



**Habitat Regulations Assessment (Stage One Screening) of the
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste:**

RECAP Partnership Waste Management Design Guide (SPD)

Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council

November 2009





Habitats Regulations Assessment (Stage one Screening) of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste:

Partnership Waste Management Design Guide (SPD)

Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council

REPORT CONTROL

Project: HRA of the Partnership (CCC and PCC) Waste Management Design Guide

Client: Cambridgeshire CC and Peterborough City Council

Job Number: A055997

File Origin: H:\Environmental Projects\A Projects - Proposed Projects\QS0486 Cambs
CC Waste

Document Checking:

Primary Author	Adrian Hutchings Principal Ecologist	Initialed:	<i>A.R. Hutchings</i>
----------------	---	------------	-----------------------

Checked By	Clare May Consultant Ecologist	Initialed:	<i>CEJ May</i>
------------	-----------------------------------	------------	----------------

Verified By	Ben Arnold Director (Mineral and Waste)	Initialed:	<i>BA</i>
-------------	--	------------	-----------

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
1	26/05/2009	1 st Draft	ARH
2	24/09/2009	2 nd Draft	ARH
3	28/10/2009	3 rd Draft	ARH



4

23/11/09

Final

ARH

Contents

1. Introduction	5
1.1. Project Aims and outputs	5
1.2. Project Background	6
2. Overview of Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA).....	8
2.1. Project Guidance	9
2.2. The Method	9
2.3. Project timetable.....	10
2.4. Professional judgment	11
2.5. Consultation with Natural England	12
3. Screening.....	13
3.1. Scope of the Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD	13
3.2. Natura 2000 sites considered in this report.....	14
3.3. Possible Effects of the Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD	17
3.4. Recommendations.....	19
3.5. Conclusions of the Habitat Regulations Assessment - Screening Stage.....	19

Appendices

Appendix A. Descriptions of Natura 2000 sites in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough

Appendix B. List of Adopted Plans, Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and other policy documents considered to be relevant to this scoping exercise

Appendix C. Screening of the RECAP Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD

Appendix D. Screening of plans for potential in-combination effects with the RECAP Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD



Section 1 Introduction and Background

1. Introduction

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP) has commissioned WYG Environment to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the RECAP Partnership Waste Management Design Guide (PWMDG) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which forms part of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework (LDF).

The RECAP Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD has been produced by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Partnership (RECAP). This Partnership has already produced the PWMDG SPD with extensive consultation with District and County Development control and chief planning officers, as well as waste management officers and the construction industry in Cambridgeshire. This assessment has been undertaken on behalf of both Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

1.1. Project Aims and outputs

Aims

The main aims of this commission are to:

- Undertake a screening/scoping assessment of the SPD to identify whether it is likely to have a significant effect on Natura 2000 sites (including Ramsar sites). This will determine whether a full Appropriate Assessment is required for this non site-specific document. A full Assessment would lead to proposals for mitigation or alternative solutions and establishing with reasonable certainty that adverse effect could be avoided.



- The identification of any further work required to inform the potential for likely adverse impacts within the PWMDG SPD.

It is also necessary to consider the 'in-combination' effects of the SPD and other relevant plans contained within Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) and associated documents, Community Strategies, Biodiversity Action Plans etc. This must take account of both positive and negative interactions between the related plans.

This work is intended to inform and facilitate the decision making process, with respect to what guidance, should be included within the PWMDG SPD.

Outputs

There are 2 key outputs required for the Partnership Waste Design Guide SPD to facilitate this process:

- An overall conclusion as to whether the PWMDG SPD passes the HRA. This should include an 'in-combination' assessment with other plans and projects. If a failure of the HRA is identified, then which sections / policies giving rise to this should be identified and recommendations made for possible amendments / further investigative work.
- A desk based assessment of each potential effect on each Natura 2000 site (including Ramsar sites) where significant effects could not be ruled out during the Screening / Scoping Assessment.

1.2. Project Background

Directive 92/43/EEC (the Habitats Directive) on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora requires that any plan or project likely to have a significant effect on a protected site either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, is to be subject to an Appropriate Assessment (AA) of its implications for the site with reference to the site's conservation objectives.



In October 2005 the European Court of Justice ruled that this requirement extended to land use plans. This has now been set out in the *Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2007* which inserts a new Part IVA into the 1994 Regulations and came into force on 21 August 2007.

Land use plans to which AA is applicable include Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).

If the content of the SPD is not assessed, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, it cannot then be adopted as it does not satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. Where any part of the SPD is found to impact on the integrity of a site of European importance an amendment to the content will be required until it can conclude no harm will be caused.



Section 2

Methodology

2. Overview of Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Guidance on the Habitat Regulations Assessment process is provided in DCLG guidance: Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment Guidance for Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents. The DCLG guidance proposes a 3-stage approach collectively known as the Appropriate Assessment process. It is possible to summarise the AA process prescribed in Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive into three main tasks:

Stage 1. Screening. Determining whether the plan - 'in combination' with other plans and projects - is likely to have an adverse effect on a European site (s);

Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment. Determining whether, in view of the European site's conservation objectives, the plan - 'in combination' with other plans and projects - would have an adverse effect (or risk of this) on the integrity of the site(s);

Stage 3: Assessment of alternative solutions. Where the plan is assessed as having an adverse effect (or risk of this) on the integrity of a site(s), there should be an examination of alternatives

In accordance with the DCLG guidance (2006), the precautionary principle will be applied in the Appropriate Assessment process.

This document focuses on the Stage 1 Screening process and in the determination of whether the SPD is likely to have an adverse effect on the European sites in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Natural England have advised through consultation that Natura 2000 sites beyond



the County and Peterborough City boundaries should also be assessed. All Natura 2000 sites within 15km of these boundaries are considered in this assessment.

2.1. Project Guidance

In the design of our methodology the following guidance was referred to:

- EU Directive 92/43/EC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora
- EC (2001) Assessment of plans and projects significantly affecting Natura 2000 sites: methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC
Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 as amended
- DEFRA (2006) Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 Consultation Document
- DCLG (2006) Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment
- ODPM (2006) Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Guide to Good Practice
- ODPM (2005) Planning Policy Statement 9 on Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- ODPM (2005) Circular 06/2005 on Biodiversity and Conservation – Statutory Obligations and the Impact within the Planning System
- English Nature (2006) Draft Guidance on the Assessment of Regional Spatial Strategies and Sub Regional Strategies under the Provisions of the Habitats Regulations

2.2. The Method

This Stage 1 screening study is structured around three steps and these are outlined below.



Step 1 - Screening and Scoping of the SPD content

This entails liaison with the competent Authorities and Natural England and will include an agreement of the outcome of this precursor work with the relevant key agency(s). This stage also includes an outline of the findings and where a full Appropriate Assessment is deemed necessary indicates the content and/or policies to be carried forward to the full AA.

A general source-pathway-receptor-consequence approach was adopted for the assessment at the screening stage and an outline reasoning is provided for all content and policies “screened out” in Appendices C and D. In addition a thorough “in combination” approach to assessment was adopted.

Step 2 - The collection of all desk based data and information required to progress the Screening Study to a conclusion

Reliance has been placed upon existing published reports, policy documents and development plans etc. relevant to the study area.

Step 3 - A report of the findings of the desk based phase of the project as a “Draft Assessment Report”

The initial consultation draft was submitted on 26 May 2009 and this was followed by a stakeholder consultation period until 1st July 2009. All comments and amendments from this initial consultation have now been incorporated into this final version of the PWMDG SPD.

2.3. Project timetable

The Partnerships project timetable is given below:



Stage	Date
Project Initiation Meeting – Meeting 1	28 April 2009
Submission of Draft Assessment Report	26 May 2009
Stakeholder Consultation period	1st June -1 July 2009
Draft version	24 th September 2009
Final Report	23 rd November 2009

2.4. Professional judgment

Professional judgment has been used throughout this study. This is particularly relevant to decisions made in relation to potential impacts, since the nature of a design guide is necessarily broad and the amount of detail available, especially in relation to spatial locations of waste management facilities is limited.

The reliability of professional judgment can be quantified to some extent by reference to the experience of the professional concerned. This report was authored by Adrian Hutchings with technical direction on waste management and review from Ben Arnold.

