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1 Introduction

1.1 Kirklees Council is producing a new Local Plan to set the framework for development in the district over the next 15-20 years. Once adopted, the Local Plan will replace the saved policies from the existing Kirklees Unitary Development Plan.

1.2 In October 2015, LUC carried out a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the emerging Local Plan on behalf of Kirklees Council. That HRA Report was based on the Draft Local Plan (November 2015) which comprises two parts: “Strategy and Policies” and “Allocations and Designations”. Since then, Kirklees Council has refined its policies and site allocations, following a period of consultation. This 2016 HRA is therefore based on the Publication Draft Local Plan (September 2016) “Strategies and Policies” and “Allocations and Designations”, and has been updated in response to comments received on the 2015 HRA.

Background to the preparation of the new Local Plan

1.3 Kirklees Council worked on the preparation of a new Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy between 2005 and 2013. The Core Strategy was intended to set the framework for planning decisions in Kirklees up to 2028, including how much development should take place and broadly where, and setting out policies to ensure that development would take place in a sustainable way.

1.4 Several iterations of the Core Strategy were produced during its development, including a Preferred Options Consultation Report (2006), an Options Consultation Report (2009), a Draft Proposals Consultation (2010) and the Proposed Submission version (2011).

1.5 The Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State in 2012; however in October 2013 the decision was made to withdraw the Core Strategy and move towards the production of a new-style Local Plan. The new Local Plan has a broader scope than the Core Strategy – as well as setting out the overarching development strategy for the district up to 2031, it includes site allocations for different types of development. It also sets out the planning policies that will be used to assess planning applications.

1.6 The Draft Local Plan was made available for consultation between November 2015 and February 2016. Following completion of the consultation period, the Local Plan has been updated and is now available as the Publication Draft Local Plan (September 2016).

1.7 The consultation responses that were received for the Draft Local Plan and which relate to the HRA work are summarised in Appendix 1, along with an explanation of how those comments have been addressed in this updated HRA.

The requirement to undertake Habitats Regulations Assessment of Development Plans

1.8 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\(^1\) and again in 2012\(^2\). Therefore when preparing the new Local Plan, Kirklees Council is required by law to carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment although consultants can undertake the HRA on

---

\(^1\) The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007. HMSO Statutory Instrument 2007 No. 1843. From 1 April 2010, these were consolidated and replaced by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (SI No. 2010/490). Note that no substantive changes to existing policies or procedures have been made in the new version.

The requirement for authorities to comply with the Habitats Regulations when preparing a Local Plan is explained in the online National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

1.9 The HRA refers to the assessment of the potential effects of a development plan on one or more Natura 2000 sites, including Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs):

- SACs are designated under the Habitats Directive and target particular habitats (Annex 1) and/or species (Annex II) identified as being of European importance.

1.10 Potential SPAs (pSPAs), candidate SACs (cSACs), Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) and Ramsar sites should also be included in 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).

1.11 For ease of reference during HRA, these designations can be collectively referred to as European sites, despite Ramsar designations being at the international level. The term ‘European site’ is interchangeable with the term ‘Natura 2000 site’ in the context of HRA. The latter is used throughout this report.

1.12 The overall purpose of the HRA is to conclude whether or not a proposal or policy, or whole development plan, would adversely affect the integrity of the site in question either alone or in combination with other plans. This is judged in terms of the implications of the plan for a site’s ‘qualifying features’ (i.e. those Annex I habitats, Annex II species, and Annex I bird populations for which it has been designated). Significantly, HRA is based on the precautionary principle meaning that where uncertainty or doubt remains, an adverse impact should be assumed.

### Stages of the Habitats Regulations Assessment

1.13 **Table 1.1** below summarises the stages involved in carrying out a full HRA, based on various guidance documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Screening (the 'Significance Test')</td>
<td>Description of the plan. Identification of potential effects on Natura 2000 sites. Assessing the effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking into account potential mitigation provided by other policies in the plan).</td>
<td>Where effects are unlikely, prepare a ‘finding of no significant effect report’. Where effects judged likely, or lack of information to prove otherwise, proceed to Stage 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment (the 'Integrity Test')</td>
<td>Gather information (plan and Natura 2000 sites). Impact prediction. Evaluation of impacts in view of conservation objectives.</td>
<td>Appropriate Assessment report describing the plan, Natura 2000 site baseline conditions, the adverse effects of the plan on the Natura 2000 site, how these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Potential SPAs are sites that have been approved by Government and are currently in the process of being classified as SPAs.
4 Candidate SACs are sites that have been submitted to the European Commission, but not yet formally adopted.
5 SCIs are sites that have been adopted by the European Commission but not yet formally designated as SACs by the Government.
7 The HRA Handbook. David Tyldesley & Associates, a subscription based online guidance document: https://www.dtapublications.co.uk/handbook/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where impacts considered to affect qualifying features, identify</td>
<td>effects will be avoided through, firstly, avoidance, and secondly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternative options. Assess alternative options. If no alternatives</td>
<td>mitigation including the mechanisms and timescale for these mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exist, define and evaluate mitigation measures where necessary.</td>
<td>measures. If effects remain after all alternatives and mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measures have been considered proceed to Stage 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Assessment where no alternatives exist and adverse impacts</td>
<td>Identify and demonstrate 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (IROPI).</td>
<td>This stage should be avoided if at all possible. The test of IROPI and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remain taking into account mitigation</td>
<td>demonstrate no alternatives exist. Identify potential compensatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.14 In assessing the effects of the Kirklees Local Plan in accordance with Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012, there are potentially two tests to be applied by the competent authority: a 'Significance Test', followed if necessary by an Appropriate Assessment which will inform the 'Integrity Test'. The relevant sequence of questions is as follows:

- **Step 1:** Under Reg. 102(1)(b), consider whether the plan is directly connected with or necessary to the management of the sites. If not –

- **Step 2:** Under Reg. 102(1)(a) consider whether the plan is likely to have a significant effect on the site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects (the 'Significance Test'). [These two steps are undertaken as part of Stage 1: Screening shown in Table 1.1 above.] If Yes –

- **Step 3:** Under Reg. 102(1), make an Appropriate Assessment of the implications for the site in view of its current conservation objectives (the 'Integrity Test'). In so doing, it is mandatory under Reg. 102(2) to consult Natural England, and optional under Reg. 102(3) to take the opinion of the general public. [This step is undertaken during Stage 2: Appropriate Assessment shown in Table 1.1 above.]

- **Step 4:** In accordance with Reg.102(4), but subject to Reg.103, give effect to the land use plan only after having ascertained that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of the Natura 2000 site.

1.15 It is normally anticipated that an emphasis on Stages 1 and 2 of this process will, through a series of iterations, help ensure that potential adverse effects are identified and eliminated through the inclusion of mitigation measures designed to avoid, reduce or abate effects. The need to consider alternatives could imply more onerous changes to a plan document. It is generally understood that so called 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest' (IROPI) are likely to be justified only very occasionally and would involve engagement with both the Government and European Commission.

1.16 The HRA should be undertaken by the ‘competent authority’ - in this case Kirklees Council, and LUC has been commissioned to do this on its behalf. The HRA also requires close working with Natural England as the statutory nature conservation body in order to obtain the necessary information and agree the process, outcomes and any mitigation proposals. The Environment Agency, while not a statutory consultee for the HRA, is also in a strong position to provide advice and information throughout the process as it is required to undertake HRA for its existing licences and future licensing of activities.

---

Previous HRA work

Core Strategy HRA

1.17 As described above, the Kirklees Core Strategy reached a late stage in its development before being withdrawn, and the Core Strategy was subject to HRA screening by LUC throughout its development (the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA was not undertaken). The last HRA Screening Report for the Core Strategy was produced in May 2012 in relation to the Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy.

1.18 The Core Strategy HRA concluded the following

As described in the May 2012 HRA Screening Report for the Core Strategy, likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites were not able to be ruled out for a number of proposals in the Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy. This was because the policies in question were considered likely to lead (either directly or indirectly) to development but the precise nature and location of that development was unknown. Some of the 12 policies for which uncertainty was identified could also have led to an increase in visitor numbers at Natura 2000 sites, or to an increase in the volume of vehicle traffic in the area. Therefore, the potential effects identified included physical loss or damage to habitat from development as well as erosion/trampling from increased recreation and non-physical disturbance including air, noise and light pollution.

Although the Core Strategy did not specify the precise nature and location of individual developments, and this would not have been known until either a more specific DPD was prepared or planning applications came forward, most of the potential effects identified through the screening exercise related to the South Pennine Moors SAC and the Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) due to housing, employment and other types of development (e.g. minerals, transport improvements) being proposed in settlements in the south-west of the district. It was also noted that these effects could combine with effects from development proposed in adjacent authorities to the south and west of Kirklees.

However, despite the uncertainty that was flagged up, Appropriate Assessment was not undertaken in relation to the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. This was because the proposals that could potentially lead to significant effects on Natura 2000 sites would either be assessed in more detail during the preparation of lower tier plans or because effects would depend on how the proposals would eventually be implemented, and undertaking Appropriate Assessment in relation to the Core Strategy would not allow for more solid conclusions to be reached. Natural England was consulted on the HRA Screening Report and agreed with the conclusions and the decision not to undertake Appropriate Assessment.

The conclusions of the HRA Screening Report for the Core Strategy are being drawn on throughout the HRA of the Local Plan as appropriate, although the wider scope of the Local Plan (in particular the fact that it will allocate specific sites for development) should mean that it is possible to reach more certain conclusions with regards to the potential for significant effects on Natura 2000 sites.

1.19 This significant body of fairly recent HRA work was drawn upon where relevant to inform the HRA of the Local Plan. However, the HRA of the Local Plan was carried out as a separate process to the earlier HRA of the Core Strategy and any information that was drawn on from the HRA of the Core Strategy was fully reviewed and updated.

Draft Local Plan HRA

1.20 A full HRA was carried out in October 2015 for the emerging Draft Local Plan. The HRA concluded the following:

At this stage in the Kirklees Local Plan preparation, provided that the identified mitigation and recommendations are implemented, adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites around Kirklees from policies and site allocations in the Local Plan will not occur in relation to:

- Physical loss or damage to offsite habitat.
- Noise/vibration and light pollution.
- Recreation.
- Changes to water quality or quantity.
However, until the transport modelling work in relation to the Local Plan which is currently being undertaken on behalf of Kirklees Council is complete, adverse effects on the integrity of South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2), Rochdale Canal SAC and Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC cannot be ruled out. This issue will therefore need to be examined further during later stages of the HRA process for the Local Plan.

The conclusion of no adverse effects on integrity in relation to physical loss or damage to habitat at the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) as a result of development in the vicinity of the SPA depends on the implementation of the following recommendation:

- It is recommended that, for the site allocations and safeguarded land sites that are within 2km of the South Pennine Moors SPA, the potential to affect habitat that is functionally connected to the SPA is added to the relevant site allocations in the Allocations and Designations document (for example in the ‘constraints’ section of the allocation boxes). It should be clearly specified that potential for physical loss or damage to functionally connected land and impacts on the qualifying bird species of the SPA, should be assessed, and avoided or mitigated as required prior to granting permission for the development of these sites.

The conclusion of no adverse effects on integrity in relation to recreation and urban edge pressures at the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phases 1 and 2) depends on the implementation of the following recommendation:

- It is recommended that the Kirklees Local Plan takes a similar approach to the policy safeguards that are being put in place in the Bradford Core Strategy, i.e. a policy specifying zones of influence and the specific requirements for development within those areas in order to protect the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA (and SAC).

1.21 Following consultation on the Draft Local Plan and supporting documents, including the HRA report, a number of comments were received. Those that relate to the HRA work are provided in Appendix 1. The key comments were those from Natural England (the statutory consultee for the Habitats Regulations), who said (in summary):

- Data and mitigation used to screen potential effects on the South Pennine Moors SAC should be site-specific. This has been addressed in Chapter 3.

- The distance at which habitats could be functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SAC should be explained, with evidence. It is also not acceptable to pass on assessment of sites that could have functional connectivity to the planning stage; functional connectivity should be ruled out or confirmed at the HRA stage. This has been addressed in Chapter 3, with further information in Appendix 4.

- Justification for ruling out possible hydrological connection to Denby Grange Colliery SAC should be explained fully. This has been addressed in section Chapter 3.

- Further consideration should be given to possible in-combination effects with policies in Bradford’s Core Strategy. This has been addressed in section Chapter 5.

- Natural England disagrees that Policy DLP39 will provide mitigation as it does not make reference to protecting natural environmental receptors. This has been addressed in Appendix 1.

Structure of this report

1.22 This chapter (Chapter 1) has described the background to the production of the Kirklees Local Plan and the requirement to undertake HRA. The remainder of the report is structured into the following sections:

- **Chapter 2: The Local Plan** summarises the content of the Publication Draft Local Plan (September 2016), which is the subject of this HRA report.

- **Chapter 3: HRA Screening Methodology** sets out the approach taken and the tasks carried out during the screening stage of the HRA.
• **Chapter 4: HRA Screening Assessment of the Publication Draft Local Plan** summarises the findings of the screening stage of the HRA and describes whether significant effects on Natura 2000 sites are likely to result from the implementation of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

• **Chapter 5: Appropriate Assessment** describes the approach taken to the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA and summarises the findings.

• **Chapter 6: Conclusions** summarises the HRA conclusions for the Publication Draft Local Plan and describes the next steps to be undertaken.
2 The Publication Draft Local Plan

2.1 The Publication Draft Local Plan (September 2016) comprises two parts: "Strategy and Policies" and "Allocations and Designations". Together these two documents set the framework for development in Kirklees up to 2031.

2.2 The Strategy and Policies document sets out an overall Vision for Kirklees as follows:

In 2031, Kirklees will be a great place to live, work and invest in, delivered through an integrated approach to housing and employment. Development will have taken place in a sustainable way (balancing economic, social and environmental priorities) and by making efficient and effective use of land and buildings supported by necessary infrastructure and with minimal effect on the environment. Health inequalities will have been reduced, enabling higher standards of health and well-being resulting from improved access to training and job opportunities, a decent and affordable home, access to services and green spaces and opportunities for physical activity and a healthy lifestyle.

The diverse character of the district as a whole and within its different character areas will be retained and enhanced while creating opportunities to build thriving communities which respond to local needs.

Kirklees will be ideally placed to encourage inward investment and stimulate economic growth. This will be achieved through the provision of new prime employment land, sites of strategic importance for employment with a focus on manufacturing and engineering including Cooper Bridge and Chidswell and safeguarded employment land which, as a whole, provide the opportunities to grow businesses, improve economic resilience and increase the district’s ability to compete with other areas, economic benefits of housing delivery and the potential to reduce out-commuting.

There will be a focus on regenerating our towns whilst safeguarding and reinforcing those elements which make them distinctive. Huddersfield Town Centre will be revitalised through an enhanced independent retail, cultural and leisure offer; mixed use development of the Waterfront and St. George’s Quarters and other key sites; and next generation digital connectivity. Dewsbury will be transformed by building on its strategic location, driven by integrated housing and economic development in the town centre and connected to communities. Supporting the rural economy will be encouraged and opportunities facilitated by provision of high speed broadband.

There will be a mix of high quality housing which offers choice and meets the needs of all our communities including affordable housing. The challenges of an ageing population will have been addressed and a range of housing and employment choices available to attract and retain younger age groups within the district to build sustainable communities.

People will have access to a range of local facilities including services, health-care and education provision, and adequate infrastructure. Places will be well-connected encouraging sustainable travel including increased opportunities for walking and cycling and improved links to other parts of the Leeds City Region and beyond.

The local character and distinctiveness of Kirklees and its places will be retained. The natural, built and historic environment will be maintained and enhanced through high quality, inclusive design and safe environments, opportunities for play and sport, the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, minimisation of waste, enhancement of distinctive and contrasting landscapes, tree and woodland protection, opportunities for local food growing, the enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity and the protection and enhancement of heritage assets.

2.3 The Publication Draft Local Plan (Strategy and Policies document) then sets out 10 Strategic Objectives which summarise the measures needed to achieve the overall vision:
1 Support the growth and diversification of the economy, to increase skill levels and employment opportunities including the provision of a high quality communication infrastructure.

2 Strengthen the role of town centres, particularly Huddersfield, Dewsbury and Batley, to support their vitality and viability.

3 Improve transport links within and between Kirklees towns and with neighbouring towns and cities, giving priority to public transport, commercial traffic, and to cycling and walking.

4 Provide new homes which meet the needs of the community offering a range of size, tenure and affordability, with good access to employment, public transport, shops and services.

5 Tackle inequality and give all residents the opportunity of a healthy lifestyle, free from crime and to achieve their potential in work and education.

6 Protect and improve green infrastructure so that residents have access to good quality open spaces, sport and recreation opportunities, and for wildlife to flourish.

7 Promote development that helps to mitigate climate change, and development which is adapted so that the potential impact from climate change is reduced.

8 Protect and enhance the characteristics of the built, natural and historic environment, and local distinctiveness which contribute to the character of Kirklees.

9 Promote the use of brownfield land to meet development needs and support the regeneration of areas.

10 Facilitate the sustainable use and management of minerals and waste.

2.4 Chapters 4-17 of the Publication Draft Local Plan (Strategy and Policies document) then set out draft policies within the following sections:

- Delivering growth and sustainable development
- Place shaping
- Economy
- Homes
- Retailing and Town Centres
- Transport
- Design
- Climate Change
- Natural Environment
- Historic Environment
- Minerals
- Waste
- Health and supporting communities
- Green belt and open spaces

2.5 The final section of the Strategy and Policies document sets out proposals for monitoring the Local Plan.

2.6 The second part of the Local Plan, the Allocations and Designations document, makes site-specific allocations for residential, employment and mixed use development, and for open space, traveller sites, minerals and waste sites. These allocations will provide for the overall quantum of development set out in the Strategy and Policies document. The draft plan also identifies safeguarded land which will potentially accommodate development beyond the end of the plan period.
Potential impacts of the Local Plan on Natura 2000 sites

2.7  **Table 2.1** below sets out the range of potential impacts that development in general and related activities may have on Natura 2000 sites.

### Table 2.1 Potential impacts and activities adversely affecting Natura 2000 sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad categories and examples of potential impacts on Natura 2000 sites</th>
<th>Examples of activities responsible for impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical loss</strong></td>
<td>Development (e.g. housing, employment, infrastructure, tourism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Removal (including offsite effects, e.g. foraging habitat)</td>
<td>Infilling (e.g. of mines, water bodies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mine collapse</td>
<td>Alterations or works to disused quarries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smothering</td>
<td>Structural alterations to buildings (bat roosts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Habitat degradation</td>
<td>Aforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cessation of or inappropriate management for nature conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical damage</strong></td>
<td>Flood defences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sedimentation / silting</td>
<td>Dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevention of natural processes</td>
<td>Mineral extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Habitat degradation</td>
<td>Recreation (e.g. motor cycling, cycling, walking, horse riding, water sports, caving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erosion</td>
<td>Development (e.g. infrastructure, tourism, adjacent housing etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trampling</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fragmentation</td>
<td>Arson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Severance / barrier effect</td>
<td>Cessation of or inappropriate management for nature conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Edge effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-physical disturbance</strong></td>
<td>Development (e.g. housing, industrial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise</td>
<td>Recreation (e.g. dog walking, water sports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vibration</td>
<td>Industrial activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual presence</td>
<td>Mineral extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human presence</td>
<td>Navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Light pollution</td>
<td>Vehicular traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artificial lighting (e.g. street lighting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water table/availability</strong></td>
<td>Water abstraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drying</td>
<td>Drainage interception (e.g. reservoir, dam, infrastructure and other development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flooding / stormwater</td>
<td>Increased discharge (e.g. drainage, runoff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water level and stability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water flow (e.g. reduction in velocity of surface water)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Barrier effect (on migratory species)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broad categories and examples of potential impacts on Natura 2000 sites | Examples of activities responsible for impacts
--- | ---
**Toxic contamination**  
- Water pollution  
- Soil contamination  
- Air pollution | Agrochemical application and runoff  
Navigation  
Oil / chemical spills  
Tipping  
Landfill  
Vehicular traffic  
Industrial waste / emissions

**Non-toxic contamination**  
- Nutrient enrichment (e.g. of soils and water)  
- Algal blooms  
- Changes in salinity  
- Changes in thermal regime  
- Changes in turbidity  
- Air pollution (dust) | Agricultural runoff  
Sewage discharge  
Water abstraction  
Industrial activity  
Flood defences  
Navigation  
Construction

**Biological disturbance**  
- Direct mortality  
- Out-competition by non-native species  
- Selective extraction of species  
- Introduction of disease  
- Rapid population fluctuations  
- Natural succession | Development (e.g. housing areas with domestic and public gardens)  
Predation by domestic pets  
Introduction of non-native species (e.g. from gardens)  
Fishing  
Hunting  
Agriculture  
Changes in management practices (e.g. grazing regimes, access controls, cutting/clearing)
3 HRA Screening Methodology

3.1 HRA Screening of the Publication Draft Local Plan (September 2016) has been undertaken in line with current guidance and seeks to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. The tasks that have been undertaken during the Screening stage of the HRA are described in detail below.

Identification of Natura 2000 sites which may be affected by the Local Plan and the factors contributing to and defining the integrity of these sites

3.2 During the HRA of the now-withdrawn Core Strategy, an initial investigation was undertaken to identify the Natura 2000 sites within or adjacent to the Kirklees district boundary which may be affected by development. This involved the use of GIS data to map the locations and boundaries of Natura 2000 sites using publicly available data from Natural England.

3.3 All Natura 2000 sites lying partially or wholly within 15km from the district boundary were included in the HRA of the Core Strategy, in order to address the fact that development resulting from a plan may affect Natura 2000 sites which are located outside the administrative boundary of the plan. This distance has generally been considered reasonable in other local authority HRAs to ensure that all designated sites that could potentially be affected by development are identified and included in the assessment. For this reason the same buffer distance is being applied during the HRA of the Local Plan, although it is recognised that sites beyond 15km from the Kirklees boundary could be affected by development within the district, for example if the water resources used to supply the district come from a source that lies further afield and which is subject to European designation. Therefore, if information obtained during the HRA indicates that other Natura 2000 sites could be affected they will be included in the assessment.

