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1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Introduction to this Assessment

This Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening has been carried out by Atkins Limited (Atkins) on behalf of Babergh District Council for the Babergh: Working Draft Core Strategy (May 2011) and subsequently updated for the Core Strategy Submission Draft. The Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) is referred to as ‘the Plan’ for the purpose of this report.

The Plan covers the whole of the administrative area of Babergh and is a high level strategic document that sets out the long-term spatial planning framework for the development of Babergh between 2011 and 2026. More details regarding the contents of the Core Strategy are provided in Section 2 of this report.

This document is the final screening report and it builds on a previous draft report (July 2011) in which recommendations were provided for Babergh District Council to consider incorporating into the Core Strategy to mitigate potential issues identified during the HRA screening process. These have now been considered by the Council in consultation with Natural England and, where appropriate, incorporated into the Core Strategy.

1.2 Background to HRA

An HRA is required by Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (referred to below as “the Habitat Regulations”) for all plans and projects which are likely to have significant effects on European sites. European sites include Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA). HRA is also required, as a matter of UK Government policy for proposed SPAs (pSPA), candidate SACs (cSAC) and listed Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar sites) for the purposes of considering plans and projects which may affect them1. Within this report all of the above designated nature conservation sites are referred to as ‘European sites’.

Screening forms the first stage of HRA. If Screening cannot conclude that there are no Likely Significant Effects then formal Appropriate Assessment is required. The stages of the HRA process are:

- Stage 1 – Screening: To test whether a plan or project either alone or in combination with other plans and projects is likely to have a significant effect on a European site;
- Stage 2 – Appropriate Assessment: To determine whether, in view of a European site’s conservation objectives, the plan (either alone or in combination with other projects and plans) would have an adverse effect (or risk of this) on the integrity of the site with respect to the site structure, function and conservation objectives. If adverse impacts are anticipated, potential mitigation measures to alleviate impacts should be proposed and assessed;
- Stage 3 – Assessment of alternative solutions: Where a plan is assessed as having an adverse impact (or risk of this) on the integrity of a European site, there should be an examination of alternatives (e.g. alternative locations and designs of development); and,

---

- Stage 4 – Assessment where no alternative solutions remain and where adverse impacts remain: In exceptional circumstances, where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, damaging plans or projects may be permitted, but compensatory measures must be put in place to offset negative impacts.

The stages of HRA screening used for this work, in accordance with the method prepared for Babergh District Council and agreed with Natural England in 2010, are:

- **Stage A – Preliminary Review**: A preliminary assessment of the Issues and Options Core Strategy was undertaken by Atkins in 2010 to feed into consideration of the selection of options. This stage involved identifying all European sites in and around the Plan area that might be at risk of impacts from the options for development within the Plan. Further information on the designated sites was obtained at this stage. An initial report was provided to Babergh Council advising where options would have been likely to have significant effects on identified European sites and providing recommendations for how likely significant effects could be avoided. The purpose of the Preliminary Review report was solely to inform the development of the Core Strategy and did not form an HRA screening report. No assessment of ‘in combination’ effects on the European sites, arising from cumulative impacts with other projects or plans, was carried out at Stage A.

- **Stage B – HRA Screening**: This report provides the results of Stage B. A draft version was completed for the Working Draft Core Strategy. This final version has been updated in the light of the Core Strategy Submission Draft. The HRA Screening is being undertaken, to determine whether, in view of the conservation objectives of the European sites identified at Stage A, the plan (either alone or in combination with other projects and plans) would have a likely significant effect on these European sites. Where likely significant effects are anticipated, recommendations to alter the Plan and potential mitigation measures to alleviate effects were proposed and assessed.

- **Stage C – HRA Screening update**: To provide an updated HRA Screening for the Submission Core Strategy following the consultation period for the Draft Core Strategy, and gain the approval of Natural England for the findings of the screening.

‘Mitigation measures’ are referred to above. This term is used within this report to refer to measures to avoid, cancel or reduce the effects of the Plan on a European site, in accordance with Natural England guidance. In accordance with this guidance, mitigation measures would include the following:

> “Avoidance measures eliminate the likelihood of any effects. Cancellation measures have the effect of cancelling out potentially adverse effects on a European site before their effects are felt. Reduction measures are designed to reduce likely significant effects, perhaps to a level that is insignificant or in a way that makes them unlikely to occur.”

Mitigation measures do not include compensation, which would be required if following HRA screening and subsequent Appropriate Assessment, it is predicted that for reasons of overriding public interest and in the absence of alternative solutions, adverse impacts would occur.

The first consideration in screening is to formally record whether the Plan is directly connected with or necessary to the nature conservation management of a European site. The Babergh Core

---

2 Correspondence and meeting between Atkins, Babergh Council and Jonathan Bustard and colleagues at Natural England, (meeting date 21 April 2010)
3 Atkins, Preliminary Review of Issues and Options Core Strategy Report (March 2009) to inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment October 2009.
Strategy is not directly connected with or necessary to the nature conservation management of any European site.

1.3 Outline of this Report

Following this introduction:

- Section 2 outlines details of Core Strategy Submission Draft and provisions within the document to protect European sites;
- Section 3 of this report outlines the methodology used for this HRA screening;
- Section 4 provides details of the relevant five European sites, namely Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA, Stour and Orwell Estuaries Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA, Deben Estuary Ramsar site and the Sandlings SPA (including their Conservation Objectives and site vulnerabilities);
- Section 5 sets out recommendations Atkins provided in July 2011 for amendments to the Plan and other mitigation measures;
- Section 6 details the results of the HRA screening for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site;
- Section 7 details the results of the HRA Screening for the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site;
- Section 8 details the results of the HRA Screening for the Sandlings SPA;
- Section 9 details the other plans and projects identified which may lead to in combination effects on the five European sites; and,
- Section 10 provides the conclusions of the HRA Screening.

Supporting information is provided in appendices. Appendix A contains the detailed assessment and recommendations for individual policies within the Working Draft Core Strategy which was the subject of the draft HRA Screening exercise in July 2011. Appendix B contains the Babergh Core Strategy Key Diagram, which illustrates the key areas where growth is proposed and also shows the location of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. Appendix C contains relevant site descriptions for the five European sites. Documents that have been reviewed for additional information on potential issues affecting these European sites include:

- The HRA documents for other Plans and Projects listed in Section 9.
- Babergh Water Cycle Study Stage 1 / 2, Royal Haskoning for Babergh Council, June 2011.
- Disturbance to Waterbirds Wintering in the Stour-Orwell Estuaries SPA, a report from Wildside Ecology to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Unit, 2007.
- Ecological Assessment for Brantham Industrial Estate, the Landscape Partnership, September 2010.
- A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Haven Gateway, the Landscape Partnership, 2008.

5 Taken from the JNCC website (www.jncc.gov.uk) accessed in June 2011
2. Plan Details

2.1 Proposed Plan

The Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft provides the strategic context that will guide the preparation of subsequent Development Plan Documents identified in the Local Development Framework.

None of the proposals within the Plan are directly connected with, or necessary to the nature conservation management of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site or Sandlings SPA.

2.2 Brief Description of Plan

The Plan includes a vision of how the area will develop in physical, economic, environmental and social ways to meet the needs of residents, businesses and others, strategic objectives to achieve this vision and a spatial strategy which will identify how many settlements and other areas will develop or be preserved.

The Plan includes a total of 18 core policies that will be used to establish development principles and broad indications of the location of strategic housing, employment, retail and other development proposals. The Key Diagram shows the broad locations of development proposals for the District (see Appendix B).

The key areas where development would be focussed are illustrated in Table 4.1, which sets out the planned housing allocations. Strategic Employment Sites are also proposed at two of these areas, the Ipswich Fringe and Brantham.

Table 2-1: Key Areas where Residential Development is proposed in the Core Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings for which provision is made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury and Great Cornard</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Fringe</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantham Regeneration, Core and Hinterland Villages</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the areas described above are shown on the Key Diagram, in Appendix B, which also shows the location of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. As shown on the Key Diagram, the direction of growth for development within the Ipswich Fringe is towards the west, away from the Orwell Estuary. The core and hinterland villages are scattered across the District. Among them, Brantham is highlighted in the Core Strategy as a site where existing brownfield land is allocated for redevelopment, under an allocation preserved from the previous Local Plan. Brantham is adjacent to the Stour Estuary.

2.3 Provisions within the Plan that Protect European Sites

When planning applications are determined, all of the relevant policies and supporting text in the Plan would be taken into account and used as the basis for decision-making. The working draft Core Strategy includes some policies that may directly or indirectly contribute to protecting European sites.

**Policies contributing to protection of European sites: CS3, CS4, CS5, CS9 and CS10**

Policy CS10 (sustainable development) states that development should “protect and enhance biodiversity” and “create green spaces and / or extend existing green infrastructure”.

Other policies allow for green infrastructure provision. The detail provided on green infrastructure increases within the policies where the areas under consideration are closer to a European site. Policies CS3 (Strategy for Sudbury / Great Cornard) and CS4 (Strategy for Hadleigh) include a requirement, where appropriate, for a green infrastructure framework. The Ipswich Fringe is close to Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. Policy CS5 (Strategy for Growth in Babergh’s Ipswich Fringe) must be considered in combination with the Key Diagram, which shows the overall direction of growth in this fringe being towards the west, away from the Orwell Estuary. The policy itself states that development in the fringe should “be based upon and designed around a green infrastructure framework providing high quality design … [including] links with existing formal and informal green spaces, wildlife areas and natural landscape settings and features, particularly the Gipping Valley footpath, Chantry Park and Belstead Brook Park”.

Policy CS9 (Green Infrastructure) states “all new development will make provision for high quality, multi-functional green infrastructure…. Specific requirements, characteristics and standards of GI provision within strategic sites and larger site allocations will be identified in the site allocation DPD and where appropriate through master planning mechanisms”. Specific mention is made in the supporting text to this policy to the proximity of the Ipswich Fringe to the Stour and Orwell Estuaries and the need for management of alternative recreational opportunities to be “integral to the shape and design of any development in this area”.

**Other Policies contributing indirectly to protection of European sites: CS7 and CS8**

The policies mentioned above are the key policies contributing to protection of the European sites. However, others should also have an indirect contribution to protection. These are:

Policy CS7 (Reducing Carbon Dioxide Emissions) should improve the standards of new development, contributing to the wider controls needed on climate change, which can affect designated sites such as the estuaries through altered patterns of coastal erosion and therefore potentially increased coastal squeeze.

Policy CS8 (Renewable Energy) encourages measures to achieve 15% reduction in predicted carbon production for all types of development. However, the effects of this policy are not assumed to be entirely beneficial and in the detailed assessment (Appendix A1) consideration is given to the effects of wind turbines on bird mortality.
3. Methodology and Scope of Screening

3.1 The Plan

Available information regarding the Plan has been gathered. This information is vital for the analysis of whether the Plan is likely to have a significant effect on the European sites. A summary of the Plan and its contents is given above in Section 2.

3.2 Scope - Determination of the European Sites included in the HRA

The scope of the HRA screening exercise was defined in consultation with Natural England, to determine which European sites should be included in the HRA. An initial review of the Plan in light of the Habitats Regulations has been undertaken by Atkins as part of the HRA process. This initial review looked at European sites within the District and then at the wider geographic extent or zone of influence of any effects which could arise as a result of the Plan and considered which European sites should be included within the assessment. The distance within which European sites were considered depended on the potential effects. For example, changes in water resources could affect a European site far downstream of a District. However, in this instance such consideration of downstream effects was not necessary as the European site downstream, Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, also forms the eastern boundary of Babergh District and is therefore automatically included in the scope.

