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1. Introduction

The Purpose of this Report

1.1 This screening report is an assessment of whether the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations. A SEA is required if the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have a significant effect on the environment.

1.2 This report will also screen to determine whether the Neighbourhood Plan requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) in accordance with Article 6(3) and (4) of the EU Habitats Directive and with Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. A HRA is required when it is deemed that likely adverse significant effects may occur on protected Habitats (Natura 2000) sites, as a result of the implementation of a plan or project.
2. The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan

Name of Qualifying Body and Local Planning Authority

2.1 The qualifying body preparing the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council. The Local Planning Authority is Bassetlaw District Council.

Location and spatial extent of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan

2.2 The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan covers the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area, comprising the full extent of the civil parish of Rampton and Woodbeck in Nottinghamshire.

2.3 Rampton and Woodbeck is a rural civil parish located in the eastern part of Bassetlaw District, itself the northernmost district in Nottinghamshire. The Parish has an area of approximately 893 hectares, and a resident population of 1,139 people (2011 Census). Rampton village, in the centre of the parish, is the primary settlement, whilst Woodbeck, in the western portion of the parish, is a planned settlement focussed around Rampton High Security Hospital. The parish also includes part of the recently closed Cottam Power Station complex to its eastern extent. The market town of Retford lies 7.5 miles (12 km) west of Rampton village.

2.4 Access to the village is via a variety of unclassified roads, providing access northwards to Gainsborough, westwards to Retford, and southwards to the A57 towards both Lincoln and the A1. Rampton village offers a limited range of services and facilities: a village hall, pub, convenience store, part-time post service, and a primary school. Woodbeck is within a short driving distance of the facilities in Rampton, and is also equipped with its own social club.
Timeframe of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan

2.5 To 2037.

Main aims of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan

2.6 The vision of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is as follows:

‘Our hope is that Rampton and Woodbeck will continue to be safe and peaceful rural communities reflecting and conserving its local character and landscape. The distinctive Trent side character, the River Trent, public open spaces and wider countryside that provide a haven for residents and our wildlife will be protected and enhanced for future generations to enjoy. Rampton and Woodbeck will continue to have a vibrant community and any new development shall respect the areas character of the villages, whilst meeting the needs of current and future residents in terms of housing, infrastructure and local facilities’

2.7 The vision is, in turn, supported by six objectives:

**Objective 1 - Residential Developments:** To influence the location, scale, design and type of new housing in Rampton and Woodbeck to ensure that it safeguards or improves the character of local areas, meets identified local housing needs, enhances the villages setting and its connection/relationship with the surrounding countryside. This will include allocating appropriate land for residential development within both villages.

**Objective 2 - Local Green Spaces:** The Neighbourhood Plan will seek to designate valued and important spaces as ‘Local Green Spaces’ to protect their significance and importance for future generations.

**Objective 3 - The Design of New Developments:** To manage development in a way that minimises any negative impact on our landscape, historic and built environments. This will include producing a set of ‘local design principles’ to help guide new developments in the most appropriate way.

**Objective 4 - Natural Environment:** To manage new development so it respects and enhances our natural environment and our natural assets such as the River Trent and its associated wildlife, the wider countryside and biodiversity of the area.

**Objective 5 - Village Amenities:** To preserve our few existing village amenities for the benefit of the wider community.

**Objective 6 - Important Views:** To preserve and enhance the identified “important views” within the villages and the wider Parish, as identified from the Rampton and Woodbeck Character Assessment.
2.8 Only a draft neighbourhood plan that meets each of a set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made. One of these basic conditions requires the making of the neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area.

2.9 For the purposes of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, the relevant part of the Local Plan (formerly Local Development Framework) is the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

2.10 The Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD was adopted in December 2011. It sets out a vision for change in Bassetlaw to 2028, along with the place-specific policy approaches to be taken in order to achieve this vision. A small number of more detailed development management policies on key issues that will need to be addressed when delivering new development, are also included.

2.11 Rampton is identified as a Rural Service Centre (Policy CS8): a settlement that offers a range of services and facilities, and access to public transport, that makes it a suitable location for limited rural growth. Woodbeck is identified in the All Other Settlement class (Policy CS9). A parallel process of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) was undertaken alongside the plan-making process for the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD.

2.12 Given the importance of having an up-to-date local plan, Bassetlaw District Council is currently in the process of preparing the Bassetlaw Local Plan which will include strategic policies for the period 2018 to 2035. Consultation on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan commenced on 14 January 2019 and ended on 10 March 2019 in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) 2012. A further Regulation 18 consultation is due to commence in early 2020. Upon adoption, the Bassetlaw Local Plan will replace the 2011 Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. A Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared as part of the integrated SA and SEA of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. Habitats Regulations Assessment screening of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan has also been undertaken.

Does the Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Neighbourhood Plan propose allocations?

2.13 A neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development, including housing. Where they do contain policies relevant to housing supply, these policies should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need.

2.14 The strategic policies of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan have been informed by an up-to-date local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Rural settlements will accommodate a minimum of 1,777 new dwellings and deliver the necessary associated infrastructure from 2018 to 2035. This will be delivered through existing planning permissions and sites allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan process and Local Plan site allocation process. Where neighbourhood plan groups choose to take forward a neighbourhood plan, the Draft Local Plan sets out the housing requirement to be met.
2.15 In January 2019 Bassetlaw District Council issued a housing requirement figure for Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area, for the period 2018 – 2035. The minimum housing requirement is 39 dwellings, representing a 10% increase in the number of dwellings in the parish as at August 2018. Growth is capped at 75 dwellings, representing 20% of the existing number of dwellings in the two settlements combined.

2.16 The Draft Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan allocates 7 specific housing sites for development with a cumulative site capacity of 29 dwellings (Policies 2 – 7), with the potential for additional infill sites to come forward up to the 20% cap as windfall development (Policy 8).
3. Legislative Background

3.1 A neighbourhood plan or order must be compatible with European Union obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant. This assessment concerns two European Union directives:

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

3.2 The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive is a European Union requirement that seeks to provide a high level of protection of the environment by integrating environmental considerations into the process of preparing certain plans and programmes.

3.3 The aim of the Directive is “to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development, by ensuring that, in accordance with this Directive, an environmental assessment is carried out of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.”

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

3.4 Under the provisions of the EU Habitats Directive and translated into English law by the Habitats Regulations (The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) Regulations 2012), a competent authority must carry out an assessment of whether a plan or project will significantly affect the integrity of any European Site, in terms of impacting the site’s conservation objectives. HRA is the assessment of the impacts of a land use proposal against the conservation objectives of Habitats (Natura 2000) sites. Specifically, it is to ascertain whether or not a proposal (either alone or in combination with other proposals) would potentially damage the internationally designated features of that site.

