Pirelli)	10/0847	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H5	Glebelands	03/1531	No	This application is for a school site which at the time did not require a HRA. The site is adjacent to the River Usk SAC.
H7	Bethesda Close	11/0590	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H8	The Seven Stiles	08/0551	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H9	Frobisher Road	07/1524	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H10	Pencoed Castle	06/0267	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H11	Laburnum Drive	08/0064	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H12	Former Tredegar Park Golf Course	09/0096	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination. The site is adjacent to the River Ebbw which is a

Appendix E- E2
Sites with existing commitments

				known otter commuting route. Conditions attached to the application ensure that there is a 10m buffer from the River and a wetland habitat that is to be created as part of the planning condition.
H13	Allt Yr Yn Campus	09/0101	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H14	Monmouthshire Bank Sidings	07/0540	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions, such as the agreement of all works with CCW and NCC prior to commencement, there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H15	Victoria Wharf	07/0539	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions such as the agreement of all works with CCW and NCC prior to commencement there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H16	Penmaen Wharf	07/0031	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H17	Former Hurrans Garden Centre	09/0874	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H19	Hartridge High School	07/1590	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H21	Former Floors 2 Go	09/0234	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H23	Traston Lane	05/0287	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H24	30-33 High Street	06/0468	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.

Appendix E- E2
Sites with existing commitments

H25	Taylors Garage	10/0257	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H26	Ty Du Works	03/0760	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H30	Rear of South Wales Argus	13/0830		<u>Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.</u>
H31	Roman Lodge Hotel	08/1445	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H32	Former Sainsburys	09/0733	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H34	Bankside, Coverack Road	09/1243	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H36	Farmwood Close	06/0065	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H37	City Vizion	07/0055	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H38	Lysaghts Village (Orb Works)	08/0565	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H39	Former Bettws Comprehensive	10/0214	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination. Otters are known to use Bettws Brook however it is unlikely they would cross the road to the proposed site.

Appendix E- E2
Sites with existing commitments

H40	Westmark, Old Town Dock	05/1644	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H41	Trinity View	09/0851	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H42	Black Clawson	07/0889	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions there would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
H43	Portskewett Street	10/0794	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination. Planning application is retrospective and buildings are already present.
H44	Turner Street	11/0843	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H45	Lysaghts Parc	09/0850	No	Given the distance and accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H47	Glan Llyn	06/0471	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H56	Opp Belmont Lodge	07/0386	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H57	Treberth Crescent	10/0519	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.

Appendix E- E2
Sites with existing commitments

H58	Panasonic	13/0669	No	<u>Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.</u> Internationally protected sites
H59	24 Crawford Street		No	<u>Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.</u> Internationally protected sites
H60	Turner Street	11/0843	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
H61	Parry Drive	10/0099	No	<u>Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.</u> Internationally protected sites
EM1(iii)	Celtic Springs	14/0204	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
EM1(v)	Gwent Europark	07/0743.	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
EM1(vii)	Llanwern Former Steelworks	06/0471	No	Given the distance, lack of suitable habitat connecting the site to the Internationally protected sites, and the accessibility to countryside it is unlikely that this allocation would result in LSE on any of the Internationally designated sites alone or in combination.
EM1(viii)	Phoenix Park (Pirelli)	10/0852	Yes	An AA was undertaken. Concerns over potential run-off into the Usk were alleviated through the imposition of suitable conditions. Potential in-combination effects of the adjoining housing development and other developments in the vicinity were assessed. No significant adverse effects were considered likely.
EM1(x)	Monmouthshire Bank Sidings	07/0540	Yes	An AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions, such as the agreement of all works with CCW and NCC prior to commencement, there

Appendix E- E2
Sites with existing commitments

				would be no adverse effects on the Internationally protected sites alone or in combination.
--	--	--	--	---

Appendix E E3

Mitigation Measures contained within the LDP for the Internationally Designated Sites