3.4 Four Natura 2000 sites are located within 15km of the Kirklees District boundary, although only the South Pennine Moors SAC, the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and a tiny part of the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA actually fall within the district (all lie in the south western corner). There are no Ramsar sites present within Kirklees (+15km). The four Natura 2000 sites within 15km of Kirklees are listed below in Table 3.1 and are mapped in Figure 3.1 at the end of this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)</th>
<th>Special Protection Areas (SPAs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors – this site comprises two designations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale Canal</td>
<td>- Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denby Grange Colliery Ponds</td>
<td>- South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where both of these sites are referred to together they are referred to as ‘phases 1 and 2’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 The attributes of these sites which contribute to and define their integrity have been described (see Appendix 2). This information has been based on the Natura 2000 standard data forms on the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) website\(^9\).\(^{10}\). This analysis has enabled Natura 2000 site interest features to be identified, along with the features of each site which determine site integrity and the specific sensitivities of the site. This information allows an analysis of how

---

\(^9\) www.jncc.defra.gov.uk

\(^{10}\) There has been some updates to these since the 2015 HRA of the Draft Local Plan. These changes are explained in Appendix 2.
the potential impacts of the Publication Draft Kirklees Local Plan may affect the integrity of each site.

Assessment of 'likely significant effects' of the Local Plan

3.6 As required under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010\(^\text{11}\) an assessment has been undertaken of the 'likely significant effects' of the Publication Draft Local Plan. A screening matrix was prepared in order to assess which components of the Local Plan would be likely to have a significant effect on Natura 2000 sites. The findings of the screening assessment are summarised in Chapter 4 and the full screening matrix can be found in Appendix 3.

3.7 A risk-based approach involving the application of the precautionary principle was adopted in the assessment, such that a conclusion of 'no significant effect' was only reached where it was considered very unlikely, based on current knowledge and the information available, that a proposal in the Local Plan would have a significant effect on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site.

3.8 A 'traffic light' approach has been used to record the likely impacts of the policies and site allocations on Natura 2000 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>

Screening assumptions and information used in reaching conclusions about likely significant effects

3.9 The screening stage of the HRA has taken the approach of screening each Local Plan policy individually, which is consistent with current guidance. For the site allocations, the very high number of allocations means that they have been screened in groups by type (e.g. residential sites, employment sites etc.). This approach allows the screening matrix to reflect the different effects that certain development types would have, for example employment development is less likely than residential development to increase recreation pressure on nearby Natura 2000 sites.

3.10 For some types of impacts, screening for likely significant effects has been determined on a proximity basis, using GIS data to determine the proximity of potential development locations to the Natura 2000 sites that are the subject of the assessment. However, there are many uncertainties associated with using set distances as there are very few standards available as a guide to how far impacts will travel. Therefore, during the screening stage a number of assumptions have been applied in relation to assessing the likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites that may result from the Local Plan, as explained below. These assumptions draw from the information gathered during the HRA screening of the Core Strategy and Draft Local Plan as appropriate, as well as the conclusions of that work (as summarised in Chapter 1).

Physical loss of habitat

3.11 Any development resulting from the new Local Plan will be located within Kirklees District; therefore loss of habitat from within the boundaries of a Natura 2000 site can be ruled out in relation to those sites that lie entirely outside of Kirklees (i.e. Rochdale Canal SAC and Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC). However, the potential for loss of habitat from within the boundaries of the Natura 2000 sites that lie partially within the district (South Pennine Moors SAC, Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2))

\(^{11}\) SI No. 2010/490
needs to be considered if Local Plan proposals could result in development coming forward in those areas.

3.12 In addition, loss of habitat from outside of the boundaries of a Natura 2000 site could still affect the site if it occurs in an area used for offsite foraging or roosting by the qualifying species of the site (land in an area used for foraging or roosting by SPA birds, for example, would be functionally connected to the Natura 2000 site). Therefore, consideration needs to be given to whether the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees have transient species amongst their qualifying features which could be affected by habitat loss resulting from development on functional land outside of the Natura 2000 site boundary. This consideration is relevant to the Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) as these designations have bird species as their qualifying features.

3.13 Natural England queried the assumptions that had been made regarding sites that could be functionally connected to the SPA sites, in their consultation response to the 2015 HRA. As a result, the assumptions were reviewed and the following was agreed between Kirklees Council and Natural England:

- The screening distance for foraging birds in Kirklees would be considered to be 2.5km, which is appropriate for the species present at the South Pennine Moors SPAs (see Table 3.2) and consistent with the foraging distance used for birds in the South Pennines in the HRA of the Bradford Core Strategy.

- All the site allocations within 2.5km of the SPAs would be reviewed to identify those that could be screened out on the basis of the following criteria:
  - Safeguarded land sites can be screened out because there is no intention to develop the sites within the lifetime of the current Local Plan, therefore the ecological status could alter significantly between the assessment and any application for development;
  - Active minerals extraction sites can be screened out as the nature of the habitats present and level of disturbance is considered to preclude the use of the sites as foraging grounds for the SPA bird species; and
  - Where allocation sites have extant planning permission covering the entire site, and a review of the planning documents shows that the potential for impacts to functionally linked land has been considered and addressed, these sites can be screened out of further assessment.

- Where it was not possible to screen out sites based on desk study, site-specific habitat surveys would be carried out to determine whether the habitats and species present indicate functional connectivity to the SPAs.

3.14 The ecology of the species present at the South Pennine Moors SPAs defines the 2.5km buffer, as set out in Table 3.2.

### Table 3.2 Foraging distance for SPA birds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bird species (designated features)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Usage of non-SPA habitat</th>
<th>Required buffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden plover (Pluvialis apricaria)</td>
<td>Annex 1 species. Citation (2015): qualifying feature of Phase 1 and Phase 2. Conservation objectives (Phase 1, 2014 and Phase 2, 2015): qualifying feature of Phase 1 and Phase 2. JNCC reassessment (2001): qualifying feature.</td>
<td>Extensive usage. Foraging is primarily on grassland habitats outside of the SPA. Various wet grassland habitats are preferred, depending on availability of invertebrate prey. Females forage during the day (6.6-7.4 km from nest) and males forage at night (2.4 to 2.7 km from nest). The moorland edge is avoided for nesting.</td>
<td>2.5km is considered a proportionate distance, and provides a consistent approach with other LPA HRA work undertaken in relation to the South Pennines SPA, local evidence and knowledge, and NE's zones of influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 It was also appropriate to apply these criteria to two existing mill sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bird species (designated features)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Usage of non-SPA habitat</th>
<th>Required buffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merlin (Falco colubarius)</strong></td>
<td>Annex 1 species. Citation (2015): qualifying feature of Phase 1 and Phase 2. Conservation objectives (Phase 1, 2014 and Phase 2, 2015): qualifying feature of Phase 1 and Phase 2. JNCC reassessment (2001): qualifying feature.</td>
<td>Will use land outside of the SPA however, as an aerial predator this species’ distribution is linked to distribution of prey and there is little fidelity for specific sites.</td>
<td>2.5km is considered a reasonable distance for the likely functionally connected land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-eared owl (Asio flammeus)</strong></td>
<td>Annex 1 species. Citation (2015): qualifying feature of Phase 1 and Phase 2. Conservation objectives (Phase 1, 2014 and Phase 2, 2015): qualifying feature of Phase 1. JNCC reassessment (2001): qualifying feature.</td>
<td>Will use land outside of the SPA. This species is a predator of voles primarily. Therefore the distribution is linked to the distribution of habitat suitable for voles. This is likely to be found in areas of lower agricultural intensification, particularly rough pastures.</td>
<td>2.5km is considered a reasonable distance for the likely functionally connected land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breeding bird assemblage</strong></td>
<td>Listed as a qualifying feature on Phase 2 citation (2015) and conservation objectives document (2015). Not listed on JNCC reassessment (2001). Described as non-qualifying interest on old citation (English Nature, 2000). Species listed are: Peregrine, Lapwing, Dunlin, Snipe, Curlew, Redshank, Common Sandpiper, Whinchat, Wheatear, Ring Ouzel and Twite.</td>
<td>Of the bird species comprising the assemblage, the following will make use of land outside of the boundary of the South Pennine Moors SPA Phase 1 and 2.</td>
<td>2.5km is considered a reasonable distance for the likely functionally connected land of the assemblage species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Twite (Carduelis flavirostris) travel between 0.1 and 2.6 km from the nest when feeding, and forage almost exclusively on dandelion and sorrel seeds found in unimproved grassland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Curlew (Numenius arquata) breeds within the SPA, utilises wet grassland and arable fields during migration and prefers wet grassland for foraging during the breeding season. Can fly up to 2 km to forage, however will typically use the closest available suitable foraging site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus) may breed within the SPA but are more typical of the moorland fringe. Adult birds will chaperone newly hatched and unfledged chicks to adjacent land to forage. Therefore, in instances where lapwing are breeding within the SPA, only immediately adjacent habitat is likely to be functionally linked to the SPA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peregrine (Falco peregrinus) hunt over a wide area and where this species is breeding within the SPA it is likely that these individuals will hunt over habitats outside of the SPA. However, as an aerial predator, this species shows low fidelity for individual sites. Other species of the assemblage are restricted to the habitats of the SPA, or are discussed elsewhere in this table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird species (designated features)</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Usage of non-SPA habitat</td>
<td>Required buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlin (<em>Calidris alpina schinzii</em>)</td>
<td>Annex 1 species. Citation (2015): not listed apart from as part of breeding bird assemblage. Conservation objectives (Phase 1, 2014 and Phase 2, 2015): not listed apart from as part of breeding bird assemblage. JNCC reassessment (2001): qualifying feature.</td>
<td>Largely restricted to upland habitats of the SPA for both nesting and foraging during the breeding season.</td>
<td>No buffer required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15 Impacts relating to offsite habitat loss can be screened out in relation to the South Pennine Moors SAC and Rochdale Canal SAC because these sites do not include transient species amongst their qualifying features. Impacts relating to offsite habitat loss can also be screened out in relation to Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC because this site is located approximately 1km outside of Kirklees district (at the nearest point) where any development resulting from the Local Plan would be located, and the qualifying great crested newt is not expected to travel that far.

3.16 Therefore, effects relating to physical loss of habitat onsite need to be considered in relation only to South Pennine Moors SAC, Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2). Loss of habitat offsite needs to be considered only in relation to Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2).

**Non-physical disturbance (noise, vibration and light pollution)**

3.17 Noise and vibration effects, e.g. during the construction of new housing or other development, are most likely to disturb bird species and are therefore a key consideration with respect to Natura 2000 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 some nocturnal bird species, and therefore have an adverse effect on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites where bats or nocturnal birds are a qualifying feature. None of the Natura 2000 sites within and around Kirklees are designated for bats.

3.18 The 2015 HRA assumed that the effects of noise, vibration and light would be most likely to be significant if development takes place within 2km of a Natura 2000 site; however this HRA has been updated based on additional information described above (and in Appendix 4), and uses a 2.5km screening distance as this is the distance at which offsite habitats could be associated with the Natura 2000 sites. This type of impact is only relevant where Natura 2000 sites have qualifying features sensitive to these disturbances.

3.19 As Rochdale Canal SAC and Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC lie well outside of Kirklees District, impacts associated with noise, vibration and light pollution can be screened out in relation to those sites. Similarly, the South Pennine Moors SAC only has habitats amongst its qualifying features which are not vulnerable to these types of impacts. Therefore, the impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution only needed to be considered in relation to South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2).

**Air pollution**

3.20 Air pollution is most likely to affect Natura 2000 sites where plant communities or terrestrial and aquatic 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.

---

13 Government guidance on Great crested newts: Surveys and Mitigation for Development Projects indicates that a buffer distance of 500m is adequate when considering great crested newt travel distances from water bodies: [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/great-crested-newts-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/great-crested-newts-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects)
affecting the pH and nitrogen availability that can then affect plant health, productivity and species composition.

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

3.22 Based on the Highways Agency Design for Road and Bridges (DMRB) Manual Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1\(^\text{14}\) (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. Where increases in traffic volumes are forecast, this 200m buffer needs to be applied to the relevant roads in order to make a judgement about the likely geographical extent of air pollution impacts.

3.23 The DMRB Guidance for the assessment of local air quality in relation to highways developments provides criteria that should be applied at the screening stage of an assessment of a plan or project, to ascertain whether there are likely to be significant impacts associated with routes or corridors. 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.

3.24 An assessment has been undertaken to identify which Natura 2000 sites lie within 200m of the strategic road network. The South Pennine Moors SAC and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) both have a number of strategic roads running through the sites and Rochdale Canal SAC cuts across a number of strategic roads. Therefore, impacts relating to increased air pollution were not able to be screened out in relation to any of the Natura 2000 sites included in the HRA on the basis of their distance from the strategic road network.

3.25 None of the strategic roads close to the SPAs/SACs will be subject to proposals to change traffic speeds or road alignment, therefore AADT has been used as the indicator for significant changes in traffic emissions. Kirklees Council has analysed the effect of planned growth on strategic roads within 200m of Natura 2000 sites and estimated increases in AADT to 2030. This has been done by locating existing Department for Transport (DfT) traffic count sites in the immediate vicinity and applying a growth factor to them. The growth factor has been calculated using the DfT’s National Trip End Model (NTEM) forecasts contained within the TEMPro software. The NTEM data set is created from a series of models developed and run by DfT’s Transport Appraisal and Strategic Modelling division. The forecasts are:

- Population.
- Employment.
- Households by car ownership.
- Trip ends.
- Simple traffic growth factors, based on data from the National Transport Model (NTM).

3.26 The qualifying habitats and species of the South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) and Rochdale Canal SAC are potentially sensitive to air pollution – the Site Improvement Plans for these sites identify the impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition as priority issues for the sites. While the Site Improvement Plan for Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC does not identify increased air pollution as a priority issue, the qualifying species, great crested newt, is potentially vulnerable to increased nitrogen deposition which can result in changes to vegetation and water chemistry. Therefore, the potential for increased air

pollution to impact any of the Natura 2000 sites in Kirklees (+15km) needs to be considered at this stage.

3.27 Where employment and waste management development is proposed, consideration is being given to whether activities on the site could potentially result in effects on Natura 2000 sites as a result of increased air pollution from industry and waste management processes.

Recreation and urban impacts

3.28 Recreation activities and general human presence can have an adverse impact on the integrity of a Natura 2000 site as a result of physical disturbance, e.g. through erosion, arson and trampling as well as disturbance to species including breeding birds. Where policies or site allocations in the Local Plan are likely to result in an increase in the local population, or where an increase in tourism is considered likely, the potential for an increase in visitor numbers and the associated impacts at sensitive Natura 2000 sites has been identified. Consideration has been given to factors such as the characteristics and current use of the Natura 2000 sites and their accessibility from potential development areas. On this basis, recreation and urban impacts were considered to be key considerations with regards to the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA but are less likely to be significant in relation to Denby Grange Colliery Ponds and Rochdale Canal SAC.

3.29 Visitor survey work undertaken by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council, which informed the HRA of the Bradford Core Strategy, resulted in the identification of a ‘zone of influence’ for recreational impacts on the South Pennine Moors SAC and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2). This represents the area from within which most recreational visitors to the SAC and SPA are expected to originate and was found to extend to approximately 10.5km around the SAC and SPA boundaries. ‘Urban edge’ impacts (which include fly tipping, off-road vehicle use, wildfire and increased predation) were considered to be experienced primarily where development takes place within 400m of the Natura 2000 sites (on the basis of work carried out in the south of England in relation to heathland areas). The HRA Report concluded that adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA could not be ruled out due to recreation pressure, loss of functionally linked land used by the breeding bird assemblage and urban edge pressures. Therefore, a policy was developed for inclusion in the submitted Bradford Core Strategy setting out the measures which will avoid and/or mitigate these impacts and reflected the distances identified through survey work: a 400m exclusion zone around the SPA and SAC where only exceptional development will be permitted to mitigate urban edge effects; a 2.5km zone where only exceptional development will be permitted to mitigate urban edge effects; a 7km zone within which important foraging areas outside the SPA will be protected; and a 7km zone within which residential developments contribute to greenspace improvements that deflect visitors away from the SPA (and avoid effects), the implementation of onsite access management measures and a programme of habitat management and monitoring. This approach has been scrutinised during the Examination in Public into the Bradford Core Strategy.

3.30 A 2014 study by Natural England provides additional information that can be drawn upon to inform the assumptions used in the assessment of recreational impacts in this HRA. The study analysed the results of visitor surveys and identified the following:

- 73% of visits to the South Pennines involve travel distances of five miles or less and 82% are less than ten miles; and
- Residents of Kirklees make 13 annual visits to the South Pennines per capita, which contributes 21.8% or 4.3 million visits to the 20 million visits made each year to the South Pennines.

3.31 With reference to the Natural England study and the Bradford Core Strategy HRA, 7km is considered an appropriately conservative screening distance, inside which recreational pressure impacts could require mitigation.

3.32 The nature of development proposed is also being taken into account, for example employment sites are considered less likely to result in increased recreation pressure than residential sites as employees will be at work within the development site for the majority of the time.

---

3.33  Particular consideration is being given to the potential need to take a strategic approach to mitigation of recreation pressure on the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA and offsite areas of functional land, in the form of buffers for development and provision of alternative natural green spaces.

3.34  Therefore, at this stage, recreation-related impacts needed to be considered in relation to all of the Natura 2000 sites within Kirklees (+15km) but are a more significant consideration in relation to South Pennine Moors SAC and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2).

**Water quantity and quality**

3.35  New development has the potential to result in increased demand for water abstraction and treatment. During the HRA of the now-withdrawn Kirklees Core Strategy it was concluded that significant effects on Natura 2000 sites were not expected to result from increased demand for water abstraction because Yorkshire Water’s Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) at that time\(^\text{17}\) indicated that there was available capacity to accommodate the planned growth in the area from the existing sources of supply. It was also noted that Yorkshire Water’s water abstraction licences had been assessed through the Environment Agency’s review of consents work and had remained unchanged following that review. Yorkshire Water’s WRMP has since been updated, and the latest version\(^\text{18}\), which sets out the water company’s plans to plans to maintain a balance between supply and demand for the 25 year period from 2015/16 to 2039/40, indicates that there will be a significant deficit in water supply over the planning period in the Grid Surface Water Zone (SWZ) in which Kirklees District lies. This is attributed in part to the impacts of climate change. The WRMP sets out a number of options for balancing the deficit, and the preferred approach involves a combination of demand reduction (including reducing leakage and processing losses) and ways of increasing supply (including increasing abstraction from certain boreholes). On the basis of that preferred solution, it is concluded that a surplus can be achieved during the 25 year planning period. The preferred solution was subject to HRA and it was concluded that there would be no significant effects on Natura 2000 sites\(^\text{19}\). **Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the new Local Plan will not have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites as a result of increased demand for water consumption.**

3.36  Likely significant effects in relation to water quality were also able to be ruled out during the HRA of the Core Strategy, because Yorkshire Water confirmed\(^\text{20}\) that the existing Meltham and Clayton West waste water treatment works that serve Kirklees are downstream of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) and the South Pennine Moors SAC, and therefore would not affect water quality at these sites as there is no hydrological connection. Although water supplied to the Rochdale Canal in part arises from the Pennines\(^\text{21}\), the Rochdale Canal SAC is to the west of Kirklees District on the other side of the Pennines, and would not be affected by discharges from the waste water treatment works that serve Kirklees. Significant effects of this nature can therefore be screened out in relation to Rochdale Canal SAC.

3.37  Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC is also not hydrologically connected to waterbodies within Kirklees that receive discharges from the waste water treatment works that serve Kirklees. A 2016 study\(^\text{22}\) for Natural England identified that the ponds at Denby Grange Colliery SAC are fed by a combination of shallow groundwater, Stony Cliffe Beck, and surface water flows; Stony Cliffe Beck is not connected to any other surface water bodies upstream of the SAC. While the site overlies a bedrock aquifer with connectivity to the whole of Kirklees District, this is not connected to the ponds and there is no connectivity via the surface aquifer that would mean that development in Kirklees could affect the site.

3.38  It should also be noted that there are established regulatory mechanisms over the treatment of waste water that take into account environmental impacts including likely significant effects on

---

\(^{17}\) At the time, the latest version was: Yorkshire Water (2010) Final Water Resources Management Plan 2010-2035.


\(^{20}\) Emails between Yorkshire Water and Kirklees Council dated 14th April 2011.


Natura 2000 sites, which should provide safeguards to ensure no adverse effects on integrity arise.

3.39 Therefore, issues associated with water quality and quantity were able to be screened out in relation to all Natura 2000 sites in Kirklees (+15km).

Summary of screening assumptions

3.40 Table 3.3 below summarises the types of effects that have been screened in and out of the assessment, based on the screening assumptions described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 Summary of screening assumptions used for the Kirklees Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Pennine Moors SAC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical loss of or damage to habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-physical disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and urban impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation of ‘likely significant effect’

3.41 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.

3.42 In the Waddenzee case23, the European Court of Justice ruled on the interpretation of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive (translated into Reg. 102 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).
- 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).

3.43 Another opinion delivered to the Court of Justice of the European Union24 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.”

---

23 ECJ Case C-127/02 “Waddenzee” Jan 2004.
24 Advocate General’s Opinion to CJEU in Case C-258/11 Sweetman and others v An Bord Pleanala 22nd Nov 2012.
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’.

**Mitigation provided by the Local Plan**

3.45 Some of the potential effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan could be mitigated through the implementation of other policies in the plan itself, such as those relating to the provision of improved sustainable transport links (which could help to mitigate potential increases in air pollution associated with increased vehicle traffic) and the provision of green infrastructure within new developments (which could help mitigate increased pressure from recreation activities at Natura 2000 sites). During the HRA of the Core Strategy, most of the mitigation referred to was set out in other Core Strategy policies covering topics such as those listed above. It was also noted that the use of good practice construction techniques may help to mitigate potential noise and light pollution effects associated with new development. The extent to which mitigation may be achieved through the Draft and now Publication Draft Local Plan has been considered during the screening process and has influenced the screening conclusions (see Appendix 3 and Chapter 4).

3.46 In addition to mitigation provided by the Local Plan, it has been assumed that national legislation and guidance for the protection of Natura 2000 sites will be adhered to.

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

3.47 Regulation 102 of the Amended Habitats Regulations 2010 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, where likely significant effects are identified from the new Kirklees Local Plan, it is necessary to consider whether there may also be significant effects in combination with other plans or projects. This exercise has been carried out as part of the screening stage of the HRA.