The Plan contains a strategy for growth, including housing distribution, strategic employment sites and related infrastructure within the district. The Plan therefore focuses on regeneration and future development within the district. There are unlikely to be significant emissions to air or water or water level effects which could be generated through individual developments such as large scale power stations and quarry operations as these types of development are not included in the Plan. The exception to this is the potential for water resources and quality in the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site to be influenced by the scale of development proposed across the District. This has been investigated within the Water Cycle Study\(^6\), the findings of which are taken into account in this HRA report.

The housing provision within the Plan allows for an increased population within the District, with resultant potential for increased recreational pressure on European sites with associated impacts such as disturbance to key species.

The most recent England Leisure Visits report states that people will travel up to 17.3 km to a countryside destination (England Leisure Visits: Summary of the 2005 Leisure Visits Survey, Natural England, 2005). As a precaution this distance was increased to 20 km for an initial screen of European sites to ensure that all sites that may be impacted by recreational pressures from new housing developments are considered as part of the HRA process.

There are 21 European sites within 20 km of the District. Some areas are covered by more than one designation. These are listed below:

- Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar site;

\(^6\) Babergh Water Cycle Study Stage 1 / 2; Royal Haskoning, Final Report for Babergh Council, June 2011.
- Staverton Park and the Thicks, Wantisden SAC;
- Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site;
- Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site;
- Sandlings SPA;
- Hamford Water SPA and Ramsar site;
- Breckland SAC and SPA;
- Abberton Reservoir SPA and Ramsar site;
- Colne Estuary SPA and Ramsar site;
- Essex Estuaries SAC;
- Orfordness- Shingle Street SAC;
- Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Ramsar site; and
- Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries SAC.

Among these sites, only the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar Site fall within the district (with the European sites forming the eastern edge of Babergh District). The remainder of the European sites fall within 20 km of the District. It is understood that at the time of writing this report there are no additional sites under consideration for designation, such as candidate SACs and proposed SPAs, that need to be taken into account in this HRA\(^7\).

The Plan states that any future provision of housing will be concentrated in Sudbury, Hadleigh and Ipswich fringe, with some potentially to be provided in Brantham, which is adjacent to the Stour Estuary. This approach will focus the majority of development on or adjacent to existing built-up areas including open areas of green space. As a result, in consultation with Natural England\(^8\), the following European sites have been eliminated from the HRA process as it is extremely unlikely that there will be any likely significant effects on these sites given their distance to these towns:

- Abberton Reservoir SPA and Ramsar site is located 21.7 km from Hadleigh, 26.1 km from Ipswich fringe and 22.2 km from Sudbury;
- Colne Estuary SPA and Essex Estuaries SAC (whose boundary overlap) are located 23 km from Ipswich fringe, 24 km from Sudbury and 20.5 km from Hadleigh;
- Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Ramsar site and Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries SAC have the same site boundaries. These sites are located 21 km from Ipswich fringe, 33.8 km from Hadleigh and 27 km from Sudbury;
- Blackwater Estuary SPA is located 26 km from Hadleigh, 26.5 km from Sudbury and 29 km from Ipswich fringe;
- Orfordness Sheet Shingle SAC is located 19.4 km from Ipswich fringe, 32 km from Hadleigh and 46 km from Sudbury;
- Breckland SAC and SPA is located 25 km from Sudbury, 35 km from Hadleigh and 41 km from Ipswich fringe.

---

\(^7\) M. Meadows of Natural England; pers. comm. to C. Wansbury of Atkins, 7\(^{th}\) June 2011

\(^8\) Email correspondence between Sarah Bassett, Atkins and Jonathan Bustard, Natural England, May 2010.
• Hamford Water SPA and Ramsar site is located 24 km from Hadleigh and 35 km from Sudbury. ‘As the crow flies’ Hamford Water is 15 km from the Ipswich fringe, but to drive there would be over 30 km\textsuperscript{9}, due to the presence of the Stour Estuary.

• Staverton Park and the Thicks, Wantisden SAC is located 27 km from Hadleigh and 41 km from Sudbury, but is within 15 km from Ipswich. Staverton Park and the Thicks SAC is not open to public access. There is a public footpath running through part and alongside the SAC, but there is little car parking availability nearby and the right-of-way is not well used. It is considered unlikely that people will travel from Ipswich to this use this footpath, given the distance and lack of public access to the site. Therefore there will be no likely significant effects of the Staverton Park and The Thicks SAC.

The Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site forms the eastern edge of Babergh District. Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site is about 14 km from the Ipswich Fringe. The Sandlings SPA is located 27 km from Hadleigh and 41 km from Sudbury. Although it is 15 km from Ipswich measured on the map, in terms of driving distance this is estimated at 18 km\textsuperscript{10}. While this is slightly more than the 17.3 km the England Leisure Visits report states that people will travel to a countryside destination, the Sandlings is a popular destination and Ipswich is within 20 km. Therefore, Sandlings SPA is included as a precaution.

Therefore the HRA screening exercise will contain a record of the assessment of ‘likely significant effects’ from the Plan on five European sites, some of which have the same boundaries:

• Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site;
• Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site; and
• Sandlings SPA.

Further details of these European sites including their location, designation details and conservation objectives are provided in Section 4.

3.3 Obtaining Information on European Sites with the Potential to be Affected

Information has been gathered the European sites to be included in the HRA. This includes contacting Natural England for the Conservation Objectives and Favourable Conditions Tables for each European site and obtaining the latest Natura 2000 forms for SPAs and GIS for Ramsar sites from the JNCC website.

The Conservation Objectives and Favourable Conditions Tables for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site and Sandlings SPA have been obtained from Natural England for the purpose of this assessment.

3.4 Obtaining Information on Other Projects and Plans

In accordance with the Habitat Regulations there is a need to consider the potential for likely significant effects of the Plan ‘in combination’ with other projects and plans.

\textsuperscript{9} Using directions given on www.multimap.co.uk

\textsuperscript{10} Using directions given on www.multimap.co.uk
Statutory bodies surrounding, or in close proximity to, the five European sites were contacted for details of any projects or plans that have been subject to HRA in order to determine if there would be a cumulative impact on these European sites in-combination with the Plan.

The following organisations have been contacted for details of other plans and projects which have the potential for adverse effects upon the five European sites:

- Babergh Council;
- Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk;
- Forest Heath District Council;
- East Cambridgeshire District Council;
- Braintree District Council;
- Colchester Borough Council;
- Tendring District Council;
- Maldon District Council;
- Rochford District Council;
- Mid Suffolk District Council;
- Suffolk Coastal District Council;
- Ipswich Borough Council;
- Natural England;
- Essex and Suffolk Water; and
- Environment Agency.

3.5 Method of Assessing the Potential for Likely Significant Effects of the Plan ‘Alone’ and ‘In Combination’

Following the gathering of information on the Plan and the European sites, an assessment was undertaken to predict the likely significant effects of the Plan on the European sites ‘alone’. In order to inform this process, all parts of the Core Strategy were assessed to see if they could result in likely significant effects on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site or Sandlings SPA.

Likely significant effect is defined as any effect that may reasonably be predicted as a consequence of a plan or project that may affect the conservation objectives of the features for which the site was designated, but excluding trivial or inconsequential effects. Likely significant effect is defined within the Habitats Regulations Guidance Note 3 (English Nature, 1999) and would include any of the following:

- Causing change to the coherence of the site or to the Natura 2000\textsuperscript{11} series (e.g. presenting a barrier between isolated fragments, or reducing the ability of the site to act as a source of new colonisers);

\textsuperscript{11} Natura 2000 sites are SPAs and SACs; subsequent guidance (PPS9) confirms that the same consideration should be given to Ramsar sites, proposed SPAs and candidate SACs.
• Causing reduction in the area of habitat or of the site;
• Causing direct or indirect change to the physical quality of the environment (including the hydrology) or habitat within the site;
• Causing ongoing disturbance to species or habitats for which the site is notified;
• Altering community structure (species composition);
• Causing direct or indirect damage to the size, characteristics or reproductive ability of populations on the site;
• Altering the vulnerability of populations to other impacts;
• Causing a reduction in the resilience of the feature against external change (for example its ability to respond to extremes of environmental conditions); and,
• Affecting restoration of a feature where this is a conservation objective.

Each of the 17 policies within the working draft Core Strategy has been examined in detail to see if they will have a likely significant effect on the five European sites. The working draft wording of each policy as well as the findings of this assessment is given in Table A-1 in Appendix A. Sections 6, 7 and 8 summarise the findings of the HRA in relation to the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site (Section 6), Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site (Section 7) and Sandlings SPA (Section 8), updated to take account of the latest wording in the Submission Draft Core Strategy.

The potential for likely significant effects of the Plan on these five European sites ‘in combination’ with other projects and plans has also been considered, feeding into the assessments in sections 6, 7 and 8 of this report. HRAs that have been completed due to possible likely significant effects on and/ adverse effects on integrity of the on Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site or Sandlings SPA were reviewed in order to determine whether there is the potential for in-combination effects (see Section 9).

HRA is an iterative process. Where necessary, suggestions can be made of how to amend the Plan to avoid likely significant effects on a European site. This iterative approach has been adopted as part of this assessment and recommendations for the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Draft were provided earlier in this process (see section 5 of this report).

Current guidance from Natural England advises that mitigation measures can be taken into account at the HRA screening stage. However, there must be “an acceptable level of certainty that the measures will be delivered in a way, and in time, to achieve their function and statutory purpose”. Atkins’ recommendations were considered by the Council in consultation with Natural England and, where appropriate, incorporated into the Core Strategy, and this has been taken into account within this screening report.

The precautionary principle (as enshrined in the Habitats Regulations) has been taken into account during this HRA. The precautionary principle is used when an HRA cannot objectively demonstrate that there will be no likely significant effects on the European sites. If this occurs the subsequent stages of HRA must be completed for the project or plan, as explained above in section 1.2.

---

4. The European Sites

This section includes information about Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site and the Sandlings SPA including information about their designation status, their location, a brief description of the sites and their conservation objectives.

4.1 Stour and Orwell Estuary SPA and Ramsar site

The SPA and Ramsar site are considered together, because the boundaries of the two designations cover the same land and the conservation objectives are combined under Natural England’s management and monitoring system.

Table 4.1 - Information about the Stour and Orwell SPA and Ramsar site

| Site Designation Status                      | Stour and Orwell Estuary SPA  
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Stour and Orwell Estuary Ramsar site;       | Stour and Orwell Estuary Ramsar site;  

| Location of European Site                   | The Stour and the Orwell Estuaries lie along the easternmost edges of Babergh District. The site comprises Stour Estuary SSSI and Orwell Estuary SSSI.  
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                             | The Stour and Orwell estuaries straddle the eastern part of the Essex/Suffolk border in eastern England. The Stour Estuary forms the south-eastern part of Essex/Suffolk boundary. The Orwell Estuary is a relatively long and narrow estuary with extensive mudflats and some saltmarsh, running from Ipswich in the north, southwards towards Felixstowe.  

| Brief Description of the European Site      | The SPA and Ramsar site both cover the same land, 3,676.92 ha in area. The estuaries include extensive mud-flats, low cliffs, saltmarsh and small areas of vegetated shingle on the lower reaches. The mud-flats hold Enteromorpha, Zostera and Salicornia spp. The site also includes an area of low-lying grazing marsh at Shotley Marshes on the south side of the Orwell. In summer, the site supports important numbers of breeding Avocet Recurvirostra avosetta, while in winter they hold major concentrations of waterbirds, especially geese, ducks and waders. The geese also feed, and waders roost, in surrounding areas of agricultural land outside the SPA.  
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The site has close ecological links with the Hamford Water and Mid-Essex Coast SPAs, lying to the south on the same coast.