Receptor	Vulnerability Factor	Recommended Mitigation Outlined within the Plan	Relevant Policies within the Plan that aim to minimise any likely significant effects on Internationally designated sites
River Usk SAC			
Otters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Barriers to movement -Habitat loss -Disturbance -Water quality/diffuse pollution -Coastal squeeze 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercourses must not be culverted; • Minimum 7m buffer of bank side habitat retained; • Sensitive working programme-Otter surveys must be carried out and this may include obtaining relevant licenses from Natural Resources Wales; • HRA may be required for certain allocations; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP3 <u>Flood Risk</u> supportive text 2.15 states that Watercourses within the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) area must not be culverted and development must avoid obstructing the water course by providing a buffer zone of 12.5m minimum for reens and 7m minimum for field ditches in order to allow ongoing maintenance; • Policy SP4 (iv) <u>Water Resources</u> ensures that water quality will be protected during construction; • Policy SP4 supportive text 2.19 states that water abstracted from Natura 2000 sites will not have significant effects on conservation status of that site; • Policy SP5 <u>Countryside</u>-ensures that the Countryside is protected and enhanced;
Fish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Barriers to movement -Flow depletion/abstraction -Habitat loss -Disturbance -Water quality/diffuse pollution -Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation) -Coastal squeeze 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive working programme-this may include obtaining relevant licenses from Natural Resources Wales; • HRA may be required for certain allocations; • Lighting scheme to be submitted to ensure no light spill onto the Usk; • Timings of works must be sensitive to migratory fish patterns; • Vibration must be minimised to prevent disturbance to migratory fish; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy GP5 <u>Natural Environment</u> ensures that the developer will be expected to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken as part of the planning process if applicable; • Policy SP9 <u>Conservation of the Natural, Historic and built environment</u> supportive text 2.28 refers to the Council's duty to ensure that designated sites are protected; • Policy SP14 <u>Transport proposals</u> (ix) states that transport proposals will be supported where they result in environmental improvements such as air quality and enhanced biodiversity; • Policy SP16 <u>Major Road schemes</u> supportive text 2.51 refers readers to Policy GP5 with regards to development on the Gwent Levels;. Supportive text 2.33 states that the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken; • Policy SP17 <u>Employment Land and Urban regeneration</u> supportive

Appendix E E3

Mitigation Measures contained within the LDP for the Internationally Designated Sites

			<p>text 2.746 states that mitigation and management will be required if necessary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy SP21 <u>Minerals</u> supportive text 2.83 states that developers will need to ensure that any proposals have regard for other policies within the plan;• Policy GP1 <u>Climate Change</u> supportive text 3.4 states that flood mitigation and ancillary works will be required to consider impacts on sensitive environments set out in Policy GP5;• Policy GP5 <u>Natural Environment</u> aims to protect and enhance the natural environment and supportive text states that any proposals that are likely to have significant effect upon European sites will be considered contrary to the ethos of the plan;• Policy CE3 <u>Routeways, Corridors and Gateways</u> supportive text 4.2 states that proposals should seek to enhance biodiversity and wildlife connectivity;• Policy CE10 <u>Coastal</u> supportive text 4.46 states that in environmentally sensitive areas and Environmental Statement will be required;• Policy CE8 <u>Conservation Areas</u> supportive text 4.35 states that the plan seeks to protect and enhance Newport's unique rich and unique environment;• Policy CE11 <u>Renewable Energy</u> supportive text 4.51 states proposals that effect the special qualities of the Gwent Levels or any other protected sites will be resisted unless no adverse effects can be demonstrated;• Policy H1 <u>Housing sites</u> supportive text 5.3 states that the developer will be expected to carry out a HRA in accordance with GP5;• Policy EM1 <u>Employment Land allocations</u> supportive text states that sufficient information will be required in order for a HRA to be undertaken. as some of the proposals could impact on the Internationally designated sites;• EM2 <u>Newport Docks</u> supportive text 6.22 states that state that
Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Flow depletion/abstraction-Habitat loss-Water quality/diffuse pollution-Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)-Aerial pollution-Coastal squeeze	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sensitive working programme-this may include obtaining relevant licenses from Natural Resources Wales;• HRA may be required for certain allocations	
Severn Estuary SAC			
Fish	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Barriers to movement-Flow depletion/abstraction-Habitat loss-Disturbance-Water quality/diffuse pollution-Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)-Coastal squeeze	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sensitive working programme-this may include obtaining relevant licenses from Natural Resources Wales;• HRA may be required for certain allocations• Lighting scheme to be submitted to ensure no light spill onto the Usk which is a migratory route for the fish;• Timings of works must be sensitive to migratory fish patterns;• Vibration must be minimised to prevent disturbance to migratory fish;	
Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Flow depletion/abstraction-Habitat loss	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sensitive working programme-this may include obtaining relevant	

Appendix E E3

Mitigation Measures contained within the LDP for the Internationally Designated Sites