3.48 The first stage in identifying ‘in-combination’ effects involves identifying which other plans and projects in addition to the new Kirklees Local Plan may affect the Natura 2000 sites that will be the focus of this assessment. This exercise was previously carried out as part of the HRA of the now-withdrawn Core Strategy and in the 2015 HRA of the Draft Local Plan; the list of relevant plans has been reviewed and updated in order to identify those components of nearby plans that could have an impact on the Natura 2000 sites within the Kirklees boundary (+15km), e.g. areas or towns where additional housing or employment development is proposed near to the Natura 2000 sites (as there could be effects from the transport, water use, infrastructure and recreation pressures associated with the new developments).

3.49 There are a large number of potentially relevant plans; therefore the review has focussed on planned spatial growth within authorities adjacent to Kirklees as well as other authorities that are adjacent to the Natura 2000 sites included in this HRA. The findings of any associated HRA work for those plans have been reviewed where available.

3.50 Appendix 5 presents the updated review of other plans, outlining the components of each plan that could have an impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites and considering the findings of the accompanying HRA work (where available). This information is also summarised in Chapter 4 and will be updated as appropriate as the HRA of the Local Plan progresses. The following authorities’ plans and HRA work has been included:

---

25 For example: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-sites-and-areas-how-to-review-planning-applications
Shared boundary with Kirklees District:
- Bradford Metropolitan District
- Leeds City
- Wakefield District (includes Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC within its boundary)
- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough
- Calderdale District
- Rochdale District (includes part of Rochdale Canal SAC within its boundary)
- Oldham District (includes part of Rochdale Canal SAC within its boundary)
- High Peak District
- Peak District National Park

Shared boundary with South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA and/or Rochdale Canal SAC:
- Tameside District (HRA Report considered in-combination effects with Oldham District)
- Sheffield District
- Craven District
- Pendle District
- Burnley District
Figure 3.1: Natura 2000 sites within Kirklees District (+15km)
4 HRA Screening Assessment of the Publication Draft Local Plan

4.1 As described in Chapter 3, a screening assessment has been carried out in order to identify the likely significant effects of the Publication Draft Kirklees Local Plan on the Natura 2000 sites in and around the district. The full screening matrix used for this assessment can be found in Appendix 3 and the findings are summarised below.

4.2 This HRA report has taken the approach of screening each policy and group of site allocations individually, which is consistent with current guidance. In reality, however, the Publication Draft Local Plan policies will combine to deliver the overall scale of development within the district and the in-combination effects of the policies together have therefore been taken into consideration where relevant.

Significant effects likely

4.3 None of the policies or site allocations in the Publication Draft Local Plan are considered likely to result in significant effects on the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees District.

Significant effects unlikely

4.4 Significant effects are considered unlikely in relation to most of the Publication Draft Local Plan policies. The following 34 policies are screened out because they will not result directly in development (i.e. they set out criteria for development that will be determined under other more specific policies, which have been screened separately for their impacts on Natura 2000 sites):

- PLP1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- PLP2: Place shaping
- PLP3: Location of new development
- PLP5: Masterplanning large sites
- PLP7: Efficient and effective use of land and buildings
- PLP8: Safeguarding employment land and premises
- PLP9: Supporting skilled and flexible communities and workforce
- PLP11: Housing mix and affordable housing
- PLP13: Town centre uses
- PLP14: Shopping frontages
- PLP16: Food and drink uses and the evening economy
- PLP22: Parking
- PLP23: Core walking and cycling network
- PLP24: Design
- PLP25: Advertisements and shop fronts
- PLP27: Flood risk
- PLP28: Drainage
• PLP29: Management of water bodies
• PLP32: Landscape
• PLP33: Trees
• PLP34 Conserving and enhancing the water environment
• PLP35: Historic environment
• PLP37: Site restoration and aftercare
• PLP38: Minerals safeguarding
• PLP39: Protecting existing and planned minerals infrastructure
• PLP43: Waste management hierarchy
• PLP45: Safeguarding waste management facilities
• PLP51: Protection and improvement of local air quality
• PLP52: Protection and improvement of environmental quality
• PLP53: Contaminated and unstable land
• PLP58: Garden extensions
• PLP59: Infilling and redevelopment of brownfield sites
• PLP60: The re-use and conversion of buildings
• PLP61: Urban green space
• PLP62: Local green space

4.5 PLP6: Safeguarded land (Land to be safeguarded for potential future development) has also been screened out on the basis that it will not result in development within the plan period.

4.6 Another three policies are unlikely to have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites because they could help to mitigate the potential effects of development proposed elsewhere in the Publication Draft Local Plan as follows:

• PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars, which could provide mitigation for the air pollution impacts of development in Kirklees;
• PLP30: Biodiversity and geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive; and
• PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network. This policy seeks to protect and enhance existing green infrastructure and to provide for the delivery of new green infrastructure. This could help to mitigate the potential impacts of development in terms of increased recreation pressure at Natura 2000 sites. However, it is uncertain how effective this will be at mitigating increased recreational use of Natura 2000 sites, as it will depend on factors such as the comparable nature and quality of the greenspace to be protected under this policy.

4.7 In addition, the 503 allocations that the Publication Draft Local Plan makes for local and urban green space (referred to collectively as open space allocations in the screening matrix) in the Allocations and Designations document have also been screened out from having likely significant effects as they will not result in development. The potential for these allocations to provide mitigation for the effects associated with pressure for recreation space from other Publication Draft Local Plan policies on Natura 2000 sites has been considered separately below.

4.8 A number of other policies in the Publication Draft Local Plan could result in development in any part of Kirklees which could therefore potentially be located within close proximity of the Natura 2000 sites within Kirklees and/or could result in an increase in traffic generation or demand for recreation pressure. However, there is no detail available at this stage about the location of the development that could result from these policies (or in several cases the nature of the
The areas of Kirklees in which development would need to be located to affect Natura 2000 sites through physical loss of habitat or direct disturbance are very small, and are located away from the main urban areas in the north of the District where the spatial strategy directs the majority of development. In addition, policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity is considered to provide robust mitigation about the potential for effects on Natura 2000 sites, as described above. The policies that have been screened out as unlikely to have significant effects on this basis are:

- PLP4: Providing infrastructure
- PLP15: Residential use in town centres policy
- PLP17: Huddersfield town centre
- PLP18: Dewsbury town centre
- PLP19: Strategic transport infrastructure
- PLP21: Highways safety and access
- PLP26: Renewable and low carbon energy
- PLP40: Alternative development on protected minerals infrastructure sites
- PLP41: Proposals for exploration and appraisal of hydrocarbons
- PLP42: Proposals for production of hydrocarbons
- PLP44: New waste management facilities
- PLP46: Waste disposal
- PLP47: Healthy, active and safe lifestyles
- PLP48: Community facilities and services
- PLP49: Educational and health care needs
- PLP50: Sport and physical activity
- PLP54: Buildings for agriculture and forestry
- PLP55: Agricultural and forestry workers' dwellings
- PLP56: Facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and cemeteries
- PLP57: The extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings
- PLP63: New open space

4.9 The site allocations that are made in the Allocations and Designations document for Traveller sites and waste management are also screened out, as described in Appendix 3. The two Traveller site and one waste site allocations are all located in the north of the District, away from Natura 2000 sites and are not considered likely to result in a significant amount of traffic generation or increased demand for recreation space and are therefore unlikely to have a significant effect on Natura 2000 sites. The potential for these allocations to contribute to cumulative effects on Natura 2000 sites from the overall scale of growth proposed in the Local Plan is considered separately further ahead in this report.

**Significant effects uncertain**

4.10 For a number of the Publication Draft Local Plan proposals it was concluded that there may be a significant effect on one or more Natura 2000 sites, although this is uncertain. Therefore, in line with the precautionary approach being applied in the HRA, until significant effects can be ruled out they are identified as likely significant effects.

4.11 The following proposals would all result in development which could combine to increase air pollution from vehicle traffic and/or pressure for recreation space. In addition, depending on the location of development resulting from the proposals there is a chance that physical damage/loss
of habitat or non-physical disturbance could affect the South Pennine Moors SAC or SPA (Phases 1 and 2).

4.12 The following proposals were therefore highlighted as having potential in-combination but uncertain significant effects on Natura 2000 sites:

- PLP10: Supporting the rural economy
- PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers
- PLP36: Proposals for mineral extraction

4.13 In addition, the proposals for the overall quantum of development in Kirklees were also not able to be screened out for the same reasons (these proposals are set out in the supporting text of the Publication Draft Local Plan rather than in draft policies):

- Provision of 23,000 jobs
- Development of 31,140 homes

4.14 The specific site allocations for residential development (208 sites), employment development (14 sites), mixed use development (13 sites) and minerals site allocations (35 sites) were also not able to be screened out, as all have potential in-combination air pollution impacts. However, it was possible to screen out some types of site and specific sites, in relation to other impacts. The locations of the allocated sites are shown in Maps 4.1-4.6 at the end of this section.

### Physical loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance

4.15 While none of the residential, employment, mixed use or minerals site allocations are within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites and so physical loss of habitat from within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites is not likely, seven of the residential site allocations, one employment site and one minerals site are within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) and could support habitat that could be used by qualifying bird species from the SPAs. Development of these sites could therefore result in offsite habitat loss or damage or non-physical disturbance such as noise, vibration and light pollution, which could have a significant effect on the SPAs.

4.16 The screening of allocated sites for potential offsite habitat loss / non-physical disturbance on the South Pennine Moors SPAs undertaken by the Kirklees Council Ecologist considered all allocated sites within 2.5km of the SPA boundaries. It was possible to screen the majority out of further assessment, as shown in Table 4.1.

#### Table 4.1 Initial screening of allocated sites within 2.5km of South Pennine Moors SPA boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Screening outcome</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1866 Provisional Open Land at Meltham</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Predominantly Brownfield site. Cannot be screened out on the basis of previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H200 Existing Housing Allocation at Meltham</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Greenfield site. Planning Application 2015/93847 pending on the site. Cannot be screened out on the basis of previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2585 Unallocated land at Holmbridge</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Previous survey evidence - Previous planning permission 2010/91518 for conversion of Mill now expired – brownfield site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2649 Existing business and industry Allocation at Marsden</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Previous survey evidence – Part previously developed site, with planning permission 2011/9156 and within the centre of Marsden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H288a Provisional Open Land site at Hade Edge</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Greenfield site. Pending planning application. Cannot be screened out on the basis of previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H342 Provisional Open Land on west side of Meltham</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Greenfield site. Cannot be screened out on the basis of previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H343 Provisional Open Land</td>
<td>Screen in: site-</td>
<td>Greenfield site. Cannot be screened out on the basis of previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Screening outcome</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on east side of Meltham</td>
<td>specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H356 Provisional Open Land at Slaithwaite</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Greenfield site with some survey evidence – Majority of the site has Planning Permission 2014/93946. However, part of the site has not been surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H626 Provisional Open Land at Holmbridge</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Greenfield site. Cannot be screened out on the basis of previous surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H67 Provisional Open Land at Meltham</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Greenfield site with some survey evidence – planning permission 2014/90722 &amp; 2014/93959 under construction. However, part of the site has not been surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H784 Provisional Open Land at Mill Moor Road Meltham</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Previous survey evidence: outline planning permission – 2014/91342 and full application pending 2015/93861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H785 UDP housing allocation at Colders Lane, Meltham</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Previous survey evidence - Planning permission 2012/90096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME1966 Minerals extraction site</td>
<td>Screen in: site-specific habitat survey needed</td>
<td>Site abuts existing minerals extraction site it is therefore not considered likely that SPA birds will use the site due to disturbance caused by site activities, however additional work to confirm suitability of land to be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2245 Minerals extraction site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active minerals extraction site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2246 Minerals extraction site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active minerals extraction site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2252 Minerals extraction site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active minerals extraction site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2254 Minerals extraction site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active minerals extraction site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2255 Minerals extraction site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active minerals extraction site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX1919 Mixed use site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active mill: no suitable habitat and high levels of disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX1920 Mixed use site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Active mill: no suitable habitat and high levels of disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2166 Safeguarded land site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Site will not be developed within the plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2167 Safeguarded land site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Site will not be developed within the plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2170a Safeguarded land site</td>
<td>Screen out</td>
<td>Site will not be developed within the plan period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air pollution**

4.17 The scale of development resulting from the site allocations in combination would also contribute to increased vehicle traffic and the associated air pollution, as well as pressure for recreation space. The impacts of air pollution could potentially affect any of the Natura 2000 sites within 15km of Kirklees but are concluded more likely to have significant effects on the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phases 1 and 2) due to their closer proximity to the development proposed.

4.18 Data provided by Kirklees Council shown in Table 4.2 has allowed the potential sources of air pollution for each site to be narrowed down; Rochdale Canal SAC and the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPAs could be affected by air pollution from the M62 and therefore remain screened in at this stage. Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC can be screened out at this stage due to the increase in traffic on the A637 being under 1,000 AADT.
### Table 4.2 Strategic roads within 200m of Natura 2000 and the effect of Local Plan proposals on them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natura 2000 site</th>
<th>Strategic road within 200m</th>
<th>Forecast increase in AADT 2030</th>
<th>Potential effect on Natura 2000 site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC</td>
<td>A637</td>
<td>967 (27 HGV)</td>
<td>Increase in AADT not significant: screen out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale Canal SAC</td>
<td>M62 (J19-20)</td>
<td>11,202 (1707 HGV)</td>
<td>Potentially significant increases in vehicle flows: screen in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A664</td>
<td>697 (17 HGV)</td>
<td>Increase in AADT not significant: screen out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A627(M)</td>
<td>321 (32 HGV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A671</td>
<td>372 (6 HGV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A640</td>
<td>447 (16 HGV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC</td>
<td>A6024</td>
<td>451 (8 HGV)</td>
<td>Increase in AADT not significant: screen out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A635</td>
<td>311 (6 HGV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A62</td>
<td>531 (11 HGV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A640</td>
<td>336 (9 HGV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M62 (J23-22)</td>
<td>11,927 (1,978 HGV)</td>
<td>Potentially significant increases in vehicle flows: screen in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recreation impacts

4.19 Recreation-related impacts are also more likely to have significant effects on the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phases 1 and 2), but are considered to occur from any allocated residential or mixed use site within 7km of the Natura 2000 site.

4.20 Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC is located approximately 1km to the east of the Kirklees District boundary; therefore is relatively accessible for people travelling from the north of Kirklees where most development is proposed. However, the site is not known to be widely used for recreation activities and Natural England’s Site Improvement Plan does not identify recreation-related issues or disturbance as a priority issue for the site. Therefore, particularly in light of the mitigation provided through the open space allocations and green infrastructure provisions in the Local Plan, recreational pressure impacts on Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC can be screened out.

4.21 Rochdale Canal SAC is located over 7km to the west of the Kirklees District boundary at the closest point; therefore it is not considered to be a particularly convenient and accessible location for day to day recreation activities, particularly for people living in the north of Kirklees where the Local Plan directs the majority of new development. The SAC is designated for the presence of floating water-plantain within the watercourse; therefore the integrity of the site could be affected by boating activities but other types of recreation activities are not likely to impact upon the designation. The impacts of population growth within Kirklees on levels of boating activity on the canal are likely to be minimal and the Site Improvement Plan for the SAC does not include recreation-related issues or disturbance as a priority issue for the site. Therefore, recreational pressure impacts on Rochdale Canal SAC can be screened out.
Recreation-related impacts are therefore only a risk to the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPAs. 67 of the allocated residential sites and six of the mixed use sites lie within 7km of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phases 1 and 2).

Summary of uncertain significant effects

Table 4.3 summarises the types of impact and Natura 2000 sites affected for the policies, strategies and site allocations identified as having uncertain significant effects. Where impacts have been screened in, they are indicated with a ‘✓’ or the number of site allocations affected. Those screened out are indicated with an ‘x’. Those policies, strategies and site allocations that have been screened in have been considered further at the Appropriate Assessment stage to determine whether they would be likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the whole Natura 2000 site in question (see Chapter 5).

Table 4.3 Policies, strategies and site allocations with uncertain significant effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential impact:</th>
<th>Air pollution</th>
<th>Onsite habitat loss</th>
<th>Non-physical disturbance / offsite habitat loss</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Natura 2000 sites:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA and Rochdale Canal SAC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA – if development is within site</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors SPAs only – if development is within 2.5km on land with potential for functionally-connected habitat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA – if development is within 7km</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies

PLP10: Supporting the rural economy

PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers (excluding allocated sites)

PLP36: Proposals for mineral extraction (excluding allocated sites)

Strategies

23,000 jobs (excluding allocated sites)

31,140 homes (excluding allocated sites)

Site allocations

Residential

Employment

Mixed use

Minerals

Seven sites

One site

One site

62 sites

x

x

x

x

x

x

x
4.24 The site allocations with the potential to affect the South Pennine Moors SPA in relation to non-physical disturbance or offsite habitat loss were then subject to an additional screening exercise. The Kirklees Council Ecologist surveyed each of the allocated sites within 2.5km of the SPA boundaries (that had not been previously screened out on the basis of site type or previous survey data) to determine whether the habitats present at those sites are suitable for use by the SPA's qualifying bird species. The findings of the habitat surveys are provided in full in Appendix 4 and summarised in Table 4.3.

Table 4.4 Habitat survey findings allocated sites within 2.5km of SPA that were not previously screened out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocated site</th>
<th>Habitats present</th>
<th>Suitability for use by SPA bird species</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minerals site ME1966</td>
<td>Amenity grassland, improved grassland, heathland, buildings.</td>
<td>Unlikely to be connected in relation to golden plover, but possible due to location and topography of site and surrounding land. Highly unlikely to be functionally connected to SPA in relation to short-eared owl, dunlin, twite, curlew or lapwing.</td>
<td>Uncertain effects on South Pennine Moors SPA. Appropriate Assessment required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H288A</td>
<td>Improved grassland.</td>
<td>Could be used by golden plover for foraging. Land used occasionally by hunting merlin is not considered to be functionally linked to the SPA. Highly unlikely to be functionally connected to SPA in relation to short-eared owl, dunlin, twite, curlew or lapwing.</td>
<td>Uncertain effects on South Pennine Moors SPA. Appropriate Assessment required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H342</td>
<td>Semi-improved neutral grassland, improved grassland.</td>
<td>Unlikely to be functionally connected in relation to short-eared owl, due to limited extent of potentially suitable foraging habitat. Highly unlikely to be functionally connected to SPA in relation to golden plover, merlin, dunlin, twite, curlew or lapwing.</td>
<td>No likely significant effects on South Pennine Moors SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H356</td>
<td>Improved grassland, semi-improved neutral grassland.</td>
<td>Unlikely to be functionally connected in relation to golden plover due to sloping topography and disturbance levels. Land used occasionally by hunting merlin is not considered to be functionally linked to the SPA. Highly unlikely to be functionally connected to SPA in relation to short-eared owl, dunlin, twite, curlew or lapwing.</td>
<td>No likely significant effects on South Pennine Moors SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H67</td>
<td>Active construction site, improved grassland, and possibly cattle-grazed permanent pasture.</td>
<td>Highly unlikely to be functionally connected to SPA in relation to golden plover, merlin, short-eared owl, dunlin, twite, curlew or lapwing.</td>
<td>No likely significant effects on South Pennine Moors SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H200</td>
<td>Species poor semi-improved neutral grassland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H343</td>
<td>Improved grassland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site H626</td>
<td>Improved grassland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment site E1866</td>
<td>Standing water, buildings &amp; hardstanding, semi-improved neutral grassland, and improved grassland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5  Appropriate Assessment

Appropriate Assessment approach

5.1 Following the screening stage, if likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites are unable to be ruled out, the plan-making authority is required under Regulation 102 of the Habitats Regulations 2010 to make an 'Appropriate Assessment' of the implications of the plan for Natura 2000 sites, in view of their conservation objectives. EC Guidance\(^\text{26}\) states that the Appropriate Assessment should consider the impacts of the plan (either alone or in combination with other projects or plans) on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites with respect to their conservation objectives and to their structure and function.

5.2 A site’s integrity depends on it being able to sustain its ‘qualifying features’ (i.e. those Annex 1 habitats, Annex II species, and Annex 1 bird populations for which it has been designated) and to ensure their continued viability. A high degree of integrity is considered to exist where the potential to meet a site’s conservation objectives is realised and where the site is capable of self-repair and renewal with a minimum of external management support.

5.3 An Appropriate Assessment has therefore been undertaken for all of the Natura 2000 sites in Kirklees District (+15km) where likely significant effects from the Publication Draft Local Plan were identified (or were not able to be ruled out) during the screening stage, i.e. in relation to the potential for effects from:

- Development of 31,140 homes
- Provision of 23,000 jobs
- PLP10: Supporting the rural economy
- PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers
- PLP36: Proposals for mineral extraction
- Site allocations for residential development (209 sites), employment development (14 sites), mixed use development (13 sites) and minerals site allocations (35 sites).

5.4 Of the allocated sites, five residential, one employment and one minerals site are within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) and could support habitat which could be functionally connected to the SPAs. These could therefore result in offsite habitat loss or damage or non-physical disturbance such as noise, vibration and light pollution, which could have a significant effect on the SPA.

5.5 67 of the residential sites and six mixed use sites are within 7km of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phases 1 and 2) and could therefore contribute to recreational pressure.

5.6 As described in Chapter 1, a conclusion needs to be reached as to whether or not a policy or site allocation in the Local Plan would adversely affect the integrity of a Natura 2000 site. As stated in the EC Guidance, assessing the effects on the site(s) integrity involves considering whether the predicted impacts of the Local Plan policies (either alone or in combination) have the potential to:

- Cause delays to the achievement of conservation objectives for the site.
- Interrupt progress towards the achievement of conservation objectives for the site.
- Disrupt those factors that help to maintain the favourable conditions of the site.
- Interfere with the balance, distribution and density of key species that are the indicators of the favourable condition of the site.

\(^{26}\) Assessment of plans and projects significantly affecting European sites. Methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC. European Commission Environment DG, November 2001.
• Cause changes to the vital defining aspects (e.g. nutrient balance) that determine how the site functions as a habitat or ecosystem.
• Change the dynamics of relationships that define the structure or function of the site (e.g. relationships between soil and water, or animals and plants).
• Interfere with anticipated natural changes to the site.
• Reduce the extent of key habitats or the population of key species.
• Reduce the diversity of the site.
• Result in disturbance that could affect the population, density or balance between key species.
• Result in fragmentation.
• Result in the loss of key features.