Recent Case Law

3.5 The ‘People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta’ (12 April 2018) judgement ruled that Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive should be interpreted as meaning that mitigation measures should be assessed as part of an Appropriate Assessment, and should not be taken into account at the screening stage. The precise wording of the ruling is as follows:

Article 6(3) ………must be interpreted as meaning that, in order to determine whether it is necessary to carry out, subsequently, an appropriate assessment of the implications, for a site concerned, of a plan or project, it is not appropriate, at the screening stage, to take account of measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of the plan or project on that site.

3.6 In light of the above, the HRA screening stage has not relied upon avoidance or mitigation measures to draw conclusions as to whether the Neighbourhood Plan would result in likely significant effects.

3.7 The ‘Holohan v An Bord Pleanala’ (9 Nov 2018) CJEU judgement states:

Article 6(3) of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora must be interpreted as meaning that an ‘appropriate assessment’ must, on the one hand, catalogue the entirety of habitat types and species for which a site is protected, and, on the other, identify and examine both the implications of the proposed project for the species present on that site, and for which that site has not
been listed, and the implications for habitat types and species to be found outside the boundaries of that site, provided that those implications are liable to affect the conservation objectives of the site.

Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43 must be interpreted as meaning that the competent authority is permitted to grant to a plan or project consent which leaves the developer free to determine subsequently certain parameters relating to the construction phase, such as the location of the construction compound and haul routes, only if that authority is certain that the development consent granted establishes conditions that are strict enough to guarantee that those parameters will not adversely affect the integrity of the site.

Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43 must be interpreted as meaning that, where the competent authority rejects the findings in a scientific expert opinion recommending that additional information be obtained, the ‘appropriate assessment’ must include an explicit and detailed statement of reasons capable of dispelling all reasonable scientific doubt concerning the effects of the work envisaged on the site concerned.
4. **SEA Screening**

When is SEA Required?

4.1 Planning Practice Guidance – Strategic environmental assessment requirements for neighbourhood plans (Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 11-026-20140306) states that,

> “In some limited circumstances, where a neighbourhood plan is likely to have significant environmental effects, it may require a strategic environmental assessment. Draft neighbourhood plan proposals should be assessed to determine whether the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects. This process is commonly referred to as a “screening” assessment and the requirements are set out in regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

If likely significant environmental effects are identified, an environmental report must be prepared in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of regulation 12 of those Regulations.

One of the basic conditions that will be tested by the independent examiner is whether the making of the neighbourhood plan is compatible with European Union obligations (including under the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive).

To decide whether a draft neighbourhood plan might have significant environmental effects, it must be assessed (screened) at an early stage of the plan’s preparation according to the requirements set out in regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. These include a requirement to consult the environmental assessment consultation bodies.

Each consultation body will be able to advise on particular topics relevant to its specific area of expertise and responsibility, and the specific information that it holds.

Where it is determined that the plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects (and, accordingly, does not require an environmental assessment), a statement of reasons for the determination should be prepared. A copy of the statement must be submitted with the neighbourhood plan proposal and made available to the independent examiner.”
4.2 This diagram shows the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive’s field of application in the form of a diagram. The original diagram is from ‘A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Objective’. The red arrows indicate the process route for the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening Assessment.

4.3 The table below shows the assessment of whether the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan will require a full SEA. The questions below are drawn from the diagram above which sets out how the SEA Directive should be applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the Neighbourhood Plan subject to preparation and/or adoption by a national, regional or local authority OR prepared by an authority for adoption through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government? (Art. 2(a))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The preparation of and adoption of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is allowed under The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Localism Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislative procedure by Parliament or Government? (Art. 2(a))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2011. The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan will be prepared by Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council (as the 'relevant body') and will be 'made' by Bassetlaw Council as the local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the Neighbourhood Plan required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions? (Art. 2(a))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Whilst the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is not a requirement and is optional under the provisions of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Localism Act 2011, it will if ‘made’, form part of the Development Plan for the District. It is therefore important that the screening process considers whether it is likely to have significant environmental effects and hence whether SEA is required under the Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the Neighbourhood Plan prepared for agriculture, forestry, fisheries, energy, industry, transport, waste management, water management, telecommunications, tourism, town and country planning or land use, AND does it set a framework for future development consent of projects in Annexes I and II (see Appendix 4) to the EIA Directive? (Art 3.2(a))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan covers a range of land use issues and allocations. Although the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is a non-strategic scale document, focused solely upon the Parish of Rampton and Woodbeck, it can set the framework for future development consent of some of the projects in Annexes I and II to the EIA Directive (see Appendix 4 for list).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the Neighbourhood Plan determine the use of small areas at local level, OR is it a minor modification of a PP subject to Art. 3.2? (Art. 3.3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Determination of small sites at local level only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment? (Art. 3.5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Appendix 1 presents the environmental effects which have the potential to arise as a result of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **HRA Screening**

5.1 **The requirement to undertake HRA**

The requirement to undertake HRA of development plans was confirmed by the amendments to the Habitats Regulations published for England and Wales in July 2007 and updated in 2010 and again in 2012. These updates were consolidated into the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

5.2 **The HRA refers to the assessment of the potential effects of a development plan on one or more European Sites, including Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs):**

- SPAs are classified under the European Council Directive “on the conservation of wild birds” (79/409/EEC; ‘Birds Directive’) for the protection of wild birds and their habitats (including particularly rare and vulnerable species listed in Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, and migratory species);
- SACs are designated under the Habitats Directive and target particular habitats (Annex 1) and/or species (Annex II) identified as being of European importance.

5.3 **The National Planning Policy Framework** (paragraph 176) also expects potential SPAs (pSPAs), possible SACs (pSACs) and Ramsar sites to be included within the assessment.

- Ramsar sites support internationally important wetland habitats and are listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention, 1971).

5.4 **Candidate SACs (cSACs) and Sites of Community Importance (SCIs), which are sites that have been adopted by the European Commission but not yet formally designated by the government, should also be considered.**

5.5 **For ease of reference during HRA, these designations are collectively referred to as European sites, despite Ramsar designations being at the wider, international level.**

**Identification of European sites which may be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan**

5.6 **In order to initiate the search of European sites that could potentially be affected by a neighbourhood plan, it is established practice in HRAs to consider European sites within the area covered by the plan, and other sites that may be affected beyond this area.**

5.7 **Bassetlaw District Council has adopted a methodology that uses a 15km area of search to identify European sites that may be affected by plans and projects within Bassetlaw, therefore this distance has been applied in this HRA.**

5.8 **Although there are no European Sites within Bassetlaw District, four sites have been identified that lie within 15km of the District boundary:**

- Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC
- Hatfield Moor SAC
- Thorne Moor SAC
- Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA
Of these, part of the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC lies within 15km of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area boundary.