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Water quality/diffuse pollution-Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)-Aerial pollution-Coastal squeeze	<ul style="list-style-type: none">licenses from Natural Resources Wales;• HRA may be required for certain allocations	<p>sufficient information will be required in order for a HRA to e undertaken. as some of the proposals could impact on the Internationally designated sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy T1 <i>Railways</i> supportive text 7.9 refers to Para 2.55 which states that that a 5m buffer of bank side vegetation must be retained and the watercourse must not be culverted and In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a HRA as part of the planning process;• Policy T5 <i>Walking and Cycling</i> supportive text 7.17 states that proposals near or in an internationally designated sites will be subject to HRA;• Policy T8 <i>All Wales Coastal Path</i> supportive text 7.24 states that any additional proposals will be within the approved parameters of The Wales Coastal Path AA;• Policy CF3 <i>Water Based Recreation</i> supportive text 9.17 states that any proposals arising as a result of this policy must adhere to other policies within the plan including GP5;• Policy CF4 <i>Riverfront Access</i> supportive text 9.21 states that any proposals arising as a result of this policy must adhere to other policies within the plan including GP5;• Policy CF10 <i>Celtic Manor</i> supportive text 9.35 states that residential development will not be appropriate as it is not appropriate for the rural area of the Usk Valley and that other relevant policies in the plan should also be taken into account;• Policy CF11 <i>Outdoor Leisure Development</i> supportive text 9.44 states that any proposals will be required to be respectful of their surroundings and be designed to have minimal impact. Supportive text 9.46 aim to protect the water environment from excessive abstraction. Supportive text 9.47 states that any associated development may be unacceptable fro example floodlighting and appropriate conditions will be attached to any planning permission;• Policy M2 <i>Mineral Development</i>. supportive text10.7 states that developers must consider any impacts that a proposal may have on biodiversity;
Severn Estuary SPA			
Birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Disturbance to feeding/roosting sites-Habitat loss-Water quality/diffuse pollution-Change of nutrient loading/organic loading-Loss of sight lines-Aerial pollution-Coastal squeeze	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sensitive working programme-this may involve obtaining relevant licences to from Natural Resources Wales.• Bird surveys must be carried out if significant effects are likely;• HRA may be required for certain allocations;• Screening;• Monitoring;	
Severn Estuary Ramsar			
Fish	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Barriers to movement-Flow depletion/abstraction-Habitat loss-Disturbance-Water quality/diffuse pollution-Increase in suspended solids in water column (siltation)-Coastal squeeze	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sensitive working programme-this may include obtaining relevant licenses from Natural Resources Wales;• HRA may be required for certain allocations• Lighting scheme to be submitted to ensure no light spill onto the Usk which is a migratory route for the fish;	

Appendix E E3

Mitigation Measures contained within the LDP for the Internationally Designated Sites

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timings of works must be sensitive to migratory fish patterns; • Vibration must be minimised to prevent disturbance to migratory fish; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy W2 <i>Waste Management Proposals</i> supportive text 11.10 states that proposals resulting in prejudice nature conservation interests will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the reasons for development outweigh adverse impacts. Supportive text 11.11 states that development will be permitted where no unacceptable impacts on air and noise can be demonstrated. Supportive text 11.12 states that water resources will be managed through appropriate conservation and efficiency measures without adversely affecting ecology. Supportive text 11.14 states that waste schemes should not have significant adverse effects on the land. Supportive text 11.16 states that certain proposals will require an EIA; <p>Objective 6- Conservation and the Environment</p> <p>Monitoring Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No net loss of a SINC which do not meet the requirements of the Plan -No net loss of protected woodland and trees -No developments in Green belt which do not meet the requirements of the Plan -No planning consents with outstanding objections on statutory designations from NRW
Birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Disturbance to feeding/roosting sites -Habitat loss -Water quality/diffuse pollution -Change of nutrient loading/organic loading -Loss of sight lines -Aerial pollution -Coastal squeeze 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive working programme-this may involve obtaining relevant licences to from Natural Resources Wales. • Bird surveys must be carried out if significant effects are likely; • HRA may be required for certain allocations; • Screening; • Monitoring, 	
Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Habitat loss -Flow depletion/abstraction -Water quality/diffuse pollution -Aerial pollution -Coastal squeeze 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive working programme-this may include obtaining relevant licenses from Natural Resources Wales; • HRA may be required for certain allocations 	

APPENDIX F:

RESPONSES TO REVISED DEPOSIT LDP JUNE 2013

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

LDP Page number	Chapter Summary	Changes to the HRA Screening Report as a result of the Revised Plan	Likely significant effect	Council Response
12	<p>Introduction and Overview</p> <p>Provides history and context the city. Outlines the objectives of the plan.</p>	<p>Change of text Page 14 of the HRA Screening Report::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional objective Waste (Objective 10) • Update in list of chapters and headings (section 3.12) <p>Change of text Page 14 of the HRA Screening Report Section 3.13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a gateway to Wales, Newport will be a centre of regeneration that celebrates its culture and heritage, while being a focus for varied economic growth that will strengthen its contribution to the region. It will be a place that people recognise as a lively, dynamic, growing City, with communities living in harmony in a unique natural environment. <p>Additional text added to Page 1 of the HRA Screening Report. Numbering changed to reflect this;</p> <p>Update text Page 17 of HRA Screening Report Section 3.29 and 3.32 re. Policies which have the potential to affect the Usk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP16 Major road schemes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i)M4 Motorway Junction 28 Tredegar Park ii)Eastern extension of southern distributor iii)Western extension of southern distributor 	<p>No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Introduction and Overview.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

		<p>iv)Old Green Junction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP18 Employment Sites: i) West Newport at Duffryn; iii)River Usk are and docks; • Policy H1 Housing: Allocation H50 Herbert Road, H51 Whiteheads Works H52 Old Town Dock; • Policy EM1 Employment land allocation: i)Duffryn ii)East of Queensway meadows iv)Solutia • Policy EM2 Regeneration site: iv)Old Town Dock; v) Riverfront; vii)Crindau: viii)Whitehead works; <p>Delete Policy EM2 i) Glan Llyn Table C1-C4 Delete Policy EM2 v) Lower dock street Table C1-C4</p>		
22	<p>Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies</p> <p>Sets out overall spatial</p>	<p>Additional text Table E3-Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP3 <u>Flood Risk</u> supportive text 2.15 states that Watercourses within the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) area must not be culverted and development must avoid obstructing the water course by providing a buffer zone of 12.5m minimum for reens and 7m minimum for field ditches in order to allow ongoing maintenance; 	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies.	NOTED

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

	strategy of the Plan and strategic Policies.	<p>Change of text Table B1: SP10 <i>Building requirement</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Policy states that sufficient land will be made available to meet to the housing target of 10,350. The Policy states that the development will be on previously developed land. <p>Change of Policy title Table B1- SP12 to Community Facilities;</p> <p>Change of Policy title Table B1- SP13 to <i>Planning Obligations</i>;</p> <p>Change of Policy description Table B1 SP17 top 168 hectares of employment land;</p> <p>Change of text Table E3-Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SP16 <i>Major Road schemes</i> supportive text 2.51 refers readers to Policy GP5 with regards to development on the Gwent Levels; Supportive text 2.55 and 2.56 states that the developer will be required to provide sufficient information to enable a HRA to be undertaken; 		
49	<p>General Policies</p> <p>Outlines the general policies applicable to any proposed development in Newport. These should be considered as a whole.</p>	<p>Additional text to Table E3-Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy GP1 <i>Climate Change</i> supportive text 3.4 states that flood mitigation and ancillary works will be required to consider impacts on sensitive environments set out in Policy GP5; Policy GP2 <i>General Amenity</i> supportive text 3.11 states that an Environmental Statement will be required if a project is Environmental Impact 	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised General Policies.	NOTED

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

		<p>Assessment Development;</p> <p>Delete Policy GP8 <i>Archaeology</i> from Table B1 of HRA Screening Report.</p>		
62	<p>Environment</p> <p>Outlines the policies that that focus upon countryside protection, the general built environment, the historic environment and the natural environment.</p>	<p>Delete Policy CE3 <i>Development in Green Wedges</i> from Table B1 of HRA Screening Report.</p> <p>Delete Policy CE6 <i>Shop fronts</i> from Table B1 of HRA Screening Report.</p> <p>Delete Policy CE7 <i>Signs and Advertisements</i> from Table B1 of HRA Screening Report.</p> <p>Adjust Policy numbering of Table B1 Environment;</p> <p>Additional text to Table E3 –Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy CE10 <i>Coastal</i> supportive text 4.46 states that in environmentally sensitive areas and Environmental Statement will be required; • Policy CE11 <i>Renewable Energy</i> supportive text 4.51 states proposals that effect the special qualities of the Gwent Levels or any other protected sites will be resisted unless no adverse effects can be demonstrated; 	<p>No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Environment Policies.</p>	NOTED
78	<p>Housing</p> <p>Sets out housing requirements for the duration of the plan and sources of housing land. This includes existing commitments to housing.</p>	<p>Change Housing Section Table C1-C4; 2 new allocations H30 and H35 add to Table C1-C4 to be assessed;</p> <p>Update Table E2-Housing sites allocated in previous UDP to reflect changes made to H1 Housing in revised LDP;</p> <p>Deletion of Housing allocation H55 Crindau from Table C1-C4;</p>	<p>There have been several changes made within the Housing Policy H1.</p> <p>The additional sites would not result in LES on the Internationally designated sites due to the distance, lack of habitat connectivity and accessibility to other natural</p>	