5.7 The conservation objectives for each Natura 2000 site (listed in Appendix 2) are generally to maintain the qualifying features in favourable condition. The Site Improvement Plans for each Natura 2000 site provide a high level overview of the issues (both current and predicted) affecting the condition of the Natura 2000 features on the site(s) and outline the priority measures required to improve the condition of the features. These have been drawn on to help to understand what is needed to maintain the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites.

5.8 For each Natura 2000 site where an uncertain likely significant effect was identified at the screening stage in relation to a policy or group of site allocations in the Local Plan (i.e. those listed in Table 4.2 and shaded orange in the screening matrix in Appendix 3), the potential impacts have been set out below and judgements made (based on the information available) regarding whether the impact will have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site. Consideration has been given to the potential for mitigation measures to be implemented that could reduce the likelihood or severity of the potential impacts such that there would not be an adverse effect on the integrity of the site.

South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2)

5.9 As concluded in Chapter 4, Local Plan proposals have the potential to significantly affect the SPA in relation to physical damage/loss of habitat (both onsite and offsite), non-physical disturbance, increased air pollution and recreation and urban impacts. The policies and proposals in the Publication Local Plan that could result in these impacts are PLP10: Supporting the rural economy, PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers, PLP36: Proposals for mineral extraction and the proposals for the overall quantum of development in Kirklees (provision of 23,000 jobs and development of 31,140 homes). Impacts on water quality and quantity were able to be screened out.

Physical damage/loss of habitat

5.10 The SPA extends within the boundaries of Kirklees District and the Site Improvement Plan for the South Pennine Moors identifies ‘planning permission: general’ as a priority issue for the site, and something that could potentially affect the qualifying bird species of the SPA.

5.11 While the Local Plan does not allocate any development within the boundaries of the SPA, four policies (PLP10: Supporting the rural economy, PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers and PLP36: Proposals for mineral extraction) could potentially result in development anywhere in the District. However, the safeguards provided by policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity mean that it is highly unlikely that development of these types would take place resulting in damage to or loss of habitat from within the boundaries of the SPA.

5.12 However, as described in Chapter 3, consideration also needs to be given to the potential for development to impact upon offsite, functionally connected habitat areas used by the qualifying bird species of the SPA, which are known to travel up to 2.5km from the SPA boundaries for foraging and roosting. Species that are particularly likely to travel outside of the SPA boundaries for foraging and roosting are the golden plover, short eared owls, and merlin (Appendix 4).

5.13 For most of the allocated sites, due to the nature of the sites and the habitats they contain, there is no current functional connectivity with the South Pennine Moors SPAs and therefore significant effects in relation to loss of or damage to offsite habitats can be ruled out. However, for two of the sites, there is the possibility that the sites could be used by bird species from the SPA. H288A
and ME1966 both have the potential to be functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

5.14 To confirm that golden plover are or are not using either of the sites would require bird surveys during breeding season; the timing of which has not allowed survey results to feed into this HRA Report. Therefore this Appropriate Assessment has taken the approach of assuming, as a precaution, that the two sites are functionally connected to the SPA for golden plover. If that is the case, development at either of the sites could adversely affect the integrity of the SPA if the loss of habitat affects a foraging site used by a significant proportion of the golden plover population of the South Pennine Moors SPA, or causes golden plover to move elsewhere, such that the SPA population is affected.

5.15 An assessment of the two sites considered the area of alternative potentially suitable habitat available in the immediate vicinity (within 250 metres) and the effect that habitat loss at the sites would have on the overall SPA population of golden plover. The assessment of habitat area was carried out using GIS mapping and based on aerial photography, which was used to identify habitats potentially suitable for foraging golden plover in the vicinity of each site. The habitat area estimates are summarised in Table 5.1 and shown on Figure 5.1 and 5.2 at the end of this section.

Table 5.1 Areas of suitable golden plover habitat in and around sites H288A and ME1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Approximate area of suitable habitat at the site</th>
<th>Approximate area of suitable habitat in surrounding area</th>
<th>Proportion of suitable habitat in the vicinity that will be lost if the site is developed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H288A</td>
<td>2.5ha</td>
<td>21.27ha</td>
<td>10% of suitable habitat within 250 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME1966</td>
<td>4.34ha</td>
<td>34.71ha</td>
<td>11% of suitable habitat within 250 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.16 The area of habitat suitable for golden plover within sites H288A and ME1966 is a small proportion of the habitat available in the immediate vicinity. Large areas of contiguous habitat are adjacent to the sites and in the case of ME1966 provide habitat further away from existing sources of disturbance (minerals extraction). There are also substantial areas of potentially suitable habitat beyond 250m, including land closer to the SPA.

5.17 The fields surrounding the two sites could provide a suitable alternative habitat if golden plover were displaced from sites H288A and ME1966, and are predominantly within the green belt thereby maintaining their openness for the duration of the plan period. Golden plover can remain faithful to specific fields; therefore mitigation may be required in the form of management of nearby fields specifically to improve their suitability for golden plover.

5.18 For policies and strategies that could result in development occurring anywhere in the district (PLP10, PLP12, PLP 36 and the total employment and housing provision), mitigation will be provided by policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity, which states that 'proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive’.

5.19 As a precautionary approach, to allow for potential changes in habitat over time (and therefore use of land by SPA bird species) and to allow any required mitigation to be identified and tailored to specific sites, survey information will be updated at the time of any planning application for all sites within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors SPA. Within the Local Plan “Allocations and Designations” document, for those site allocations within 2.5km of the SPA boundary, additional evidence will be required at the time of a planning application to determine whether the development will have the potential for adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA.

5.20 With this mitigation in place, for most of the policies, strategies and site allocations in the Local Plan, it is considered that there is adequate mitigation incorporated into the Plan to enable a conclusion of **no adverse effects on integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) as a result of physical disturbance or loss of habitat, either onsite or offsite.**
5.21 The impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution can affect the qualifying bird species of the SPA, and as with loss of habitat, could be significant up to 2.5km from the SPA due to the use of offsite functionally connected habitat by the SPA qualifying bird species. Therefore, development at the allocated sites within 2.5km of the SPA could result in noise and vibration affecting SPA birds, particularly during construction of any new development. Light pollution could occur during construction, but also occupation of new developments. However, good practice construction methods and specific design measures could be required to reduce noise, vibration and light pollution during and post-construction.

5.22 As described in relation to offsite habitat disturbance or loss, above, potential functional connectivity to the South Pennine Moors SPAs cannot be ruled out for two of the allocated sites, ME1966 and H288A; however, should further survey indicate that either of these sites are used by foraging golden plover, sufficient alternative habitats are available in the immediate vicinity to allow habitat management works to provide compensation for the loss of foraging sites, over and above the area to be affected by development. None of the other allocated sites within 2.5km support habitat that has the potential to be functionally connected to the SPAs, therefore they should not result in non-physical disturbance to the qualifying bird species.

5.23 For the policies and strategies that could result in development anywhere in the district (PLP10, PLP12, PLP36 and the overall employment and housing allocations), policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity provides general mitigation for impacts on the SPA, including in relation to non-physical disturbance. Policy PLP24: Design seeks to ensure that development contributes towards enhancement of the natural environment, supports biodiversity and connects to and enhances ecological networks. Policy PLP36\[27\]: Proposals for Mineral Extraction will only permit mineral extraction sites that do not cause significant disturbance to residents from dust, noise and vibration (and this requirement would also help to reduce these effects on SPA birds). Policy PLP52: Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality requires development proposals to evaluate the potential to increase pollution from noise, vibration, light, dust and odour, and incorporate measures to prevent or reduce the pollution.

5.24 **With the mitigation measures described above,** it can be concluded that there is sufficient mitigation incorporated into the Local Plan to conclude that will be no adverse effects on integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA as a result of non-physical disturbance, for the majority of the policies, strategies and allocated sites.

**Air pollution**

5.25 While the qualifying bird species of the SPA may be indirectly affected by changes to habitat associated with air pollution effects, the Site Improvement Plan for the SPA does not identify air pollution as a current key vulnerability. In addition, none of the South Pennine Moors Phase 1 is within 200m of the M62, and the area of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA that could be affected by a potential increase in nitrogen deposition (i.e. 200m either side of the M62), is less than 1% (0.87%) of the overall SPA area. Therefore, even if nitrogen deposition does increase in this area, it is unlikely to significantly alter or reduce the overall extent of the habitats supporting the SPA qualifying bird species.

5.26 **Therefore, it is not considered likely that air pollution could have an adverse effect on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2).**

**Recreation and urban impacts**

5.27 The South Pennine Moors SPAs are accessible and attractive for recreational use and their location within the boundary of Kirklees District means that the population growth resulting from the Local Plan is likely to lead to an increase in visitor numbers. The SPAs are located in the southwest of Kirklees, away from the main urban areas where most development will be focussed (the SPA is approximately 8.5km from the centre of Huddersfield). However, there are allocations for residential and other types of development within the south and western parts of the District within fairly close proximity of the SPA, where people would need to travel much shorter distances.

\[27\] The 2015 HRA Report incorrectly referred here to the Proposals for Mineral Extraction policy as DLP39 rather than DLP37, as it was called in the Draft Local Plan.
to use the moors for recreational purposes. In addition, recreational pressure from new development within other authorities surrounding this large SPA is also likely to occur and could cause in-combination effects.

### 5.28 Site Improvement Plan for the South Pennine Moors SPA

The Site Improvement Plan for the South Pennine Moors SPA identifies public access/disturbance as one of the priority issues for the site, and the impacts of wildfire/arson as another and these impacts could affect the habitats supporting the SPA. The South Pennine Moors Integrated Management Strategy and Conservation Action Programme lists popular types of recreation activities on the South Pennine Moors as including walking, horse-riding, cycling/mountain biking, hang gliding, rock climbing, model aircraft flying, orienteering, fell running, off-road driving (including 4x4 and scrambling), grouse shooting and angling. Effects on breeding birds are most likely to result from uncontrolled dogs, orienteering, large walking events, model aircraft, hang gliders and uncontrolled fires.  

### 5.29 Provision of Green Infrastructure

While the provision of green infrastructure (including the allocation of large areas of open space) elsewhere in the District through the Local Plan may provide some mitigation for the potential pressure for recreation space at the SPA, the open space provided through allocations for local and urban green space is unlikely to be comparable in nature to the South Pennine Moors SPA and would not provide locations for many of the activities enjoyed by visitors to the moors such as rock climbing or hang gliding.

### 5.30 As explained in Chapter 3

As explained in Chapter 3, 7km has been taken to be the threshold distance at which development could result in impacts upon the South Pennine Moors SPA (and SAC). This is the distance at which studies supporting the Bradford Core Strategy have determined that mitigation may be required for recreation impacts. It is also a distance which encompasses most of the trips made to the South Pennines, as identified in Natural England’s visitor study. The number of housing and mixed use sites allocated within the Local Plan means that there is an indicative capacity for 4,579 new dwellings within the SPA, and the majority of those sites are within 5-7km. Kirklees has an average household size of 2.3/2.4, so development of all the allocated sites represent 10,532-10,990 new residents. This population growth would be an incremental increase over the plan period, and excludes any other population increase within the 7km zone.

### 5.31 Residents of Kirklees make an average of 13 annual trips to the South Pennines, per capita, which contributes 21.8% or 4.3 million visits to the 20 million visits made each year to the South Pennines. Therefore, the allocated sites would result in c.136,900 to 142,900 additional trips per year. This represents c.0.3% of the total annual trips to the South Pennines.

### 5.32 Mitigation for these impacts will be provided by Policy PLP63: Open space, which requires new housing developments to provide new open space, and by management plans already in place to manage visitor pressure within the South Pennine Moors SPAs and the Peak District National Park.

### 5.33 The relatively small increase in overall trips to the South Pennine Moors likely to arise from the increased population within Kirklees, coupled with the mitigation in place, means it is possible to conclude that the Local Plan will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA as a result of increased recreation pressure and urban edge impacts.

#### South Pennine Moors SAC

### 5.34 As described in Chapter 3

As described in Chapter 3, Publication Draft Local Plan proposals could potentially affect the South Pennine Moors SAC in relation to physical damage/loss of habitat (onsite), increased air pollution and recreation and urban impacts. The policies and proposals that could result in these impacts PLP10: Supporting the Rural Economy, PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers, PLP36: Proposals for mineral extraction and the proposals for the overall quantum of development in Kirklees (provision of 23,000 jobs and development of 31,140 homes). Physical damage/loss of habitat (offsite), non-physical disturbance and impacts on water quality and quantity were able to be screened out.

---

30 Census 2011
Physical damage/loss of habitat (onsite)

5.35 While the Publication Draft Local Plan does not allocate any development within the boundaries of the SAC, three policies (PLP10: Supporting the Rural Economy, PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers and PLP36: Proposals for Mineral Extraction) could potentially result in development anywhere in the District and therefore within the boundaries of the SAC. However, the safeguards provided by policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity are considered adequate to ensure that new development locations will not be permitted within the boundary of the SAC and there will not be an adverse effect on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SAC as a result of physical damage/loss of onsite habitat.

Air pollution

5.36 Natural England’s Site Improvement Plan for the South Pennine Moors SAC identifies air pollution, specifically the impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition, as one of the priorities for the site and something which can affect the qualifying habitats of the SAC including European dry heaths, blanket bogs, woodland and quaking bogs.

5.37 The UK Air Pollution Information System (APIS)\(^{31}\) provides an online database of air pollutants and deposition levels at European sites and their qualifying habitats and species. For the South Pennine Moors SAC, APIS shows that nitrogen deposition (kg/ha/year) for all of the qualifying habitats is exceeding the critical loads, and has been for a number of years. The major contributor to nitrogen deposition at this SAC is agriculture (37.23%), with road transport contributing 7.68% to the total nitrogen deposition across the site.

5.38 The overall scale of residential, employment and other types of development proposed through the Local Plan is likely to result in an increase in traffic on the local and national strategic road network in and around Kirklees. A number of strategic roads run through the South Pennine Moors SAC, including the A62 Manchester Road which runs between Huddersfield and Manchester, the A640, also between Huddersfield and Manchester, and the A635 between Holmfirth and Manchester; however data from Kirklees Council has allowed air pollution impacts from these roads to be screened out, because the increase in annual average daily traffic flows along these routes over the plan period is likely to be less than 1,000. The increase in forecast trips on the M62 has the potential to contribute to air pollution at the SAC within 200m either side of the M62 as it is forecast to have an increase in annual average daily traffic flows of more than 1,000 AADT. However, the M62 lies on the edge of the district and it is difficult to isolate the contribution of traffic arising from planned growth within Kirklees from other sources. While an increase of more than 1,000 AADT indicates the potential for significant effects, it is necessary to understand how much air pollution associated with the increase in traffic along the M62 is likely to be generated in order to determine whether additional nitrogen deposition within 200m either side of the route is likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC.

5.39 The Council has commissioned an Air Quality Assessment Report to consider the development associated with the Local Plan. The study identifies sensitive ecosystems (e.g. SSSIs, which form components of the SAC) as part of the assessment. Once the Council’s Air Quality Assessment Report and findings become available, this HRA Report will be updated to reflect the findings in relation to air pollution effects.

5.40 In advance of the final report being available, consideration has been given to other relevant information available at this point in time.

5.41 The Department for Transport - Road Investment Strategy for the 2015/16-2019/20 Road Period\(^{32}\) includes a commitment to improve a length of the M62:

- **M62 Junctions 20-25** – upgrading the M62 to Smart Motorway between junction 20 (Rochdale) and junction 25 (Brighouse) across the Pennines. Together with other Smart Motorways already under construction in Greater Manchester and existing Smart Motorways in Yorkshire, this will provide a full four lane Smart Motorway link between Leeds and Manchester.

---

\(^{31}\) [http://www.apis.ac.uk/](http://www.apis.ac.uk/)

5.42 Smart motorways aim to use technology to actively manage the flow of traffic, increase capacity and reduce congestion. The report emphasises the commitment to improving air quality and includes the provision of an Air Quality Fund aiming to increase ultra-low emission vehicles, sustainable travel and green transport initiatives and address both particulate matter and nitrogen oxides (NOx). It also includes an Environment Fund aiming to balance increasing road capacity and mitigate the impacts of roads on neighbouring communities and the environment; a key target is to increase the number of SSSIs in good or recovering condition. The fund also aims to develop a Smart Motorways operational algorithm to optimise air quality and journey times. The upgrade of this section of the M62 should therefore help to reduce traffic emissions despite forecast increases in traffic. This is alongside general improvements in vehicle standards and overall reductions in vehicle emissions that are likely to be achieved during the plan period through existing and future legislation.

5.43 In addition, the measures in the Local Plan set out in policy PLP19 seek to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport including the upgrades to the Transpennine rail line between Leeds and Manchester.

5.44 Alongside the above regarding the usage of the M62, and traffic management proposed, the area of the SAC that could be affected by a potential increase in nitrogen deposition (i.e. 200m either side of the M62), is less than 1% (0.28%) of the overall SAC area. Therefore, even if nitrogen deposition does increase in this area, it is unlikely to significantly alter or reduce the overall extent of the qualifying habitats of the SAC.

5.45 In summary, while there is likely to be an increase above 1,000 AADT on the M62 during the Local Plan period, a proportion of which will be linked to the Local Plan, the Highways England SMART Motorway committed scheme, improved rail links on this route and Local Plan policies provide mitigation, and the area of habitats within the SAC that might be affected by any increases in nitrogen deposition either side of the M62 is less than 1% of the overall area of the SAC.

5.46 Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the Local Plan will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SAC as a result of increased air pollution.

Recreation and urban impacts

5.47 The boundaries of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (phases 1 and 2) are very similar; therefore much of the information set out above in relation to the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) with regards to recreational use of the site is also relevant to the South Pennine Moors SAC. While the disturbance-related impacts of recreation activities are less applicable to the SAC than the SPA, because it is designated on the basis of habitats rather than bird species, the habitats of the SAC can be damaged by human activities such as trampling resulting from people diverting from original paths, due to overuse and erosion and lighting fires.

5.48 The relatively small increase in overall trips to the South Pennine Moors likely to arise from the increased population within Kirklees, coupled with the mitigation described above in relation to the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2), means it can also be concluded that the Kirklees Local Plan would not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SAC.

Rochdale Canal SAC

5.49 As described in Chapter 3, Local Plan proposals could potentially affect this SAC in relation to increased air pollution and recreation and urban impacts. However, likely significant effects on water quality and quantity, recreational pressure, habitat loss (onsite or offsite) and non-physical disturbance were able to be screened out. The policies and proposals that could result in air pollution impacts in-combination are PLP10: Supporting the Rural Economy, PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers, PLP36: Proposals for Mineral Extraction and the proposals for the overall quantum of development in Kirklees (provision of 23,000 jobs and development of 31,140 homes).

Air pollution

5.50 Rochdale Canal SAC cuts across a number of strategic roads including the M62 which runs along the northern edge of Kirklees and links with Manchester. Data from Kirklees Council has allowed
air pollution impacts from most of these roads to be screened out (see Table 4.2), although the M62 has the potential to contribute to air pollution at the SAC as it would have an increase in AADT above 1,000, either from the Kirklees Local Plan alone or in combination with development from neighbouring districts. Natural England’s Site Improvement Plan for the SAC identifies air pollution, specifically the impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition, as one of the priority issues for the site and something which can affect the qualifying floating water plantain.

5.51 For the Rochdale Canal SAC, APIS shows that nitrogen deposition (kg/ha/year) for floating water plantain is exceeding the critical loads for this type of habitat, and has been for a number of years. The highest contributor to nitrogen deposition at this SAC is agriculture (24.01%), with road transport contributing 12.49% to the total nitrogen deposition across the site.

5.52 As discussed above for the South Pennine Moors SAC, it is necessary to understand how much air pollution associated with the increase in traffic along the M62 is likely to be generated in order to determine whether nitrogen deposition within 200m either side of the route is likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC. The introduction of the Smart Motorway on the M62 between Junctions 20 and 25 plus general improvements in vehicle standards and overall reductions in vehicle emissions means that nitrogen deposition arising from increased traffic over the plan period is unlikely to be significant.

5.53 Mitigation of vehicle emissions along the M62 is also provided in the Local Plan through policy PLP19 seeking to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport including the upgrades to the Transpennine rail line between Leeds and Manchester.

5.54 Finally, the area of the Rochdale Canal SAC that could be affected by a potential increase in nitrogen deposition (i.e. 200m either side of the M62), is less than 2% (1.91%) of the overall SAC area. Therefore, even if nitrogen deposition does increase in this area, it is unlikely to significantly alter or reduce the overall extent of the qualifying habitats of the SAC.

5.55 In summary, while there is likely to be an increase above 1,000 AADT on the M62 during the Local Plan period, a proportion of which will be linked to the Local Plan, the Highways England SMART Motorway committed scheme, improved rail links on this route and Local Plan policies provide mitigation, and the area of habitats within the SAC that might be affected by any increases in nitrogen deposition either side of the M62 is less than 2% of the overall area of the SAC.

5.56 Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the Local Plan will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the Rochdale Canal SAC as a result of increased air pollution.

**In-combination effects with neighbouring Local Plans**

5.57 In most cases, the current HRA work carried out for neighbouring Local Plans has concluded that the plans in question would not result in likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites, and therefore in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out (see Appendix 5).

5.58 However, while no in-combination effects are expected with regards to the adopted Barnsley Core Strategy (2011), in-combination effects with the emerging Local Plan cannot be ruled out at this stage. The Habitat Regulations Assessment (2016) for the emerging Barnsley Local Plan noted that proposed housing allocations within a 2km South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC buffer zone could have potential to lead to significant negative effects on these designations. There is potential for emerging Local Plan site allocations to have in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan, however the Barnsley proposals are not sufficiently advanced to reach a conclusion regarding the potential for in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan.

5.59 The latest HRA for the Burnley Local Plan (2016, Preferred Options stage) concluded that, although not likely, the plan may lead to offsite damage/disturbance to the habitats, affecting the qualifying features of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA, and increased air pollution and increased recreation affecting South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA and Rochdale Canal SAC. The HRA suggests this should be revisited in the next stage of HRA for the Burnley Local Plan and Appropriate Assessment should be carried out if required. **Therefore it is not yet possible to reach a conclusion regarding the potential for in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan.**
5.60 In the case of Calderdale District, HRA work for the new combined plan\textsuperscript{33} is not yet available, and the HRA for the Craven Local Plan is currently being undertaken, therefore HRA work has either not yet started or has not yet been able to draw any firm conclusions.