Adrian Hutchings MIEEM

Principal Ecologist

Adrian has been a professional ecologist for over 20 years and has extensive experience in directing, managing and undertaking a wide range of ecological projects. He has undertaken a number of projects involving Appropriate Assessment under regulation 48 of the Habitats Directive including SAC and policy documents.

Ben Arnold FGS, AIEMA

Director

Ben is the Director of WYGE's Waste Consultancy unit based in the Lyndhurst office and has extensive experience of the waste management discipline. He specialised in the preparation of



Statements of Need in support of minerals and waste developments, including market appraisals and presentation of evidence at Public Inquiry.

2.5. Consultation with Natural England

An open and constructive dialogue has been maintained with Natural England (NE) throughout this assessment process. NE has endorsed the conclusions of the HRA work for the PWMDG SPD.



Section 3

Stage 1 Screening

3. Screening

3.1. Scope of the Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD

The PWMDG SPD seeks to provide guidance to developers on design issues and is consistent with a drive towards the sustainable management of waste.

This SPD will be part of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework (LDF) following its likely adoption in 2011.

This PWMDG has been created to:

1. Detail the waste segregation, storage and collection requirements that designers and developers need to satisfy;
2. Provide a strategic tool for use by Planning Authorities when assessing planning applications;
3. Address the unique waste management problems presented by high density developments;
4. Expand upon the requirements set out in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy for developer obligations relating to the funding and provision of waste management infrastructure;
5. Highlight the financial implications of waste management upon developers;
6. Highlight examples of good practice demonstrating what can be achieved;
7. Contribute to sustainability and reduced environmental impact.

The PWMDG SPD will also be used as a mechanism for demonstrating developer proposals comply with the requirements of the Guide. The Guide contains the RECAP Waste Management



Design Guide Toolkit that will allow a developer, in consultation with the Local Authority, to make an effective evaluation of the waste management requirements upon them and demonstrate compliance as necessary. All proposals should demonstrate use of the Toolkit and submit it, as complete, with the development proposals and plans.

The Guide puts significant emphasis on timely consultation with the relevant Local Authority. This forms the backbone of ensuring effective design for waste management.

In general terms the aim of this SPD is to expand on the policies in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, and in doing so enhance the quality and sustainability of development within the Local Authority areas concerned. The document is designed to be thought provoking and to aid the design process by recommending best practice, providing case studies and asking relevant questions about key issues that need to be considered.

3.2. Natura 2000 sites considered in this report

The principle aim of this document is to 'screen' the potential of the Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD for its likely effect, either alone or in combination, on the Natura 2000 sites within the County of Cambridgeshire and City of Peterborough Council boundaries. Natural England also require consideration of the 'likely effects' on Natura 2000 sites beyond the County boundary up to a distance of 15 km.

European Sites

There are fourteen Natura 2000 sites within the Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Council administrative areas:

- Ouse Washes Special Protection Area;
- Nene Washes Special Protection Area;



- Ouse Washes Special Areas of Conservation;
- Nene Washes Special Areas of Conservation;
- Fenlands Special Areas of Conservation, including Woodwalton Fen, Chippenham Fen and Wicken Fen;
- Barnack Hills and Holes Special Areas of Conservation;
- Orton Pit Special Areas of Conservation;
- Devil's Dyke Special Areas of Conservation;
- Portholme Special Areas of Conservation;
- Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Areas of Conservation;

- Chippenham Fen Ramsar;
- Ouse Washes Ramsar;
- Nene Washes Ramsar;
- Wicken Fen Ramsar;
- Woodwalton Fen Ramsar.

Up to 15 km from the Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Council administrative areas the following Natura 2000 sites are found:

- Breckland SAC & SPA;
- The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, SPA and Ramsar;
- Baston Fen SAC;
- Norfolk Valley Fens SAC;
- Rex Graham Reserve SAC;
- Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC;
- Grimsthorpe SAC;
- Rutland Water SPA and Ramsar;
- Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits pSPA and pRamsar.



Details on these sites are given in Appendix A, including their primary qualifying features for SPA, SAC and/or Ramsar status.



3.3. Possible Effects of the Partnership Waste Management Design Guide SPD

The PWMDG SPD covers a specific subject matter from a broad range of disciplines. The range of possible effects on the environment however, is minimised by the nature of the good practice guidance which is itself based on recognised environmental and sustainability principles. The method of application of the Toolkit is criteria-based and considers the impact on the environment at every stage.

The waste audit approach adopted by the PWMDG SPD requires all proposals, which are likely to generate significant volumes of waste through constructional and operational phases, to demonstrate how waste will be minimised and managed in a sustainable manner in accordance with the waste hierarchy.

It is possible to state that the primary effect or impact of this SPD will be the enhancement of the quality and sustainability of new development. It is also possible to identify several key characteristics of the SPD that help to reach a conclusion regarding its potential to have a significant likely effect on Natura 2000 sites. These are:

- It is primarily a guidance document that seeks to improve the quality and sustainability of development proposals in relation to a range of design related issues;
- It does not present policies or proposals, and serves only to expand on policies within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has already been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a Habitat Regulations Assessment;
- It provides guidance on how environmental issues should be considered as an integral part of the design process. This increases the likelihood of the respective



Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies on Biodiversity and Environmental Protection being implemented effectively and therefore provides greater protection for the Natura 2000 sites;

- The PWDG is a non-site site specific SPD and therefore works in combination with spatial plans and policy documents, which themselves consider in detail the likely effects on the environment and the Natura 2000 sites in question. The Development Control Process will assess the likely impact on Natura 2000 sites in combination with the guidance set out in the PWMDG SPD;
- All plans under consideration during the in-combination assessment, have also undergone the SA and/or HRA process and enforced by relevant legislation have strong environmental protection and sustainability intent. The likelihood of 'in-combination' effects is therefore significantly reduced;
- During the screening process design guide principles and plan policies have been screened out as specialist opinion could not identify a pathway over which any significant likely effect would take place.

The plans and programmes considered in the 'in combination' assessment are listed in Appendix B and the screening matrices for both the stand alone and 'in combination' assessments are given in Appendix C.

On the basis of these characteristics it is considered that the PWMDG SPD alone will not lead to any likely significant adverse effect on the Natura 2000 sites and network.

Also, when considering the document 'in combination' with the other plans and programmes, a similar conclusion of "no likely significant adverse effect" is reached. The PWMDG is specifically designed to work 'in combination' with the respective LDF documents and the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has already been subject to the SA and HRA processes.



3.4. Recommendations

There is no requirement to take the HRA further to Stage 2 or 3 and the primary recommendation from the Stage 1 Screening process is that the PWMDG SPD should largely remain unaltered and should proceed to the next consultation phase.

A single amendment to the PWMDG SPD should be made and this relates to the addition of a bullet point to the 'Protection of the Environment' Assessment criterion. This has been recommended by Natural England during the consultation phase of this Stage 1 Screening process. The text should be amended as follows:

"Assessment must be made of the impact proposals may have in terms of:

- Nuisance and amenity (including visual impact); and
- Pollution threat to environmental media (i.e. air, land and water);
- *Damage and disturbance to nationally and internationally protected sites and wider biodiversity."*

3.5. Conclusions of the Habitat Regulations Assessment - Screening Stage

The PWMDG SPD is a guidance document that aims to improve the quality and sustainability of new development within the County of Cambridgeshire and in the Unitary Authority area of Peterborough. It does not present any policies or proposals, and serves only to provide greater clarity about the expectations in relation to existing policies within the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD has been subject to both Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment.



On this basis it is considered that there will be no likely significant adverse effect on the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites as a result of the PWMDG SPD. It can be objectively concluded that there is no requirement to proceed to the next stage of an Appropriate Assessment.