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

		<p>Deletion of Housing Allocation H57 Hartridge Farm Road from Table C1-C4:</p> <p>Delete Policy H16 <i>Caravans</i> from Table B1, adjust numbering accordingly;</p> <p>Change of Policy Title H5-Affordable Housing Exceptions”</p> <p>Deletion of Housing site 29.</p> <p>Gypsy and Traveller sites have been allocated and assessed.</p>	<p>green spaces.</p> <p>Those allocations from the UDP that have gone through the planning process would have undergone the relevant assessments to ensure that the development would not result in LSE, alone or in combination.</p> <p>These have been considered in combination with the other policies within this Plan.</p> <p>The amended proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites have been assessed. No LSE are expected as a result of these allocations.</p>	
94	<p>Employment</p> <p>Sets out all employment land policies and allocation for the duration of the Plan.</p>	<p>Delete Policies <i>EM v) Newport Docks and EM vi) Port Road Maesglas</i> from Tables C1-C4;</p> <p>Change of text to Table E3-Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy EM1 <u><i>Employment Land allocations</i></u> supportive text 6.6, 6.8, 6.11, 6.12 state that sufficient information will be required in order for a HRA to be undertaken. as some of the proposals could impact on the Internationally designated sites; <p>Delete Policies <i>EM2 i) Glan Llyn and EM2 v) Lower Dock Street</i> from Tables C1-C4;</p> <p>Additional Text to Table E3-Mitigation:</p>	<p>There have been changes made to the employment land allocations. The most relevant change is the addition of a new Policy, EM3 Newport Docks. However, this allocation had been assessed with the Deposit LDP</p>	<p>Minor alteration of supportive text in paragraphs 2.55, 2.56, 2.68, 5.3, 6.7, 6.9, 6.12, 6.22 and 6.28.</p> <p>The developer will not be expected to undertake a HRA. The developer will be expected to provide sufficient information in order for a HRA to be undertaken.</p>

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EM2 <i>Regeneration</i> supportive text 6.18 states that proposals adjacent to the River Usk will need to satisfy the relevant requirements of GP5. Supportive text 6.21 states that state that sufficient information will be required in order for a HRA to e undertaken. as some of the proposals could impact on the Internationally designated sites. Supportive text 6.24 states that the riparian habitat along the River Ebbw must be maintained; <p>Additional Policy to Table C1-C4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EM3 Newport Docks: <p>Additional text to Table E3-Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EM3 <i>Newport Docks</i> supportive text 6.27 states that state that sufficient information will be required in order for a HRA to e undertaken. as some of the proposals could impact on the Internationally designated sites; <p>Amend numbering EM4 Alternative uses of employment;</p>		
105	<p>Transport</p> <p>Sets out transport strategy for the Plan. It includes improvements to rail, car parking, walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Change of text to Table E3 Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy T1 Railways supportive text 7.9 refers to guidance provided elsewhere in the Plan; 	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Transport Policies.	NOTED
112	<p>Retailing and the City Centre</p>	<p>Additional Policy to Table B1-R5 Café Quarter-a B policy;</p> <p>Amend Policy description R7 Table B1:</p>	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Retail and the City Centre Policies.	NOTED

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

	Provides detailed Policies that aim to promote the City Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Policy states that development outside the defined retail boundary will be classed as out of town development; <p>Amend Policy number R5 to R6 Table C1-C4 Retail in district centre;</p> <p>Delete Policy R7 Newport Retail Park District Centre Proposals from Table B1;</p>		
126	<p>Community Facilities and other infrastructure</p> <p>Provides Policies on how the Local Planning Authority will promote and improve the economic and social well being of its area</p>	<p>Change of Policy Title Table B1 Policy CF1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of Playing fields, land and building used for leisure, sport, recreation and play; <p>Adjust CF policy numbering Table B1;</p> <p>Adjust CF Policy numbering Table E3 Mitigation;</p> <p>Deletion of Policy CF2 Protecting sub regional sport and leisure facilities from Table B1;</p> <p>Deletion of Policy CF14 Protection of existing school sites from Table B1;</p> <p>Changes of text Table E3-Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CF11 Outdoor Leisure Development supportive text 9.45 states that any proposals will be required to be respectful of their surroundings and be designed to have minimal impact and that in applicable cases the Council will require an EIA. Supportive text 9.46 aim to protect the water environment from excessive abstraction. Supportive text 9.47 states that any associated development may be unacceptable for example 	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Community facilities and other infrastructure Policies.	NOTED