5.61 As work progresses on the Local Plans in neighbouring districts, the plans will be subject to their own HRAs, which will need to assess the potential for in-combination effects. If there are further updates to the Kirklees HRA, those will also need to review any changes to neighbouring plans.

\textsuperscript{33} The Calderdale Core Strategy previously reached Preferred Options stage but is now being amalgamated into a combined plan along with the Land Allocations Plan that was previously to be prepared.
Figure 5.1 Estimate of suitable golden plover habitat in the vicinity of site H288A
Figure 5.2 Estimate of suitable golden plover habitat in the vicinity of site ME1966
Map 5.1 Residential and mixed use site allocations within 7km of the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC
6 Conclusions

6.1 The HRA of the Publication Draft Kirklees Local Plan (November 2016) has been undertaken in accordance with currently available guidance and based on a precautionary approach as required under the Habitats Regulations. The overall HRA findings reached during the Appropriate Assessment stage are presented in Chapter 5 of this report and the HRA conclusions and recommendations are summarised below.

6.2 At this stage in the Kirklees Local Plan preparation, provided that the identified mitigation and recommendations are implemented, adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites around Kirklees from policies and site allocations in the Local Plan will not occur in relation to:

- Physical loss or damage to offsite habitat.
- Noise/vibration and light pollution.
- Recreation.
- Changes to water quality or quantity.
- Air quality.

6.3 At this stage, with the information available, it is considered unlikely that there will be adverse effects on integrity in relation to air pollution at South Pennine Moors SAC and the Rochdale Canal SAC due to increases in traffic forecast along the M62. This is due to the small area of both SACs that would be affected by nitrogen deposition (within 200m either side of the M62), as well as measures in the Local Plan and other strategies to improve flows along the M62, reduce congestion, reduce vehicle emissions and encourage use of public transport.

6.4 This HRA has concluded no adverse effects on integrity of the South Pennine Moors SAC in relation to physical loss or damage to onsite habitat, and no adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) in relation to physical loss or damage to offsite habitat or non-physical disturbance (noise/vibration or light pollution) as a result of development in the vicinity of the SPA. However, as a precautionary approach, to allow for potential changes in potential offsite habitat (functionally connected to the SPA) over time and therefore use of land by SPA bird species, survey information should be updated at the time of any planning application for all sites within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors SPA. It has therefore been recommended to Kirklees Council that the text within the Local Plan “Allocations and Designations” document for those site allocations within 2.5km of the SPA boundary indicates that additional evidence will be required at the time of a planning application to determine whether the development will have the potential for adverse effects on the integrity of the SPA. This recommendation has been addressed by the Council in the Publication Draft Local Plan.
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Appendix 1
Consultation comments received for the Draft Local Plan and how these have been addressed
Consultee | Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate | Response and any action taken to address consultation comment in this updated HRA Report
--- | --- | ---
Natural England | Natural England welcomes the assessment framework and presentation of the report however we have a number of concerns regarding the conclusions reached which need to be addressed to ensure compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). | Noted; see responses to specific comments below.
Natural England | Bradford Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment We are pleased to see reference to the draft Bradford Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) however we are concerned about the method in which the assessment findings and draft mitigation have been applied in this assessment. In particular we note that paras 5.24 and 5.25 conclude no adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as similar safeguards to those proposed in the Bradford Core Strategy HRA can be adopted. Natural England do not object in principle to the use of data collected by Bradford for their Core Strategy HRA or the adoption of similar approaches to avoidance and mitigation, however we do not consider that adverse effects can be ruled out until proposed mitigation has been detailed in the context of the Kirklees Local Plan. Furthermore much of the data collected and avoidance and mitigation measures proposed by Bradford are specific to local circumstances at Ilkley/Rombolds Moor and may not be appropriate to local circumstances in and adjacent to Kirklees, for instance the visitor surveys carried out by Bradford. We advise that you consider the data available from the Bradford Core Strategy HRA and identify where direct application is applicable and where there are evidence gaps where further data is necessary to support the assessment of the Kirklees Local Plan. | Noted. A revised approach and evidence base has been agreed with Natural England, including undertaking additional survey work on sites that are within 2.5km of the south Pennine Moors. This has been presented in Chapters 3-5 and Appendix 4 of this HRA Report for the Publication Draft Local Plan.
Natural England | HRA Screening Methodology Natural England note that para 3.13 of the HRA report refers to a 1-2km screening distance for foraging Special Protection Area (SPA) bird species, whereas para 3.28 refers to the 2.5km distance proposed by Bradford. We advise that you reason for using this distance rather than Bradford’s approach is explained We recommend that you identify one screening distance with a clear rationale for the decision. Natural England are concerned that development to the east of the plan area may impact on | A revised approach and evidence base has been agreed with Natural England, including undertaking additional survey work on sites that are within 2.5km of the south Pennine Moors. This has been presented in Chapter 3 and Appendix 4 of this HRA Report for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate</th>
<th>Response and any action taken to address consultation comment in this updated HRA Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>HRA Screening Assessment of the Draft Local Plan&lt;br&gt;While we note that DLP24 is not promoting development, we advise that the HRA should consider the in-combination effects of this policy with broad targets for growth and specific allocations in the plan. Natural England consider that further details of the assessment are required with regards to DLP27 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. For example of the assessment of a similar policy we would direct your attention to the assessment of Bradford Core Strategy Policy EN6 in their HRA. It is also worth noting that EN6 includes specific reference to the potential for adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC in the policy text.</td>
<td>DLP24 Core walking and cycling network is now called PLP23. The potential contribution of this to recreational pressure has been considered in Appendix 3.&lt;br&gt;PLP26 Renewable and low carbon energy is now called PLP26. The potential for this to affect the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA has been considered in Appendix 3. While the HRA of the Bradford Local Plan went into greater detail on the potential effects of wind turbines on bird species, ultimately it concluded that, since the plan did not allocated specific sites for wind turbines and contained wording to identify the risk to the SAC/SPA, there would be no significant impact. Kirklees policy PLP26 contains similar safeguards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Appropriate Assessment&lt;br&gt;Natural England disagree with the assessment of no adverse effects on integrity with regards to allocations within 2km of the South Pennine Moors Phases 1 and 2 SPA in paras</td>
<td>As described above, a revised approach and evidence base has been agreed with Natural England, including undertaking additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate</td>
<td>Response and any action taken to address consultation comment in this updated HRA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.13 and 5.14 of the HRA. We do not consider that the potential impacts of the plan on functionally connected land for birds can be effectively passed down the line to the project stage. We advise that evidence will need to be provided to demonstrate either that the specific allocations in the plan are unsuitable for SPA birds and that development on these sites will not impact on adjacent functionally connected land or evidence on the availability and distribution of functionally connected land in the area to show that development at these locations can go ahead without adverse effects on SPA birds. Should assessment be left to the project stage and surveys show that a site cannot be delivered without adverse effects on integrity of the South Pennine Moors Phases 1 or 2 SPA then the Plan would be unsound. Natural England disagree with the argument in para 5.16 that DLP39 will protect European Sites from proposals for minerals extraction as this policy makes no reference to protecting natural environmental receptors. As mentioned in this letter Natural England are concerned about the potential for adverse effects on the integrity of Denby Grange Colliery SAC from both changes in hydrology and recreational pressures and consequently disagree with the assessment in paras 3.32 - 3.35 of the HRA.</td>
<td>survey work on sites that are within 2.5km of the south Pennine Moors. This is described in Chapters 3-5 and Appendix 4 of this HRA Report for the Publication Draft Local Plan. DLP37 Site Restoration and Aftercare was incorrectly referred to as DLP39 in the 2015 HRA of the Draft Local Plan. Reference to this has been updated in the HRA Report for the Publication Draft Local Plan. Further consideration has also been given to the potential hydrological and recreational impacts on Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC, as described in Chapter 3 of the HRA Report for the Publication Draft Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE</td>
<td>Object: May not be legally compliant in relation to Habitats Regulations As the Council may be aware, the issue of avoidance and mitigation of impacts on the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC has been a major reason for proposed main modifications to the Bradford Core Strategy. In particular, MM28 of that Strategy establishes an up-to-date zoning approach that is deemed to be compliant with the Habitats Regulations. By contrast, PLP30 is generalised and only makes passing reference to the Habitats Directive. Considering the importance of the South Pennine Moors to the biodiversity and landscape assets of Kirklees, we do not consider this to be a robust approach, and suggest that a more prescriptive policy be added along the lines of Bradford’s MM28. We have supplied a PDF copy of MM28 for your reference.</td>
<td>As noted above by Natural England, consideration has been given to the approach taken by Bradford in its Core Strategy, although as Natural England has stated, transferring the exact same approach may not be appropriate. A revised approach and evidence base has been agreed with Natural England, including undertaking additional survey work on sites that are within 2.5km of the south Pennine Moors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate</td>
<td>Response and any action taken to address consultation comment in this updated HRA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Michael Stringer</td>
<td>I tried to open the link on the &quot;international and national importance for nature conservation from the detrimental impacts of development (2)&quot; but could not - all I got was the same page on &quot;1.2 Supporting Documents&quot; repeated. Has anybody assessed Oakwell Park in North Kirklees with regard to this? There are foxes, rabbits, grey squirrels, badgers (I'm told but not seen personally) here as well as lesser spotted woodpeckers, jays, sparrow hawks, owls, herons, goldfinches, greenfinches, chaffinches, bullfinches, blue tits, great tits, coal tits, long-tailed tits, nuthatches, dunnocks and wrens as well as the ubiquitous magpies, crows, jackdaws, blackbirds, robins and sparrows. We have also seen rose-ringed parakeets too. All this birdlife visits us to feed across the Bradford Road (A652). There may be other wildlife present here too that I have not seen personally. I ask about the designation of Oakwell Park because I think it is obviously attractive to a wide variety of wildlife. It is important that we do everything we can to protect and encourage it to thrive. The Green Belt designation is vital in this respect; we cannot allow Oakwell Park to be &quot;developed&quot; into a tiny corner. The wildlife needs the green space to exist and expand. And we need this so people can experience it, wonder at it and enjoy it for generations to come.</td>
<td>Oakwell Park is not designated as a European site (SAC, SPA or Ramsar site); therefore it does not fall within the scope of the HRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Dean</td>
<td>I would like the council to go further in the local plan than simply protect the SAC from development. There is an opportunity for the plan to recognise the enormous benefit to Kirklees residents in putting the habitat of the SAC into good ecological condition. It presently is not and the Moors for the Future Partnership have as of October 2015 started on a 16m Euro project to improve this. The partnership (led by the Peak District National Park Authority) is also taking advantage of several other funding streams to further this work, much of this across the moorland landscape of Kirklees. It would be at no cost for the local plan to recognise and support this, taking a more proactive role in the partnership and the management of the Kirklees portion of the SAC.</td>
<td>Noted, this comment relates to the Local Plan itself rather than the HRA report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Robert Bamforth</td>
<td>Paragraph 1.27 specifically mentions the South Pennines Special Protection Area (presumably meaning South Pennines SPA phase 2) and other, more localised, protected areas just beyond the Kirklees boundary. However it fails to mention the Peak District National Park (South Pennines SPA Phase 1) and the extensive cross boundary impacts</td>
<td>The HRA assesses the likely impacts of the Local Plan on the integrity of South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA and Peak District Moors (South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate</td>
<td>Response and any action taken to address consultation comment in this updated HRA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between Kirklees and the Peak Park Authority in the Colne and Holme Valleys. We are very concerned that the plan as a whole does not place sufficient emphasis on protecting the core Pennine SPAs AND the adjacent areas in the Colne and Holme Valleys, which have an impact on the landscape and habitats of the core areas. Protection of both the core and non-core areas is a central element of the IMSACAP (Programme), which is co-sponsored by Kirklees Metropolitan Council via the Standing Conference of South Pennine Authorities (SCOSPA). Yet there is no mention in the plan of IMSACAP or SCOSPA.</td>
<td>Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA, as well as the South Pennine Moors SAC, as explained in Chapter 3 of the HRA report. The reference to paragraph 1.27 does not relate to the HRA report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Attributes of Natura 2000 sites within Kirklees District (+15km)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Area (ha)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Qualifying features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key vulnerabilities and environmental conditions to support site integrity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Pennine Moors SAC | 64,983 | Fragmented sites to the north and west of the boundary, some within the boundary and some parts further out towards the 15km buffer boundary. | Annex I Habitats:  
European Dry Heaths  
Blanket Bogs (priority feature\(^{34}\))  
Old sessile oak woods with *Ilex* and *Blechnum* in the British Isles  
Northern Atlantic Wet Heaths with *Erica Tetralix*  
Transition mires and quaking bogs\(^{35}\) | • Agricultural activities and moorland management regime, particularly rotational burning and fire management are thought to be altering plant species composition and soil nutrients. Current management plans may be maintaining unfavourable conditions.  
• Changes to the hydrological regime, have led to erosion and lowering of the water table. This is a threat to the hydrological integrity of blanket bog habitat.  
• Public recreation activities such as rock climbing and dog walking, are likely to disturb qualifying features, particularly at sensitive times of the year. Poor air quality puts pressure on this site, as levels of nitrogen deposits are in exceedance of critical loads.  

The conservation objectives are to\(^{36}\) -  
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 the qualifying natural habitats. |

---

\(^{34}\) Some of the natural habitats and species listed in the Habitats Directive and for which SACs or SPAs have been selected are considered to be particular priorities for conservation at a European scale and are subject to special provisions in the Directive and the Habitats Regulations.

\(^{35}\) South Pennine Moors SAC Site Citation, 2005 (from http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4973604919836672?category=5758332488908800).

\(^{36}\) European Site Conservation Objectives for South Pennine Moors SAC (UK0030280), Natural England, July 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Qualifying features</th>
<th>Key vulnerabilities and environmental conditions to support site integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors Phase 1)</td>
<td>45,270</td>
<td>Fragmented site lying to the south and west of Kirklees, very slightly within the district boundary to the south and stretching out towards the 15km buffer.</td>
<td>Annex 1 Birds (breeding): Merlin <em>Falco columbarius</em>, Golden plover <em>Pluvialis apricaria</em>, Short-eared Owl <em>Asio flammeus</em>. Non-qualifying species of interest: The site supports a rich upland breeding bird assemblage which, as well as the qualifying species listed above, includes important numbers of Peregrine <em>Falco peregrinus</em>, Lapwing <em>Vanellus vanellus</em>, Dunlin <em>Calidris alpina schinzii</em>, Snipe <em>Gallinago gallinago</em>, Curlew <em>Numenius arquata</em>, Redshank <em>Tringa tetanus</em>, Common Sandpiper <em>Actitis hypoleucos</em>, Whinchat <em>Saxicola rubetra</em>, Wheatear <em>Oenanthe oenanthe</em>.</td>
<td>Historic air pollution, fires and land management have led to erosion, gullying, lowered water tables and other hydrological changes. These threaten a range of qualifying species and their supporting habitat. The moorland management regime, particularly rotational burning and fire management are thought to be altering plant species composition and soil nutrients. Current management plans may be maintaining unfavourable conditions. Major urban and industrial centres near to the Peak District Moors provide significant visitor pressure. Grazing pressure is generally being lowered and appropriate burning encouraged by two separate ESAs which encourage and support habitat restoration. Low breeding success is an issue at this site, as suitable habitat exists to support more breeding pairs than currently recorded. It is thought this may be linked to hunting/poaching as, since 2000, two gamekeepers with responsibility for land management within the SPA have been convicted of wildlife crimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Qualifying features</td>
<td>Key vulnerabilities and environmental conditions to support site integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2)** | 20,936 | Fragmented site lying to the north and west of Kirklees, slightly within the district boundary and stretching out over the 15km buffer line. | *Ring Ouzel Turdus torquatus*  
*Twite Carduelis flavirostris*\(^{37}\) | The conservation objectives are to\(^ {38}\) -  
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.  
- The distribution of the qualifying features within the site. |

---

\(^{37}\) Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA Site Citation, 2000 (from http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6145889668169728?category=5758332488908800).  
\(^{38}\) European Site Conservation Objectives for Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA (UK9007021), Natural England, June 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Qualifying features</th>
<th>Key vulnerabilities and environmental conditions to support site integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunlin <em>Calidris alpina</em></td>
<td>• Pressures outside the site, in particular the loss of functionally connected land through agricultural intensification, increase the vulnerability of the bird populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snipe <em>Gallinago gallinago</em></td>
<td>• Low breeding success is an issue at this site, as suitable habitat exists to support more breeding pairs than currently recorded. It is thought this may be linked to hunting/poaching as, since 2000, two gamekeepers with responsibility for land management within the SPA have been convicted of wildlife crimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curlew <em>Numenius arquata</em></td>
<td>The conservation objectives are to <strong>40</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redshank <em>Tringa totanus</em></td>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common Sandpiper <em>Actitis hypoleuca</em></td>
<td>• The extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short-eared owl <em>Asio flammeus</em></td>
<td>• The structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whinchat <em>Saxicola rubetra</em></td>
<td>• The supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wheatear <em>Oenanthe oenanthe</em></td>
<td>• The population of each of the qualifying features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ring Ouzel <em>Turdus torquatus</em></td>
<td>• The distribution of the qualifying features within the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twite <em>Carduelis flavirostris</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) Site Citation, 1995 (from http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4885083764817920?category=5758332488908800).

40 European Site Conservation Objectives for South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA (UK9007022), Natural England, March 2015. This document updates and replaces earlier versions dated 29 May 2012 and 30 June 2014 to reflect Natural England’s Strategic Standard on European Site Conservation Objectives 2014. Previous references to the additional features identified in the 2001 UK SPA Review (Peregrine, Short-eared Owl, Dunlin) have been removed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Qualifying features</th>
<th>Key vulnerabilities and environmental conditions to support site integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Very small site located approximately 2km outside of the site boundary to the east.</td>
<td>Annex II Species: Great crested newt <em>Triturus cristatus</em>&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Hydrological pressures include the fact that the Old Pond dries out too early to allow newts to develop their terrestrial stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of a buffer of appropriate terrestrial habitat should allow greater habitat connectivity and strengthen the metapopulation, consisting of populations both inside and outside the SAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The surrounding woodland needs managing to ensure that the margins of the ponds are not shaded, as this reduces growth of plants suitable for egg-laying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Himalayan Balsam, a non-native invasive species, could dominate the woodland flora and hamper tree regeneration. This could over-shade the Old Pond and reduce suitability of surrounding terrestrial habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Groundwater pollution is associated with poor water quality of the Old Pond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conservation objectives are to<sup>42</sup> -

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:

---

<sup>41</sup> Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC Site Citation, 2005 (from http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5474466230435840?category=5758332488908800).

<sup>42</sup> European Site Conservation Objectives for Denby Grange Colliery Ponds Special Area of Conservation Site Code: UK0030036, Natural England, March 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Qualifying features</th>
<th>Key vulnerabilities and environmental conditions to support site integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rochdale Canal SAC | 25        | A long thin site to the west of Kirklees, stretching inwards from the 15km buffer to around 5km from the site boundary. | Annex II Species: Floating water-plantain *Luronium natans*[^43] | - The extent and distribution of the habitats of qualifying species.  
- The structure and function of habitats of qualifying species.  
- The supporting processes on which qualifying natural habitats rely.  
- The populations of qualifying species.  
- The distribution of qualifying species within the site.  
- Changes in hydrology, such as dredging and draining of the canal are likely to have negative effects on the site’s qualifying feature.  
- Air pollution has been identified as a pressure on the site, as current nitrogen deposition is in exceedance of critical loads at the site.  