Appendices

- Appendix A. Descriptions of Natura 2000 sites in the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council administrative areas and up to 15km outside these areas
- Appendix B. List of Adopted Plans, Development Plan Documents (DPDS) and other policy documents considered to be relevant to this scoping exercise
- Appendix C. Screening of the PWMDG SPD
- Appendix D. Screening of plans for potential 'in-combination' effects with the PWMDG SPD



Appendix A

Natura 2000 sites being considered for HRA screening exercise within the Cambridgeshire County Council and the Peterborough City Council administrative areas:

- The Ouse Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar;
- The Nene Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar;
- Fenland SAC (comprising Chippenham Fen Ramsar, Wicken Fen Ramsar & Woodwalton Fen Ramsar);
- Barnack Hills and Holes SAC;
- Orton Pit SAC;
- Devils Dyke SAC;
- Portholme SAC;
- Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC;

The Ouse Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar

Unitary Authority	Cambridgeshire; Norfolk
Centroid	TL498895
SAC EU code	UK0013011
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Spa and Ramsar
Area (ha)	311.35

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1149 Spined loach *Cobitis taenia*

The Ouse Washes represent **spined loach** *Cobitis taenia* populations within the River Ouse catchment. The Counter Drain, with its clear water and abundant macrophytes, is particularly important, and a healthy population of spined loach is known to occur.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection



Not applicable.

The Nene Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar

Unitary Authority	Cambridgeshire; City of Peterborough
Centroid	TL302990
SAC EU code	UK0030222
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	88.19

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1149 Spined loach *Cobitis taenia*

Moreton's Leam, a large drainage channel running along the eastern flank of the Nene Washes, contains the highest recorded density of **spined loach** *Cobitis taenia* in the UK. There may also be thriving populations in the smaller ditches of the Washes. The site represents spined loach populations in the Nene catchment.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.



Fenland SAC (comprising Chippenham Fen Ramsar, Wicken Fen Ramsar & Woodwalton Fen Ramsar)

Unitary Authority	Cambridgeshire
Centroid	TL554701
SAC EU code	UK0014782
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	618.64

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

6410 *Molinia* meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (*Molinia caerulea*)

Fenland contains, particularly at Chippenham Fen, one of the most extensive examples of the tall herb-rich East Anglian type of M24 *Molinia caerulea* – *Cirsium dissectum* fen-meadow. It is important for the conservation of the geographical and ecological range of the habitat type, as this type of fen-meadow is rare and ecologically distinctive in East Anglia.

7210 Calcareous fens with *Cladium mariscus* and species of the *Caricion davallianae*

* Priority feature

The individual sites within Fenland cSAC each hold large areas of **calcareous fens**, with a long and well-documented history of regular management. There is a full range from species-poor *Cladium*-dominated fen to species-rich fen with a lower proportion of *Cladium* and containing such species as black bog-rush *Schoenus nigricans*, tormentil *Potentilla erecta* and meadow thistle *Cirsium dissectum*. There are good transitions to purple moor-grass *Molinia caerulea* and rush pastures, all set within a mosaic of reedbeds and wet pastures.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

1149 Spined loach *Cobitis taenia*

1166 Great crested newt *Triturus cristatus*



Barnack Hills and Holes SAC

Centroid	TF075046
Latitude	52 37 40 N
Longitude	00 24 41 W
SAC EU code	UK0030031

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site:

6211 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (important orchid sites) * Priority feature

This habitat at Barnack Hills and Holes consists largely of CG5 *Bromus erectus* – *Brachypodium pinnatum* grassland. It supports what is considered to be the largest UK population of the nationally scarce man orchid *Aceras anthropophorum*. It also supports a rich assemblage of other orchid species, such as fragrant orchid *Gymnadenia conopsea*, pyramidal orchid *Anacamptis pyramidalis* and bee orchid *Ophrys apifera*. The site represents orchid-rich grassland in the northern part of its range, on limestone rather than on chalk.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Orton Pit SAC

Unitary Authority	City of Peterborough
Centroid	TL162943
SAC EU code	UK0030053
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)



Area (ha) 141.24

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

3140 Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of *Chara* spp.

Orton Pit's extensive pond system, occupying the disused ridge-and-furrow created as a result of clay extraction for the brick-making industry, contains alkaline water low in nutrients. The site supports a total of ten species of charophyte including the main English population of bearded stonewort *Chara canescens*. *C. canescens* is an early coloniser of ponds at the site and is rarely found in ponds over 20 years old. It favours brackish conditions, which at Orton Pit are thought to be provided by the release of salts out of the top few millimetres of the clay that becomes oxidised over a period of time. Other nationally scarce stonewort species present include *Chara aspera*, *C. contraria*, *C. pedunculata* and *Tolypella glomerata*. The distribution of *Chara* species across the site varies according to the age and stage of succession of the ponds, with few being found in ponds greater than 25 years old.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1166 Great crested newt *Triturus cristatus*

Orton Pit in the East Midlands contains the largest known population of **great crested newt** *Triturus cristatus* in the UK and possibly in Europe. The extensive pond systems occupy disused ridge and furrow areas created by clay workings, at various successional stages. Management of water levels and predatory fish is essential for the maintenance of the newt population. New ponds are created in ways that allow water control, and measures are taken to encourage rapid colonisation by newts in order to maintain the population. The range of habitats found throughout the site, including surrounding areas of grassland and scrub, provide good conditions for feeding and sheltering newts.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.



Devils Dyke SAC

Unitary Authority	Cambridgeshire; Suffolk
Centroid	TL611622
SAC EU code	UK0030037
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	8.02

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

6211 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (important orchid sites) * Priority feature

Devil’s Dyke consists of a mosaic of CG3 *Bromus erectus* and CG5 *Bromus erectus* – *Brachypodium pinnatum* calcareous grasslands. It is the only known UK semi-natural dry grassland site for lizard orchid *Himantoglossum hircinum*.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Portholme SAC

Unitary Authority	Cambridgeshire
Centroid	TL237708
SAC EU code	UK0030054



Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	91.93

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

6510 Lowland hay meadows (*Alopecurus pratensis*, *Sanguisorba officinalis*)

This large site represents **lowland hay meadows** in eastern England. It is the largest surviving traditionally-managed meadow in the UK, with an area of 104 ha of alluvial flood meadow (7% of the total UK resource). There has been a long history of favourable management and very little of the site has suffered from agricultural improvement, and so it demonstrates good conservation of structure and function. It supports a small population of fritillary *Fritillaria meleagris*.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC

Unitary Authority	Cambridgeshire
Centroid	TL340526
SAC EU code	UK0030331
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	66.48

Designation:

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site



Not applicable

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1308 Barbastelle *Barbastella barbastellus*

The site comprises a mixture of ancient coppice woodland (Eversden Wood) and high forest woods likely to be of more recent origin (Wimpole Woods). A colony of **barbastelle** *Barbastella barbastellus* is associated with the trees in Wimpole Woods. These trees are used as a summer maternity roost where the female bats gather to give birth and rear their young. Most of the roost sites are within tree crevices. The bats also use the site as a foraging area. Some of the woodland is also used as a flight path when bats forage outside the site.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.



Natura 2000 sites beyond the County of Cambridgeshire and the Peterborough City Council areas, but within 15 kilometres of these boundaries:

- Breckland SAC and SPA;
- The Wash SAC, SPA and Ramsar;
- Baston Fen SAC;
- Norfolk Valley Fens SAC;
- Rex Graham Reserve SAC;
- Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC;
- Grimsthorpe SAC;
- Rutland Water SPA and Ramsar;

Breckland SAC & SPA

Unitary Authority	Norfolk; Suffolk
Centroid	TL862948
SAC EU code	UK0019865
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	7548.06

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

2330 Inland dunes with open *Corynephorus* and *Agrostis* grasslands

Wangford Warren and adjoining parts of RAF Lakenheath are included in the Breckland site as the only occurrence of this habitat type in the UK. The site has one of the best-preserved systems of active inland sand dunes in the UK. The habitat type, which is in part characterised by the nationally rare grey hair-grass *Corynephorus canescens* occurring here at its only inland station, is associated with open conditions with active sand movement. The site shows the colonisation sequence from open sand to acidic grass-heath.

3150 Natural eutrophic lakes with *Magnopotamion* or *Hydrocharition*-type vegetation

The Breckland meres in Norfolk represent **natural eutrophic lakes** in the east of England. They are examples of hollows within glacial outwash deposits and are fed by water from the underlying chalk aquifer. Natural fluctuations in groundwater tables mean that these lakes occasionally dry out. The flora is dominated by stonewort – pondweed *Characeae* – *Potamogetonaceae* associations.