Table F1- Assessment of Revised LDP June 2013, proposed changes to the HRA and Council Response

		<p>floodlighting and appropriate conditions will be attached to any planning permission;</p> <p>Amend numbering Table C1-C4 Policy CF13i)-vii) School sites;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Former Whitehead II. Novellis III. Glan Llyn IV. Llanwern V. Duffryn VI. Duffryn Juniors VII. South of Percoed reen 		
140	<p>Minerals</p> <p>Outlines various Policies in place to safeguard mineral resources.</p>	<p>Additional text Table E3 Mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy M2 Mineral Development supportive text 10.5 states that development must satisfy other policies within the plan. Supportive text10.8 states that developers must consider any impacts that a proposal may have on biodiversity; 	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Minerals Policies.	NOTED
144	<p>Waste</p> <p>Outlines regional projects across south east Wales for dealing with waste disposal.</p>	<p>Change of Policy description Table B1 Policy W1 Waste site allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Policy states that land is safeguarded for waste purposes at Docks Way waste disposal site; <p>Amend allocation W1 i) Docks Way Newport Table C1-C4;</p>	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Waste Policies.	NOTED
149	<p>Monitoring</p>	Change of text Table E3 Mitigation from CCW to Natural Resources Wales	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Monitoring Policy	NOTED

APPENDIX G:

RESPONSE TO THE MAC JUNE 2014

**G1-MAC CHANGES AND PROPOSED HRA AMMENDMENTS
G2-RE-ASSESSMENT OF HOUSING ALLOCATIONS WITH EXISTING
COMMITTMENTS**

Table G1-Assessment of the MAC June 2014 proposed HRA Changes and Council response

REF	LDP Page number	Chapter Summary	Changes to the HRA Screening Report as a result of the Revised Plan	Likely significant effect	Council Response
MAC 1					
1.1	13	Introduction and Overview Provides history and context the city. Outlines the objectives of the plan.	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Introduction and Overview.	Noted
1.2	12	Objective 10 - Waste	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Objective 10	Noted
MAC 2					
2.1	16	Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies Sets out overall spatial strategy of the Plan and strategic Policies.	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies	Noted
2.2	18		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.3	20		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.4	21		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.5	21		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.6	22		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.7	22		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.8	23		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.9	24		Change to text in HRA: Page 16 3.16-amend housing requirement Appendix B1-amend text in for SP10 to 11,623 units and also delete <i>"The policy states that development outside the settlement boundary will not be permitted."</i>		Noted
2.10	25		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.11	26		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.12	27		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.13	28		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.14	29		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted

Table G1-Assessment of the MAC June 2014 proposed HRA Changes and Council response

2.15	30		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.16	30		Change of text in HRA: Page 18 & 19 section 3.29, 3.32, 3.35-delete major road schemes ii) eastern extension SDR and iv) Green Junction remodelling. Delete text in Table C1-C4 major road schemes ii) eastern extension SDR and iv) Green Junction remodelling.		Noted
2.17	31		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.18	31		Change of wording to HRA: Table E3 Mitigation measures Policy SP16 Supportive text 2.61. Delete 2.55 and 2.56. Replace with 2.6		Noted
2.19	/		Change of wording in HRA: S17 & S18 have merged into one policy. Delete Policy S18 from table C1-C4. Amend text in Appendix B Policy SP17: <i>“provision will be made for 160 hectares of employment land”</i> Amend table E3 Mitigation policy SP18-amend policy number to SP17 supportive text 2.33 states developer must consider impact not only on the River Usk but the impacts on the Severn Estuary SA, SPA and RAMSAR site.		Noted
2.20	36		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.21	36		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
2.22	37		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
MAC 3					
3.1	39	General Policies Outlines the general policies applicable to any proposed development in Newport.	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised General Policies.	Noted
3.2	45		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
3.3	44		Change of text in 3.24 of LDP-see council response		Where a site is known to be a habitat or commuting route of a European Protected Species under the Conservation of

Table G1-Assessment of the MAC June 2014 proposed HRA Changes and Council response