13 www.jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2011
Qualification as an SPA (taken from JNCC Natura 2000 data sheet, a copy of which is provided in Appendix C)

Qualifying species include:
- Avocet (breeding)
- Northern pintail *Anas acuta* (wintering)
- Dark-bellied Brent goose *Branta bernicla bernicla* (wintering)
- Red knot *Calidris canutus* (wintering)
- Black-tailed godwit (Icelandic) *Limosa limosa islandica* (wintering)
- Grey plover *Pluvialis squatarola* (wintering)
- Redshank *Tringa totanus* (wintering and passage)

It also qualifies as a wetland of international importance, by regularly supporting at least 20,000 waterfowl with 63,017 waterfowl (5 year peak mean 19/05/2005)

Qualification as a Ramsar Site (taken from Information Sheet on Ramsar Wetlands, a copy of which is provided in Appendix C)

The site qualifies as a Ramsar site for the following reasons:
Criterion 2
- Contains seven nationally scarce plants: stiff saltmarsh-grass *Puccinellia rupestris*; small cord-grass *Spartina maritima*; perennial glasswort *Sarcocornia perennis*; lax-flowered sea lavender *Limonium humile*; and the eelgrasses *Zostera angustifolia*, *Z. marina* and *Z. noltei*.
- Contains five British Red Data Book invertebrates: the muscid fly *Phaonia fusca*; the horsefly *Haematopota grandis*; two spiders, *Arctosa fulvolineata* and *Baryphema duffeyi*; and the Endangered swollen spire snail *Mercuria confusa*.

Criterion 5

Conservation Objectives of the European Site

Natural England’s Conservation Objectives for this site are, subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats and geological features in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is
designated (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar):

- Littoral sediment;
- Neutral grassland – lowland;
- Boundary and linear features ("Tidal-bank");
- Coastal open waters.

(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.

The JNCC note that "There is pressure for increased port development and marine recreation in this area. Marine recreation is being addressed within the Estuary Management Plan. Port development is being considered by public inquiry. Maintenance dredging of the River Stour and River Orwell poses potential threats to the SPA but the activity is being addressed through the provisions of the Habitats Regulations. The saltmarsh is eroding, partly as a result of natural coastal processes; the beneficial use of dredgings is taking place to try to combat these processes."

Key issues include:

- Physical loss:
  - Removal (e.g. harvesting, coastal development);
  - Smothering (e.g. by artificial structures, disposal of dredge spoil).
- Physical damage:
  - Siltation (e.g. dredging, outfall);
  - Abrasion (e.g. mobile benthic fishing, anchoring).
- Non-physical disturbance:
  - Noise (e.g. boat activity);
  - Visual (e.g. recreational activity).
- Non-toxic contamination:
  - Changes in nutrient loading (e.g. agricultural run-off, outfalls);
  - Changes in organic loading (e.g. mariculture, outfalls);
  - Changes in turbidity (e.g. run-off, dredging).
- Biological disturbance:
  - Selective extraction of species (e.g. bait digging, wildfowling, commercial and recreational fishing).

---

Existing Condition of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar Site:

The Stour and Orwell Estuaries form the eastern edge of Babergh District. Issues such as recreational use required more detailed consideration compared to the other European sites due to the Estuaries’ relative proximity to the residential areas of Babergh. As a result, additional details on existing conditions are provided regarding this site.

The Natural England condition assessment records for the SSSIs comprising the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site are summarised as follows:

**Stour Estuary SSSI:** This SSSI includes 10 units of land. Natural England records one of these units, totalling 2% of the SSSI by area to be in unfavourable condition, due to coastal squeeze.

**Orwell Estuary SSSI:** This SSSI includes 23 units of land. Natural England records show six of these, totalling 21.5% of the SSSI by area to be in unfavourable condition, all due to coastal squeeze. In places, studies of coastal habitats found an increase in saltmarsh area, but Natural England recorded these areas as ‘unfavourable no change’ due to the presence of sea walls preventing further natural evolution of the coast. Some potential for recreational disturbance was noted in places, particularly on the north bank, outside Babergh District.

In December 2007 Wildside Ecology produced a report on “Disturbance to Waterbirds Wintering in the Stour-Orwell Estuaries SPA”. The following bullet points are taken from the report summary, which explained that records over three winters showed:

- “The Orwell was busy compared with the Stour (about four times as busy) but birds on the Stour were generally more sensitive to activity and more prone to leave study sites (one in six events caused disturbance on the Orwell, one in three on the Stour).

- Walkers, those with dogs, and boats, were the most frequent activities on the SPA. These also caused most of the disturbance that was recorded but birds were most sensitive to relatively infrequent events such as shots, aircraft and bait-diggers which displaced greater numbers of birds.

- The impact of activities was site-specific and related to their numbers, the state of the tide, number of birds present, width of mudflat and upper shore characteristics. Events on the shore caused most disturbance at high tide and events occurring in the estuary most at low tide. There was twice as much disturbance at high tide.

- Birds appeared to habituate to benign events such as sailing boats, vehicles and horses and little disturbance was caused by these events where they were most frequent. But there was strong evidence that apparent habituation to more disruptive events was actually the result of reduced bird numbers. Fewer birds occurred where the number of events was greatest, especially at high tide.

- Low disturbance frequencies occurred therefore where bird numbers were either:

  a) relatively unaffected by activities (most of the mudflats of the Stour, the wider mudflats of the Orwell (above 400 m) and a few isolated roosts on both estuaries);

  b) severely affected by activities (parts of the northern shore of the Orwell at high tide, areas close to car parks or housing at both states of tide and narrow mudflats on the Orwell at low tide).

- Disturbance occurred on mudflats on the Orwell that are favoured feeding areas for birds but where visitor levels were high. Hidden approaches, relatively small mudflats and access to the shore at low tide compounded these effects.

15 Taken from Natural England website June 2011.
• Overall, birds in most parts of the SPA, particularly on the Stour, are affected little by the majority of activities at low tide. Fewer events, the larger numbers of birds and the availability of alternative areas on the estuary probably caused the increased sensitivity of birds on the Stour [compared to the Orwell]. By contrast, the high levels of activity around most of the Orwell, the relatively low numbers of birds at high tide and comparatively small mudflats at low tide, suggest that disturbance may be having an impact on populations of birds in this estuary."
4.2 Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site

The SPA and Ramsar site are considered together, because the boundaries of the two designations cover the same land and the conservation objectives are combined under Natural England's management and monitoring system.

Table 4.2 - Information about the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Designation Status</th>
<th>Deben Estuary SPA</th>
<th>Deben Estuary Ramsar site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of European Site</td>
<td>The Deben Estuary is located on the coast of Suffolk in eastern England. It extends south-eastwards for over 12 km from the town of Woodbridge to the sea just north of Felixstowe. It lies within the Suffolk Coastal District. The SPA and Ramsar site both comprise the Deben Estuary SSSI. It is to the north-east of Babergh District, about 14km from the nearest parts of Babergh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of the European Site</td>
<td>The Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site both cover the same land, 978.93 ha in area. Deben Estuary is relatively narrow and sheltered, and has limited amounts of freshwater input. The estuary mouth is the narrowest section and is protected by the presence of shifting sandbanks. The intertidal areas are constrained by sea walls. The saltmarsh and intertidal mud-flats that occupy the majority of the site, however, display the most complete range of saltmarsh community types in Suffolk. The estuary holds a range of swamp communities that fringe the estuary, and occasionally form larger stands. In general, these are dominated by Common Reed <em>Phragmites australis</em>. The estuary is of importance for its wintering waterbirds, especially Avocet <em>Recurvirostra avosetta</em>. Qualification as an SPA (taken from JNCC Natura 2000 data sheet, a copy of which is provided in Appendix C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification as a Ramsar Site (taken from Information Sheet on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Avocet *Recurvirostra avosetta* (wintering)
- Dark-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla bernicla* (wintering)
Ramsar Wetlands, a copy of which is provided in Appendix C

The site qualifies for Ramsar protection by supporting a population of the mollusc *Vertigo angustior* (an Annex II species\(^{16}\)). Martlesham Creek is one of only about fourteen sites in Britain where this species survives.

A second Ramsar qualifying species is the dark-bellied brent goose, *Branta bernicla bernicla* (an Annex I species)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Objectives of the European Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Conservation Objectives for Deben Estuary are (subject to natural change) to maintain the following habitat in favourable condition (*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivities of the European Site (taken from the documents in Appendix C and the Suffolk Coastal District Core Strategy Habitats Regulations Assessment (November 2010))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to the Natura 2000 data sheet, the saltmarsh and intertidal habitats are vulnerable to sea level rise and coastal squeeze. These issues are being addressed through the Shoreline Management Plan (the Essex and South Suffolk SMP is currently being produced by the Environment Agency) and research into possible managed retreat in parts of the site. Work by Suffolk Coastal District Council identified the Deben Estuary as a site that would attract visitors, particularly where housing was proposed within 1km (if walking) and 8 km (if driving) of home. These distances only include land within Suffolk Coastal District, but visitors from further afield will also contribute to recreational pressures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{16}\) Listed on Annex II of the Habitats Directive
4.3 Sandlings SPA

This section includes information about Sandlings SPA, the designation status, the location of the site, a brief description of the site and its conservation objectives.

Table 4.3 - Information about the Sandlings SPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Designation Status</th>
<th>Sandlings SPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite site including: Blaxhall Heath SSSI; Leiston – Aldeburgh SSSI; Sandlings Forest SSSI; Sutton and Hollesley Heath SSSI; Snape Warren SSSI; and Tunstall Common SSSI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Location of European Site | The SPA lies within the Suffolk Coastal District, within the County of Suffolk. It is about 15km to the northeast of the nearest part of Babergh District. |

| Brief Description of the European Site | Sandlings SPA includes six component SSSIs, with a total area of 3,391.8 ha. The SPA includes areas of forestry land, within which woodlark and nightjar nest and forage in open areas. Elsewhere in the SPA these birds are found in heathland habitat. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification as an SPA (taken from JNCC Natura 2000 data sheet, a copy of which is provided in Appendix C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Nightjar <em>Caprimulgus europaeus</em> (breeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Woodlark <em>Lullula arborea</em> (breeding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Conservation Objectives of the European Site | The Conservation Objectives for all the SSSIs for this SPA are to maintain, in favourable condition*, the habitats for the populations of woodlark (*Lullula arborea*) and nightjar (*Caprimulgus europaeus*). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The habitats listed in the Conservation Objectives for each component SSSI are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandlings Forest SSSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coniferous woodland,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiston – Aldeburgh SSSI (SPA does not include whole of SSSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standing Open Water and Canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fen, Marsh and Swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supraittoral Sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lowland Acid Grassland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Lowland Dwarf Shrub Heath
• Broadleaved, Mixed and Yew Woodland
Sutton and Hollesley Heaths SSSI
• Lowland dwarf shrub heath
Snape Warren SSSI
• Fen, Marsh and Swamp
• Lowland Acid Grassland
• Lowland Dwarf Shrub Heath
Tunstall Common SSSI
• Lowland acid grassland
• Lowland dwarf shrub heath
Blaxhall Heath
• Supralittoral Sediment
• Lowland Acid Grassland
• Lowland Dwarf Shrub Heath
(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable

According to the Natura 2000 data sheet, Sandlings Forest SSSI, the largest of the component SSSIs, is dominated by commercial forestry. Within the forest, large areas of open ground suitable for woodlark and nightjar were created by storm damage in 1987. Maintenance of open areas in the future relies on clear felling as the main silvicultural practice and the maintenance of some areas earmarked for woodlark and nightjar habitat. These objectives are included in the East Anglia Forest District Strategic Plan.