4030 European dry heaths

The dry heaths of Breckland are representative of **European dry heaths** in East Anglia, in



eastern England, developed under a semi-continental climate. Breckland has an average annual precipitation of only 600 mm, relatively hot summers and cold winters. Frosts can occur in any month of the year. The dry acidic heath of Breckland represents H1 *Calluna vulgaris* – *Festuca ovina* heath in the SAC series. The sand sedge-dominated *Carex arenaria* sub-community (H1d) is typical of areas of blown sand – a very unusual feature of this location. The highly variable soils of Breckland, with underlying chalk being largely covered with wind-blown sands, have resulted in mosaics of heather-dominated heathland, acidic grassland and calcareous grassland that are unlike those of any other site. In many places there is a linear or patterned distribution of heath and grassland, arising from fossilised soil patterns that formed under peri-glacial conditions. Breckland is important for rare plants, such as perennial knawel *Scleranthus perennis* ssp. *prostratus*, and rare invertebrates.

6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)

Breckland in East Anglia is the most extensive surviving area of the rare grassland type CG7 *Festuca ovina* – *Hieracium pilosella* – *Thymus praecox* grassland. The grassland is rich in rare species typical of dry, winter-cold, continental areas, and approaches the features of grassland types in central Europe more than almost any other **semi-natural dry grassland** found in the UK. The terrain is relatively flat, with few physical variations, but there are mosaics of calcareous grassland and heath/acid grassland, giving rise to patterns of structural variation.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

91E0 Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion*, *Alnion incanae*, *Salicion albae*) * Priority feature

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

1166 Great crested newt *Triturus cristatus*



The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SPA, SAC and Ramsar

Unitary Authority	Lincolnshire; Norfolk
Centroid	TF558403
SAC EU code	UK0017075
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	107761.28

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time

On this site sandy sediments occupy most of the subtidal area, resulting in one of the largest expanses of sublittoral **sandbanks** in the UK. It provides a representative example of this habitat type on the more sheltered east coast of England. The subtidal sandbanks vary in composition and include coarse sand through to mixed sediment at the mouth of the embayment. Sublittoral communities present include large dense beds of brittlestars *Ophiothrix fragilis*. Species include the sand-mason worm *Lanice conchilega* and the tellin *Angulus tenuis*. Benthic communities on sandflats in the deeper, central part of the Wash are particularly diverse. The subtidal sandbanks provide important nursery grounds for young commercial fish species, including plaice *Pleuronectes platessa*, cod *Gadus morhua* and sole *Solea solea*.

1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide

The Wash, on the east coast of England, is the second-largest area of intertidal flats in the UK. The sandflats in the embayment of the Wash include extensive fine sands and drying banks of coarse sand, and this diversity of substrates, coupled with variety in degree of exposure, means that there is a high diversity relative to other east coast sites. Sandy intertidal flats predominate, with some soft mudflats in the areas sheltered by barrier beaches and islands along the north Norfolk coast. The biota includes large numbers of polychaetes, bivalves and crustaceans. Salinity ranges from that of the open coast in most of the area (supporting rich invertebrate communities) to estuarine close to the rivers. Smaller, sheltered and diverse areas of intertidal sediment, with a rich variety of communities, including some eelgrass *Zostera* spp. beds and large shallow pools, are protected by the north Norfolk barrier islands and sand spits.

1160 Large shallow inlets and bays

The Wash is the largest embayment in the UK, and represents **Large shallow inlets and bays** on the east coast of England. It is connected via sediment transfer systems to the north Norfolk coast. Together, the Wash and North Norfolk Coast form one of the most important marine areas in the UK and European North Sea coast, and include extensive areas of varying, but predominantly sandy, sediments subject to a range of conditions. Communities in the intertidal include those characterised by large numbers of polychaetes, bivalve and crustaceans. Sublittoral communities cover a diverse range from the shallow to the deeper parts of the embayments and include dense brittlestar beds and areas of an abundant reef-building worm ('ross worm')



Sabellaria spinulosa. The embayment supports a variety of mobile species, including a range of fish and 1365 Common seal *Phoca vitulina*.

1170 Reefs

The Wash is the largest embayment in the UK with extensive areas of subtidal mixed sediment. In the tide-swept approaches to the Wash, with a high loading of suspended sand, the relatively common tube-dwelling polychaete worm *Sabellaria spinulosa* forms areas of biogenic reef. These structures are varied in nature, and include reefs which stand up to 30 cm proud of the seabed and which extend for hundreds of metres (Foster-Smith & Sotheran 1999). The reefs are thought to extend into The Wash where super-abundant *S. spinulosa* occurs and where reef-like structures such as concretions and crusts have been recorded. The site and its surrounding waters are considered particularly important as it is the only currently known location of well-developed stable *Sabellaria* reef in the UK. The reefs are particularly important components of the sublittoral as they are diverse and productive habitats which support many associated species (including epibenthos and crevice fauna) that would not otherwise be found in predominantly sedimentary areas. As such, the fauna is quite distinct from other biotopes found in the site. Associated motile species include large numbers of polychaetes, mysid shrimps, the pink shrimp *Pandalus montagui*, and crabs. *S. spinulosa* is considered to be an important food source for the commercially important pink shrimp *P. montagui* (see overview in Holt *et al.* 1998).

1310 Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand

The largest single area of this vegetation in the UK occurs at this site on the east coast of England, which is one of the few areas in the UK where saltmarshes are generally accreting. The proportion of the total saltmarsh vegetation represented by **Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand** is high because of the extensive enclosure of marsh in this site. The vegetation is also unusual in that it forms a pioneer community with common cord-grass *Spartina anglica* in which it is an equal component. The inter-relationship with other habitats is significant, forming a transition to important dune, saltmeadow and halophytic scrub communities.

1330 Atlantic salt meadows (*Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae*)

This site on the east coast of England is selected both for the extensive ungrazed saltmarshes of the North Norfolk Coast and for the contrasting, traditionally grazed saltmarshes around the Wash. The Wash saltmarshes represent the largest single area of the habitat type in the UK. The **Atlantic salt meadows** form part of a sequence of vegetation types that are unparalleled among coastal sites in the UK for their diversity and are amongst the most important in Europe. Saltmarsh swards dominated by sea-lavenders *Limonium* spp. are particularly well-represented on this site. In addition to typical lower and middle saltmarsh communities, in North Norfolk there are transitions from upper marsh to freshwater reedswamp, sand dunes, shingle beaches and mud/sandflats.

1420 Mediterranean and thermo-Atlantic halophilous scrubs (*Sarcocornetea fruticosi*)

The Wash and North Norfolk Coast, together with the North Norfolk Coast, comprises the only area in the UK where all the more typically Mediterranean species that characterise **Mediterranean and thermo-Atlantic halophilous scrubs** occur together. The vegetation is dominated by a shrubby cover up to 40 cm high of scattered bushes of shrubby sea-blite *Suaeda vera* and sea-purslane *Atriplex portulacoides*, with a patchy cover of herbaceous plants and



bryophytes. This scrub vegetation often forms an important feature of the upper saltmarshes, and extensive examples occur where the drift-line slopes gradually and provides a transition to dune, shingle or reclaimed sections of the coast. At a number of locations on this coast perennial glasswort *Sarcocornia perennis* forms an open mosaic with other species at the lower limit of the sea-purslane community.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

1150 Coastal lagoons * Priority feature

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1365 Common seal *Phoca vitulina*

The Wash, on the east coast of England, is the largest embayment in the UK. The extensive intertidal flats here and on the North Norfolk Coast provide ideal conditions for **common seal *Phoca vitulina*** breeding and hauling-out. This site is the largest colony of common seals in the UK, with some 7% of the total UK population.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

1355 Otter *Lutra lutra*

Baston Fen SAC

Unitary Authority	Lincolnshire
Centroid	TF136171
SAC EU code	UK0030085
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	2.2

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable



Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1149 Spined loach *Cobitis taenia*

The Counterdrain, a large drainage channel running alongside Baston Fen, contains high densities of **spined loach** *Cobitis taenia*. It is an example of spined loach populations in the Welland catchment. The patchy cover from submerged plants provides excellent habitat for the species.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Norfolk Valley Fens SAC

Unitary Authority	Norfolk
Centroid	TL937960
SAC EU code	UK0012892
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	616.21

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

7230 Alkaline fens

Norfolk Valley Fens is one of two sites selected in East Anglia, in eastern England, where the main concentration of lowland Alkaline fens occurs. This site comprises a series of valley-head spring-fed fens. Such spring-fed flush fens are very rare in the lowlands. Most of the vegetation at this site is of the small sedge fen type, mainly referable to M13 *Schoenus nigricans* – *Juncus subnodulosus* mire, but there are transitions to reedswamp and other fen and wet grassland types. The individual fens vary in their structure according to intensity of management and provide a wide range of variation. There is a rich flora associated with these fens, including species such as grass-of-Parnassus *Parnassia palustris*, common butterwort *Pinguicula vulgaris*, marsh helleborine *Epipactis palustris* and narrow-leaved marsh-orchid *Dactylorhiza traunsteineri*.



Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix

4030 European dry heaths

6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia)

6410 Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae)

7210 Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae * Priority feature

91E0 Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) * Priority feature

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1014 Narrow-mouthed whorl snail *Vertigo angustior*

Norfolk Valley Fens represents narrow-mouthed whorl snail *Vertigo angustior* in East Anglia. At Flordon Common a strong population occurs in flushed grassland with yellow iris *Iris pseudacorus* maintained by light grazing.

1016 Desmoulin`s whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana*

Norfolk Valley Fens is one of several sites representing Desmoulin`s whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana* in East Anglia. Within Norfolk Valley Fens there are a number of marginal fens around pingos – pools that formed in hollows left when large blocks of ice melted at the end of the last Ice Age. These are very ancient wetlands and several support strong populations of *V. moulinsiana* as part of a rich assemblage of Red Data Book and Nationally Scarce species in standing water habitat.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Rex Graham Reserve SAC

Unitary Authority

Suffolk

Centroid

TL737746

SAC EU code

UK0019866

Status

Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)



Area (ha) 2.67

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

6211 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (important orchid sites) * Priority feature

This is a disused chalk pit with developing dry grassland characterised by false oat-grass *Arrhenatherum elatius*. The site has been selected as it supports the largest population of military orchid *Orchis militaris* in the UK, comprising more than 95% of the current total population.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC

Unitary Authority	Norfolk
Centroid	TF686224
SAC EU code	UK0012801
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	351.83

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix*

Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog represent the largest and best examples of M16 *Erica tetralix* – *Sphagnum compactum* wet heath in East Anglia. This vegetation community is part of a lowland mixed valley mire, a complex series of plant communities grading from wet acid heath through valley mire to calcareous fen. This gradation is of outstanding interest. The mire is extremely diverse and supports many rare plants, birds and insects, including the dragonfly *Sympetrum scoticum*, a northern species with a very local distribution in south-east England. Birds protected at European level occurring in the heathland at this site include European



nightjar *Caprimulgus europaeus*, hen harrier *Circus cyaneus* and merlin *Falco columbarius*.

7150 Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion

Dersingham Bog represents Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion in eastern England. There are examples of this habitat type present in natural bog pools of patterned valley mire, in flushes on the margins of valley mire and locally in disturbed areas associated with trackways and paths in mire and wet heath. Mosaics containing this habitat type are important for bog orchid *Hammarbya paludosa*.

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

4030 European dry heaths

Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Grimsthorpe SAC

Unitary Authority	Lincolnshire
Centroid	TF033205
SAC EU code	UK0030043
Status	Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Area (ha)	0.35

Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for selection of this site

Not applicable

Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for selection of this site

6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*)



Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site

1654 Early gentian *Gentianella anglica*

Grimsthorpe is the most northerly outpost for early gentian *Gentianella anglica*, with 2–3 colonies totalling several hundred plants in old oolitic limestone quarries.

Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection

Not applicable.

Rutland Water SPA and Ramsar:

SPA

Unitary Authority	Rutland
SPA status	Classified 04/10/1991
SPA EU code	UK9008051
Area (ha)	1556.87
Component SSSI/ASSIs	Rutland Water

Rutland Water is located in Rutland, in the English East Midlands. It is a man-made pump storage reservoir created by the damming of the Gwash Valley in 1975 and is the largest reservoir in the United Kingdom. In general the reservoir is drawn down in the summer and filled during the autumn and winter months when river levels are high. The main habitats are open water and a mosaic of lagoons, reedswamp, marsh, old meadows, scrub and woodland. The lagoons are one of the most important areas for wintering wildfowl.

Qualifying species

This site qualifies under **Article 4.2** of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by supporting populations of European importance of the following migratory species:

Over winter

Gadwall *Anas strepera*, 1,156 individuals representing at least 3.9% of the wintering Northwestern Europe population (5 year peak mean 1991/2 - 1995/6)



Shoveler *Anas clypeata*, 526 individuals representing at least 1.3% of the wintering Northwestern/Central Europe population (5 year peak mean 1991/2 - 1995/6)

Assemblage qualification: A wetland of international importance.

The area qualifies under **Article 4.2** of the Directive (79/409/EEC) by regularly supporting at least 20,000 waterfowl

Over winter, the area regularly supports 23,501 individual waterfowl (5 year peak mean 1991/2 - 1995/6) including: Lapwing *Vanellus vanellus*, Coot *Fulica atra*, Goldeneye *Bucephala clangula*, Tufted Duck *Aythya fuligula*, Pochard *Aythya ferina*, Teal *Anas crecca*, Wigeon *Anas penelope*, Cormorant *Phalacrocorax carbo*, Great Crested Grebe *Podiceps cristatus*, Little Grebe *Tachybaptus ruficollis*, Shoveler *Anas clypeata*, Gadwall *Anas strepera*.

Ramsar

Ramsar Information Sheet: UK11062 Rutland Water

Produced by JNCC: Version 3.0, 13/06/2008

Ramsar criterion 5 - assemblages of international importance:

Species with peak counts in winter:

19274 waterfowl (5 year peak mean 1998/99-2002/2003)

Ramsar criterion 6 – species/populations occurring at levels of international importance.

Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation):

Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:

Gadwall , *Anas strepera strepera*, NW Europe 1014 individuals, representing an average of 1.6% of the population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

Northern shoveler, *Anas clypeata*, NW & C Europe 619 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

Species/populations identified subsequent to designation for possible future consideration under criterion 6.

Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:

Mute swan, *Cygnus olor*, Britain 563 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)



Contemporary data and information on waterbird trends at this site and their regional (sub-national) and national contexts can be found in the Wetland Bird Survey report, which is updated annually. See www.bto.org/survey/webs/webs-alerts-index.htm.

Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits pSPA and pRamsar

Proposed SPA

Description:

This chain of both active and exhausted sand and gravel pits extends for approximately 35 kilometres along the alluvial deposits of the River Nene floodplain from Clifford Hill on the southern outskirts of Northampton, downstream to Thorpe Waterville, north of Thrapston. They form an extensive series of shallow and deep open waters which occur in association with a wide range of marginal features, such as sparsely-vegetated islands, gravel bars and shorelines, and habitats including reedswamp, marsh, wet-ditches, rush pasture, rough grassland and scattered shrub. This range of habitat and the varied topography of the lagoons provide valuable resting and feeding conditions for major concentrations of wintering waterbirds, especially ducks and waders. Species such as golden plover *Pluvialis apricaria* and lapwing *Vanellus vanellus* also spend time feeding and roosting on surrounding agricultural land outside the pSPA.

Qualifying species and assemblages:

The site is proposed to be designated due to its European ornithological importance, particularly as wintering habitat for wildfowl and wading birds:

- 1% or more of the Great Britain populations of Bittern *Botaurus stellaris* and Golden plover *Pluvialis apricaria*
- used regularly by 1% or more of the biogeographical populations of Gadwall *Anas strepera*
- used regularly by over 20,000 waterbirds in any season of various species including wigeon *Anas Penelope*, crested grebe *Podiceps cristatus* and coot *Fulica atra*.

Proposed Ramsar

Criterion 5: An internationally important assemblage of wintering birds, regularly supporting 20,000+ individuals

Criterion 6: Internationally important winter populations of: Mute Swan *Cygnus olor*; Gadwall *Anas strepe*

Gadwall , *Anas strepera strepera*, NW Europe 1014 individuals, representing an average of 1.6% of the population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)



Mute swan, *Cygnus olor*, Britain 563 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

Contemporary data and information on waterbird trends at this site and their regional (sub-national) and national contexts can be found in the Wetland Bird Survey report, which is updated annually. See www.bto.org/survey/webs/webs-alerts-index.htm.