		These should be considered as a whole.			Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), development proposals must be completed in a sensitive manner, to protect the conservation status of the internationally and nationally important site.
MAC 4.1		Environment Outlines the policies that that focus upon countryside protection, the general built environment, the historic environment and the natural environment.	This Policy has now been removed and is no longer a MAC.	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Environment Policies.	Noted
4.2	55		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
4.3	55		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
4.4	57		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
4.5	62		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
MAC 5					
5.1	64	Housing Sets out housing requirements for the duration of the plan and sources of housing land. This includes existing commitments to housing.	Addition of new table G2-Exisitng housing commitments Amend Table C1-C4 Alcan can be removed as it is an existing commitment New housing proposals to be assessed include: -Panasonic -Former Postal Exchange, Mill Street -Queens Hill School -Telford Depot -Uskside Paint Mill	There have been several changes made within the Housing Policy H1. The additional sites would not result in LES on the Internationally designated sites due to the distance, lack of habitat connectivity and accessibility to other natural green spaces.	Noted
5.2	70		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
5.3	70		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
5.4	71		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
5.5	71		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
5.6	75		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
5.7	75		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
5.8	75		Delete text from tables C1-C4 H15 G&T transit accommodation Land at Celtic Way		Noted

Table G1-Assessment of the MAC June 2014 proposed HRA Changes and Council response

5.9	76		Delete text from tables C1-C4 H15 ii) G&T permanent residential accommodation at former Ringland Allotments	Those allocations from the UDP that have gone through the planning process would have undergone the relevant assessments to ensure that the development would not result in LSE, alone or in combination. These have been considered in combination with the other policies within this Plan. The amended proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites have been assessed. No LSE are expected as a result of these allocations.	Noted
5.10			This Policy is no longer proposed as a MAC.		Noted
MAC 6					
6.1		Employment Sets out all employment land policies and allocation for the duration of the Plan.	Change of policy numbering page 15, 19, section 3.29, 3.32, 3.35 – EM1-EM3 Change of policy numbering page 18 EM1-i)Duffryn, ii) east of Queensway meadows, iii)Celtic Springs, iv)Solutia, v) Gwent Europark, vi)Land off Chartist Drive, vii)Llanwern, viii)Phoenix Park, ix)Godfrey Road, x)Cardiff Road Delete Policy EM2 Regeneration.	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Employment	Noted

Table G1-Assessment of the MAC June 2014 proposed HRA Changes and Council response

			Amend numbering EM2 Newport Docks		
			Change Tables C1-C4		
			Change of policy numbering in Appendix B-EM3		
MAC 7					
7.1	86	Transport	No proposed changes to the NRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Transport Policies	Noted
7.2	86		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
7.3	88		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
		Sets out transport strategy for the Plan. It includes improvements to rail, car parking, walking and cycling.			
MAC 8					
8.1	92	Retailing and the City Centre	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Retailing and the City Centre Polices	Noted
8.2	95	Provides detailed Policies that aim to promote the City Centre	No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
8.3	96		Delete Policy R7 in Appendix B1, amend numbering		Noted
8.4	101		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
8.5	102		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
8.6	102		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
MAC 9					
9.1	105	Community Facilities and other infrastructure	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Community Infrastructure Policies	Noted
9.2	106		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
9.3	113	Provides Policies on how the Local Planning Authority will promote and improve the economic and social wellbeing of its area	Delete allocation CF13 v), vi), vii) School sites from table C1-C4.		Noted
MAC 10					
10.1	114	Minerals	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised	Noted
10.2	114		No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted
10.3	115	Outlines various	No proposed changes to the HRA		Noted

Table G1-Assessment of the MAC June 2014 proposed HRA Changes and Council response

10.4	116	Policies in place to safeguard mineral resources.	Amend Appendix B Policy M3 to: “This Policy states that proposals for exploration of oil and gas will be considered against criteria including any adverse environmental damage etc.”	Minerals Policies	
MAC 11					
11.1	117	Waste Outlines regional projects across south east Wales for dealing with waste disposal.	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Waste Policies	Noted
11.2	118		Delete Policy W1 Waste site allocations Docks Way from Table C1-C4		Noted
11.3	118		Amend number of Policy W2 to W1 in Table C1-C4		Noted
11.4	118		Amend Policy to W2 in Appendix B1		Noted
MAC 12					
12.1	121-131	Monitoring	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Monitoring	Noted
MAC 13					
13.1	132	Infrastructure Requirement	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected	Noted
13.2	133		Delivery and Implementation information of the anticipated delivery rates of the sites assessed in the Housing, Employment and Community Facilities Chapters.		Noted
MAC 14					
14.1	146	Procedures		No LSE are expected	Noted
14.2	141				Noted
MAC 15					
15.1 – 15.22		Proposals Maps, Constraints Maps and Inset Maps	Changes are a visual representation of the Policy amendments assessed under the relevant Chapter of the LDP.	No LSE are expected	Noted

Appendix G2 - Table H1-Assessment of the Matters Arising Changes September- December 2014, proposed HRA and Council Changes.