On the heathland SSSIs, lack of traditional management has resulted in the heathland being subjected to successional changes with the consequent spread of bracken, shrubs and trees. This is being addressed through habitat management work under the Countryside Stewardship Scheme and Tomorrows Heathland Heritage, and is resulting in the restoration of more typical heathland

---

habitat favourable to both nightjar and woodlark.

Human influences on the site include the frequent presence of travellers’ caravans. This is a longstanding problem, and a variety of mechanisms are utilised to keep them from the heathland; the digging of trenches and construction of earth barriers around the borders of sites is proving effective.

A visitor survey report was produced for the South Suffolk Sandlings area in 2011. This work was undertaken to understand current recreational use. The Sandlings SPA is within the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As such, work is ongoing to ensure that future recreational use is managed in a way that protects the ecological importance of the SPA.
5. Recommendations

In July 2011 the HRA screening identified some details within individual policies where clarifications within the policy or explanatory text could avoid or reduce potential risks that the policies could result in likely significant effects on a European site. These recommendations are set out below, in the order of the policies they affected. Policy numbers refer to those in the working draft Core Strategy.

Recommendations arising from the Water Cycle Study

A Water Cycle Study has been produced covering the whole of Babergh District18. This study provides recommendations for Babergh Council in relation to the Core Strategy, which allow for a series of growth options. To avoid duplication these recommendations are not replicated within this HRA report. For the purposes of HRA screening it is assumed that the recommendations in the Water Cycle are adopted in full.

Text to be inserted into Core Strategy: Recommended location is within Section 3 – The Delivery of Growth, Provision of Infrastructure and Monitoring:

“Babergh has a rich natural heritage, and at the forefront of this are the Stour and Orwell Estuaries which are acknowledged as being of international importance through their designation as a Special Protection Area (SPA), and a Wetland of International Importance (Ramsar site). In addition, there are other European sites beyond the district which could be affected by inappropriate development within Babergh, particularly Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site and Sandlings SPA, which fall within 20 km of the district boundary.

In order to ensure the protection of these European sites for generations to come, measures will be implemented to take account of the pressures of development which may arise from policies within the Babergh Core Strategy. The main effect which could arise as a result of the proposed development over the next 15 years is from increased population growth in the district, and the allocation of additional housing, which in turn may result in increased recreational pressures on the European sites through rises in visitor numbers. These sites support species which are susceptible to disturbance, and without appropriate measures in place there is a risk of degradation to these sites.

With this in mind a series of measures will be implemented, to ensure that the policies contained within this document will not have a significant effect on the European sites. These measures will include the following:

1 Reducing/ preventing an increase in recreational demand on the estuaries;

• Careful consideration has been given with regard to the distribution of housing. The target location for the largest provision of new housing is to be within Sudbury and Great Cornard. This town is over 20 km from the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site and other European sites, and

18 Babergh Water Cycle Study Stage 1 / 2; Royal Haskoning, Final Report for Babergh Council, June 2011
as such it is considered that increases in visitor numbers from this location will be minimal.

- The distribution of housing across the district up to 2031 will be steered away from the estuaries, unless housing allocations provide measures to avoid negative impacts. Specific site allocations will be detailed in the Site Allocation DPDs.

- New Accessible Natural Green Space will be provided to reduce demand on the estuaries. As set out in Policy CS10, this will be expected to take into account the detailed work on Green Infrastructure undertaken for the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. For example, a Country Park is being extended at Belstead Brook Park, to the south of Ipswich Fringe. This should contribute to mitigation of potential recreation issues resulting from the increase in the population of Ipswich as well as that of the Ipswich Fringe within Babergh. The Site Allocations DPD will include specific links between development allocations and greenspace provision requirements.

### 2 A Monitoring Programme

A precautionary approach is proposed, whereby despite the plans for provision of alternative greenspace, monitoring is also proposed. This provides Babergh Council with the opportunity to take additional action if unexpected increases in disturbance occur. This measure is required to ensure that any unexpected effects can be identified and their sources confirmed so that action can be taken.

- The programme will review “Disturbance to Waterbirds Wintering in the Stour-Orwell estuaries SPA” (Wildside Ecology 2007) report to identify key areas where birds are sensitive to disturbance along the Orwell and Stour Estuaries. Babergh Council will also obtain and review visitor studies being undertaken by the surrounding local authorities on the Deben Estuary and the Suffolk Sandlings.

- This programme will look to include baseline visitor surveys, to establish where in the district, and beyond, people are travelling from to reach the estuaries. This survey will be undertaken in the first year of the adopted strategy, i.e. prior to any increases in visitor numbers as a result of housing development.

- Visitor surveys will be undertaken at a frequency to be agreed with Natural England and neighbouring local authorities. Discussions with Natural England\(^9\) indicate that this is likely to be every five years.

Reporting on this monitoring plan will be tied in with the annual monitoring programme described under Policy CS17.

### 3 Planned Mitigation Measures:

If during the monitoring programme it is found that recreational pressure is increasing, then this will trigger the requirement to consider whether additional mitigation is required. This will be done by Babergh Council in consultation with Natural England. If required, a mitigation strategy will be devised in consultation with Natural England. The level of mitigation required will depend on what

\(^9\) Meeting of Babergh Council, Atkins, Natural England and RSPB, 13 July 2011.
impacts are arising and where the visitors are travelling from who are creating the pressures. Possible mitigation measures that might be considered are:

- Delaying further developments until suitable provision for Natural Green Space has been made in accordance with the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Further increases in Natural Green Space;
- Production of a visitor management plan for the estuary or estuaries;
- Employment of wardens to ensure that dogs are kept on leads and visitors are made aware of the sensitivities of the area affected by increased disturbance; and
- Signage and paths to filter visitors away from the key sensitive areas within the SPA / Ramsar site

Cross references to Policy CS7 (policy CS10 in the Submission Draft)

If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 below are made to its supporting text, the following Policies should be amended to cross-refer to CS7:

- Policy CS2 regarding development across Babergh District
- Policy CS3 Strategy for Sudbury / Great Cornard
- Policy CS4 Strategy for Hadleigh
- Policy CS5 Strategy for Ipswich Fringe
- Policy CS6 Strategy for the core and hinterland villages and Brantham
- Policy CS9 Renewable Energy
- Policy CS11 Local Economic Strategy
- Policy CS12 on The Rural Economy
- Policy CS13 Mix and Type of Dwellings
- Policy CS15 on Rural Exception Housing
- Policy CS16 Infrastructure Provision.

Text to be inserted into Policy CS6 regarding development in the core and hinterland villages and at Brantham

Correction: the explanatory text regarding the Brantham redevelopment states that “Adjacent land is designated as a AONB and as a SSSI. The tongue of land to the south to the railway is of wildlife significance.” It is essential that this text is corrected to include the statement that adjacent land is designated as an SSSI and forms part of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site.

Policy CS6 refers to proposed redevelopment of a brownfield site at Brantham. The Core Strategy recognises the sensitive location of Brantham, but does not make an explicit commitment to the protection of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. Either in the policy itself or in the explanatory text more information is required to refer to Policy CS10 on Green Infrastructure and the need to provide mitigation within any development proposal for potential recreational impacts on the SPA and Ramsar site. At the Core Strategy stage, no commitments are made to the form and intensity of development. However, the explanatory text states:
“It will be expected that such a scheme will deliver new employment buildings, new dwellings and improved community facilities proportionate to the amount of development permitted, all in accordance with an agreed masterplan. A high quality development will be sought, particularly in the event that riverside development is sought”.

It is recommended that wording is added stating:

“The masterplan and mitigation strategy will need to ensure that direct and indirect negative impacts on the integrity of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar Site are avoided. In particular, provision of alternative Natural Green Space will be required, in line with the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. Provision and funding for the green infrastructure will be provided by the developer(s). It is anticipated that the green infrastructure provision would include creation of a new Public Open Space, for which the design and management plan should aim for quality suitable for designation as a Local Nature Reserve”.

Text to be inserted into Explanatory Text for Policy CS7 – Sustainable Development

This policy includes an expectation that development should “protect and enhance biodiversity”. Government policy recommends that Core Strategy policies should not duplicate national ones, such as the protection afforded to European sites in PPS9. However, PPS9 was published prior to the ruling that HRA is required for Local Development Documents. Natural England advises that Plans should now make it clear that any development would not be in accordance with the plan if it could have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site. While risks can be reduced by the amendments to individual policies, as explained above, clarification should be provided in the supporting text for Policy CS7 to explain that biodiversity includes, but is not limited to, legally protected sites. With regard to SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites, additional text should be provided stating that:

- Any development proposal that would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will be subject to assessment under the Habitats Regulations at Site Allocation and/or project application stage. The HRA for this Core Strategy does not obviate the need for such assessment. If it cannot be ascertained that there would be no adverse effects on site integrity the project will be refused unless it passes the tests in Regulation 62, in which case any necessary compensatory measures will need to be secured in accordance with Regulation 66; and

- Any development that would have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects would not be in accordance with the Core Strategy.

It would not be appropriate to name the individual European sites in this text, as additional sites could be designated in the future and such a list could be interpreted as pre-judging the sites that could be affected by an individual development proposal.

Amendments Proposed for Policy CS17 on Monitoring

While this policy will not influence development directly, it sets out Babergh Council's commitment to monitoring and reporting on progress towards meeting the Plan’s objectives and identifying any unintended impacts. It is recommended that this includes reporting on;

- progress by Babergh and neighbouring Councils with the proposals in the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy; and,
• reviewing information from Natural England, the Wetland Birds Survey and organisations monitoring visitor pressure, pressure and, when appropriate, supplementing this with monitoring disturbance of wintering birds in the Stour and/or Orwell estuaries as explained above with regards to the monitoring programme.

This would help the Council to take account of progress in providing mitigation for recreational pressures in the programming of development and in assessing individual planning applications. Monitoring will focus on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar Site within Babergh, as impacts at Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar Site and Sandlings SPA would be monitored by other Councils, through mitigation strategies agreed with Natural England.

**Delivery of Recommendations**

The recommendations fall into three groups: changes to the wording of the Core Strategy; provision of additional accessible natural greenspace; and precautionary monitoring. In a time of cuts to, and careful prioritisation of, public spending it is necessary to consider whether the mitigation proposed can be delivered.