European sites outside the 15km zone may need to be considered in exceptional circumstances and therefore each plan subject to HRA should consider whether there are any pathways by which effects could occur on more distant European sites:

**Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar**

The Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar lies north of Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area and has hydrological connectivity via the River Trent that forms the eastern boundary of the Area. However, the SAC and Ramsar are beyond the 15km buffer in which effects are likely, and the SPA is over 35km north. In addition, the River Trent is a main river with several large settlements along it. Therefore, the Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to result in significant effects upon the Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar and they have not been considered further in this HRA.

**Sherwood Forest indicative prospective potential SPA (ppSPA)**

Although not formally a pSPA, Natural England has advised that there is a possibility of a Sherwood Forest pSPA being designated in the future on account of supporting populations of breeding nightjar and woodlark. In a note to Local Planning Authorities dated March 2014, Natural England advocates a precautionary approach to any plans or projects which could affect such a site. No formal assessments of the boundary of any future SPA have been made; therefore, it is not possible to definitively identify whether individual sites would fall inside or outside any possible future designated area. However, the Natural England note encloses a map which highlights the areas of greatest ornithological interest for breeding nightjar and woodlark. The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area boundary lies within 15km from these areas.

The locations of the European sites are shown on the map on the previous page.

**Ecological attributes of the European sites**

The attributes that contribute to and define the integrity of the two European sites considered in this HRA have been described in Appendix 2. Such attributes were identified using the Conservation Objectives for each site, Standard Data Forms for SACs and SPAs, as well as Natural England’s Site Improvement Plans (SIPs). This information is used to inform the assessment of how the potential impacts of the Neighbourhood Plan may affect the integrity of each site.

**Assessment of ‘likely significant effects’ of the Neighbourhood Plan**

As required under Regulation 105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the ‘Habitats Regulations’), an assessment has been undertaken of the ‘likely significant effects’ of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan. A risk-based approach involving the application of the precautionary principle has been adopted in the assessment, such that a conclusion of ‘no significant effect’ has only been reached where it is considered very unlikely, based on current knowledge and the information available, that a proposal in the Neighbourhood Plan would have a significant effect on the integrity of a European site.
A screening matrix has been prepared (Appendix 3), which considers the potential for likely significant effects resulting from each policy in the Draft Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan. A ‘traffic light’ approach has been used in the screening matrix to record the likely effects of the policies and site allocations on European sites and their qualifying habitats and species, using the colour categories shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>There are likely to be significant effects (Appropriate Assessment required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>There may be significant effects, but this is currently uncertain (Appropriate Assessment required).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>There are unlikely to be significant effects (Appropriate Assessment not required).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation of ‘likely significant effect’**

5.17 Relevant case law helps to interpret when effects should be considered as a likely significant effect, when carrying out HRA of a land use plan.

5.18 In the *Waddenzee* case, the European Court of Justice ruled on the interpretation of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive (translated into Reg. 105 in the Habitats Regulations), including that:

- An effect should be considered ‘likely’, “if it cannot be excluded, on the basis of objective information, that it will have a significant effect on the site” (para 44);
- An effect should be considered ‘significant’, “if it undermines the conservation objectives” (para 48); and
- Where a plan or project has an effect on a site “but is not likely to undermine its conservation objectives, it cannot be considered likely to have a significant effect on the site concerned” (para 47).

5.19 A relevant opinion delivered to the Court of Justice of the European Union commented that:

*The requirement that an effect in question be ‘significant’ exists in order to lay down a de minimis threshold. Plans or projects that have no appreciable effect on the site are thereby excluded. If all plans or projects capable of having any effect whatsoever on the site were to be caught by Article 6(3), activities on or near the site would risk being impossible by reason of legislative overkill.*

5.20 This opinion (the ‘Sweetman’ case) therefore allows for the authorisation of plans and projects whose possible effects, alone or in combination, can be considered ‘trivial’ or de minimis; referring to such cases as those “that have no appreciable effect on the site”. In practice such effects could be screened out as having no likely significant effect; they would be ‘insignificant’.

**Assessment**

5.21 A detailed Screening matrix is presented in Appendix 3, and the findings are described below in relation to each type of potential impact that the Local Plan could give rise to.

**Physical damage/loss of habitat**

5.22 Any development resulting from the Neighbourhood Plan will be located within Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area. Loss of habitat from within the boundaries of a
European site can be ruled out as there are no European sites within the Neighbourhood Area.

5.23 Loss of habitat from outside the boundaries of a European site could still result in likely significant effects if that habitat supports qualifying species from within the European sites, for example habitat that is used for foraging by birds.

5.24 The Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC is 15km away and the possible Sherwood Forest pSPA is over 10km from the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan development allocations and, with intervening infrastructure and settlements, it would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the allocations. Furthermore, the area of land to be lost to development is just over 3 hectares in total.

5.25 Likely significant effects on all European sites can be screened out in relation to physical damage or loss of off-site habitat.

Non-physical disturbance (noise, vibration and light)

5.26 Noise and vibration effects, e.g. during the construction of new housing or employment development, are most likely to disturb bird species and are thus a key consideration with respect to European sites where birds are the qualifying features, although such effects may also impact upon some mammals and fish species. Artificial lighting at night (e.g. from street lamps, flood lighting and security lights) is most likely to affect bat populations and other nocturnal animals, and therefore have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites where bats or nocturnal animals are a qualifying feature.

5.27 It has been assumed that the effects of noise, vibration and light pollution are most likely to cause an adverse effect if development takes place within 500m of a European site with qualifying features sensitive to these disturbances, or known off-site breeding, foraging or roosting areas.

5.28 The European sites lie outside of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area boundary and are all well over 500m from new development allocations, therefore likely significant effects as a result of non-physical disturbance are not expected to occur.

Air pollution

5.29 Air pollution is most likely to affect European sites where plant, soil and water habitats are the qualifying features, but some qualifying animal species may also be affected, either directly or indirectly, by any deterioration in habitat as a result of air pollution. Deposition of pollutants to the ground and vegetation can alter the characteristics of the soil, affecting the pH and nitrogen availability that can then affect plant health, productivity and species composition.