The conservation objectives are to[^44] -  
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 the habitats of qualifying species.  
- The structure and function of habitats of qualifying species.  
- The supporting processes on which qualifying natural habitats rely.  
- The populations of qualifying species.  
- The distribution of qualifying species within the site. |

In the time between the preparation of the HRA Report for the Draft Local Plan and the preparation of this HRA for the Publication Draft Local Plan, many Natura 2000 standard data forms were revised. The table below summarises the changes in vulnerabilities listed on those data forms since the previous HRA report was published. Note that there were no changes to the qualifying species of each site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>‘New’ vulnerabilities (listed on current forms but not listed on Natura 2000 forms at the time of the previous HRA)</th>
<th>No longer vulnerabilities (listed on Natura 2000 forms at the time of the previous HRA but no longer listed on current forms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC</td>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Peak District Moors SPA (South Pennine Moors SPA Phase I) | Fire and fire suppression  
Human-induced changes in hydrology  
Reduced fecundity/genetic depression  
Hunting/taking of terrestrial animals | Agriculture                                                                                                        |
| South Pennine Moors SPA Phase 2                | Fire and fire suppression  
Human-induced changes in hydrology  
Reduced fecundity/genetic depression  
Hunting/taking of terrestrial animals | Grazing                                                                                                            |
| Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC                | Invasive non-native species  
Pollution to groundwater  
Forest and plantation management and use | None                                                                                                               |
| Rochdale Canal SAC                             | None                                                                                                              | Shading  
Boat traffic                                                                                                     |
Appendix 3
HRA Screening of the Draft Kirklees Local Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development</td>
<td>None - while this policy sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, the likely effects on Natura 2000 sites of any development proposed are considered separately in relation to other Local Plan policies. In addition, the policy aims to ensure that development improves the environmental conditions of the area.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP2: Place shaping</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP3: Location of new development</td>
<td>None – the policy sets out the broad spatial strategy for directing development within Kirklees but does not determine the amount or type of development that will take place – this is considered separately below in relation to other more specific policies. In addition, directing most development to the larger</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP 4: Providing infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure development</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>No: While this policy could lead to the development of infrastructure there is no certainty about its type or location until the planning application stage. The Natura 2000 sites within Kirklees are in the south western corner of the district away from the main urban areas where most development is allocated, which reduces the likelihood of significant effects, and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC and SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP 5: Masterplanning</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large sites</td>
<td>development; rather it sets out criteria that will apply to new development proposed under other Local Plan policies. In addition, the policy requires masterplans for developments to demonstrate a good understanding and respect for the natural environment.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP 6: Safeguarded land (Land to be safeguarded for potential future development)</td>
<td>Will not result in development within the plan period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP7: Efficient and effective use of land and buildings</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Employment strategy: provision of 23,000 jobs | Employment development
Increased vehicle traffic
Increased demand for water treatment | Physical damage/loss of habitat.
Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.
Air pollution. | Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors | Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate | Uncertain: The policy would result in large-scale employment development within Kirklees which could have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites and this needs to be considered in more detail |
### Local Plan policy/allocation

| Local Plan policy/allocation | Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal | Likely effects if proposal implemented | Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected | Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect | Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?

| | | | (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees. | European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. | during the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA. Specific sites allocated for employment development have been subject to HRA screening separately further ahead in this matrix. |

#### PLP8: Safeguarding employment land and premises
- None – the policy will not itself result in new development.
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A

#### PLP9: Supporting skilled and flexible communities and workforce
- None – the policy will not itself result in new development.
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A
- N/A

#### PLP10: Supporting the Economic and tourism-
- Physical damage/loss of
- Physical damage/loss
- Policy PLP30: Uncertain: This policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| rural economy                 | related development in rural areas  
Increase in recreation pressure  
Increased vehicle traffic  
Increased demand for water treatment | habitat.  
Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.  
Disturbance from recreation.  
Air pollution. | of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.  
Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees.  
Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees. | Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive.  
Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.  
Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars.  
The allocation of open | could result in development in rural areas of Kirklees, which could be within close proximity of the Natura 2000 sites in the south west of the District. As it could stimulate tourism-related activities it could also contribute to an increase in visitor pressure at the South Pennine Moors SAC and South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) in combination with other development. There may also be an increase in vehicle movements in and around the District with the associated air pollution. These issues therefore need to be considered in more detail during the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Housing strategy: development of 31,140 homes | Residential development
Increase in recreation pressure
Increased vehicle traffic
Increased demand for water treatment | Physical damage/loss of habitat.
Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.
Air pollution.
Disturbance from recreation. | Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.
Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors | Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive.
Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the | Uncertain: The policy would result in large-scale residential development within Kirklees which could have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites and this needs to be considered in more detail during the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA. Specific site allocations for residential development have been subject to HRA screening separately further ahead in this matrix. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP11: Housing mix and affordable housing</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP12: Accommodation for Travellers</td>
<td>Development of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Physical damage/loss of habitat.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-</td>
<td>SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure through policies such as PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure may help to mitigate the potential impacts of increased recreation pressure on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>Uncertain: The policy would result in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Showpeople</td>
<td>Increase in recreation pressure</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution. Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation.</td>
<td>physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure through policies such as PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure may help to mitigate the potential impacts of increased development of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople within Kirklees, which in combination with other development, could contribute to increases in traffic and pressure for recreation which could have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites. This needs to be considered in more detail during the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA. Specific site allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople have been subject to HRA screening separately further ahead in this matrix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP13: Town centre uses</td>
<td>None – the policy seeks to direct development to the main urban centres and therefore away from sensitive Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP14: Shopping frontages</td>
<td>None – the policy seeks to direct development to the main urban centres and therefore away from sensitive Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP15: Residential use in town centres</td>
<td>Residential development Increase in recreation pressure Increased vehicle traffic Increased demand for water treatment</td>
<td>Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation.</td>
<td>Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3)</td>
<td>No: The policy would result in residential development in town centres, which would therefore be located away from sensitive Natura 2000 sites and so would not have impacts associated with habitat loss or non-physical disturbance. While the policy could contribute to an increase in the population and therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP16: Food and drink uses and the evening economy</td>
<td>None – the policy relates to criteria that would apply to proposals for food and drink uses in defined centres.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP17: Huddersfield town centre</td>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation could affect</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and</td>
<td>No: Any development resulting from the policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure through policies such as PLP3: Strategic Green Infrastructure may help to mitigate the potential impacts of increased recreation pressure on Natura 2000 sites.

Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure through policies such as PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure may help to mitigate the potential impacts of increased recreation pressure on Natura 2000 sites.

Increased traffic, air pollution and recreation pressure, these issues are considered separately through the HRA of the overall quantum of development for Kirklees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment development</td>
<td>Increase in recreation pressure</td>
<td>recreation.</td>
<td>any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure through policies such as PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure may help to mitigate the potential impacts of increased</td>
<td>would be at Huddersfield which is located away from sensitive Natura 2000 sites. While the policy could contribute to an increase in the population and economic activity in Kirklees and therefore increased traffic, air pollution and recreation pressure, these issues are considered separately through the HRA of the overall quantum of development for Kirklees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in recreation pressure</td>
<td>Increased vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased demand for water treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP18: Dewsbury town centre</td>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation.</td>
<td>Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure</td>
<td>No: Any development resulting from this policy would be at Dewsbury which is located away from sensitive Natura 2000 sites. While the policy could contribute to an increase in the population and economic activity in Kirklees and therefore increased traffic, air pollution and recreation pressure, these issues are considered separately through the HRA of the overall quantum of development for Kirklees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP19: Strategic transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Development of transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive.</td>
<td>No: Most of the transport improvement schemes identified in the policy are located away from sensitive Natura 2000 sites. While improvements to the M62 (smart motorway between junctions 20 and 25) could affect the South Pennine Moors SAC and the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2) as the motorway cuts through the sites, the scheme is coming forward separately to the Local Plan and it is assumed that it is being subject to HRA at the project level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP20: Sustainable travel</td>
<td>None – the policy will not</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The policy promotes the</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP21: Highways safety and access</td>
<td>Development of transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA</td>
<td>use of sustainable modes of transport and as such may provide mitigation for the impacts of other policies in relation to increased car use and the associated air pollution.</td>
<td>No: While this policy could lead to the development of transport infrastructure there is no certainty with regards to its nature or location until the planning application stage. The Natura 2000 sites within Kirklees are in the south western corner of the district away from the main urban areas where most development is directed through the Local Plan, which reduces the likelihood of significant effects, and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

itself result in new development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP22: Parking</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP23: Core walking and cycling network</td>
<td>New cycling and walking routes Opportunities for recreation</td>
<td>Disturbance from recreation</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP47 provides for well maintained and accessible open spaces which may help to mitigate pressure on Natura 2000 sites for recreation resulting from other Local Plan policies. The allocation of open</td>
<td>No: While this policy could improve accessibility to the Natura 2000 sites for walkers and cyclists from existing settlements or the residential / mixed use site allocations (in combination), it will also provide opportunities for recreation elsewhere. Mitigation provided by other policies in the plan will contribute to reducing recreational pressure on the SAC/SPA. Overall, it is not considered that policy PL23 will have a significant effect on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP24: Design</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP25: Advertisements and shop fronts</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP26: Renewable and low carbon energy</td>
<td>Development of renewable energy infrastructure</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted</td>
<td>No: While this policy could lead to the development of renewable energy infrastructure there is no certainty with regards to its type or location until the planning application stage. Wind turbine developments can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP27: Flood risk</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. The wording of PLP26 states that proposals will only be supported where they will “not have an unacceptable impact on protected species, designated sites of importance for biodiversity.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP28: Drainage</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>adversely affect bird species and could therefore cause physical damage or disturbance to qualifying species of the South Pennine Moors SPA. However, protection for designated sites within the policy itself is considered to provide sufficient safeguard. Policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP29: Management of water bodies</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP30: Biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This policy does not permit development which would directly or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wording of PLP26 states that proposals will only be supported where they will “not have an unacceptable impact on protected species, designated sites of importance for biodiversity.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This policy should help to provide mitigation against the potential impacts of the development proposed elsewhere in the Local Plan as it seeks to protect and enhance existing Green Infrastructure and to provide for the delivery of new Green Infrastructure. This could help to mitigate the potential impacts of development in terms of increased recreation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP32: Landscape</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP33: Trees</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP34 Conserving and enhancing the water environment</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP35: Historic environment</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP36: Proposals for Minerals-related</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss</td>
<td>Policy PLP30:</td>
<td>Uncertain: The policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pressure at Natura 2000 sites. However, it is uncertain how effective this will be in mitigating increased recreational use of Natura 2000 sites, as it will depend on factors such as the comparable nature and quality of the greenspace to be protected under this policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| mineral extraction | development  
Increased vehicle traffic  
Increased demand for water treatment | habitat.  
Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.  
Air pollution. | of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.  
Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees. | Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive.  
Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. | could result in minerals-related development within Kirklees which could have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites and this needs to be considered in more detail during the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA. Specific site allocations for minerals-related development have been subject to HRA screening separately further ahead in this matrix. |
<p>| PLP37: Site restoration and aftercare | None – the policy will not itself result in new development. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| PLP38: Minerals safeguarding | None – the policy will not itself result in new development. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP39: Protecting existing and planned minerals infrastructure</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP40: Alternative development on protected minerals infrastructure sites</td>
<td>Redevelopment of sites containing minerals infrastructure Increase in recreation pressure (if sites are redeveloped for residential uses) Increase in vehicle traffic (depending on what use sites are redeveloped for) Increased demand for water treatment.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution. Disturbance from recreation. Air pollution.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the redevelopment of sites containing minerals infrastructure which, depending on the nature of the redevelopment could have significant effects on Natura 2000 sites. However, there is no certainty with regards to the type or location of development that may result until the planning application stage and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP41: Proposals for exploration and appraisal of hydrocarbons</td>
<td>Onshore oil and gas exploration</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase. The allocation of open space in Kirklees through the Local Plan and improvements to green infrastructure through policies such as PLP31: Strategic Green Infrastructure may help to mitigate the potential impacts of increased recreation pressure on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>No: While the policy could result in the exploration of onshore oil and gas within Kirklees, there is no certainty about the nature or location of activities until the planning application stage. In addition, policy PLP30 and PLP41 itself provide robust mitigation for impacts on Natura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP41 itself requires that any adverse impacts must be avoided or mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority, with safeguards to protect environmental interests put in place as necessary.</td>
<td>2000 sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP42: Proposals for production of hydrocarbons</td>
<td>Production of hydrocarbons</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP42 itself requires that any adverse impacts, both individual and cumulative are avoided or mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</td>
<td>No: While the policy could result in the production of hydrocarbons within Kirklees, there is no certainty about the nature or location of activities until the planning application stage. In addition, policy PLP30 and PLP42 itself provide robust mitigation for impacts on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP43: Waste management hierarchy</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PLP44: New waste management facilities | Development of waste management facilities  
Increased vehicle traffic  
Increased demand for water treatment | Physical damage/loss of habitat.  
Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.  
Air pollution. | Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.  
Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees. | Policy PLP44 itself states that proposals for waste management facilities should be located in sustainable locations where potentially adverse impacts on biodiversity can be avoided or adequately mitigated.  
Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.  
Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions. | No: While the policy could result in the development of waste management facilities within Kirklees, there is no certainty about the nature or location of developments until the planning application stage. In addition, policy PLP30 and policy PLP44 itself provide robust mitigation for impacts on Natura 2000 sites. The waste site allocation made in the Local Plan has been subject to HRA screening separately further ahead in this matrix. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP45: Safeguarding waste management facilities</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP46: Waste disposal</td>
<td>Development of waste management facilities (landfill or land raising) Increased vehicle traffic Increased demand for water treatment</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution. Air pollution.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. No: While the policy could result in the development of landfill facilities at a number of former quarries, none are located within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phase 2). The policy could also result in landfilling at other locations, however the policy makes it clear that this type of development will only take place if need cannot be met by treatment.</td>
<td>No: While the policy could result in the development of landfill facilities at a number of former quarries, none are located within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA (Phase 2). The policy makes it clear that this type of development will only take place if need cannot be met by treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP47: Healthy, active and safe lifestyles</td>
<td>Development of sports, leisure and cultural facilities</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Using good practice construction techniques</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of sports, leisure and cultural facilities which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites; however there is no certainty with regards to the type or location of development that may result until the planning application stage and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive.</td>
<td>Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>higher in the waste hierarchy. In addition, policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on Natura 2000 sites and it is assumed that proposals for waste management facilities would be assessed at that time in relation to their potential impacts on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP48: Community facilities and services</td>
<td>Development of community services and facilities</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of community services and facilities which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites; however there is no certainty until the planning application stage with regards to the type or location of development that may result and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP49: Educational and health care needs</td>
<td>Development of education and healthcare facilities</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of education and healthcare facilities which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites; however there is no certainty with regards to the type or location of development that may result until the planning application stage and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP50: Sport and physical activity</td>
<td>Development of sport and leisure facilities</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of sport and leisure facilities which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites; however there is no certainty with regards to the type or location of development that may result until the planning application stage and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP51: Protection and improvement of local air quality</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This policy requires development which has the potential to increase levels of local air pollution to unsafe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP52: Protection and improvement of environmental quality</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This policy requires development which has the potential to increase pollution in Kirklees to incorporate mitigation to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment. The policy also states that development should where possible improve the existing environment. As such, the policy could provide mitigation for the potential impacts of other Local Plan policies on Natura 2000 sites in relation to air or water pollution.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP53: Contaminated and unstable land</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP54: Buildings for agriculture and forestry</td>
<td>Development of buildings for agriculture and forestry in the green belt</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of buildings for agriculture and forestry in the Green Belt which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites (the Green Belt in Kirklees overlaps with the South Pennine Moors SAC and the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and is adjacent to the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA; however there is no certainty until the planning application stage with regards to the type or location of development that may result and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP55: Agricultural and</td>
<td>Development of residential</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors</td>
<td>Policy PLP30:</td>
<td>No: The policy could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forestry workers’ dwellings</td>
<td>properties for agricultural and forestry workers in the green belt</td>
<td>habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>result in the development of dwellings for agriculture and forestry workers in the Green Belt which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites (the Green Belt in Kirklees overlaps with the South Pennine Moors SAC and the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and is adjacent to the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA; however there is no certainty until the planning application stage with regards to the type or location of development that may result and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP56: Facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and cemeteries</td>
<td>Development of sport and recreation facilities in the green belt</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of sport and recreation facilities in the Green Belt which could result in damage or disturbance to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.

SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.

SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.

SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.

SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.

SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.

SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP57: The extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings</td>
<td>Extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings in the green belt</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the redevelopment or extension of existing buildings in the Green Belt which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites (the Green Belt in Kirklees overlaps with the South Pennine Moors SAC and the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and is adjacent to the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA; however there is no certainty until the planning application stage with regards to the type or location of development that may result and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.

the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive.

Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLP58: Garden extensions</td>
<td>None – the policy will not itself result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP59: Infilling and redevelopment of brownfield sites</td>
<td>None – the policy could result in the redevelopment of or infilling at existing brownfield sites but is not expected to result in new</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP60: The re-use and conversion of buildings</td>
<td>None – the policy would potentially permit the reuse or conversion of existing buildings within the green belt but is not expected to result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP61: Urban green space</td>
<td>None – the policy seeks to protect urban green space and would not result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This policy will protect urban green spaces in Kirklees. This may help to mitigate impacts of the development proposed elsewhere in the Local Plan in terms of increased recreation pressure at Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP62: Local green space</td>
<td>None – the policy seeks to protect local green space and would not result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This policy will protect local green spaces in Kirklees. This may help to mitigate impacts of the development proposed elsewhere in the Local Plan in terms of increased recreation pressure at Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP63: New open space</td>
<td>Development of sport and recreation facilities</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat. Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution.</td>
<td>South Pennine Moors SAC (onsite loss of habitat only), South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>No: The policy could result in the development of sport and recreation facilities which could result in damage or disturbance to Natura 2000 sites; however there is no certainty with regards to the type or location of development that may result until the planning application stage and policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on the SAC or SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential site allocations (the Allocations and Designations document identifies 209 site allocations for residential)</td>
<td>Residential development Increase in recreation pressure Increased vehicle traffic Increased demand for</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat (offsite) and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation</td>
<td>Uncertain: The residential site allocations in combination would result in large-scale residential development within Kirklees which could result in an increase in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential development Increase in recreation pressure Increased vehicle traffic Increased demand for

Physical damage/loss of habitat (offsite) and non-physical disturbance could affect South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors

Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation

Uncertain: The residential site allocations in combination would result in large-scale residential development within Kirklees which could result in an increase in

HRA of the Publication Draft Kirklees Local Plan November 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development)</td>
<td>Water treatment</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution. Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation.</td>
<td>(South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. Policy PLP47 provides for well maintained and accessible open spaces which may help to mitigate pressure on Natura 2000 sites for recreation resulting from other Local Plan policies. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and vehicle traffic and the associated air pollution, and increased pressure for recreation. While none of the allocated residential sites are within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites, as shown in Map 4.1 in Chapter 4, 11 are within 2.5km of the South Pennines Moors SPAs and could therefore result in offsite habitat loss and/or non-physical disturbance in those areas, particularly during the construction phase. Of those sites, five have been identified during the initial screening stage as having the potential to contain habitat used by the qualifying bird species of the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phases 1 and 2). These 67 of the residential / mixed use sites are within 7km of one of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRA of the Publication Draft Kirklees Local Plan 102 November 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment site allocations (the Allocations and Designations document identifies 14 site allocations for employment development).</td>
<td>Employment development Increased vehicle traffic Increased demand for water treatment</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat offsite (none of the employment site allocations are located within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites). Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution (offsite). Air pollution.</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat (offsite) and non-physical disturbance (also offsite) could affect South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. Air pollution could affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2), Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA and Rochdale Canal SAC.</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the</td>
<td>Uncertain: The employment site allocations in combination would result in large-scale employment development within Kirklees which could result in an increase in vehicle traffic and the associated air pollution. While none of the allocated employment sites are within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites, (as shown in Map 4.2 in Chapter 4) two are within 2.5km of the South Pennines Moors SPAs and could therefore result in offsite habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mixed use site allocations (the Allocations and Designations document identifies 13 site allocations for mixed use development). | Mixed use development  
Increase in recreation pressure  
Increased vehicle traffic  
Increased demand for water treatment | Physical damage/loss of habitat offsite (none of the mixed use site allocations are located within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites).  
Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution (offsite). | Physical damage/loss of habitat (offsite) and non-physical disturbance (also offsite) could affect South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA.  
Air pollution could | Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal | Uncertain: The mixed use site allocations in combination would result in large-scale development within Kirklees which could result in an increase in vehicle traffic and the associated air pollution.  
While none of the allocated mixed use sites... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation.</td>
<td>affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees. Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees.</td>
<td>meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. Policy PLP47 provides for well maintained and accessible open spaces which may help to mitigate pressure on Natura 2000 sites for recreation resulting from other Local Plan policies. Using good practice construction techniques could mitigate the potential impacts of noise, vibration and light pollution during the construction phase.</td>
<td>are within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites (as shown in Map 4.3 in Chapter 4); two are within 2.5km of the South Pennines Moors SPAs and could therefore result in offsite habitat loss and/or non-physical disturbance in those areas, particularly during the construction phase. Of those sites, none have been identified during the initial screening stage as having the potential to contain habitat used by the qualifying bird species. Habitat loss and/or non-physical disturbance will therefore not occur. Six of the sites are within 7km of one of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees and are therefore most likely to contribute to recreational pressure. Therefore, only air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/ allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space site allocations (the Allocations and Designations document identifies 503 site allocations for local and urban greenspace).</td>
<td>None – the allocations for open space in Kirklees would not result in new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The allocation of open space may help to mitigate impacts of the development proposed elsewhere in the Local Plan in terms of increased recreation pressure at Natura 2000 sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller site allocations (the Allocations and Designations document identifies two site allocations for Traveller sites).</td>
<td>Development of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Increase in recreation pressure. Increased vehicle traffic. Increased demand for water treatment.</td>
<td>Air pollution. Disturbance from recreation.</td>
<td>Disturbance from recreation could affect any of the Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees but is most likely to affect South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA as they are within Kirklees. Air pollution could affect any of the</td>
<td>Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats</td>
<td>No: The Local Plan allocates two sites for Travellers; however they are both located in the north of the District, well away from the nearest Natura 2000 sites as shown in Map 4.4 in Chapter 4. While the allocation of the sites could contribute to an increase in vehicle traffic and the associated air pollution, and increased pressure for recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals site allocations</td>
<td>Minerals-related development</td>
<td>Physical damage/loss of habitat offsite (none of the minerals site allocations are located within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites). Non-physical disturbance such as noise/vibration and light pollution (offsite). Air pollution.</td>
<td>Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars. Policy PLP47 provides for well maintained and accessible open spaces which may help to mitigate pressure on Natura 2000 sites for recreation resulting from other Local Plan policies.</td>
<td>Uncertain: These site allocations would result in minerals-related development within Kirklees which could result in an increase in vehicle traffic and the associated air pollution. While none of the allocated minerals sites are within the boundaries of Natura 2000 sites (as...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan policy/allocation</td>
<td>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</td>
<td>Likely effects if proposal implemented</td>
<td>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</td>
<td>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste site allocation (the Allocations and Designations document)</td>
<td>Development of waste management facility at Emerald Street,</td>
<td>Air pollution.</td>
<td>Natura 2000 sites in and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>Specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars.</td>
<td>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)? shown in Map 4.3 in Chapter 4), six are within 2.5km of the South Pennines Moors SPAs and could therefore result in offsite habitat loss and/or non-physical disturbance in those areas, particularly during the construction phase. Of those, one site has been identified during the initial screening stage as having the potential to contain habitat used by the qualifying bird species (as shown in Map 4.5 in Chapter 4) and so could result in habitat loss and/or non-physical disturbance in those areas. Therefore, these issues need to be considered in more detail during the Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy PLP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that No: This site is located in the north of Kirklees, well away from the nearest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan policy/ allocation</th>
<th>Likely activities (operations) to result as a consequence of the proposal</th>
<th>Likely effects if proposal implemented</th>
<th>Natura 2000 site(s) potentially affected</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures – if implemented would avoid likely significant effect</th>
<th>Could the proposal have likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites (taking mitigation into account)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identifies one site allocation for waste development).</td>
<td>Huddersfield Increased vehicle traffic Increased demand for water treatment</td>
<td>and around Kirklees.</td>
<td>proposals which may directly or indirectly compromise achieving the conservation objectives of a designated or candidate European protected site will not be permitted unless the proposal meets the conditions specified in Article 6 (3) - (4) of the Habitats Directive. Policy PLP20: Sustainable travel and demand management seeks to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Natura 2000 sites (as shown in Map 4.5 in Chapter 4) and the site is already in operation as a waste management facility. Policy PLP30 provides robust mitigation for impacts on Natura 2000 sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarded land (the Allocations and Designations document identifies 66 sites to be safeguarded for future development).</td>
<td>None – the site allocations will not result in development within the plan period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4
Kirklees Council Ecology report
Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – Screening

Introduction

This document forms part of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the Kirklees Allocations and Designations document. A HRA is required in respect of the potential for development of allocated sites to have an adverse significant effect on the conservation objectives of Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) Special Protection Area and South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area (here after referred to collectively as the South Pennine Moors SPA).