Changes in the wording to the Core Strategy are undertaken by Babergh Council itself, subject to review through consultation, the Examination in Public and final approval by central government. It is therefore justifiable to expect that appropriate wording can be provided to safeguard the European sites.

Provision of accessible natural greenspace is dependent on the actions of Babergh and neighbouring Councils, recreational site managers and developers. The Councils have agreed to be guided by the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy, ensuring a co-ordinated approach by neighbouring Councils. It is understood that Babergh Council are also reviewing Green Infrastructure potential outside the Haven Gateway area and will include Green Infrastructure proposals within Policy CS16 on Infrastructure Provision.

The current draft wording of the Core Strategy includes a specific policy (CS10) on the expectations for appropriate green infrastructure within development schemes. Key areas where additional greenspace would be required are the Ipswich Fringe and, if development occurs, Brantham. Funding is already in place for the extension of Belstead Brook Park on the Ipswich Fringe. Subject to the mitigation proposed above, the Core Strategy would include a clear commitment to specific green infrastructure provision if development occurs at Brantham. Therefore, it is justifiable to be confident that new strategically located accessible natural greenspace will be provided.

Monitoring would be undertaken by the Council, primarily using information collected by others, such as Natural England's site condition records. However, an element of additional monitoring would be required. Subject to the mitigation proposed above, the Core Strategy would include a clear commitment to monitoring, tied in with its ongoing annual monitoring programme. Initial work has already been undertaken to characterise disturbance to wintering birds in the estuaries\(^{20}\). Therefore, it is justifiable to expect that appropriate precautionary monitoring can occur.

6. Results of Screening for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site

This assessment was undertaken for the working draft Core Strategy document dated May 2011 and is based on the detailed assessments of each policy in Appendix A. Since that iteration of assessment, the Council have taken into consideration the HRA recommendations in Section 5. This had lead to some revision of the Core Strategy wording (dated 28.09.11). These revisions have been reviewed and their implications for the HRA are reported in the Update and Conclusions of this report (Section 10). Policy numbers refer to those in the working draft Core strategy; the full wording of each draft policy is provided in Appendix A for ease of reference.

During the detailed assessment of individual policies, certain policies have been identified where, in the absence of suitable mitigation, there could be Likely Significant Effects. These are:

- Policy CS2 regarding development across Babergh District
- Policy CS3 Strategy for Sudbury / Great Cornard
- Policy CS4 Strategy for Hadleigh
- Policy CS5 Strategy for Ipswich Fringe
- Policy CS6 regarding development in the core and hinterland villages and at Brantham
- Policy CS9 Renewable Energy
- Policy CS11 Local Economic Strategy
- Policy CS12 on The Rural Economy
- Policy CS13 Mix and Type of Dwellings
- Policy CS15 on Rural Exception Housing
- Policy CS16 Infrastructure Provision

The assessment of Likely Significant Effects set out in table 6.1 below was based on the assumption that the changes recommended above in Section 5 would be made. Babergh Council have subsequently incorporated those recommendations into the Core Strategy Submission Draft.
### Table 6.1 Screening Results for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Designation Status</th>
<th>Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the individual elements of the Plan likely to give rise to impacts on the European Site</td>
<td>Policy CS2 sets out the overall housing strategy. The subsequent policies CS3 to CS6 set out the strategy for individual areas; amongst these CS5 describes growth in the Ipswich Fringe, approximately 4km from the Orwell Estuary, and CS6 covers development at Brantham, a village adjacent to the Stour Estuary. Policy CS9 promotes renewable energy, which would include wind turbine schemes. Policy CS11 promoted economic development, including development in the east of the District, close to the estuaries. CS12 encourages appropriate development in, among other areas, coastal villages. Policies CS 13, 15 and 16 also promote specific types of development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe any likely direct, indirect or secondary effects of the Plan on the European Site by virtue of:

- Size and scale;
- Land take;
- Resource requirements (water extraction, etc);
- Emissions (to land, water or air);
- Excavation requirements;
- Duration of construction, operation, decommissioning, etc.; and
- Other.

Detailed comments on each policy are provided in Appendix A.

No proposals are made within the Core Strategy for development within the SPA / Ramsar site. Therefore direct habitat loss or fragmentation impacts would not be predicted. Four key issues require consideration: water quality and resources; increased bird mortality resulting from wind turbines; coastal processes; and increased recreational use.

**Water resources and quality**

With regard to European sites, the Water Cycle Study concludes that “it is not anticipated that the proposed development will have a significant effect on internationally designated sites, but, depending on the recommendations in this study and their adoption into the Core Strategy, this should be confirmed through consultation with Natural England as part of the Habitats Regulations assessment of the Core Strategy”. Provided the recommendations of the WCS are incorporated into the Core Strategy, likely significant effects as a result of changes in water resources or quality are not predicted.

**Wind turbines**

The Core Strategy encourages renewable energy (Policy CS9). No locations or specific types of development are proposed, but wind turbines have been erected elsewhere in East Anglia and careful consideration is required of potential indirect impacts on SPAs through increased bird mortality.
when individual planning applications are assessed. Provided the recommendations are followed to make it clear that development supported by Policy CS9 must still meet other requirements for sustainability, including protection of European sites, likely significant effects are not predicted.

Coastal processes

Coastal squeeze has been identified as an issue at some locations along the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site in Natural England monitoring records. The coast of Babergh District is formed by the two estuaries of this SPA / Ramsar site. These estuaries are included in the Essex and South Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) being drafted by the Environment Agency. The previous Essex SMP ended at Manningtree, to the south of Babergh, and the Suffolk SMP began at Felixstowe, to the north. The estuaries have been included in the current draft to provide complete coverage and in recognition of the fact that they are also affected by coastal changes. Babergh Council endorsed the policies in the draft SMP in 201021. The SMP includes a partnership approach to finding sustainable solutions where erosion is or may become an issue. It is for the SMP to set the strategy for sections of coast and SMPs need to be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment if a European site could be affected. The draft Core Strategy does not identify a need or make commitment to additional hard costal defences. Development close to the coast is not suggested outside existing built up areas. Therefore indirect effects through increased coastal squeeze are not predicted as a result of the Core Strategy.

Recreational pressure

Recreational use of the estuaries can result in disturbance of wintering birds. This issue has been investigated for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries in Wildside Ecology’s 2007 report, the findings of which are summarised above in Section 4.

The issue of potential recreational disturbance resulting from increasing local population is discussed in appendix A for the whole District (Policy CS2) and individual areas (Policies CS3 to CS6).

Increasing recreational use could increase disturbance to the wintering birds for which the SPA and Ramsar site were

---

21 Babergh District Council Strategy Committee; Minutes of a meeting of the strategy committee… Thursday 16 September 2010
Describe any likely changes to the site arising as a result of:

- Reduction of habitat area;
- Disturbance to key species;
- Habitat or population fragmentation;
- Reduction in species density;
- Changes in key indicators of conservation value (e.g. water quality); and
- Climate Change.

n.a. 

However, Babergh District Council are contributing to the wider mitigation strategy under the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy and have made provision for new public open space at key sites close to the estuaries. Details are provided within the Strategy and key examples are noted within the assessment of individual policies in Appendix A of this HRA report.

A precautionary approach is proposed, whereby despite the plans for provision of alternative greenspace, monitoring is also proposed. This provides Babergh Council with the opportunity to take additional action if unexpected increases in disturbance occur.

Therefore, subject to the mitigation strategy proposed in this document, likely significant effects would not be predicted.
7. Results of Screening for the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site

This assessment was undertaken for the working draft Core Strategy document dated May 2011 and is based on the detailed assessments of each policy in Appendix A. Since that iteration of assessment, the Council have taken into consideration the HRA recommendations in Section 5. This had lead to some revision of the Core Strategy wording (dated 28.09.11). These revisions have been reviewed and their implications for the HRA are reported in the Update and Conclusions of this report (Section 10). Policy numbers refer to those in the working draft Core strategy; the full wording of each draft policy is provided in Appendix A for ease of reference.

During the detailed assessment of individual policies, certain policies have been identified where, in the absence of suitable mitigation, there could be Likely Significant Effects. These are:

- CS2 overall housing strategy
- CS5 Strategy for growth in Babergh’s Ipswich Fringe

These policies could result in additional development within about 14 km from Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar Site.

The assessment of Likely Significant Effects set out in table 6.1 below was based on the assumption that the changes recommended above in Section 5 would be made. Babergh Council have subsequently incorporated those recommendations into the Core Strategy Submission Draft.
### Table 7.1 Screening Results for the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Designation Status</th>
<th>Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the individual elements of the Plan likely to give rise to impacts on the European Site</td>
<td>The overall housing strategy (CS2) and Strategy for growth in Babergh's Ipswich Fringe (CS5) include potential additional development within about 14 km from Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any likely direct, indirect or secondary effects of the Plan on the European Site by virtue of:</td>
<td>Detailed comments on each policy are provided in Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Size and scale;</td>
<td>No proposals are made within the Core Strategy for development within the SPA / Ramsar site. Therefore direct habitat loss or fragmentation impacts would not be predicted. Only indirect effects require consideration, specifically water resources / quality and recreational pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land take;</td>
<td>Water resources and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resource requirements (water extraction, etc);</td>
<td>Babergh is outside the catchment of any water course flowing into the Deben Estuary. The Water Cycle Study for Babergh District does not predict any wider effect from water resources and quality issues requiring consideration of European sites beyond the Stour and Orwell Estuaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emissions (to land, water or air);</td>
<td>Recreational pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excavation requirements;</td>
<td>Consideration has been given to Babergh’s contribution to any in combination effect on the site as a result of increased recreational use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Duration of construction, operation, decommissioning, etc.; and</td>
<td>The Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site lies wholly within Suffolk Coastal District Council’s (SCDC) area. SCDC undertook a detailed exercise to predict increasing visitor numbers as a result of local population growth in their area and Ipswich, including the Ipswich Fringe area within Babergh. Overall, based on visitor figures for the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, an increase of between 2.5 and 5% in visitor numbers was predicted. SCDC and Natural England have agreed that, subject to appropriate mitigation, housing numbers proposed within Suffolk Costal District would not have a likely significant effect on the SPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other.</td>
<td>As part of the 2.5 – 5% increase, 0.8% to 1.4% would result from increases in Ipswich (Ipswich Council's area) / Ipswich fringe (Babergh). This would result from an indicative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increase of 3,320 dwellings within Ipswich and 350 dwellings in Ipswich Fringe (Babergh).

A precautionary approach has been taken to mitigation, with contributions of new green infrastructure to be provided in all three Council areas (SCDC, Ipswich and Babergh Councils). The contribution provided within Babergh may be seen as disproportionately large compared to the proportion of new dwellings in the Babergh part of the Ipswich Fringe. However, this is justified by the comparatively rural nature of Babergh, allowing new sites such as the extension of Belstead Brook Park to be created more easily than in the more urbanised area of Ipswich itself.

Increasing recreational use could increase disturbance to the wintering birds for which the SPA and Ramsar site were selected.

However, Babergh are contributing to the wider mitigation strategy under the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. SCDC are intending to undertake monitoring, so that additional action can be taken if this strategy is found to be inadequate.

Therefore, likely significant effects are not predicted.