5.30 In terms of vehicle traffic, nitrogen oxides (NOx, i.e. NO and NO2) are considered to be the key pollutants. Subsequent deposition of nitrogen compounds may lead to both soil and freshwater acidification, and eutrophication of soils and water.

5.31 Based on the Highways Agency Design Manual for Road and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (which was produced to provide advice regarding the design, assessment and operation of trunk roads (including motorways)), it is assumed that air pollution from roads is unlikely to be significant beyond 200m from the road itself.

5.32 Based on the DMRB guidance, affected roads which should be assessed are those where:
- Daily traffic flows will change by 1,000 AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) or more; or
- Heavy duty vehicle (HDV) flows will change by 200 AADT or more; or
- Daily average speed will change by 10 km/hr or more; or
- Peak hour speed will change by 20 km/hr or more; or
- Road alignment will change by 5 m or more.

5.33 It has been assumed that only those roads forming part of the primary road network (motorways and primary ‘A’ roads) are likely to experience any significant increases in vehicle traffic as a result of development (i.e. greater than 1,000 AADT). As such, where a site is within 200m of only minor roads, no significant effect from traffic-related air pollution is considered to be the likely outcome.

5.34 All European sites lie outside of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area boundary and are located over 200m from the primary road network. They have therefore been screened out in relation to air pollution.

Impacts of recreation

5.35 Recreational activities can result in likely significant effects on European sites as a result of erosion, trampling and nutrient enrichment of habitats, and disturbance of species resulting in a compromised ability to breed or survive. Where Local Plan policies are likely to result in an increase in the local population, or where an increase in visitor numbers to the European site is considered likely, there may be potential for associated recreational impacts.

5.36 A well-established approach to avoiding recreational pressures has been developed as part of planning decisions which involve the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (TBH SPA). The TBH SPA, located in southern England, is designated for ground nesting heathland birds including nightjar. The TBH Delivery Framework – which is endorsed by Natural England, and which was scrutinised for robustness and appropriateness by the Technical Assessor of the South East Plan – suggests that at distances between 400m and 5 km, residential housing is likely to result in significant effects associated with recreation and other urban edge effects such as cat predation. Beyond this distance, the Assessor recommended that larger developments (above 50 dwellings) between 5 and 7 km from the SPA be assessed and may be required to provide appropriate mitigation.

5.37 Beyond 7km the effect of recreational pressures on a heathland and woodland site are likely to be minimal. And this distance is reduced to 5km for smaller developments of below 50 dwellings.

5.38 The European sites assessed in this screening are over 10km from Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area boundary and therefore do not need further consideration.

Cat predation

5.39 Cat predation due to an increase in residential populations and cat ownership can result in likely significant effects on European sites where ground nesting bird species are the qualifying features. Nightjar are ground nesting species, and therefore these birds and their nests are vulnerable to predation by domestic cats.

5.40 As described above, the increased risk of cat predation associated with residential schemes in relation to the TBH SPA resulted in the adoption of a 400m development exclusion zone, together with pressure associated with recreational access. NE specifies that at distances
of less than 400m avoidance measures are likely to be ineffective at reducing the risks associated with predation.

5.41 The European sites assessed in this screening are over 10km from Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area boundary and therefore do not need further consideration.

Water quantity and quality

5.42 An increase in demand for water abstraction and treatment resulting from the growth proposed in the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan could result in changes in hydrology at European sites, specifically a decrease in water quality or changes to water levels. Depending on the qualifying features and particular vulnerabilities of the European sites, this could lead to likely significant effects on the sites qualifying features.

5.43 All of the European sites included within this HRA are outside the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Area. They are not hydrologically connected to the Neighbourhood Area and can therefore be screened out given the lack of impact pathways.

5.44 Likely significant effects associated with changes in water quality and quantity can be screened out in relation to all European sites included in this HRA.

Identification of other plans and projects which may have ‘in combination’ effects

5.45 Regulation 105 of the Amended Habitats Regulations 2017 requires an Appropriate Assessment where “a land use plan is likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) and is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site”. Therefore, it is necessary to consider whether there may be significant effects from the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan in combination with other plans or projects.

5.46 The first stage in identifying ‘in-combination’ effects involves identifying which other plans and projects in addition to the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan may affect the European sites that were the focus of this assessment. There are a large number of potentially relevant plans and projects which could be considered; therefore, the review focused on planned spatial growth within Bassetlaw District.

5.47 The Habitats Regulations Assessment of the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2019) concluded that the Local Plan does not result in likely significant effects upon Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, Hatfield Moor SAC, Thorne Moor SAC and Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA either alone or in combination. The scale of development planned by the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is in conformity with the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.
6. Conclusions

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

6.1 The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for town and country planning purposes and sets a framework for future development consent. The policies of the Neighbourhood Plan determine the use of small areas at local level commensurate with their status in determining local planning applications.

1.1 The potential for significant effects on the natural and historic environment are not likely to be significant and the application of specific thematic policies could minimise or prevent any possible negative impacts. The content of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is therefore screened out for the requirement for a Strategic Environmental Assessment in line with Directive 2001/42/EC.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

6.2 Subject to Natural England’s review, this HRA Screening report indicates that the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is not predicted to have any likely significant effect on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, and can therefore be screened out from further assessment.

Consultation

6.3 The environmental consultation bodies (Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency) have been consulted during the preparation of this Screening Assessment. Their responses are summarised below:

- Historic England – On the basis of the information supplied and in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations, Historic England is of the view that the preparation of a SEA is not likely to be required.
- Environment Agency – Concurs with the conclusions of the screening report; significant environmental impacts are unlikely.
- Natural England – Agrees that the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan is screened-out and that a full SEA is not required, and that a HRA is not required, as the proposals are unlikely to have any significant effect upon European designated sites either alone or in combination.

6.4 A full copy of the responses received are attached as Appendix 5.

Overall

6.5 Following consideration of the anticipated scope of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, the relevant environmental issues locally, and following consultation with Historic England, the Environment Agency, and Natural England, it is concluded that the potential for significant effects to arise as a result of the Plan is unlikely. Consequently, it is considered that a formal SEA is not required.