Appendix B

List of Adopted Plans, emerging Development Plan Documents (DPDS) and other policy documents, including saved plans considered to be relevant to this scoping exercise

Adopted Statutory Plans and emerging LDF documents

Regional Spatial Strategy

The East of England Plan: the revision of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England. May 2008.

Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council Joint Documents

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003- 2016 (policies as set out in Secretary of State Direction September 2007 and as amended by the East of England Plan).

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan 1998 - 2011 (policies as set out in Secretary of State Direction September 2007)

The Location and Design of Major Waste Management Facilities, SPD. Adopted April 2006

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan, incorporating the Core Strategy, Site Specific proposals and Earith / Mepal Area Action Plan (AAP) Submission Plan September 2009

Block Fen / Langwood Fen Masterplan Draft SPD September 2009



The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities, Draft SPD. September 2009

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Waste Management Strategy (2008 – 2022)

Cambridgeshire County Council Documents

The Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 – moving transport forward. Adopted March 2006

Peterborough City Council Documents

Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) Adopted July 2005 (policies as set out in Secretary of State's Direction issued 25th June 2008)

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, Draft Pre-Submission Plan (Cabinet Version), October 2009

Peterborough Site Allocations DPD, Preferred Options, Oct/Nov 2008

Peterborough City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP), Preferred Options, Jun/July 2008

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, Preferred Options, Oct/Nov 2008

Peterborough Local Transport Plan (Second) 2006-2011 Adopted: March 2006

Cambridge City Council Documents

Cambridge City Local Plan. Adopted July 2006 (policies as set out in Secretary of State's Direction issued 2nd July 2009)

Cambridge City Development Strategy (Core Strategy) Issues and Options June 2006

Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP). Adopted February 2008 (joint Area Action Plan with South Cambridgeshire District Council)



Cambridge North West AAP 2008. Adopted October 2009

East Cambridgeshire District Council Documents

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2000. Adopted June 2000, saved 2007

East Cambridgeshire Core Strategy. Adopted October 2009

Fenland District Council Documents

Fenland Local Plan. Adopted 1993 (as set out in Secretary of State Direction September 2007)

Fenland Core Strategy and Development Policies – Preferred Option 2 September 2007

Huntingdonshire District Council Documents

Huntingdonshire District Local Plan. Adopted December 1995, Alteration adopted 2000 (policies as set out in Secretary of State Direction September 2007)

Huntingdonshire District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Adopted September 2009.

Huntingdonshire West Area Action Plan: Preferred Approach Consultation, 2009

South Cambridgeshire District Council Documents

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Adopted February 2004 (as set out in Secretary of State Direction September 2007). Saved policies from 2007 now only retained.

South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy. Adopted January 2007



Development Control Policies. Adopted July 2007

Site Specific Policies. Submission Draft January 2006 and Site Specific Policies. Responding to a Housing Shortfall October 2008 – as amended by Report of the Examination of Site Specific Policies DPD (September 2009)

Gypsy and Traveller Sites Options and Policies July 2009

Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP). Adopted February 2008 (joint Area Action Plan with Cambridge City Council)

North West Cambridge AAP 2008. Adopted October 2009

Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. Adopted February 2008

Northstowe AAP. Adopted July 2007

South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy 2006 – 2009. Adopted as Council Policy September 2006

South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity SPD , Adopted July 2009

Other documents

Cambridgeshire Local Biodiversity Action Plans

Green Infrastructure Strategy, Cambridgeshire Horizons 2006

Peterborough Green Grid Strategy, PECT/PCC, December 2007

Appendix C

SCREENING OF THE PWMDG SPD

Waste Design Guide Chapter and Section	Potential effect on Natura 2000 site(s)		Outcome of screening
Part 4. Waste Storage capacity			
<i>4.2 Residential developments</i>	✓	The internal and external segregation of waste enables more recycling and less landfill. A positive effect in the long term on Natura 2000 sites.	Screened out
<i>4.3 Commercial developments</i>	✓	The segregation of commercial waste enables more recycling and less landfill. A positive effect in the long term on Natura 2000 sites.	Screened out
<i>4.4 Skip containers and waste compaction systems</i>	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites. Development control process will manage the application of waste compaction systems.	Screened out
Part 5. Waste Storage Points			
<i>5.2 Underground storage of waste</i>	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites. Specification for construction of underground storage units provided in PWMDG Appendix G, ensuring no credible impact pathways. Possible pollution risks to nearby sensitive nature conservation sites will be dealt with in the Development Control process.	Screened out
<i>5.3 Residential storage of waste</i>	~	The choice of waste management transfer options will take into account 'Risk of environmental harm'. Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites.	Screened out





Part 6. Waste Storage Infrastructure			
6.2 Minimum specifications for waste storage systems	✓	The containment of waste from residential complexes and single units is a positive benefit. General principles for the creation of areas in PWMDG include 'Environmental protection'. Specifications for compounds based on good environmental practice are given in PWMDG.	Screened out
6.3 Assessment of storage system type and location	✓	Based on Assessment Criteria in PWMDG and location managed through Development Control process.	Screened out
6.4 Construction of storage systems	~	Specifications provided for construction, which include impervious wall and floor and adequate drainage. Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites	Screened out
6.5 Additional storage areas	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites. Managed through the Development Control process.	Screened out
Part 7. Waste Collection			
7.2 Key aspects of highway design	~	The routes of highways servicing waste collection points and the protection of Natura 2000 sites will be subject to the Development Control process.	Screened out
7.3 Waste collection vehicle specifications	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites	Screened out
7.4 Highway design	~	PWMDG refers to the use of 'Manual for Streets, and DMRB (Highways Agency) which have strong environmental protection principles.	Screened out



7.5 Commencement of collection service	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites	Screened out
7.6 Alternative methods of collection	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites.	Screened out
Part 8. Recycling Centres			
8.2 Current infrastructure	~	PWMDG refers to the requirement for 'the development of the network (of recycling centres) through the provision of further infrastructure'. Increasing provision will be the subject of Development Control and Natura 2000 will be considered in the process.	Screened out
8.3 Contribution to waste management	✓✓	Cambridgeshire's development of recycling centres 'has contributed to the county being ranked the highest recycling county in the UK...' A positive effect on Natura 2000 sites will be achieved in the medium to long term.	Screened out
8.4 Future provision of recycling centres	✓	The future location of these sites will be considered through the Development Control process. Assessment Criteria will take into account 'Environmental Protection', including the possible change in disturbance levels at location in relation to Natura 2000 sites. A beneficial effect on Natura 2000 sites as more waste is recycled with less sent to landfill.	Screened out



Part 9. Bring Sites			
9.2 Current infrastructure	✓✓	Bring sites have 'contributed to the RECAP area being historically the highest recycling area in the country'. The guidance is considered likely to have a major beneficial effect on Natura 2000 sites in the medium to long term.	Screened out
9.3 Provision of Bring Sites in future developments	✓	The waste audit process is recommended in the PWMDG and maximum recommended densities of Bring sites are given. The provision and location of these facilities will be subject to the Development Control process.	Screened out
9.4 Location of Bring Sites	~	Location identified to the Local Authority. Protection of Natura 2000 sites managed through the development control and policy and spatial planning processes.	Screened out
9.5 Management and maintenance	✓	Adequate maintenance and management of both temporary and permanent Bring sites will minimise environmental issues. Positive effect on Natura 2000 sites.	Screened out
9.6 Underground Bring Sites	~	Negligible effect on Natura 2000 sites. Specification for construction of underground storage units provided in PWMDG Appendix G, ensuring no credible impact pathways. Possible pollution risks to nearby sensitive nature conservation sites will be dealt with in the Development Control process.	Screened out