Describe any likely changes to the site arising as a result of:

- Reduction of habitat area;
- Disturbance to key species;
- Habitat or population fragmentation;
- Reduction in species density;
- Changes in key indicators of conservation value (e.g. water quality); and
- Climate Change.

n.a.
8. Results of Screening for Sandlings SPA

This assessment was undertaken for the working draft Core Strategy document dated May 2011 and is based on the detailed assessments of each policy in Appendix A. Since that iteration of assessment, the Council have taken into consideration the HRA recommendations in Section 5. This had lead to some revision of the Core Strategy wording (dated 28.09.11). These revisions have been reviewed and their implications for the HRA are reported in the Update and Conclusions of this report (Section 10). Policy numbers refer to those in the working draft Core strategy; the full wording of each draft policy is provided in Appendix A for ease of reference.

During the detailed assessment of individual policies, certain policies have been identified where, in the absence of suitable mitigation, there could be Likely Significant Effects. These are:

- CS2 overall housing strategy
- CS5 Strategy for growth in Babergh’s Ipswich Fringe

These policies could result in additional development within 20 km from Sandlings SPA. The assessment of Likely Significant Effects set out in table 6.1 below was based on the assumption that the changes recommended above in Section 5 would be made. Babergh Council have subsequently incorporated those recommendations into the Core Strategy Submission Draft.
Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Designation Status</th>
<th>Screening Results for the Sandlings SPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the individual elements of the Plan likely to give rise to impacts on the European Site</td>
<td>The overall housing strategy (CS2) and Strategy for growth in Babergh’s Ipswich Fringe (CS5) include potential additional development within 20 km of the Sandlings SPA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe any likely direct, indirect or secondary effects of the Plan on the European Site by virtue of:

- Size and scale;
- Land take;
- Resource requirements (water extraction, etc);
- Emissions (to land, water or air);
- Excavation requirements;
- Duration of construction, operation, decommissioning, etc.; and
- Other.

Detailed comments on each policy are provided in Appendix A.

No proposals are made within the Core Strategy for development within the SPA / Ramsar site. Therefore direct habitat loss or fragmentation impacts would not be predicted. Only indirect effects require consideration, specifically water resources / quality and recreational pressure.

**Water resources and quality**

Babergh is outside the catchment of any water course flowing through the area of the Sandlings SPA. The Water Cycle Study for Babergh District does not predict any wider effect from water resources and quality issues requiring consideration of European sites beyond the Stour and Orwell Estuaries.

**Recreational pressure**

Consideration has been given to Babergh’s contribution to any in combination effect on the site as a result of increased recreational use.

The Sandlings SPA lies wholly within Suffolk Coastal District Council’s (SCDC) area. SCDC undertook a detailed exercise to predict increasing visitor numbers as a result of local population growth in their area and Ipswich, including the Ipswich Fringe area within Babergh. Overall, based on visitor figures for the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, an increase of between 2.5 and 5% in visitor numbers was predicted. SCDC and Natural England have agreed that, subject to appropriate mitigation, housing numbers proposed within Suffolk Coastal District would not have a likely significant effect on the SPA.

As part of the 2.5 -5% increase, 0.8% to 1.4% would result from increases in Ipswich (Ipswich Council’s area) / Ipswich fringe (Babergh). This would result from an indicative increase of 3,320 dwellings within Ipswich and 350 dwellings...
A precautionary approach has been taken to mitigation, with contributions of new green infrastructure to be provided in all three Council areas (SCDC, Ipswich and Babergh Councils). The contribution provided within Babergh may be seen as disproportionately large compared to the proportion of new dwellings in the Babergh part of the Ipswich Fringe. However, this is justified by the comparatively rural nature of Babergh, allowing new sites such as the extension of Belstead Brook Park to be created more easily than in the more urbanised area of Ipswich itself.

Increasing recreational use could increase disturbance to the birds for which the SPA was selected: woodlark and nightjar.

However, Babergh are contributing to the wider mitigation strategy under the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. SCDC are intending to undertake monitoring, so that additional action can be taken if this strategy is found to be inadequate.

Therefore, likely significant effects are not predicted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe any likely changes to the site arising as a result of:</th>
<th>n.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction of habitat area;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disturbance to key species;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Habitat or population fragmentation;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction in species density;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in key indicators of conservation value (e.g. water quality); and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate Change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Other Projects and Plans

There are ten key relevant HRAs that have been carried out by neighbouring Councils or other organisations due to the possibility of likely significant effects on Stour and Orwell Estuary SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site and / or Suffolk Sandlings SPA.

The details of each HRA and a summary of their findings are given in Table 9.1 below. The potential for in combination effects with the Core Strategy Submission Draft are also given in Table 9.1.

Table 9-1: HRAs carried out due to possible impacts on Stour and Orwell Estuary SPA/ Ramsar, Deben Estuary SPA/ Ramsar and / or Sandlings SPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Body/ Developer</th>
<th>Title of HRA</th>
<th>Findings of HRA</th>
<th>Potential for in combination effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Borough Council</td>
<td>Appropriate Assessment of the submission draft Ipswich Borough Council Core Strategy and Policies DPD (2009, updated in Statement of Common Ground with Natural England, June 2010).</td>
<td>The Assessment concluded that the amount of housing required would not have a likely significant effect on the Stour and Orwell Estuary SPA (Statement of Common Ground, June 2010). Subject to agreed mitigation, Policy CS7: the amount of housing required, would not have a likely significant effect on SPAs.</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Suffolk Council</td>
<td>Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) (October 2007)</td>
<td>The HRA concluded that Mid Suffolk’s Core Strategy will not have a significant effect on the integrity of any SAC, SPA or Ramsar site. The Inspector’s Report into the Examination in Public States “I am satisfied that an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and this concludes that the CS will not have a significant effect on the integrity of any SACs, SPAs or Ramsar sites as a result of the policies and proposals that it contains”.</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal District Council</td>
<td>Suffolk Coastal District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Habitat Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) (November 2010)</td>
<td>It was concluded that Policy SP2 would have an adverse effect upon the integrity of a number of European sites, alone and in combination with the Ipswich Borough Core Strategy and Policies. Mitigation was proposed which, if implemented, would reduce the adverse effect to an insignificant level with no adverse effect upon the integrity of any European site.</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Body/Developer</td>
<td>Title of HRA</td>
<td>Findings of HRA</td>
<td>Potential for in combination effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Local Transport Plan Strategic HRA (May 2011)</td>
<td>The HRA author stated “By revising the LTP3 to ensure that protective measures are in place, I conclude that there will be no likely significant effects from this plan on the integrity of European Sites.”</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring Council</td>
<td>HRA of draft Core Strategy final report (November 2010)</td>
<td>The HRA authors state “A series of reduction and mitigation measures are proposed. If the council commits to adopt these measures we believe a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the international sites can be drawn for the policies and the strategy as a whole, and in combination with other plans and programmes.”</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Council</td>
<td>Site Allocations Appropriate Assessment (2009)</td>
<td>This report concluded “Having considered likely effects and avoidance and mitigation measures Colchester Borough Council is able to conclude that the Site Allocations DPD will not have adverse effects on the integrity of international sites. Discussions with Natural England and the Environment Agency during the course of the assessment helped to inform this decision.”</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England Regional Assembly</td>
<td>East of England Regional Spatial Strategy HRA (March 2010)</td>
<td>The HRA concluded that with mitigation “When these amendments are considered alongside the overall safeguards provided elsewhere in the RSS (and particularly the over-arching safeguard provided by policy IMP2) it can be concluded that the revised RSS does provide an adequate framework to enable the delivery of measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on internationally designated sites.” The East of England Plan is no longer in place, but Government has advised that the evidence based for it is still relevant.</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Review of Consents Regulation 50 Review of Consents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Body/Developer</td>
<td>Title of HRA</td>
<td>Findings of HRA</td>
<td>Potential for in combination effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>(reported in Babergh Water Cycle Study, final report June 2011)</td>
<td>Project (regulation 50 under the 1994 Habitats Regulations, addressed by Regulations 63 and 67 of the 2010 Regulations). The Review of Consents found that the current consented discharges have no adverse effect on the integrity of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site.</td>
<td>measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex and Suffolk Water</td>
<td>Draft Water Resources Management Plan (as reported in SEA Environmental Report, January 2009)</td>
<td>In terms of Essex &amp; Suffolk Water's WRMP Final Planning Solution, only the Abberton Scheme was identified as having the potential to have effects on European sites, namely the Ouse Washes, The Wash, the Stour Estuary and Abberton Reservoir. It was concluded that the scheme would not significantly adversely affect the Ouse Washes, The Wash and the Stour Estuary. However, further studies were undertaken to inform an Appropriate Assessment for Abberton Reservoir. Following liaison with Natural England, these studies were also able to conclude that the scheme would not have significant adverse effects on the integrity of the site. Indeed, Natural England stated that, “In our view, the Abberton Reservoir Scheme is likely to have a significant positive effect on the conservation status of the migratory and wintering waterfowl assemblages in the short-, medium- and long-term future of the statutorily designated site”.</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Adastral park Revised Planning Application22</td>
<td>The HRA concluded that there would be no impact on the Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar, providing the identified mitigation measures are followed.</td>
<td>Subject to the mitigation measures incorporated into the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft, in combination likely significant effects are not predicted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 Document contains HRA assessment
10. Update and Conclusions

A HRA screening exercise was undertaken to answer the question - Is the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft likely to have a significant effect ‘alone or in combination with other plans or projects’ on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar site or Sandlings SPA? It has been done as an iterative exercise, so that the recommendations could be taken into account as the draft Core Strategy evolved.

The HRA Screening exercise has been undertaken to inform the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Draft, and recommendations for Babergh to consider were made to mitigate potential issues identified during the screening process. It is considered that these recommendations (set out in section 5 of this report) have been addressed appropriately in the Core Strategy Submission Draft.

On review of the Core Strategy Submission Draft, amendment is recommended for details of wording. In the text prior to policy CS7 and within policy CS10, reference is made to SPAs and Ramsar sites. Equivalent protection is also afforded SACs and candidate / proposed European sites, so the wording should be amended to clarify this. Elsewhere, policy CS10 refers to European sites, so this is a matter of clarification rather than a change to the intended meaning of the policy. The policy itself uses the word “within”, and it is recommended that this is amended to clarify that the policy protects European sites from harm, whether a development proposal is within or outside of the designated site boundary.

The majority of the eighteen policies will not lead directly to development as they relate to design and other qualitative criteria. Where potential was identified for these to result indirectly in development that could harm a European site, they have been amended to include a cross reference to Policy CS10 on sustainable development. Policy CS10 now includes an explicit statement regarding the protection of European sites. These policies are unlikely to have likely significant effects on the European Sites.

Some of the policies in the Core Strategy will lead to development in the long term. The key policies leading to development that could affect a European site in the absence of mitigation are policies CS2 – Strategy for Development and Distribution; CS3 – Strategy for Sudbury/Great Cornard, CS4- Strategy for Hadleigh; CS5 – Strategy for Ipswich Fringe; and CS6 – Strategy for Development in Core and Hinterland Villages. These elements of the Plan are at a strategic level, as the exact details of where the strategic development sites will be located, their design and/or when (or if) these sites will be built upon is not known at this stage.