6.6 It is also concluded that the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan would not be likely to have significant effects on European sites either alone or in-combination with any other plan or project and, therefore, Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment process) is not required.
Please note this determination is based upon the Draft Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, dated September 2019). The Council reserves the right, pending future iterations of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, to undertake further screening determinations as required.
Appendix 1: Assessment of potential environmental effects

The following table presents the environmental effects which have the potential to arise because of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan. This is accompanied by a commentary on whether these effects are likely to be significant. The environmental effects have been grouped by the SEA ‘topics’ suggested by Annex I(f) of the SEA Directive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Topic</th>
<th>Likely effect? Y/N</th>
<th>Description of effect</th>
<th>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</strong> (Including biodiversity habitats and species, biodiversity sites, areas of geological interest)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Without mitigation and enhancement measures, the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to lead to effects on biodiversity, including through loss of habitat, disturbance, effects on ecological connections and indirect effects such as from impacts on water quality and quantity. Policies 2-7 of the neighbourhood Plan concern the residential development of 7 sites for a total of 29 dwellings. This followed a site assessment process where sites were scored against criterion using a traffic light system, with green indicating no conflicts, amber indicating some or minor issues (that can be overcome) and red indicating direct conflict. There were no sites with formal designations such as Local Wildlife Sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest. No Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) or Special Protection Areas (SPAs) are present within the Neighbourhood Area. The Neighbourhood Plan polices are not predicted to have a likely significant effect on the SAC or SPA, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Therefore, effects are unlikely to be significant in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect? Y/N</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong> (including residents’ quality of life, accessibility to services and facilities, deprivation and similar)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to deliver a range of benefits for the quality of life of residents and for accessibility to services, facilities and opportunities. The 2011 Census recorded 350 households and a population of 1140. Rampton and Woodbeck parish has a lower proportion of people over 65 and fewer children compared to the national average. Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2 – 8 aim to deliver future housing development across a range of sites</td>
<td>Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to deliver significant benefits for residents of Rampton and Woodbeck Parish, these are <strong>not significant</strong> in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect? Y/N</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Health</strong> (Incorporating residents’ health and wellbeing)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to have a range of benefits for residents’ health and wellbeing through promoting healthier lifestyles and supporting accessibility to services and facilities. Policies include those that support the protection of local green spaces (Policy 11) and the protection of community services and facilities (Policy 13).</td>
<td>Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to deliver significant health and wellbeing benefits for residents of Rampton and Woodbeck Parish, these are <strong>not significant</strong> in the context of the SEA Directive. Likely effects from noise quality are also <strong>not significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil</strong> (Including agricultural land, soil erosion, soil quality)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The Neighbourhood Area’s soilscape is characterised by loamy and clayey soils in the west (Mid Notts Farmlands landscape character zone) and loamy and clayey floodplain/ coastal flats with naturally high groundwater towards the River Trent (Trent Washlands landscape character zone).</td>
<td>Due to the relatively limited area of land likely to be developed through the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, effects on the soils resource are <strong>unlikely to be significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect?</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong> (Including water quality and availability)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The Neighbourhood Area is predominantly Agricultural Land Grade 3 with areas of Grade 4 along the banks of the River Trent. Policies 2-7 concern the residential development of 7 sites for a total of 29 dwellings. None of the allocated housing sites involve the loss of Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land but it is uncertain whether they will be sited on land classified as the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land as recent, detailed agricultural land classification has not taken place. Nonetheless, the total area of the proposed housing sites is some 3.1 hectares. Policy 8 seeks to limit development outside of the Rampton and Woodbeck Development Boundaries.</td>
<td>Potential effects on water availability will be limited by the relatively small-scale of proposals likely to be facilitated by the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan. Effects <strong>unlikely to be significant</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air</strong> (Including air quality)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bassetlaw District Council currently has no Air Quality Management Areas.</td>
<td>No existing air quality issues exist and there are no Air Quality Management Areas within the Neighbourhood Area. Any effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect?</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12 encourages the sustainable and sensitive development of businesses in the plan area. Policies 2-7 concern the residential development of 7 sites for a total of 29 dwellings. These policies would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
<td>on air quality are not significant in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic Factors</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In terms of climate change mitigation, the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan actively seeks to locate new housing development within or adjoining the existing settlements, where the majority of the local services and facilities are located. This will help limit potential increases in greenhouse gas emissions from an increase in the built footprint of the Neighbourhood Area. Policies 2-7 concern the residential development of 7 sites for a total of 29 dwellings. None of the allocated housing sites involve the development in Flood Risk Zones 2 or 3.</td>
<td>Due to the small scale, local scope of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, the nature and magnitude of effects directly arising as a result of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan are unlikely to be significant in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Assets</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan may lead to Potential increases in waste as a direct result of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan will be managed through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect?</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including minerals resources, waste considerations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>small increases in the Neighbourhood Area’s waste management requirements through supporting the delivery of new housing. No mineral sites or resources are likely to be affected as a result of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
<td>statutory requirements regarding waste management. Due to their limited magnitude, effects are unlikely to be significant in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage (Including historic environment, cultural heritage, historic settings)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Development undertaken in accordance with the policies of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to have effects on the fabric and setting of historic environment assets. These include designated and non-designated heritage assets. Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9 requires development to demonstrate a high design quality that will contribute to the character of the village. Particular reference is made to the Rampton and Woodbeck Character Assessment 2019. Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12 encourages the sustainable and sensitive development of employment sites in the plan area. Policies 2-7 concern the residential development of 7 sites for a total of</td>
<td>Designated Heritage Assets: there are no World Heritage Sites, Historic Parks and Gardens, or Conservation Areas in the Neighbourhood Area. There is a Scheduled Monuments- the Fleet Plantation moated site (ref 23214) located between Rampton village and the River Trent. There are six buildings and structures in Rampton and Woodbeck Parish listed by Historic England for their special architectural or historic interest. They include the Church of All Saints, and the gateway from Manor Farm to the churchyard, both Grade I listed. Torksey Viaduct over the River Trent is Grade II* listed, whilst the remaining three buildings and structures are designated as Grade II listings. There are also a number of non-designated heritage assets which need to be considered. This includes the grounds of the former Rampton Manor, identified as an Unregistered Park and Garden. No designated heritage sites are affected by the Neighbourhood Plan’s proposals. In the context of the SEA Screening Directive whilst site NP11 (Policy 7) is partly within an area of archaeological interest, Bassetlaw District Council’s Conservation team did not identify this as a constraint upon development when consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect?</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong> (Including landscape and townscape quality)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>29 dwellings. This followed a site assessment process where sites were scored against criterion using a traffic light system, with green indicating no conflicts, amber indicating some or minor issues (that can be overcome) and red indicating direct conflict. Six of the allocated housing sites have no impact upon identified heritage assets. Part of site NP11 (Policy 7) is within an area of potential archaeological interest.</td>
<td>In consideration of the points above, effects are unlikely to be significant in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that all new development would reflect the distinctive character of Rampton and Woodbeck, including local character and distinctiveness. The likelihood of significant effects on the listed buildings present in the parish is also likely to be limited by the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan’s focus on the protection of its historic character and local heritage assets. There is also the statutory protection of designated heritage assets that will run alongside any neighbourhood plan policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of landscape quality, no ‘sensitive areas’ as defined by the NPPG are present in the Neighbourhood Area. Furthermore, the likelihood of significant effects on the integrity of the landscape and townscape are likely to be limited by the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan’s focus on protecting its landscape and heritage assets and the guidance set out in its supporting Character Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The residential site allocations detailed in policies 2 – 7 conform with the landscape character policy zones that they are located within, focusing development within the existing settlements, seeking to preserve existing trees and hedgerows, and respecting the local vernacular, particularly in respect to style and scale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan’s focus on protecting and enhancing the landscape/townscape of the neighbourhood area and protecting key features of importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
<td>Likely effect? Y/N</td>
<td>Description of effect</td>
<td>Effect likely to be significant in the context of SEA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(that can be overcome) and red indicating direct conflict. The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment provides a study of the District in terms of landscape condition and sensitivity, identifying policy zones (based on recommended landscape actions). Policy zones where landscape needs to be conserved are the most sensitive to the potential impacts of new development, whereas areas that are less distinct are least sensitive and may benefit from appropriately designed schemes that could introduce new or enhanced landscape character features. In Rampton and Woodbeck there are two policy zones, each with two sub-typologies: Mid Notts Farmlands policy zones 06 and 08 (Conserve), and policy zone 07 (Create and Restore); and Trent Washlands policy zones 21 and 22 (Conserve and Reinforce), and policy zones 47 and 48 (Conserve).</td>
<td>for the historic environment will deliver positive effects on landscape and townscape quality and facilitate enhancements. Therefore, potential effects on landscape character and townscape quality are <strong>unlikely to be significant</strong> in the context of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