MAC REF	LDP Page number	Chapter Summary	Changes to the HRA Screening Report as a result of the Matters arising	Likely significant effect	Council Response
2.9	24	Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies	Appendix B1-amend text in for SP10 to 11,623 units Affordable housing target changed to 2,061. Delete <i>"The policy states that development outside the settlement boundary will not be permitted."</i>	No LSE are expected to arise from the Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies	Noted
2.19		Sets out overall spatial strategy of the Plan and strategic Policies.	Change of wording in HRA: S17 & S18 have merged into one policy. Delete Policy S18 from table C1-C4. Amend text in Appendix B Policy SP17: <i>"provision will be made for 172 hectares of employment land"</i> Amend table E3 Mitigation policy SP18-amend policy number to SP17 supportive text 2.76 states developer must consider impact not only on the River Usk but the impacts on the Severn Estuary SA, SPA and RAMSAR site and that suitable bird surveys m be required.		
2.22	37		No proposed changes to the HRA		
5.1	64	Housing Sets out housing requirements for the duration of the plan and sources of housing land.	Amend total housing allocation 11,623 Amend Table C1-C4: Alcan can be removed as it is an existing commitment New housing proposals to be assessed include: -Uskside Paint Mill --Former Postal Exchange, Mill Street -Queens Hill School -Telford Depot	There have been several changes made within the Housing Policy H1. The additional sites would not result in LES on the Internationally designated sites due to the distance, lack of habitat connectivity	Noted

		This includes existing commitments to housing.	-Panasonic (this is included in Table E2 as it already has planning permission)	and accessibility to other natural green spaces. Those allocations from the UDP that have gone through the planning process would have undergone the relevant assessments to ensure that the development would not result in LSE, alone or in combination. These have been considered in combination with the other policies within this Plan. The amended proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites have been assessed. No LSE are expected as a result of these allocations.	
5.8	75		Delete text from tables C1-C4 H15 G&T transit accommodation Land at Celtic Way and contingency site at former Ringland allotments.		
5.8a	75		Change to B policy, add to Table B1: <i>This policy may lead to development in the long term. However the policy does not provide any information about where or when the development will take place. The Plan seeks to protect European sites. One of the Plan's objectives is the Conservation of the Natural Environment (Objective 6). The Plan also commits to the conservation, enhancement and management of the natural environment (Policy SP9). Policy GP5 and its supporting text states that where proposals have the potential to impact on a European site(s) there will be a need for HRA and development will only be permitted where no significant adverse effects on European sites can be demonstrated. Therefore any development arising from this policy will have to, where necessary, complete the HRA process and prove to the Competent Authority and CCW that there would be no likely significant effects/adverse effects on integrity of European sites (or that effects can be adequately mitigated, or if necessary, compensated for). This approach to the HRA process will not affect the deliverability of this policy or the Plan. Therefore this policy will not lead to likely significant effects on European sites.</i> Delete from Table C1-C4		
6.1		Employment Sets out all employment	Delete allocation x)Cardiff Road	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Employment	Noted

		land policies and allocation for the duration of the Plan.	Change policy number in Tables C1-C4		
10.1	114	Minerals Outlines various Policies in place to safeguard mineral resources.	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the Revised Minerals Policies	Noted
12.2		Monitoring	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected	Noted
12.3					
14.1	146	Procedures	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected	Noted
15.8	N/A	Proposals Maps, Constraints Maps and Inset Maps	Changes are a visual representation of the Policy amendments assessed under the relevant Chapter of the LDP.	No LSE are expected	Noted
15.23	N/A				

APPENDIX H:

H1 – SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CHNAGES RECOMMENDED BY THE INSPECTOR

Appendix H1-Assement Schedule of Inspectors Changes

REF	Policy/Allocation	Changes to the HRA Screening Report as a result of the Revised Plan	Likely significant effect	Council Response
IC 1	Policy H1 and table of housing sites	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise	Noted
IC 2	Policy EM1 and supporting text as proposed by MAC 6.1	Delete allocation EM 1x) Cardiff Road (Monmouthshire Bank Sidings) from Tables C1-C4. Amend total employment land figure 172.	No LSE are expected to arise from the deletion of this allocation	Noted
IC 3	Policy R6 (as proposed by MAC 8.2) and proposals map/inset map DC10	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the change of boundary	Noted
IC 4	Policy R6 proposals map and inset map DC5	No proposed changes to the HRA	No LSE are expected to arise from the change of boundary	Noted