In section 3.3.2 of the Core Strategy Submission Draft, Babergh Council commits to the implementation of a series of measures to ensure that the policies above will not have a likely significant effect on the European sites. These measures will include:

1. Reducing/ preventing an increase in recreational demand on the estuaries (from the resident population) (see Policies CS9 and CS10);

2. Monitoring Programme. Reporting on this monitoring plan will be tied in with the annual monitoring programme described under Policy CS18; and

3. Planned Mitigation Measures - if during the monitoring programme it is found that recreational pressure is increasing, then this will trigger the requirement to consider whether additional mitigation is required.
In addition, with regard to the SPAs and Ramsar sites, any development proposal that would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will be subject to assessment under the Habitat Regulations at Site Allocation and/or project application stage. As noted above, clarification is needed that this also covers other European sites.

Through Policy CS9, Green Infrastructure associated with a new housing development should contribute to reducing recreational pressures on European sites. The development of a Green Infrastructure Strategy will prevent inappropriate new recreational development through improved management of access and the creation of alternative natural green space.

Policy CS10 Sustainable Development seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity. In addition, it specifies that with regard to the SPAs and Ramsar sites any development that would have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects will be refused. This will provide policy protection to these sites. As noted above, clarification is needed that this also covers other European sites and is not limited to development within the site boundary.

With regards to Policy CS18 Monitoring, even though this policy will not influence development directly, it sets out Babergh’s commitment to monitoring and reporting on progress towards meeting the Plan’s objectives and identifying any intended effects. In the supporting text, it is recognised that the Habitats Regulations also require the Council to monitor the impacts of development on European sites, particularly the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site. As part of this requirement monitoring reports will include:

- Progress by Babergh and neighbouring councils on the proposals within the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy, and Babergh’s wider Green Infrastructure Framework, and;
- Reviewing information from Natural England, the Wetlands Birds Survey and organisations monitoring visitor pressure and when appropriate, supplementing this with additional monitoring requirements in the Stour and Orwell estuaries.

Other subsequent Development Plan Documents (DPDs) will arise from Policies CS3, CS4, CS5 and CS6. These subsequent will include specific details about the locations of future growth, including the exact location of allocations sites and their proposed land uses. The Plan commits to an HRA being carried out at the development control stage/lower tier development plan stage for any development arising out of these policies. If it cannot be proven that there would be no harm to the integrity of the international sites and/or it is not possible to mitigate/compensate for these impacts the development will not be included in the lower tier plans and/or be granted planning permission.

Babergh Council have incorporated mitigation into the Core Strategy Submission Draft, based on recommendations provided by Atkins and consultation with Natural England and the RSPB. The findings of this HRA screening report will be subject to review by Natural England. The screening report will also need to be reviewed if changes are made to the Core Strategy. Subject to Natural England’s review, this screening exercise indicates that the Babergh Core Strategy Submission Draft is not predicted to have likely significant effects on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.
Appendix A

Initial HRA Screening Results and Recommendations Table

(provided to Babergh Council July 2011)
A.1 Initial HRA Screening Results and Recommendations Table

This appendix contains Table A-1 (see below) which summarises the features of each of the proposed policies within the May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy and whether each policy is considered to have a likely significant effect on the five European sites. Policy numbers refer to those in the Working Draft Core Strategy. For ease of reference, the full text of the working draft policies assessed is included in the table.

The likely significant effects take into account the measures in the Plan which seek to protect the European sites.

Where possible, policies that have been found to have no likely significant effect on a European site have been categorised as follows:

**Category A: No negative effect**

- **Policy Type A1**: Policies that will not themselves lead to development (e.g. because they relate to design or other qualitative criteria for development, or they are not a land use planning policy);
- **Policy Type A2**: Policies intended to protect the natural environment, including biodiversity;
- **Policy Type A3**: Policies intended to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site; and
- **Policy Type A4**: Policies that positively steer development away from European sites and associated sensitive areas.
- **Policy Type A5**: Policies that would have no effect because no development could occur through the policy itself, the development being implemented through later policies in the same plan, which are more specific and therefore more appropriate to assess for their effects on European sites and associated sensitive areas.

**Category B: No significant effect**

These would include policies or proposals that could have an effect but would not be likely to have a *significant* negative effect on a European site alone or in combination. This conclusion could only be reached if the effects, even in combination and taking the precautionary principle into account, are considered trivial.

If policies are predicted to have a likely significant effect, it will be noted whether these would be alone (Category C) or in combination with other plans and projects (Category D).

The table also includes recommendations for amendments to policies.

This categorisation has been based on *The Habitats Regulations Assessment of Local Development Documents (Revised Draft Guidance)* produced by Natural England in February 2009.
### Table A.1 – Initial HRA Screening Results and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2 – Settlement Pattern</strong></td>
<td><strong>CS1</strong> Settlement Pattern Policy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Policy Type A5</td>
<td>No specific recommendations are made for this Policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Number</td>
<td>Policy Title</td>
<td>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</td>
<td>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</td>
<td>Justification of Finding</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|               |                                                                              | **Countryside**                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required | The main urban areas where development is expected to be focussed are Sudbury, Hadleigh and the Ipswich Fringe. Consideration can be given as to impacts on the European sites in terms of development in the three towns as the numbers of predicted houses in these areas area is known. Comments on each area pare provided below under the relevant policies (including Policies CS3, CS4, CS5 and CS6). Their combined effect is considered here for Policy CS2. Therefore, this is effectively a consideration of the impact of CS2 alone and in combination with CS3, CS4, CS5 and CS6. No direct losses within European site are predicted. Having regard to the vulnerabilities of the European sites, consideration is given to:  
  •  water resources / quality for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site; and,  
  •  increased recreational disturbance for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site, and Sandlings SPA. | If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 (see below) are made to the supporting text, Policy CS2 should be amended to cross-reference to CS7. |
Ipswich Fringe will be allocated and protected to provide for jobs growth for Ipswich.

Employment uses that will contribute to the local economy and increase the sustainability of Core Villages, Hinterland Villages and the rural economy will be promoted and supported, where appropriate in scale, character and nature to their locality.

Proposals for uses in new and emerging employment sectors, particularly those that re-use existing land or premises, contribute to farm diversification, and/or design or produce low carbon goods or services will be encouraged subject to scale and impact on their location. A flexible approach will be taken to home working and other innovative approaches to sustainable economic activity that make a positive contribution to the local economy and are in scale and character with, and appropriate to, their location.

Town centres and Core Villages are the main focus for retail, leisure and community uses in the district. A healthy mix of uses and range of shops and services will be promoted in the two principal town centres of Sudbury and Hadleigh to ensure that these centres are active, vibrant and well used. * Allocations will be made in the Site Specific DPD, as appropriate, for new retail floorspace in Sudbury and Hadleigh.

Number and Distribution of New Homes

In addition to existing commitments and a “windfall” figure of 750 for the second half of the plan period (2021 – 2031) provision will be made for 2,500 new dwellings to be built in the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury and Great Cornard</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Fringe</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantham Regeneration,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Core and Hinterland Villages (Babergh to check)</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Water quality and environmental issues;
- Flood risk; and
- Demand management and Sustainable Drainage Systems.

The WCS considered potential impacts on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. No other European sites were found to require assessment. The details of the study and its recommendations are not repeated here, but key points are summarised. The WCS included a review of existing conditions. At present, water quality studies have found that the Overall Ecological Status of the Stour Estuary was Moderate, with an objective set of achieving Good by 2027, while the Overall Ecological Status of the River Orwell (tidal) was already Good.

The Environment Agency reviewed all the activities it consents through the Regulation 50 Review of Consents Project (Regulation 50 under the 1994 Habitats Regulations; now covered by Regulation 63 of the 2010 Regulations). The Review of Consents found that the current consented discharges have no adverse effect on the integrity of the Stour and Orwell SPA / Ramsar site.

There is one Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) for which the impact of the proposed development results in the indicative consent limits crossing the threshold of the current economic limit of treatment, and therefore potentially having a negative impact on water quality. This WwTW is Sproughton, which is west of Ipswich and upstream of the Orwell Estuary. However, due to its distance 6.5 km upstream of the boundary of the designated SPA / Ramsar site, the WCS did not anticipate that this WwTW would have a significant impact on the SPA / Ramsar site.

According to the WCS, the impact of the proposed development considered on water levels within Babergh should be minimal. All surface water runoff should be attenuated on site and the impact of increased WwTW flows is marginal in all cases. As such, the WCS states that it is not anticipated that the proposed development will impact upon water level management at the SPA / Ramsar site.

Nevertheless, the WCS recommends that the Council should seek to maximise water efficiency within all new development and promote the Environment Agency’s abstraction consenting policy throughout the District.

With regard to European sites, the WCS concludes that “it is not anticipated that the proposed development will have a significant effect on internationally designated sites, but, depending on the recommendations in this study and their adoption into the Core Strategy, this should be confirmed through consultation with Natural England as part of the Habitats Regulations assessment of the Core Strategy”.