**Description**
Covering an approximate area of 271.84 hectares, Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC is a landscape remnant of the historic Sherwood Forest, which is of World renowned cultural significance due to the high concentration of ancient oak trees and associated folklore. The trees and open woodland-pasture habitat have been utilised over the centuries as a medieval Royal hunting forest, as a source of timber for the construction of cathedrals and English naval fleets, and more recently for public amenity, recreation and tourism. There is high public usage across the SAC supported by a network of Public Rights of Way and permissive paths. Part of the SAC forms part of the Sherwood Forest National Nature Reserve.

The site lies on freely-draining, acidic, sandy soils and is notable for its rich invertebrate fauna, particularly spiders, and for a diverse fungal assemblage, including *Grifoa suphurea* and *Fistulina hepatica*. The oak population consists of approximately equal numbers of the pedunculate oak *Quercus robur* and the sessile oak *Q. petraea* covering a wide range of size and age, including an exceptional population of ancient standing oaks. Although birch (mainly *Betula verrucosa*) forms groves between the oaks the canopy is, over large areas, still rather open allowing a dense bracken field layer to develop. A wide variety of fungi are present. Within the woodland occur glades of acid grassland dominated by the tussock-forming wavy-hair grass *Deschampsia flexuosa* and which contain such characteristic herbs as heath bedstraw *Galium saxatile* and tormentil *Potentilla erecta*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>270.5ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Qualifying Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H9190</th>
<th>Old acidophilous oak woods with <em>Quercus robur</em> on sandy plains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site status* | 96.87% in unfavourable (recovering) condition  
              | 3.13% in unfavourable (no change) condition               |

**Special Area of Conservation objectives**

Ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the Favourable Conservation Status of its Qualifying Features, by maintaining or restoring;

- The extent and distribution of qualifying natural habitats
- The structure and function (including typical species) of qualifying natural habitats, and,
- The supporting processes on which qualifying natural habitats rely.

**Site Improvement Plan: pressures, threats and related development**

The main pressures and threats to this site include public access and disturbance in that the current visitor’s centre complex that is located within the SAC, is preventing the necessary restoration of the full extent of the oak woodland. The visitor centre complex needs to be physically removed and the area restored, but planning permission is proving problematic. Other issues include change in land management which has created a large age gap between the ancient trees, physical modification, impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition, disease and invasive species.

*Site status is an assessment by Natural England of the status of the SSSIs within the SAC*
**Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)**

### Description

As the Sherwood Forest prospective potential SPA (ppSPA) is not currently designated as a European Site, there is no Standard Data form or SIP for it. However, the Sherwood Forest Important Bird Area is being used as a proxy for the purposes of this assessment, and the indicative core areas for breeding for nightjar and woodlark as identified by Natural England, are likely to be the most sensitive areas. The Sherwood Forest IBA covers 7,320 ha and consists of several geographic sites stretching from south of Worksop to north of Nottingham. Once part of the 10,000 acre Royal Forest of Sherwood, the woodland is dominated by native oaks and other native trees such as silver birch, rowan, holly and hawthorn. It has been continuously forested since the end of the Ice Age.

Approximately 424.75ha of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA is also a designated National Nature Reserve (NNR). The reserve contains more than a thousand ancient oaks most of which are known to be more than 500 years old.

Sherwood Forest has the highest concentration of ancient trees in Europe and provides habitat for very rare invertebrates, particularly beetles, flies and spiders, many of which rely on the decaying and ageing timber of the veteran trees. Budby South Forest, in the northern half of the site, is dominated by link heather and supports a diverse range of insects and ground nesting birds such as woodlark, nightjar and tree pipit.

In 2004, it was estimated that there were approximately 63 male European Nightjar (females unknown) within in the IBA and approximately 25 breeding pairs of Woodlark.

### Qualifying Features

The primary reasons for potential designation of this site are that the population of *Caprimulgus europaeus*; European nightjar represents 1.88% of the total UK breeding population and the population of *Lullula arborea*; Woodlark, is 2.51% of the total UK breeding population.

| Site status* | The condition of the site was not assessed in the most recent IBA monitoring assessment. However, the IBA factsheet states that the mixed woodland habitat is in 'very unfavourable' condition, but the conditions of the nightjar and woodlark populations are favourable. |

### Prospective potential Special Protection Area objectives

As this area does not relate to an existing designated site, no conservation objectives have been established for it. However, it is anticipated that, were the site to be designated, any conservation objectives would reflect those for other SPAs, as follows:

- Ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the aims of the Wild Birds Directive, by maintaining or restoring:
  - The extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features
  - The structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features
  - The supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely
  - The population of each of the qualifying features, and,
  - The distribution of the qualifying features within the site.