A potential impact of developing site allocation in the Kirklees Local Plan, which could potentially result in significant effects on the South Pennine Moors SPA, is loss of land outside of the boundary of the South Pennine Moors SPA used for foraging by bird species that breed within the SPA. Such land is known as ‘functionally connected’ land.

Through a desk based screening process, based on distance from the South Pennine Moors SPA, current land use, and planning status and the existence of previous assessment, it has been possible to screen out the majority of allocation sites as not containing functionally linked land.

This document presents the findings of habitat survey of those allocations that have not been screened out through the desk based screening, and uses this habitat information to determine the potential for individual sites to contain land functionally linked to the South Pennine Moors SPA. Individual site assessments are presented in the appendices to this report.

Method

Site specific habitat survey

All allocation sites remaining in the assessment following the desk based screening were surveyed to collect information on the nature of the habitats present that would indicate the suitability, or otherwise, for SPA breeding birds, including:

- Phase 1 habitat classification of the habitats at a field level.
- Where grassland habitats were recorded:
  - A measurement of typical sward height and vegetation structure.
  - Information on grassland management, including grazing species and/or cutting regime.
- Presence of flushes and/or marshy grassland within the field unit.

Screening for individual species

For each of the individual species listed above their habitat requirements have been related to the information collected for individual allocations. The results of this screening process for individual species at each site are presented in Appendices 1 to 9, which also provide the results of the site level habitat survey.
Where it is not possible to screen out the potential for effect on individual SPA bird species based on suitability of habitats, data supplied by Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) for 2010 and 2011 has been considered.

**Results**

**Habitat survey**

The predominant habitat recorded during the surveys was improved grasslands, with occasional areas of other habitats including tall ruderal vegetation, acidic/neutral flushes, and buildings and hardstanding.

Grassland habitats were managed in a variety of ways, with permanent pasture the most prevalent land use, followed by silage cut. In reality the land use of specific fields is likely to vary between years and may include more than one land use, such as silage cut followed by grazing. Habitat descriptions are provided in the appendices.

The only survey constraints encountered are in respect of determining land use history. However, the information collected is considered sufficient for the present evaluation of value to specific SPA bird species.

**Screening for species**

Details of the rational for the screening in or out of individual species are provided in the appendices. However, in general the following is true for each species.

**Golden plover** (*Pluvialis apricaria*) – Golden plover nest within the blanket bog of the South Pennine Moors SPA and forage almost exclusively on short grassland outside of the SPA. Females forage during the day and can travel up to approximately 7 km from the nest, while males forage at night and can travel up to approximately 2.5 km from the nest. Both males and females typically forage in groups and use traditional foraging sites. The preference is for relatively level, open sites that are not overlooked. It has not been possible to rule out the possibility that golden plover will use the habitats of the allocations H288A and ME1966 as foraging sites.

**Merlin** (*Falco columbarius*) – Merlin nest within the upland habitats of the South Pennine Moors SPA and hunt small birds throughout a large territory that may include habitats within and outside the SPA. The potential for merlin to hunt over the individual allocation sites is variable (evaluation for each site provided in the appendices), however loss of these sites is considered only likely to result in displacement of merlin, which is unlikely to result effects on the merlin population of the SPA that are significant.

**Short-eared owl** (*Asio flammeus*) – This species nests within the habitats of the South Pennine Moors SPA and hunts field voles and other small mammals in suitable habitats, including habitats within the SPA and rank grasslands outside of the SPA. None of the allocation sites is considered to include areas of rank grassland of sufficient extent to be significant in supporting the population of short-eared owl that breeds within the SPA, therefore the loss of habitats within the allocation sites is unlikely to result in a significant effect on the short-eared owl population of the SPA.
Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*) – This species breeds and forages within the upland habitats of the South Pennine Moors SPA during the breeding season and winters in coastal areas. This species does not rely on habitats outside of the SPA and within Kirklees during the breeding season, therefore none of the allocations sites are considered functionally linked to the SPA in respect of Dunlin.

**Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)** – Twite typically breed within heathland habitats above the moorland line, and therefore within the South Pennine Moors SPA, and forage during this season on unimproved grasslands. The availability of these habitats is therefore a strong indication of the potential for a site to be functionally linked the SPA in respect of twite. No such habitats occur within any of the allocations, therefore none of the allocations are considered to be functionally linked in respect of twite.

**Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)** – Curlew nest within the upland habitats of the South Pennine Moors SPA and frequently forage on soft, typically wet, ground outside of the SPA. Curlews also preferentially use suitable habitats closest to the nest site. None of the allocation sites support sufficient areas of wet or marshy grassland that, if lost, are likely to result in a significant effect on the population of curlew using the SPA, and the location of the allocation sites is such that there is highly likely to be alternative foraging habitat closer to the SPA. Therefore, none of the allocation sites are considered to be functionally linked to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*)** – This species typically nests below the moorland line on very short grasslands or on bare ground. However, where habitats within the SPA have become degraded or have been recently burned, lapwing may nest within the SPA. Lapwing will chaperone their unfledged chicks into adjacent areas to forage, however this will only involve immediately adjacent land. None of the allocation sites are sufficiently close to the SPA to be visited by individual lapwing that are breeding within the SPA, therefore no allocation site is considered functionally linked to the South Pennine Moors SPA in respect of lapwing.

**Conclusion**

All species have been screened out of the assessment for all sites with the exception of H288A and ME1966, where it has not been possible to confidently state that these sites are not functionally linked to the SPA in respect of golden plover. An appropriate level of survey should be undertaken for each of these sites during the breeding bird season to determine if these sites are used for foraging by golden plover.
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Appendix 1: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – E1866

Survey Findings

TN1) Standing water. Fishing lake.

TN2) Buildings and hard standing.

TN3) Improved grassland. Sheep grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 4 cm.

TN4) Semi-improved neutral grassland. Rank and unmanaged. Sward height approx. 20 cm. Some tall ruderal vegetation present.
Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

The habitat of TN3 is potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. However, the field is heavily grazed by sheep and surrounded by mature trees, which is likely to reduce the suitability of this area due to disturbance and reduced sight lines respectively. Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site. The closest known significant feeding site is located at Blackmoorfoot Reservoir approximately 1.4 km north of the site. A record of a flock of 20 individuals was also recorded at Meltham Golf Course, approximately 1.2 km to the south, however this record was made in January 2011 and is not considered to be a significant feeding site for SPA breeding birds. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from Blackmoorfoot Reservoir, approximately 1.4 km to the north. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.

Short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*)

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species. Tussocky grassland is present on site (TN4 and TN5), however the area of this habitat is limited in extent and unlikely to support high densities of field vole. The closest known records of short-eared owl to the site are from Blackmoorfoot Reservoir, approximately 1.4 km to the north. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*)

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.
Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*)

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.

**Requirement for further survey**

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 2: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H67

Survey Findings

TN1) Active construction site.
TN2) Active construction site.
TN3) Active construction site.
TN4) Active construction site.
TN5) Improved grassland. Sheep grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 8 cm.
TN6) Improved grassland. Possibly cattle grazed permanent pasture (no livestock present during survey). Sward height approx. 5 cm. Minor area of acid/neutral flush present in field, dominated by soft-rush (*Juncus effusus*).

TN7) Possibly cattle grazed permanent pasture (no livestock present during survey). Sward height approx. 4 cm. Some areas of tall ruderal vegetation and areas dominated by soft-rush (*Juncus effusus*).
Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)
The habitat of TN5, TN6 and TN7 are potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. The undeveloped areas of this site lie on the eastern edge of the conurbation of Meltham, with housing to the south and a cricket ground to the west. Levels of disturbance are therefore considered to be relatively high.

Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site. The closest known significant feeding site is located at Blackmoorfoot Reservoir approximately 1.2 km north of the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)
Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from Blackmoorfoot Reservoir and a location to the west of the reservoir, the closest record is approximately 1.2 km to the northwest.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.

Short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*)
Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species. No rank or tussocky grassland is present within the site.

It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*)
Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)
The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.
It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

**Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)**

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. There is a limited extent of potentially suitable curlew foraging habitat within the site and this limited area is not considered sufficient to support significant numbers of foraging curlew. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*)**

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.

**Requirement for further survey**

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 3: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H200

Survey Findings

TN1) Species poor semi-improved neutral grassland. Unmanaged at time of survey but little accumulation of leaf litter, indicating management in previous years. Sward height approx. 35 cm.

Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

Golden plover have a preference for short grasslands and the typical sward height of the grassland on site would indicate that the site is sub-optimal as foraging habitat for golden plover.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from a location to the west of the Blackmoorfoot Reservoir, the closest record is approximately 1.4 km to the north of the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.
**Short-eared owl (Asio flammeus)**

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of unmanaged grassland, such as below young forestry plantation, with a rank or tussocky structure, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species.

The grassland habitat was rank at the time of survey, however the vegetation showed little accumulated leaf litter, which indicated regular management in previous seasons. This habitat is considered sub-optimal for field voles, and therefore for short-eared owl.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

**Dunlin (Calidris alpina schinzii)**

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

**Twite (Carduelis flavirostris)**

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

**Curlew (Numenius arquata)**

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus)**

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.
Requirement for further survey

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 4: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H288A

Survey Findings

TN1) Improved grassland. No management evident at the time of survey. Vegetation not rank therefore likely that the grassland is managed with a hay or silage cut during summer. Ward height approx. 25 cm.

TN2) Improved grassland. No management evident at the time of survey. Vegetation not rank therefore likely that the grassland is managed with a hay or silage cut during summer. Ward height approx. 25 cm.
TN3) Improved grassland. No management evident at the time of survey. Vegetation not rank therefore likely that the grassland is managed with a hay or silage cut during summer. Ward height approx. 25 cm.

TN4) Improved grassland. No management evident at the time of survey. Vegetation not rank therefore likely that the grassland is managed with a hay or silage cut during summer. Ward height approx. 28 cm.

TN5) Improved grassland. No management evident at the time of survey. Vegetation not rank therefore likely that the grassland is managed with a hay or silage cut during summer. Ward height approx. 25 cm.
Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

The habitat of the whole site is potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site, the closest major foraging sites lie at least 3 km east of the site. However, there are records of golden plover including nesting individuals within the SPA, which lies approximately 1.1 km to the southwest of the site.

Based on the available information it is not possible to rule out the possibility that golden plover are using that site for foraging. However, the lack of records of this species in the immediate area suggests that the site is not a significant foraging location.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The closest record provided by HBC is located approximately 600 m northeast of the site at Boshaw Whams Reservoir. Other records have been provide from around 1.2 km southeast of the site.

Indicated by the location of the site in relation to the SPA and the occurrence of record of Merlin within the vicinity of the site, it cannot be entirely ruled out that Merlin will hunt over the site on occasion. However, due to the lack of site fidelity displayed by this species it is considered unlikely that development of the site will result in a loss of functionally connected land that is significant in respect of Merlin.
Short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*)

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species. No rank or tussocky grassland is present within the site.

It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*)

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*)

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.

Requirement for further survey

It is not possible to rule out use of some or all of this site by birds breeding within the South Pennine Moors SPA. It is therefore recommended that bird survey is undertaken within the breeding season to determine if the site should be considered functionally linked to the SPA.
Appendix 5: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H342

Survey Findings

TN1) Semi-improved neutral grassland. Rank and unmanaged. Sward height approx. 30 cm. Some tall ruderal species present.

TN2) Semi-improved neutral grassland. Possibly light grazing by horses. Sward height variable within field, approx. 10 to 20 cm. Large areas of tall ruderal vegetation present.

TN3) Improved grassland. Horse grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 4 cm.
TN4) Semi-improved neutral grassland. Light grazing by horses. Sward height approx. 5 cm.

TN5) Semi-improved neutral grassland. Light grazing by horses. Sward height approx. 5 cm.

**Site Conclusion**

**Golden plover (Pluvialis apricaria)**

The habitat of TN2 and TN3 are potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. However, TN3 is heavily grazed by horses and the whole site is located on a valley side and lacks the open sight lines preferred by golden plover. It is considered that these factors will reduce the suitability of the site for use by this species.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

**Merlin (Falco columbarius)**

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from a location to the west of the Blackmoorfoot Reservoir, the closest record is approximately 1.3 km to the north of the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.
Short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*)

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of unmanaged grassland, such as below young forestry plantation, with a rank or tussocky structure, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species.

Tussocky grassland and areas of tall ruderal vegetation are present on site (TN1 and part of TN2); however the area of this habitat is limited in extent and unlikely to support high densities of field vole.

It is considered unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

**Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*)**

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

**Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)**

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grass lands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

**Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)**

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*)**

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.
Requirement for further survey

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 6: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H343

Survey Findings

TN1) Improved grassland. Sheep grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 5 cm.

TN2) Improved grassland. Sheep grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 5 cm.

Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

The habitats on site are potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. The site occupies an area of land between the eastern edge of Meltham and an area of mature woodland to the east; the site is approximately 75 m in width at its widest point. The site is therefore considered to lack the open site lines preferred by foraging golden plover.

Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site. The closest known significant feeding site is located at Blackmoorfoot Reservoir approximately 1.1 km north of the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from
Blackmoorfoot Reservoir and a location to the west of the reservoir, the closest record is approximately 1.1 km to the northwest.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.

**Short-eared owl (Asio flammeus)**

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species. No rank or tussocky grassland is present within the site.

It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

**Dunlin (Calidris alpina schinzii)**

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

**Twite (Carduelis flavirostris)**

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

**Curlew (Numenius arquata)**

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus)**

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.
Requirement for further survey

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 7: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H356

Survey Findings

TN1) Improved grassland. Horse grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 5 cm. This field includes an area of acid/neutral flush dominated by soft-rush (*Juncus effusus*).

TN2) Improved grassland. Horse grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 3 cm. This field includes an area of acid/neutral flush dominated by soft-rush (*Juncus effusus*).

TN3) Improved grassland. Horse grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 20 cm.
TN4) Improved grassland. Horse grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 10 cm.

TN5) Semi-improved neutral grassland. Rank and unmanaged. Sward height approx. 30 cm. Some scrub colonisation in this area.

Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

The grasslands of TN1, TN2, TN3 and TN4 are potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. However, the fields are heavily grazed by horses and located on a valley side at the western edge of Slaithwaite, without the unobstructed views typically preferred by
foraging golden plover. The relatively high level of disturbance and lack of unobstructed views is considered to reduce the suitability of the site for foraging golden plover.

Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site. The closest known significant feeding site is located at to the west of Blackmoorfoot Reservoir, approximately 1.8 km southeast of the site.

It is considered unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The closest record provided by HBC is located approximately 550 m east of the site. Other records have been provide from around 1.8 km south of the site, at Deer Hill Reservoir.

Due to the proximity of the nearest record, it cannot be entirely ruled out that Merlin will hunt over the site on occasion. However, due to the lack of site fidelity displayed by this species it is considered unlikely that development of the site will result in a loss of functionally connected land that is significant in respect of Merlin.

Short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*)

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species. A very limited area of rank grassland is present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*)

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. There are some moderately sized areas of potentially suitable curlew foraging habitat within
the site. However, the level of disturbance from grazing horses and adjacent housing is considered likely to reduce the suitability of the site for this species.

The closest record of curlew supplied by HBC originates from approximately 550 m east of the site, whereas the SPA boundary is located approximately 2.3 km to the west of the site. Curlew will successfully breed both within and outside of the SPA boundary, and will typically forage within 1 km of the nest site (occasionally straying further). Curlew will also typically use the first available suitable foraging site from the nest.

There is ample potentially suitable curlew foraging habitat between the SPA and the site; it is therefore unlikely that the site will be used by curlew breeding within the SPA. Due to the distance between the SPA and the records of curlew from the east of the site (approximately 2.8 km), these individuals are considered most likely to be breeding outside of the SPA and therefore do not form part of the breeding bird assemblage for the SPA.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus)**

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.

**Requirement for further survey**

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 8: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – H626

Survey Findings

TN1) Improved grassland. Mown – possibly for hay or silage, potentially with follow-up grazing. Sward height approx. 15 cm.

TN2) Improved grassland. Mown – possibly for hay or silage, potentially with follow-up grazing. Sward height approx. 15 cm.

Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

The habitats on site are potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. The site is located at the southwest edge of Holmbridge and is bordered on the north and east by housing. The site is therefore considered to lack the open site lines preferred by foraging golden plover.

Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site. The nearest records are of small numbers of birds located at least 1.2 km to the south west.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from
approximate 3 km to the east of the site, with other records a similar distance to the east and within the SPA itself.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.

**Short-eared owl (Asio flammeus)**

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species. No rank or tussocky grassland is present within the site.

It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

**Dunlin (Calidris alpina schinzii)**

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

**Twite (Carduelis flavirostris)**

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

**Curlew (Numenius arquata)**

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

**Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus)**

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.
Requirement for further survey

No further survey required in respect of identifying land functionally connected to the South Pennine Moors SPA.
Appendix 9: Kirklees Site Allocations HRA – ME1966

Survey Findings

TN1) Cricket ground.

TN2) Improved grassland. Sheep grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 5 cm.

TN3) Improved grassland. Sheep grazed permanent pasture. Sward height approx. 10 cm.
TN4)  Improved grassland. Silage cut. Sward height approx. 15 cm.

TN5)  Improved grassland. Sheep and cattle grazed permanent pasture. Sward height variable within field approx. 5 to 20 cm.
TN6) Heathland vegetation, with spoil from quarry workings on eastern end of field.

TN7) Agricultural buildings with areas of improved grassland.
Site Conclusion

Golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*)

The habitats of TN1, TN2 and TN3, and to a lesser extent TN4, are potentially suitable for supporting foraging golden plover. The site is located on a plateau and has good sight lines to surrounding areas, which increases the suitability of the site for golden plover.

Inspection of the Huddersfield Birdwatchers Club (HBC) data does not indicate any significant golden plover foraging sites within the vicinity of the site. However, there are records of northern passage birds (not functionally connected to the SPA) approximately 700 m southeast of the site. Other records of small numbers of golden plover have also been supplied in the wider area, the closest of which is approximately 1 km to the south.

Due to the suitability of the site, it cannot be ruled out that the site is used by golden plover. However, all records within approximately 1 km appear to be of northern passage birds, which are not considered to be functionally connected to the SPA. Due to the age of the survey information, the records should not be relied upon as the only evidence of absence of golden plover.

It is considered unlikely that development of the site will result in a loss of functionally connected land that is significant in respect of golden plover.

Merlin (*Falco columbarius*)

Merlin is an aerial predator that preys on small birds. The distribution of this species is linked to availability of prey and there is limited fidelity for specific sites displayed. The records provided by HBC are mainly distributed within 1 km of the SPA with notable exceptions at the south of Kirklees. The closest known records of this species are from Bowshaw Whams Reservoir, approximately 1.9 km to the southeast.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of merlin.
Short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*)

Short-eared owl hunt mainly field voles and their distribution is linked strongly to the abundance of this species. Short-eared owl shows more site fidelity than merlin, the other predator in the assessment, however this is strongly linked to the availability of rank or tussocky grassland, which provides that habitat requirements of its main prey species.

The area of rank grassland within the allocation site is limited, therefore it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of short-eared owl.

Dunlin (*Calidris alpina schinzii*)

Dunlin breed and forage primarily within the SPA and for this reason are considered highly unlikely to be using the site. It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of dunlin.

Twite (*Carduelis flavirostris*)

The distribution of twite is strongly linked to the availability of unimproved grasslands managed as hay meadows, which provide the food sources for this species (primarily the seeds of common sorrel and dandelion) together with the open sward structure that permits their feeding technique. No such habitat exists within the site.

It is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of twite.

Curlew (*Numenius arquata*)

Curlew require soft, typically wet, ground upon which to feed by probing for invertebrates. Such habitats are not present within the site. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of curlew.

Lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*)

Lapwing are typical of the moorland edge where they breed and forage for invertebrates. Breeding within the SPA is relatively rare and will only occur where the habitats have become degraded to such an extent that bare ground is available. Breeding individuals will walk with chicks to nearby habitats, therefore on occasions where lapwing are breeding on the SPA only land immediately adjacent to the SPA boundary is likely to be functionally linked in respect of lapwing.

Due to the distance between the SPA and the site, it is considered highly unlikely that development within this site will impact land functionally connected to the SPA in respect of lapwing.

**Requirement for further survey**

It is not possible to rule out use of some or all of this site by birds breeding within the South Pennine Moors SPA. It is therefore recommended that bird survey is undertaken within the breeding season to determine if the site should be considered functionally linked to the SPA.
Appendix 5
Review of Potential for In-Combination Effects with other Local Authority Plans
Bradford Metropolitan District lies to the north of Kirklees and includes almost the entire area of Rombalds/Ikley Moor (part of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA) in the north of the District, and edges of the central SSSI component South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA along the western boundary of the District.

**Housing**

The provision of 42,100 dwellings will be accommodated in the District between 2013 and 2030. Most will be apportioned (28,650) to the Regional City of Bradford (with Shipley and Lower Baildon), 6,700 to the Principal Towns of Ilkley, Keighley and Bingley, 3,400 to the Local Growth Centres at Queensbury, Silsden, Steeton with Eastburn and Thornton and the remaining 3,350 to the Local Service Centres.

**Employment Land Provision**

The Core Strategy supports the delivery of at least 1,600 jobs through planning for a supply of at least 135 ha of developable employment land over the Local Plan period by allocating a range of sites for general employment purposes; distributed as follows:

1. 100 ha within City of Bradford
2. 30 ha in the Airedale Corridor
3. 5 ha in the Wharfedale corridor

**HRA Findings**

The December 2014 HRA Report for the Bradford Core Strategy identifies that without adequate policy avoidance or mitigation measures, adverse effects on the integrity of the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPA could occur due to recreation pressure, loss of functionally linked land used by the breeding bird assemblage and urban edge pressures. These adverse effects should be able to be avoided or mitigated through the inclusion of the specific measures in Strategic Core Policy 8 in the Bradford Core Strategy and a planned Supplementary Planning Document to guide implementation of the South Pennine Moors Zones of Influence set out in the policy, which includes developer contributions towards greenspace improvements to deflect visitors away from the SPA (and avoid effects), implementation of onsite access management measures and a programme of habitat management and monitoring (for residential developments within 7km of the SAC/SPA boundary). During the Examination, Natural England raised concerns that there had not been a sufficient demonstration of how the mitigation measures will be achieved. A number of Main Modifications to the Core Strategy addressed this point, setting clearer guidance on buffer zones and requiring the production of an SPD. The HRA of the Proposed Modifications (2015) concluded that these measures are sufficient and that the Core Strategy (Proposed Modifications) would not result in adverse effects on the ecological integrity of this site. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

Leeds lies to the north east of Kirklees and includes a very small portion of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in its north western corner.