<p>Part 10. Educational Schemes and additional options</p>	<p>✓✓</p>	<p>The guidance is considered likely to have a major beneficial effect as increasing local knowledge will reduce the volume of waste sent to landfill and encourage residents to recycle waste.</p>	<p>Screened out</p>
<p>RECAP toolkit</p>	<p>✓✓</p>	<p>The guidance is considered likely to have a major beneficial effect. The three toolkit components will assess any implications of the waste management requirements on the surrounding environment and therefore any Natura 2000 sites within the vicinity of the proposed waste management site.</p>	<p>Screened out</p>
<p>Design Standards Checklist</p>	<p>✓✓</p>	<p>Developers will be expected to demonstrate that proposals satisfy the requirements of the PWMDG by assessing their proposals against the expected standards. The standards are based on best environmental practice.</p>	<p>Screened out</p>
<p>Assessment Criteria</p>	<p>✓✓</p>	<p>A positive benefit of applying the Assessment Criteria to proposals. Recommendation on inclusion of text in 'Protection of the Environment' Assessment Factor on " threats and disturbance to local biodiversity" (see text)</p>	<p>Screened out</p>
<p>Basis for conditions and agreements</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>The application of conditions or obligations will also secure the protection of Natura 2000 sites where necessary and can lead to enhancement of the environment.</p>	<p>Screened out</p>



Key

- xxx* Guidance is considered to have a likely significant adverse effect (no mitigation possible)
- xx* Guidance is considered to have a likely significant adverse effect (mitigation possible)
- x* Guidance is considered to have a minor adverse effect (mitigation possible)
- ~ Neutral: Option is considered to have no effect
- ✓ Guidance is considered likely to have a minor beneficial effect
- ✓✓ Guidance is considered likely to have a major beneficial effect



Appendix D

SCREENING OF PLANS FOR POTENTIAL IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS WITH THE PWMDG SPD¹

<i>Plan name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Stage</i>	<i>Sustainability Appraisal or HRA completed</i>	<i>Likely 'in combination' effects on Natura 2000 sites?</i>	<i>Comments, inc. policies relevant to the in combination' assessment</i>	<i>Outcome of screening</i>
Regional Spatial Strategy						
East of England Plan	Regional	Approved May 2008	Further Assessment published May 2008	Nil	The RSS has a key role in contributing to the sustainable development of the East of England Region. It aims to improve the quality of life for all who live in, work in or visit the	Screened out

¹ At the time of finalising this assessment November 2009, the following plans and projects were identified as having the potential to act in combination with the PWMDG SPD.



<i>Plan name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Stage</i>	<i>Sustainability Appraisal or HRA completed</i>	<i>Likely 'in combination' effects on Natura 2000 sites?</i>	<i>Comments, inc. policies relevant to the in combination' assessment</i>	<i>Outcome of screening</i>
					<p>region and it sets out proposals for where people will work and live, how they will move about the region, and much more. In particular, a key aim of the RSS is to plan for the future economic growth of the region and for the regeneration needs of less prosperous areas.</p> <p>The economic aspirations for the East of England underpin much of the new housing provision identified in the Plan.</p>	



<i>Plan name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Stage</i>	<i>Sustainability Appraisal or HRA completed</i>	<i>Likely 'in combination' effects on Natura 2000 sites?</i>	<i>Comments, inc. policies relevant to the in combination' assessment</i>	<i>Outcome of screening</i>
					Preparation was informed by Sustainability Appraisal at both the draft submission and Proposed Changes stages incorporating Strategic Environmental Appraisal. The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes were assessed against the requirements of the European Habitats Directive (East of England Regional Spatial Strategy Habitats Directive Assessment, ERM, December 2006). In response to representations on that assessment by the Regional	



<i>Plan name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Stage</i>	<i>Sustainability Appraisal or HRA completed</i>	<i>Likely 'in combination' effects on Natura 2000 sites?</i>	<i>Comments, inc. policies relevant to the in combination' assessment</i>	<i>Outcome of screening</i>
					<p>Assembly, Natural England and others, the assessment was revisited (Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England: Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations, RPS, September 2007) and a number of additional changes made to ensure the Regional Spatial Strategy is fully compliant with the Directive (Secretary of State's Further Proposed Changes, October 2007). Taking account of the Assessment and the Further Proposed Changes the RSS</p>	



<i>Plan name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Stage</i>	<i>Sustainability Appraisal or HRA completed</i>	<i>Likely 'in combination' effects on Natura 2000 sites?</i>	<i>Comments, inc. policies relevant to the in combination' assessment</i>	<i>Outcome of screening</i>
					<p>concludes that the policies of this Plan will not give rise to any adverse effects on the integrity of sites of European or international importance for nature conservation.</p> <p>The PWDG SPD contributes positively to the relevant policies in the East of England Plan.</p> <p>Relevant policies inc. Env. 1, 2 and 3 and WM1, 3, 5, 6 and 8.</p>	

Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council Joint Documents						
Cambridgeshire and	The Partnership	Adopted 2003	SA March 2002	Nil	The Structure Plan aims to secure	Screened out



<p>Peterborough Structure Plan (2003 - 16) and as amended by the East of England Plan</p>	<p>area</p>				<p>greater sustainability through integrating environmental, social and economic objectives whilst providing for new jobs and other significant development requirements.</p> <p>RECAP partners have a duty to ensure that their waste management activities comply with the relevant environmental protection legislation.</p> <p>Generally the Structure Plan should have a positive effect. It gives strong protection for identified sites of high wildlife value.</p>	
<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan</p>	<p>The Partnership area</p>	<p>Adopted 2003</p>	<p>Completed May 2003</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>This Waste Local Plan addresses the land-use planning aspects of waste management in</p>	<p>Screened out</p>



(1998 – 2011)					<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It sets out the policies and proposals of the Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) and provides the first comprehensive framework for determining planning applications for waste development within the 'Plan area'.</p> <p>This Plan aims to provide a sustainable strategy and policy framework for waste management by seeking to reduce landfill, and place greater emphasis on re-cycling and recovery from waste. It includes site specific proposals for waste management facilities.</p> <p>Relevant saved policies inc. WLP</p>	
---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--



					8 Greenbelts and WLP 11 Protected species	
The Location and Design of Major Waste Management Facilities SPD.	The Partnership area	Adopted 2006	An SA is not required for this SPD, but an HRA is required for the updated version of the SPD	Nil	This SPD has been prepared to assist in the delivery of high quality sustainable waste management facilities. The document sets out a series of key development principles based on recognised good planning and design practice. The SPD is currently being updated in line with the Minerals and Waste Plan and HRA screening is underway.	Screened out
The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan incorporating the Core Strategy, Site Specific proposals	The Partnership area	Submission plan stage Feb 2010	HRA screening and scoping report September 2008. Full Appropriate Assessment for the Core Strategy,	Nil	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan comprises two documents. The Core Strategy Development Plan Document sets out the strategic vision and	Screened out



<p>(eight parts), Earith / Mepal Area Action Plan (AAP),</p>			<p>Site Specific Proposals and the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Masterplan SPD. The documents have been subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment, which included a full Appropriate Assessment (AA). The AA concluded that these documents have no adverse impact on Natura 2000 sites.</p>		<p>objectives, including a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development whilst the Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document sets out site specific allocations for minerals and waste development and supporting site specific policies to support the strategic vision.</p> <p>Specific policies relate to the protection and restoration of local biodiversity, e.g. CS35 Biodiversity and CS27 Restoration and aftercare of mineral workings, but sites and species of international and national importance are not addressed in this Plan, since they are they are protected by other European</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	--



					and national legislation.	
Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities Draft SPD	The Partnership area	September 2009 (to be subject to public consultation in February/March 2010)	The SPD has been subject to a SA, and the guidance has been appraised against social, environmental, and economic objectives. The SA recommendations have been incorporated into the final SPD.	Nil	This SPD has been prepared to assist in the delivery of high quality sustainable waste management facilities. It is also intended to be a practical tool to support planners in negotiations and at the master planning stages, as well as a tool for development control officers and a source of guidance for developers.	Screened out
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Waste Management Strategy (2008 – 2022)	Partnership area	Adopted 2002	N/a	Nil	This strategy describes a way forward for waste management, a way forward that can reconcile the twin aspirations of customer satisfaction within achieving the National	Screened out



					<p>and European waste diversion targets.</p> <p>Covers all areas including areas with national and international designated sites as detailed above.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