### Site Improvement Plan: pressures, threats and related development

The main current threats to the site include logging and wood harvesting, climate change, changes in land use for energy production, housing and economic development, tourism and recreation and air pollution. War, civil unrest and military exercises are identified as a past threat, which is unlikely to return.

These threats have been rated low to very high, depending on the proportion of the area and/or population they are likely to affect and the severity of the threat. Recreational activities are identified as being the highest level of threat, followed by logging and wood harvesting and residential and commercial development. The IBA factsheet also identifies 'other threat' as being a high threat, but no details are given.

*Site status is an assessment by Natural England of the status of the SSSIs within the SAC*
Appendix 3: HRA Screening Matrix

The screening matrix below shows which types of impacts on European sites could potentially result from each of the policies and sites allocated in the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan. Where a site is not expected to have a particular type of impact, the relevant cell is shaded green. Where a site could potentially have a certain type of impact, this is shown in orange. The final column sets out the screening conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>European site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1: Growth requirement in Rampton and Woodbeck until 2037</td>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage Air pollution</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2: The allocation of NP01 - Woodbeck</td>
<td>Residential development Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage Air pollution</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Sherwood Forest prospective potential</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>European site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Policy 3: The allocation of NP03 - Woodbeck | Residential development  
Increase in vehicle traffic | Physical loss and damage  
Air pollution | Special Protection Area (ppSPA)  
Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)  
Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA) | Intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution. Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 4: The allocation of NP05 - Woodbeck</th>
<th>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>European site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 5: The allocation of NP07 RESERVE SITE - Rampton</th>
<th>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>European site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>European site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6: The allocation of NP08 - Rampton</td>
<td>Residential development Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage Air pollution</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7: The allocation of NP11 - Rampton</td>
<td>Residential development Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage Air pollution</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>European site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8: Residential development beyond the Requirement</td>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9: Development Principles</td>
<td>None – this policy sets principles for the design of new development, it will not</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>European site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10: Heritage assets in Rampton and Woodbeck</td>
<td>None – this policy sets out principles to protect built heritage from inappropriate development, it will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11: Local green space</td>
<td>None – this policy requires new development to protect Local Green Space, it will not itself result in development or an increase traffic or visitor numbers.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12: Local economy</td>
<td>Employment development Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage Air pollution</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage is not possible as the European sites do not lie within the Neighbourhood Area. The European sites are over 10km away with intervening infrastructure too. It would not be expected for birds to be dependent on the habitat within the Rampton and Woodbeck area. This policy alone would not be expected to cause a significant increase in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Likely activities (operation) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>European site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on European sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 13: The protection of local amenities</td>
<td>Development of community facilities</td>
<td>Physical loss and damage Air pollution</td>
<td>Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Sherwood Forest prospective potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA)</td>
<td>in the area and therefore air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14: The protection of the parish landscape</td>
<td>None – this policy sets out principles to protect the landscape and countryside from inappropriate development, it will not result in new development.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex I Projects, EIA Directive

All projects listed in Annex I are considered as having significant effects on the environment and require an Environmental Impact Assessment. The listed projects are summarised as follows:

1. Crude oil refineries, coal or shale gasification liquefaction installations
2. Thermal power stations, nuclear power stations, other nuclear reactors etc
3. Installations for the processing, reprocessing, final disposal or storage of irradiated nuclear fuel, or the production or enrichment of nuclear fuel
4. Integrated works for the initial smelting of cast-iron and steel, and the production of non-ferrous crude metals from ore
5. Installations for the extraction, processing and transforming of asbestos
6. Integrated chemical installations for the industrial scale manufacture of basic organic and inorganic fertilisers, plant health products and biocides, pharmaceuticals, and explosives
7. Construction of long-distance railway lines. Airports with a basic runway length run of 2,100 metres or more. Construction of motorways and express roads. New roads of four or more lanes and roads which have been improved so as to convert two lanes or fewer to four lanes or more, where such road would be 10 kilometres or more in continuous length
8. Inland waterways and ports for inland-waterway traffic, trading ports and piers
9. Waste disposal installations for the incineration or chemical treatment of hazardous waste
10. Waste disposal installations for the incineration or chemical treatment of non-hazardous waste
11. Groundwater abstraction or artificial groundwater recharge schemes
12. Water transfer schemes between river basins
13. Waste water treatment plants
14. Commercial extraction of petroleum and natural gas
15. Dams and water storage installations
16. Gas, oil or chemical pipelines and pipelines used for the transport of carbon dioxide for geological storage
Annex II Projects, EIA Directive

For the projects listed in Annex II the national authorities have to decide whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is needed. The projects listed in Annex II are in general those not included in Annex I but also other types such as urban development projects and flood-relief works. The listed projects are summarised as follows:

1. Agriculture, silviculture and aquaculture
   a. Projects for the restructuring of rural land holdings;
   b. Projects for the use of uncultivated land or semi-natural areas for intensive agricultural purposes;
   c. Water management projects for agriculture, including irrigation and land drainage projects;
   d. Initial afforestation and deforestation for the purposes of conversion to another type of land use;
   e. Intensive livestock installations (projects not included in Annex I);
   f. Intensive fish farming;
   g. Reclamation of land from the sea.

2. Extractive Industry
   a. Quarries, open-cast mining and peat extraction (projects not included in Annex I);
   b. Underground mining;
   c. Extraction of minerals by marine or fluvial dredging;
   d. Deep drillings, in particular: (i) geothermal drilling; (ii) drilling for the storage of nuclear waste material; (iii) drilling for water supplies; with the exception of drillings for investigating the stability of the soil;
   e. Surface industrial installations for the extraction of coal, petroleum, natural gas and ores, as well as bituminous shale.

3. Energy industry
   a. Industrial installations for the production of electricity, steam and hot water (projects not included in Annex I);
   b. Industrial installations for carrying gas, steam and hot water; transmission of electrical energy by overhead cables (projects not included in Annex I);
   c. Surface storage of natural gas;
   d. Underground storage of combustible gases;
   e. Surface storage of fossil fuels;
   f. Industrial briquetting of coal and lignite;
   g. Installations for the processing and storage of radioactive waste (unless included in Annex I);
   h. Installations for hydroelectric energy production;
   i. Installations for the harnessing of power for energy production (wind farms) and
   j. Installations for the capture of CO2 streams for the purposes of geological storage, pursuant to Directive 2009/31/EC, from installations not covered by Annex I to this Directive.