**Housing**

The provision of 70,000 new dwellings will be accommodated in Leeds between 2012 and 2028. This will be distributed most heavily through the centre and south of the District, with less housing development taking place to the north of the city centre. The Outer South West Housing Market Characteristic Area, which...
Local Plans

borders Kirklees, will accommodate 7,200 new homes, which equates to 11% of the new housing proposed in the District.

Employment Land Provision

Spatial Policy 9 sets out the provision that will be made for offices, industry and warehouse employment land and premises. It specifies that a minimum of 706,250sqm of office floorspace will be provided within the District, with a minimum of an additional 160,000sqm to be identified in or on the edge of the city centre and town centres.

A minimum of 493ha of general employment land for uses such as research and development, industrial and distribution/warehousing uses will be provided in the District.

HRA Findings

The December 2012 HRA Screening Report for the Core Strategy (taking into account Pre-Submission changes) revisited the conclusion of the earlier Habitats Regulations Assessment: Screening Determination (February 2012) that the Core Strategy policies do not give rise to any likely significant effects on the nature conservation objectives of European designated sites, either alone or in-combination with other plans and/or projects and therefore that an Appropriate Assessment was not required. It was again concluded that, even taking into account the Pre-Submission changes to the Core Strategy, Appropriate Assessment was not required as the new and amended policies did not give rise to any likely significant effects on the nature conservation objectives of European designated sites, either alone or in-combination with other plans and/or projects. Where needed, avoidance mechanisms had already been built into policies either in the Natural Resources and Waste DPD or the Core Strategy. No further updates to the HRA Report were made during the Examination. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

Wakefield Core Strategy: Adopted (April 2009)

Wakefield District lies to the east of Kirklees and includes the Denby Colliery Grange Ponds SAC in the west of the district, near to the border with Kirklees.

Housing

The largest number of additional houses will be built in Wakefield, with smaller, but significant, numbers in Castleford and Pontefract. As a Sub Regional City it is expected that the urban area of Wakefield, including its suburbs will accommodate at least 30% of the district’s housing requirement. As Principal Towns, Castleford and Pontefract are expected to accommodate at least 20% and 10% respectively.

The towns of Normanton, Featherstone, Knottingley, Hemsworth and South Elmsall/Kirkby will be the main focus for new housing growth after the Sub Regional City and Principal Towns. The towns of Horbury, Ossett and Stanley/Outwood have experienced significant growth in recent years and therefore growth will be more constrained in these settlements in order to ensure a sustainable development pattern. Together these settlements are expected to accommodate at least 25% of the district’s housing requirement.

Employment Land Provision

In total a gross supply of 350 ha of prime employment land is proposed in the district up to 2021. 255 hectares of this land is available as follows:

- 75 hectares will be primarily for commercial office development;
- 85 hectares will be primarily for light and general industry;
- 95 hectares will be primarily for wholesale and freight distribution.

An additional 95 ha of new land will be identified for wholesale and freight distribution. Beyond 2021 employment land will come forward in accordance with the requirements of the spatial development strategy and in accordance with policy CS8: The Local Economy, which states that most new employment development will be located within the urban areas of the district, particularly within city and town centres, Employment Zones, and on sites allocated for employment use.

HRA Findings

The Appropriate Assessment Report for the Core Strategy and Development Policies Development Plan
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Documents (January 2008) considered the potential impacts on Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC and concluded that the majority of the objectives, policies and proposals will not have any impact on the integrity of the SAC. Some objectives and proposals were identified as likely to have an impact on the SAC; however when considered in combination with policies that provide mitigation, no likely significant effects were identified and the full Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA was not required. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

Barnsley Core Strategy: Adopted Version (September 2011)
Barnsley Local Plan Publication Draft (June 2016)

Barnsley borough is located to the south east of Kirklees and includes a small portion of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in its western corner. The current key planning document in the borough is the 2011 Adopted Core Strategy. Barnsley Borough Council is preparing a Local Plan, which is intended to replace the 2011 Core Strategy. The most recent stage in the preparation of the emerging Local Plan was a consultation on the Publication Draft of the Local Plan, which closed on 5 August 2016.

Housing

The adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will seek to complete 21,500 new homes between 2008 and 2026. The emerging Local Plan seeks completion of at least 20,900 net additional homes between 2014 and 2033. These are to be distributed as follows:

- Urban Barnsley – 45%
- Cudworth – 6%
- Dearne – 14%
- Hoyland – 11%
- Penistone – 5%
- Royston – 6%
- Wombwell – 10%
- Other settlements – 3%

Employment Land Provision

The Adopted Core Strategy states that 350ha of land is to be provided to meet the development needs of business and industry. The emerging Local Plan proposes an allocation of around 309ha new employment land, focused on Barnsley town centre. The emerging Local Plan also allows for reserved employment land at Goldthorpe to be brought forward if there is a proven need.

HRA Findings

The February 2010 Appropriate Assessment Screening Report for the Core Strategy concluded that the Core Strategy was not likely to have any significant effects on Natura 2000 sites, and that the full Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA was not required.

The Habitat Regulations Assessment 2016 for the new Barnsley Local Plan considers the potential impacts of Barnsley’s policies and proposals in the Local Plan on South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC and Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC. It concludes that the majority of policies and proposed sites within the Local Plan will not result in any harm to the European Sites. By concentrating development in existing settlements and proposed environmental and habitat protection allocations, the Local Plan will help to protect the integrity of the SAC and SPA. There is however a risk of a potentially negative effect on the European sites arising from the proposed housing allocations within a 2km buffer zone, and further assessment will be required if they are to be allocated in the next stage of the plan.

There is potential for emerging Local Plan site allocations to have in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan, however the Barnsley proposals are not sufficiently advanced to reach a conclusion regarding the potential for in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan.

High Peak Local Plan: Adopted Version (April 2016)

High Peak District lies to the south of Kirklees and includes a large area of the southern part of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA.
### Local Plans

#### Pennine Moors SAC/SPA.

**Housing**

Provision will be made for at least 7,200 dwellings over the period 2011-2031 at an overall average annual development rate of 360 dwellings. The Glossopdale Sub area will accommodate 27-35%, the Central Sub Area will accommodate 30-33% and the Buxton Sub Region will accommodate 32-43% of this provision.

**Employment Land Provision**

The Local Plan identifies gross employment land requirements from 2011 to 2031 of 45.216ha. Employment land for offices is to be encouraged primarily in the main Market Towns while the focus of retail, leisure and office developments should be town centres. The local plan states that a minimum of 7.7ha of employment land should be allocated by the Neighbourhood Plan for Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish to support the Borough wide identified need for employment land.

**HRA Findings**

The March 2014 Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Local Plan presents the findings of the screening and Appropriate Assessment stages of the HRA and concluded that likely significant effects could not be ruled out in relation to the Plan as currently worded in relation to certain Natura 2000 sites, including South Pennine Moors SAC and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. The potential significant effects relate to possible air quality effects from operation of employment development close to the sites, possible urban effects associated with development close to the site and (in the case of Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA), the possible effects of wind turbine development on designated birds.

Following amendments to the Local Plan by the Council, an HRA addendum was produced (August 2014). The addendum concluded that the amendments made it possible to rule out any adverse effects on European sites. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

### Oldham Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies: Adopted Version (November 2011)

Oldham Borough lies to the west of Kirklees and includes edges of the central SSSI component South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA along the eastern boundary of the Borough.

**Housing**

The council will allocate sufficient land, in whole or as part of a mixed use scheme in the Site Allocations DPD, to accommodate at least 289 dwellings per year, net of clearance, on average over the LDF plan period up to 2026, informed by the findings of the SHLAA. At least 80% of the housing provision will be on previously developed land. Around 60% of the new dwellings will be provided in East and West Oldham, while 10% will be distributed within each of Failsworth and Hollinwood, Saddleworth and Lees, Royton, Shaw and Crompton, and Chadderton.

From 2010/11 to 2025/26 the borough will provide sufficient land for 4,624 new dwellings.

**Employment Land Provision**

Approximately 82 ha of land will be allocated for business, industry and office developments. The focus will be on areas that are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling as alternatives to the car. This includes Oldham Town Centre and the centres of Chadderton, Failsworth, Hill Stores, Lees, Royton, Shaw and Uppermill. Other accessible employment areas – known as 'Business and Employment Areas' and 'Saddleworth Employment Areas’ - will be designated as part of Oldham's economic land supply. The principal employment areas will form an ‘arc of opportunity’ from Oldham Town Centre through to Foxdenton and on to Hollinwood Business District with its links to Manchester City Centre.

**HRA Findings**

The November 2011 HRA Report for the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD concluded at the screening stage that the Rochdale Canal SAC could experience significant effects in relation to the development proposed in the Plan. The Appropriate Assessment stage of the HRA was then carried out, and it was concluded that, although development is proposed in areas relatively close to the
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SAC, providing that mitigating plans, policies and strategies are adopted and implemented appropriately through the development management process, development areas planned for in the Joint DPD can be allowed to go forward without harm being caused to the special interest of the Rochdale Canal SAC. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

Rochdale Core Strategy Submission version (January 2013)

Please note that Hearing Sessions of the Examination took place in the first two weeks of October 2013. Following his consideration of all the evidence submitted, the Inspector requested that the Council undertake some additional work to provide him with the appropriate basis to assess the 'soundness' of the Core Strategy. This additional work related specifically to up to date evidence of objectively assessed housing need. In order to undertake this work the Council sought a suspension of the examination in order to carry out an update of its Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The Examination hearings resumed in June 2015, and no Main Modifications appear to be currently available.

Rochdale lies to the west of Kirklees and includes the Rochdale Canal SAC as well as edges of the central SSSI component South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA along the north eastern boundary of the District.

Housing

The Core Strategy seeks to provide sufficient land to deliver at least 400 net additional dwellings per year up to 2028. It aims to maximise the potential of previously developed sites and targets development of 80% of housing on previously developed land. The south of the borough has been highlighted as the focus of the majority of future housing development due to its accessibility to the core of the city region.

Development in the north of the borough will be of an overall scale and density that reflects the accessibility and character of the Pennine fringe.

Employment Land Provision

The Core Strategy makes provision for the supply of up to 210ha of land for employment needs. This land is provided mostly in the south of the borough in the following growth corridors:

- Rochdale town centre / Kingsway corridor
- Sandbrook Park / Crown Business Park / Castleton corridor
- Middleton town centre / Oldham Road corridor
- South Heywood employment sites
- Stakehill Business Park

Office development is mainly to be confined to town centres. In the north of the borough the Core strategy aims to protect existing employment zones.

HRA Findings

The January 2013 HRA report for the Rochdale Core Strategy concluded that, providing the recommended mitigation measures, which take the form of amending and controlling development in the strategic locations through the Plan and amending the core policies, are put into place, controlled development within the identified areas can proceed without harm being caused to the special interests of any Natura 2000 sites. It is therefore important that the Plan must restrict the scale, form and location of development within the strategic locations identified in the Plan, but it is not justifiable to not allow development at all in these areas. From the Examination library, there is a letter from Natural England to the Council in August 2013, explaining that the proposed changes to the HRA the Core Strategy outlined in a note by the Council to the Inspector (dated August 2013), follow a meeting between Natural England and Rochdale Borough Council on 1 August 2013, where Natural England’s discussed concerns with the publication draft of the plan; in particular our view that the Core Strategy did not adequately contain mitigation measures recommended by the HRA. Natural England’s letter states that provided the changes outlined in the note to Inspector are incorporated into the Core Strategy and amendments made to the HRA, Natural England is satisfied with the conclusions made by the Council. The HRA confirms that the Core Strategy will not give rise to any likely significant effects as sufficient mitigation and avoidance measures are contained within the Plan. As such an Appropriate Assessment is not required. However, Natural England notes that further assessment will be necessary with respect to lower tier development plan documents, particularly in relation to subsequent land allocations Development Plan Documents and any future Masterplans. The Core
Strategy HRA has assessed as much as possible at this stage without having the exact details of land allocations and future proposals. Therefore, in-combination effects of any lower tier plans with the new Kirklees Local Plan will need to be kept under review as the HRA progresses.

Calderdale Core Strategy Preferred Options (2012)

Please note that the Council is in the process of streamlining the production of the Local Plan and will merge the Core Strategy and Land Allocations into a single plan. A consultation on Potential Sites and Other Aspects of the Local Plan took place during November and December 2015.

Calderdale District lies to the north west of Kirklees and includes areas of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in the southwest and northwest parts of the District.

Housing

The Core strategy makes provision for 16,800 additional dwellings to be created within Calderdale between 2008 and 2029. This housing requirement will be delivered in two phases:

- Phase 1: 2008 - 2015 = 600 units per annum
- Phase 2: 2016 - 2029 = 900 units per annum

Priority will be given to using brownfield land with an interim target of approximately 55% for the proportion of new housing built on brownfield land or arising through the conversion of existing buildings. Housing development is proposed to be concentrated to the larger towns of Halifax and Brighouse with each location allocated 47.9% and 20.0% of new housing to be completed in the District respectively. The Local Towns of Elland (10.0%), Sowerby Bridge (8.0%), Todmorden (6.0%) and Hebden Bridge (2.4%) have been designated as areas where smaller levels of housing development are to be located.

Employment Land Provision

The employment gross floorspace requirement in the District until 2029 has been projected at a minimum of 98,000m² of (B1a) office space and 215,000m² of (B1b,c, B2, B8) industrial/warehouse space. Sites of this development have been identified in masterplans for Halifax, Brighouse, Elland, Todmorden and Sowerby Bridge town centres.

HRA Findings

No HRA work in relation to the emerging new Local Plan for Calderdale has yet been carried out, therefore it is not yet possible to reach a conclusion regarding the potential for in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy: Adopted version (October 2011)

The Peak District National Park area covers part of the south of Kirklees District and includes a large area of the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC.

Housing

Housing land is not identified in the Core Strategy; however new housing can be accepted in exceptional circumstances where it addresses particular local needs, provides housing for key workers or it is required for conservation reasons e.g. the enhancement of local vernacular.

Employment Land Provision

New sites and buildings for business development will be permitted within or on the edge of the named settlements in the overarching development strategy. Proposals must be of a scale that is consistent with the needs of the local population.

Proposals for business development in the countryside outside the Natural Zone and the named settlements must take account of certain principles including a preference for using existing buildings that fit with local character and the need to conserve and enhance landscape character.

HRA Findings

The HRA Report for the Core Strategy (August 2010) concluded that it should be entirely possible to avoid
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and mitigate any adverse impacts on Natura 2000 Sites as a result of the Core Strategy, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, providing that a number of recommendations are implemented. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES THAT DO NOT BORDER KIRKLEES BUT INCLUDE THE SOUTH PENNINE MOORS SAC/SPA AND ROCHDALE CANAL SAC

Tameside Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document: Preferred Options (January 2013)

The Council has been involved in the preparation of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and as such work on the Core Strategy is currently on hold.

Tameside Metropolitan Borough lies to the south west of Kirklees and includes a very small portion of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA on its eastern boundary.

**Housing**

The Core Strategy makes provision for 11,000 additional dwellings to be created within Tameside between 2012 and 2029. Phased housing targets are set out in five year intervals over the Plan period, to be reviewed every 2 to 3 years:

- **Phase 1:** Years 1-5 = 500 units per annum (total homes = 2,500)
- **Phase 2:** Years 6-10 = 650 units per annum (total homes = 3,250)
- **Phase 3:** Years 11-17 = 750 units per annum (total homes = 5,250)

A target for the provision of affordable housing has been set at around 20% of new residential developments. Priority will be given to using brownfield land with a target of 80% being set with regard future development occurring on brownfield land. Housing is proposed to be supplied in sustainable locations – Ashton-under-Lyne (16%), the other towns and villages in the Borough [Droylsden (5%), Hyde (10%), Longdendale and Hattersley (15%), Denton and Audenshaw (18%), and Stalybridge (21%)], and at appropriate locations that are, or could become, sustainable and accessible, utilising public transport, walking and cycling options available.

**Employment Land Provision**

The Plan proposes focussing employment development in Ashton-under-Lyne, the Boroughs other town centres, existing employment sites and the identified proposed strategic sites (Ashton Moss West, Mottram M67 and Dukinfield Gate Street). The primary focus of the strategic sites is expected to be employment related uses and development.

**HRA Findings**

The HRA Report for the Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (August 2012) includes an assessment of the likely in-combination effects of the Core Strategy with other plans and proposals. This involved reviewing the emerging plans for the neighbouring authorities, including Oldham District which is located between Tameside and Kirklees Districts and includes fragments of the South Pennine Moors SAC and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA. The review of the HRA of Oldham Council’s Joint Core Strategy and Development Polices DPD identified a number of potential site allocations and other potential threats which could have a potential significant effect on the Rochdale Canal SAC. However, it was concluded that providing mitigating plans, policies and strategies are adopted and implemented appropriately through the development management process, development within these sites could proceed without harm being caused to the special interest of the SAC. No likely significant in-combination effects on the South Pennine Moors SAC and Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA were identified. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

**Sheffield Core Strategy (March 2009)**

*Work has commenced on the preparation of a new Local Plan but the first iteration has not yet been*
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published and no HRA work has been published.

Sheffield lies to the south east of Kirklees and includes a large area of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in the northwest of the district.

**Housing**

The Core Strategy identifies a net requirement for 29,750 new houses in Sheffield for the period 2004/05 to 2025/26. This overall provision of housing has been targeted for the city as follows:

- Net annual requirement 2004/05 to 2015/16: 1,292 homes (15,500 homes total)
- Net annual requirement 2016/17 to 2020/21: 1,425 homes (7,125 homes total)
- Net annual requirement 2020/21 to 2025/26: 1,425 homes (7,125 homes total)

The Core Strategy also identifies that total net supply of dwellings for the same period is 28,305 giving a margin of 1,445 dwellings for the period 2004/05 to 2025/26. The majority (at least 90%) of new housing development is to be concentrated within or adjacent to the main urban area of Sheffield at suitable, sustainably located sites. Further new housing development for the period 2008/09 to 2020/21 is to be concentrated in the Stocksbridge/Deepcar urban area. After 2020/21, and before then as opportunities arise, additional housing growth is targeted to be supplied in parts of the city where significant change and regeneration are taking place. This is identified as being primarily in the main urban area of Sheffield (with an emphasis on the Lower Don Valley and North East Urban Area) and Stocksbridge/Deepcar. Priority is to be given to housing development on previously developed sites and been the period of 2004/05 and 2025/26 no more than 12% of dwelling completions will be on greenfield sites.

**Employment Land Provision**

The Core Strategy identified a requirement for 72ha of land for office use and 450ha of land for other business and industry use for the period 2008-2026. This development is to be focussed to brownfield sites and the Core Strategy stipulated that no more than 4 hectares or 2.5% of all land developed for business and industry use over any five-year period, whichever is the lowest, will be greenfield land. Development locations for offices will be concentrated in the City Centre and its edges and this will make up at least 65% of total office development in the city.

**HRA Findings**

The HRA Report for the Core Strategy (November 2007) concluded that detrimental effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 as a result of the policies of the Strategy are unlikely. Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

**Pendle Core Strategy: Adopted version (December 2015)**

Pendle Borough lies to the north west of Kirklees District (beyond Calderdale) and includes a small area of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in the southeast of the borough.

**Housing**

Over the 19 year period from 2011 to 2030 provision will be made to deliver 5,662 (net) dwellings, equating to an average of 298 dwellings per annum. The majority will be delivered in the M65 Corridor and the remainder in the West Craven Towns and rural Pendle.

**Employment Land Provision**

The Local Plan will ensure that 68.0 hectares (gross) of land is brought forward for employment uses – Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 – over the plan period.

**HRA Findings**

The HRA Screening Report for the Core Strategy (September 2014) notes that only 9.1% of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA, is within the Borough boundary. The other Natura 2000 sites are at least 10.8 Km distant from Borough boundary therefore, it is concluded that any effects of the Pendle Borough Council
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Core Strategy (Pre-Submission Report) DPD upon Natura 2000 Sites are not likely to be significant and therefore the sites can be screened out as being unlikely to be affected. The proposed plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000 Site (in combination with other plans or projects). Therefore, in-combination effects with the new Kirklees Local Plan can be ruled out.

**Craven Second Draft Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft (April 2016)**

*From July to August 2016 the Council carried out a preferred housing sites consultation.*

Craven District lies to the north west of Kirklees District (beyond Bradford) and includes a small area of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in the south of the borough.

**Housing**

Over the plan period, a minimum of 5,120 new homes will be provided, within the plan area, to meet local housing requirements.

**Employment Land Provision**

The Local Plan will ensure that about 28 hectares of land is brought forward for employment use over the plan period.

**HRA Findings**

The Draft Craven Local Plan Update from February 2015 states that in relation to HRA: "A Screening exercise is currently being undertaken by the Planning Policy team to determine whether an Appropriate Assessment will be required. The Bradford Core Strategy Local Plan is of note, as during the preparation of the Core Strategy, the HRA process in considering the scale of growth for the district together with the proximity to designated sites (including the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC) has necessitated in modifications to the distribution strategy to limit potential impacts." Therefore it is not yet possible to reach a conclusion regarding the potential for in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan.

**Burnley Local Plan Preferred Options (July 2016)**

Burnley District lies to the north west of Kirklees District (beyond Calderdale) and includes a small area of the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPA in the east of the borough.

**Housing**

The Local Plan Policy SP2 states that around 4,180 net additional dwellings will be delivered over the plan period.

**Employment Land Provision**

Policy SP3 stated that around 90ha of employment land will be delivered over the plan period.

**HRA Findings**

The Local Plan Preferred Options HRA Report (July 2016) concludes that, although not likely, the plan may lead to offsite damage/disturbance to the habitats, affecting the qualifying features of the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA, and increased air pollution and increased recreation affecting South Pennine Moors SAC, South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA and Rochdale Canal SAC. The HRA suggests this should be revisited in the next stage of HRA for the Burnley Local Plan and Appropriate Assessment should be carried out if required. Therefore it is not yet possible to reach a conclusion regarding the potential for in-combination effects with the Kirklees Local Plan.

---
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