Cambridgeshire County Council Documents						
Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan Report 2006-2011	The County	Adopted March 2006	SEA March 2005 and Environmental Report 2006	Nil	<p>The Local Transport Plan 2006 - 11 for Cambridgeshire sets out how Government capital funding allocated for transport will be spent, and how this will be used to meet local and national targets.</p> <p>The LTP contains a range of Landscape and Biodiversity policies to protect and enhance the natural environment, and to promote public transport, walking, cycling and other sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The LTP also contains a commitment to produce transport</p>	Screened out



					strategies for all of the market towns in Cambridgeshire, recognising the unique nature of each of these towns. Strategies have been completed for Ely, March, St Neots, St Ives, Huntingdon & Godmanchester and Wisbech. Revised strategies for Ely and Wisbech were adopted in December and September 2008 respectively.	
Peterborough City Council Documents						
Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) Saved until 2008	Peterborough City	Adopted July 2005			Relevant policies will be replaced by LDF see below.	Screened out



<p>Peterborough Core Strategy, Site Allocations DPD, Peterborough City Centre AAP,</p>	<p>Peterborough City</p>	<p>Finalising proposed submission for approval by Council in December 2009. Submission to Sec. of State May 2010.</p>	<p>SA scoping undertaken in December 2006. Final SA report in progress. HRA Appropriate Assessment undertaken January 2009. Concluded that when specific policy changes are adopted, the Core Strategy will not adversely affect the integrity of any Natura 2000 or Ramsar site. The final revised report is in progress</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>Relevant Biodiversity policies are: LNE14, LNE15, LNE16, LNE17, LNE18, LNE19, which replace similar in the Local Plan. The policies listed here are the ones in the adopted Local Plan. Core Strategy Policy CS21 refers to Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</p>	<p>Screened out</p>
--	--------------------------	---	---	------------	---	---------------------



Peterborough Local Transport Plan 2006 - 2011	Peterborough City	The second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) was published in March 2006.	SEA 2005	Nil	The LTP2 details future strategy development proposals, local transport priorities and a programme of improvements for the Peterborough area. The LTP takes into account the changes that have taken place since the original plan was created in 2000, including the proposals for developing and enhancing the City Centre and the increase of urban growth caused by the inclusion of the City in the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Growth Corridor.	Screened out
Cambridge City Council						
Cambridge City Local Plan	Cambridge City	Adopted 2006, policies identified in Direction		Nil	This document provides policies to guide development in Cambridge to 2016, and designates sites for development,	Screened out



		saved until 2012			including a number of Areas of Major Change, which are mainly concentrated around the fringe of Cambridge.	
Cambridge City Development Strategy (Core Strategy)	Cambridge City	Issues and Options 2007.	SA March 2007 HRA screening in	Nil		Screened out

Action Plan DPDs: Cambridge East AAP 2008 (in partnership with South Cambridgeshire DC) North West Cambridge AAP (in	Cambridge City / South Cambridgeshire	CEAAP adopted 2008, NW Cambridge AAP adopted October 2009	North West Area AAP HRA concluded no likely significant effect	Nil	These DPDs, provide detailed policy guidance for development of land around Cambridge, for considerable housing growth. All AAPs have been objectively assessed as no likely significant effect.	Screened out
--	---------------------------------------	---	--	-----	---	--------------



partnership with South Cambridgeshire DC)						
East Cambridgeshire District Council						
East Cambridgeshire Local Plan	East Cambridgeshire District	Adopted 2000 Some policies saved in 2007	N/a	Nil		Screened out
East Cambridgeshire Core Strategy and Site specific policies	East Cambridgeshire District	Core Strategy adopted October 2009 Site specific policies Issues and Options 2006	SA in May 2007. HRA screening assessment (Jan 2008), no requirement for full AA	Nil	The Council has objectively concluded that the Core Strategy DPD is not likely to have any significant effects on any Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites. In the Council's opinion there is therefore no requirement to proceed to the next stage of an Appropriate Assessment. Relevant policies EN2 Design EN 6 Biodiversity and Geology	Screened out



					EN8 Pollution	
--	--	--	--	--	---------------	--

Fenland District Council						
Fenland Local Plan	Fenland District	Adopted 1993 Some policies saved in 2007	N/a	Nil	Concentrates growth in housing, employment and service provision within existing centres.	Screened out
Fenland Core Strategy Preferred Options 2 and Development Control Policies DPD	Fenland District	Preferred Options consultation 2007.	SA 2007 HRA in progress	Nil	Relevant policies in Core Strategy: 7.2 N2 Biodiversity, 7.4 N4 Protected sites and species	Screened out
Huntingdonshire District Council						
Huntingdonshire DC Local Plan 1995 and Alteration 2002	Huntingdonshire District	Adopted 1995 and 2002 Some policies saved in 2007			Provides for development to 2006 and focuses development on larger settlements.	Screened out
Huntingdonshire District Council Core	Huntingdonshire District	Adopted September	SA 2008 HRA screening	Nil		Screened out



Strategy and Development Management Policies DPDs		2009 Options consultation 2009	2008, full AA required. Undertaken in 2008			
Huntingdon West AAP	Huntingdon West	Preferred Approach Consultation (May 2008)	HRA 2008	Nil	<p>The purpose of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan is to promote development that is sustainable and provide site specific allocations and general policies for the area in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p>The Council considered that a full appropriate assessment is not required at Issues and Options as no proposals have been presented which can suitably be assessed for their impact on Natura 2000 sites.</p>	Screened out



South Cambridgeshire District Council						
South Cambridgeshire District Council Core Strategy, Development Control Policies and Site Specific DPDs	South Cambridgeshire District	Core Strategy adopted January 2007 and DC Policies July 2007. Site Specific Policies Inspectors Report September 2009	Site specific policies 2008	Nil	<p>The CS sets the vision for the district to 2016, advocates that most new development is to take place on the edge of Cambridge and a new town (Northstowe).</p> <p>The other DPDs contain allocations for housing, employment and other land uses, and policies to guide decisions on planning applications covering a wide range of topics including housing, jobs, travel and the natural environment.</p>	Screened out
Gypsy and Traveller Site DPD – issues and options 2	South Cambridgeshire District	Public consultation on this document	HRA undertaken in July 2009 and concluded that the GTS DPD is	Nil	The targets for South Cambridgeshire are at least 69 new Gypsy & Traveller pitches in the district between 2006 and	Screened out



		10th July to 9th October 2009.	not likely to have any significant effects on any Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites and therefore no full AA required.		2011, and at least a further 58 new Gypsy & Traveller pitches between 2011 and 2021. The PWMDG therefore fundamental in guiding the design of waste management facilities associated with these pitches.	
Area Action Plan DPDs Cambridge East AAP North West Cambridge AAP Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP Northstowe AAP	South Cambridgeshire District/ Cambridge City	Cambridge East AAP adopted Feb 2008; North West Cambridge AAP. Adopted October 2009; Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP adopted February	Cambridge East AAP SA 2008 and HRA 2007; Cambridge NorthWest AAP HRA 2007; Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP HRA 2007; Northstowe AAP HRA 2007	Nil	These DPDs provide detailed policy guidance for development of land around Cambridge, for considerable housing growth, around the periphery of Cambridge, including a new town, Northstowe, where up to 10,000 dwellings are proposed. All AAPs have been objectively assessed as no likely significant effect.	Screened out



		2008; Northstowe AAP adopted July 2007.				
South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity SPD	South Cambridge	Adopted July 2009	N/a	Positive beneficial effect	The SCDC Biodiversity SPD will supersede the SCDC Biodiversity Strategy	Screened out
South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy	South Cambridgeshire	Adopted by Council Sept 2006	N/a	Positive beneficial effect		Screened out
Other plans and policies						
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Local Biodiversity Action Plans	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough	Some Local Authorities have adopted the LBAP and embedded in policy	N/a	Positive beneficial effect	This is made up of a number of Biodiversity Action Plans relating to Habitats and Species. They contain objectives for improving the sustainability of priority habitats and species in farmland, grassland, wetlands, woodlands	Screened out



					and cities, towns and villages, and contain broad targets for creating or expanding new habitat.	
Green Infrastructure Strategy, Cambridgeshire Horizons	County	Launched in May 2006	N/a	Positive beneficial effect	The provision of Green Infrastructure is identified as a key priority for the successful implementation of sustainable growth.	Screened out
Peterborough Green Grid Strategy, PECT/PCC,	Peterborough	December 2007	N/a	Positive beneficial effect	A strategy to inform and guide planners, developers and key interest groups in the planning, implementation and management of multi-functional green infrastructure projects.	Screened out