4. Production and processing of metals
   a. Installations for the production of pig iron or steel (primary or secondary fusion) including continuous casting;
   b. Installations for the processing of ferrous metals: (i) hot-rolling mills; (ii) smitheries with hammers; (iii) application of protective fused metal coats;
   c. Ferrous metal foundries;
d. Installations for the smelting, including the alloyage, of non-ferrous metals, excluding precious metals, including recovered products (refining, foundry casting, etc.);
e. Installations for surface treatment of metals and plastic materials using an electrolytic or chemical process;
f. Manufacture and assembly of motor vehicles and manufacture of motor-vehicle engines;
g. Shipyards;
h. Installations for the construction and repair of aircraft;
i. Manufacture of railway equipment;
j. Swaging by explosives;
k. Installations for the roasting and sintering of metallic ores.

5. Mineral industry
   a. (a) Coke ovens (dry coal distillation);
   b. (b) Installations for the manufacture of cement;
   c. Installations for the production of asbestos and the manufacture of asbestos products (projects not included in Annex I); See under corresponding Annex I project category, Annex I (5) above;
   d. Installations for the manufacture of glass including glass fibre;
   e. Installations for smelting mineral substances including the production of mineral fibres;
   f. Manufacture of ceramic products by burning, in particular roofing tiles, bricks, refractory bricks, tiles, stoneware or porcelain.

6. Chemical industry (Projects not included in Annex I)
   a. Treatment of intermediate products and production of chemicals;
   b. Production of pesticides and pharmaceutical products, paint and varnishes, elastomers and peroxides;
   c. Storage facilities for petroleum, petrochemical and chemical products

7. Food industry
   a. Manufacture of vegetable and animal oils and fats;
   b. Packing and canning of animal and vegetable products;
   c. Manufacture of dairy products;
   d. Brewing and malting;
   e. Confectionery and syrup manufacture;
   f. Installations for the slaughter of animals;
   g. Industrial starch manufacturing installations;
   h. Fish-meal and fish-oil factories;
   i. Sugar factories.

8. Textile, leather, wood and paper industries
   a. Industrial plants for the production of paper and board (projects not included in Annex I);
   b. Plants for the pre-treatment (operations such as washing, bleaching, mercerisation) or dyeing of fibres or textiles;
   c. Plants for the tanning of hides and skins;
   d. Cellulose-processing and production installations. Annex II

9. Rubber Industry Manufacture and treatment of elastomer-based products

10. Infrastructure projects
    a. Industrial estate development projects
    b. Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks.
    c. Construction of railways and intermodal transhipment facilities, and of intermodal terminals (projects not included in Annex I);
d. Construction of airfields (projects not included in Annex I) This project category could be interpreted as including heliports;
e. Construction of roads, harbours, and port installations, including fishing harbours (projects not included in Annex I);
f. Inland waterway construction not included in Annex I, canalisation and flood relief works;
g. Dams and other installations designed to hold water or store it on a long-term basis (projects not included in Annex I);
h. Tramways, elevated and underground railways, suspended lines or similar lines of a particular type, used exclusively or mainly for passenger transport;
i. Oil and gas pipeline installations and pipelines for the transport of CO2 streams for the purposes of geological storage (projects not included in Annex I); Annex II (10)(f) Annex II (10)(h) 53;
j. Installations of long-distance aqueducts;
k. Coastal work to combat erosion and maritime works capable of altering the coast through the construction, for example, of dykes, moles, jetties and other sea defence works, excluding the maintenance and reconstruction of such works;
l. Groundwater abstraction and artificial groundwater recharge schemes not included in Annex I;
m. Works for the transfer of water resources between river basins not included in Annex I.

11. Other projects
   a. Permanent racing and test tracks for motorised vehicles;
   b. Installations for the disposal of waste (projects not included in Annex I);
   c. Wastewater treatment plants (projects not included in Annex I);
   d. Sludge-deposition sites; The treatment and disposal of sludge could be interpreted as being covered by this project category.
   e. Storage of scrap iron, including scrap vehicles;
   f. Test benches for engines, turbines or reactors;
   g. Installations for the manufacture of artificial mineral fibres; (h) Installations for the recovery or destruction of explosive substances; (i) Knackers’ yards.

12. Tourism and leisure
   a. Ski runs, ski lifts and cable cars and associated developments;
   b. Marinas;
   c. Holiday villages and hotel complexes outside urban areas and associated developments;
   d. Permanent campsites and caravan sites;

13.
   a. Any change or extension of projects listed in Annex I or Annex II, already authorised, executed or in the process of being executed, which may have significant adverse effects on the environment;
   b. Projects in Annex I, undertaken exclusively or mainly for the development and testing of new methods or products and not used for more than two years.
Appendix 5: Consultation Responses
Hi Will,

Thank you for sending this through; apologies once again for failing to meet your deadlines.

As far as our remit goes, we’re in agreement with the conclusions of the SEA screening report, i.e. the plan is unlikely to result in significant environment impacts.

I hope this is helpful,

Kind regards,

Rob

---

Rob Millbank
Planning Specialist, Sustainable Places Team
Environment Agency | Trentside Office, Scarrington Road, Nottingham NG2 5FA
rob.millbank@environment-agency.gov.uk
External: 020 3025 5036 | 07500 761448

---

From: Will Wilson [mailto:Will.Wilson@bassetlaw.gov.uk]
Sent: 02 December 2019 14:20
Dear Mr Wilson,
Thank you for your email. On the basis of the submitted information in our view there are no historic environment grounds for requiring SEA.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Fletcher, Principal Advisor and Lead Specialist, Historic Places
Mobile phone: 07771502052

Historic England | The Axis, Birmingham B1 1TF
Dear Will

Thank you for the below consultation.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening**

We welcome the production of this SEA Screening report. Natural England notes and concurs with the screening outcome i.e. that no SEA is required.

Further guidance on deciding whether the proposals are likely to have significant environmental effects and the requirements for consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in the [National Planning Practice Guidance](http://www.gov.uk/natural-england).

**Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening**

Natural England notes the screening process applied to this Neighbourhood plan. We agree with the Council’s conclusion of no likely significant effect upon the named European designated sites:

- Sherwood Forest ppSPA
- Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC
- Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar

For any queries relating to this specific advice please contact me on 0208 026 8695. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Kind regards,

Felicity

---

**Felicity Bingham**

Area Delivery

East Midlands Area Team

Tel: 02082 256387


*We are here to secure a healthy natural environment for people to enjoy, where wildlife is protected and England’s traditional landscapes are safeguarded for future generations.*