Provided the recommendations of the WCS are incorporated into the Core Strategy, likely significant effects as a result of changes in water resources or quality are not predicted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic employment allocations are intended to be focussed close to urban areas, thereby giving opportunities to avoid increasing commuting needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased recreational disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision is made in this policy for a total of 2,500 new dwellings. The figures below are taken from the draft Core Strategy. It is estimated that Babergh had a population of 85,800 in 2009. This was 12.3% of the population of Suffolk County and the second smallest district in the County. While the provision for new dwellings allows for predicted population growth, it also takes account of an increasing proportion of smaller households as the district has an ageing population with 19% of the total population older than 65 years in 2001. It is predicted that this figure will increase to 29% of the total population by 2021. It is predicted that the population will rise by 4.9% between 2001 and 2021 to 87,900. This is lower than the predicted average growth for Suffolk. The locations where housing is proposed are predominantly at a distance from the European sites (as illustrated in Key Diagram in Appendix B, also see notes on individual strategy policies below). Babergh Council’s commitment to the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy provides new and improved opportunities for recreation at sites away from the European sites both within and around Babergh. The Strategy has been co-ordinated by Babergh and neighbouring Councils, and covers the eastern part of the District, including Hadleigh. It therefore provides alternative greenspace in the areas closer to the European sites, providing a mechanism for mitigating risks of increased recreational disturbance from individual development projects in a co-ordinated way. Overall, the increase in dwellings is not likely to have a significant effect on European sites. However, this overall conclusion does not preclude the need for assessment for the individual growth areas close to European sites, as set out for Policies CS3 to 6 below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CS3           | Strategy for Sudbury/Great Cornard | An Area Action Plan DPD will subject to resource availability, be prepared for Sudbury/Great Cornard to provide a framework for all new development in the town and to ensure that development of the larger greenfield sites is integrated into the town and delivered at the right time. In addition to expanding the capacity for development of the Chilton Mixed Use, Local Plan (2006) allocation to the north, provision will be made for land to be developed for employment uses and housing to the north east of the town. The Council will encourage and support the continued growth and diversification of Sudbury town centre to serve its catchment area, particularly the provision of larger, more versatile retail and service units and improvements to public transport, strategic and local access. Development in the directions of growth will be closely monitored. | Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required | No direct losses within European site are predicted. Having regard to the vulnerabilities of the European sites, consideration is given to:  
• water resources / quality for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site; and  
• increased recreational disturbance for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site, Sandlings SPA.  
Water resources and quality  
Sudbury is located over 20 km upstream of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. The findings of the Water Cycle Study are discussed in detail above under Policy CS2 and are not repeated here as there are no specific implications regarding Sudbury. | If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 (see below) are made to the supporting text, Policy CS3 should be amended to cross-reference CS7. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the following phasing and timing reviewed to ensure delivery of an appropriate amount of new housing and employment land through the plan period:</td>
<td>Increased recreational disturbance</td>
<td>Sudbury is over 20 km from any European sites and as such disturbance impacts through recreation on the Stour and Orwell SPA / Ramsar sites or other European sites is considered unlikely. However Natural England considers that the housing allocation across the district as a whole should be considered due to the draw that the estuary sites have. This is considered above under Policy CS2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) 2011-2 onwards - implementation of the Chilton Mixed Use Development in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP01;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 2016 review of progress with delivery of CP01 and target date set for release of land for employment and housing in the direction of growth identified on the key diagram;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) mid – late part of plan period – masterplan submitted and approved and first phase of land released for development for employment land and up to 500 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to Policy XX? development in Sudbury/Great Cornard should, where appropriate, provide:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• high quality design, structural landscape planting, and layouts and scale of development that respect adjacent landscape or townscape features, ensure a separate identity and avoid creeping coalescence with adjacent settlements;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a green infrastructure framework connecting with and adding or extending formal and informal green spaces, wildlife areas, and natural landscape settings and features;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• good links and/or the enhancement of existing links for pedestrians and cyclists to the town centre, rail station, employment areas, schools, bus stops, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>Strategy for Hadleigh</td>
<td>Subsequent documents / plans / proposals will set boundaries and provide a framework for growth within the direction of growth shown on the Key Diagram. Development in Hadleigh will be closely monitored and reviewed to ensure delivery of an appropriate amount of new housing and employment land through the plan period.</td>
<td>No direct losses within European site are predicted. Having regard to the vulnerabilities of the European sites, consideration is given to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to Policy XX? development in Hadleigh should, where appropriate, provide:</td>
<td>• water resources / quality for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• high quality design, structural landscape planting, and layouts and scale of development that respect adjacent landscape or townscape features, and maintain the separate identity of Hadleigh;</td>
<td>• increased recreational disturbance for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site, and Sandlings SPA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a green infrastructure framework connecting with and adding or extending formal and informal green spaces, wildlife areas, and natural landscape settings and features; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• good links and/or the enhancement of existing links for pedestrians and cyclists to town centre shops and services, employment areas, schools, bus stops, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hadleigh will be promoted as a visitor attraction and a wide range of diverse uses and facilities will be encouraged. Small scale refurbishments and redevelopments aimed at enhancing retail quality and consumer choice will be supported in this centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 below are made to the supporting text, Policy CS4 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Habits Regulations Assessment: Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>Strategy for Growth in the Ipswich Fringe</td>
<td>Subsequent documents / plans / proposals will set boundaries and provide a framework for growth within the direction of growth shown for Babergh’s Ipswich Fringe on the key diagram. In addition to Policy XX? development in Babergh’s Ipswich Fringe should: • be based upon and designed around a green infrastructure framework providing high quality design, structural landscape planting, and connections to or potential links with existing formal and informal green spaces, wildlife areas, and natural landscape settings and features, particularly the Gipping Valley footpath, Charity Park and Belstead Brook Park; and • provide good links and/or the enhancement of existing links for pedestrians and cyclists to local shops and services.</td>
<td>Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required</td>
<td>No direct losses within European site are predicted. Having regard to the vulnerabilities of the European sites, consideration is given to: • water resources / quality for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site; and • increased recreational disturbance for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site, Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar site, and Sandlings SPA. Water resources and quality The findings of the Water Cycle Study are discussed in detail above under Policy CS2. They include one issue of direct relevance to the HRA screening of Policy CS5. There is one Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) for which the impact of the proposed development results in the indicative consent limits crossing the threshold of the current economic limit of treatment, and therefore potentially having a negative impact on water quality. This WwTW is Sproughton, which is west of Ipswich and upstream of the Orwell Estuary. However, due to its distance 6.5 km upstream of the boundary of the designated SPA / Ramsar site, the WCS did not anticipate that this WwTW would have a significant impact on the SPA / Ramsar site. Given this, there are not considered to be any likely significant effects on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site arising from water pollution as a result of the proposed development in Ipswich Fringe. Increased recreational disturbance Ipswich Fringe is located 4 km from the Orwell Estuary (to the east) and 10 km from the Stour Estuary (to the south). Given this there is potential for impacts to this SPA / Ramsar site as a result of disturbance from recreation. Ipswich Fringe is about 14 km from Deben Estuary SPA / Ramsar Site. The Sandlings SPA is located 15 km from Ipswich measured on the map, but in terms of driving distance this is estimate at 18 km. Ipswich Fringe is included within the Haven Gateway area, and is therefore included in the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. Ipswich Fringe has been identified in the Strategy as an area where opportunities exists to contribute to addressing the District and sub-regional deficit in Accessible Natural Greenspace. Hadleigh has been identified in the Strategy as an area where an opportunity exists to contribute to addressing the District and sub-regional deficit in Accessible Natural Greenspace. Policy CS4 includes an expectation that green infrastructure would be provided. Therefore, likely significant effects due to increased recreational disturbance are not predicted as a result of development in Hadleigh. If the amendments suggested below are made to the supporting text for Policy CS7, Policy CS5 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
<td>If the amendments suggested below are made to the supporting text for Policy CS7, Policy CS5 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 As measured along the watercourse using the distance measuring tool on www.magic.defra.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CS6 | Strategy for development in Core and Hinterland Villages | Proposals for development in Core Villages will be approved on sites allocated in the Site Allocations DPD, and elsewhere where proposals score positively when assessed against Policy CS11 and the following matters are addressed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority where relevant and appropriate to the scale and location of the proposal:  
- Site location and sequential approach to site selection;  
- Sustainability Appraisal;  
- Locally identified need - housing and employment, and specific local needs such as affordable housing;  
- Locally identified community needs; and  
- Cumulative impact of development in the area.  
Comprehensive redevelopment proposals for the site identified and allocated as the Brantham Industrial Area in the 2006 Babergh Local Plan will be approved where proposals comply with criteria in Local Plan Policy EM06 and policies in this Core Strategy, principally Policy CS11.  
Development in Hinterland Villages will be approved where proposals are able to demonstrate a close functional relationship to the existing settlement on sites where the relevant issues listed above are addressed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority and where the proposed development:  
- Is well designed and appropriate in size/scale, layout and character to its setting and to the village,  
- Is adjacent or well related to the existing pattern of development for that settlement,  
- Meets a proven local need, such as affordable housing or | Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required | No direct losses within European site are predicted. Having regard to the vulnerabilities of the European sites, consideration is given to:  
- Water resources / quality for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site; and  
- Increased recreational disturbance for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site.  
**Water resources and quality**  
The findings of the Water Cycle Study are discussed in detail above under Policy CS2. They include one issue of direct relevance to the HRA screening of Policy CS6. There is one Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) for which the impact of the proposed development results in the indicative consent limits crossing the threshold of the current economic limit of treatment, and therefore potentially having a negative impact on water quality. This WwTW is Sproughton, which is west of Ipswich but is relevant to both the Ipswich Fringe (CS8) and hinterland villages (CS6). It is upstream of the Orwell Estuary. However, due to its distance 6.5 km upstream of the boundary of the designated SPA / Ramsar site1, the WCS did not anticipate that this WwTW would have a significant impact on the SPA / Ramsar site.  
**Increased recreational disturbance**  
Over the majority of Babergh this Policy does not provide sufficient guidance on potential locations of development to allow assessment, apart from the in-combination assessment | **Correction:** the explanatory text regarding the Brantham redevelopment states that "Adjoint land is designated as a AONB and as a SSSI. The tongue of land to the south to the railway is of wildlife significance." It is essential that this text is corrected to include the statement that adjacent land is designated as an SSSI and forms part of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar Site.  
If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 below are made to the supporting text, Policy CS6 should be amended to cross-reference to CS7.  
Policy CS6 refers to proposed redevelopment of a brownfield site at Brantham. The Core Strategy recognises the sensitive location of Brantham, but does not make an explicit commitment to the protection of the Stour and Orwell SPA / Ramsar site. Either in the policy itself or in the explanatory text more information is required to refer to Policy CS10 on Green Infrastructure and the need to provide mitigation within any development proposal for potential recreational impacts on the SPA / Ramsar site. At the Core Strategy stage, no commitments are made to the form and intensity of development. However, the explanatory text states:  
"It will be expected that such a scheme will deliver..." | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>targeted market housing identified in a community local plan/neighbourhood plan, supports local services and/or creates or expands employment opportunities, and does not compromise the delivery of permitted or identified schemes in community/village local plans within the same functional cluster. The cumulative impact of development both within the hinterland village in which the development is proposed and within the functional cluster of villages in which it is located will be a material consideration when assessing such proposals. All proposals for development in Hinterland Villages must demonstrate how they meet the criteria list above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of overall housing numbers set out above for Policy CS2. In general, the assessment of CS2 also covers CS6 adequately, with one exception, the village of Brantham. This village is adjacent to the Stour Estuary. The Stour is the part of the SPA where human use and disturbance are lower while bird numbers recorded are higher than on the Orwell. Therefore, any policy promoting growth at Brantham must provide robust protection for the European site. The Core Strategy does not include any statement on the number of dwellings or type of employment development that might be expected at Brantham. For the purposes of this assessment the following assumptions are made: (1) the employment development would be broadly similar to past use of the site and would not give rise to further impacts on the SPA / Ramsar site, (2) housing would be approximately 700 dwellings (the maximum number used in the Water Cycle Study for growth option analysis), (3) no new points of public access to the estuary would be provided, and (4) a new public open space totalling 6 hectares would be provided. These assumptions are made in order to allow a strategic assessment of the feasibility of promoting some form of mixed use development at the site. The numbers are arbitrary and have no meaning in terms of planning policy. This report therefore makes no statement on behalf of Babergh Council or any other party that should be taken as demonstrating that a particular type or level of development would be acceptable in terms of avoiding harm to the SPA / Ramsar site or in any other way. The key question is whether development on available land at Brantham could provide sufficient new ‘Accessible Natural Green Space’. This would be required to avoid increasing recreational pressure on the Stour Estuary. Brantham currently has about 2,600 residents. Assuming that 700 new dwelling each housed four people (the average for Babergh is currently understood to be under 3, so this is highly likely to be an over-estimate), the population of Brantham would increase by 2,800. If 6 hectares of high quality new alternative Accessible Natural Green Space were created, this would provide more than 1 hectare per 1,000 people. If the site were to become a Local Nature Reserve (LNR, see recommendations), then this would meet Natural England’s target for provision of LNRs for both the new and existing population of Brantham. This approach would be subject to Babergh Council being given a legal interest in the long term management of the site if it is to be designated as an LNR. It would then ensure that Babergh Council can influence the site’s management to allow it to provide alternative recreational space for any new residents, workers at new employment areas and the existing employment buildings, new dwellings and improved community facilities proportionate to the amount of development permitted, all in accordance with an agreed masterplan. A high quality development will be sought, particularly in the event that Riverside development is sought.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>new employment buildings, new dwellings and improved community facilities proportionate to the amount of development permitted, all in accordance with an agreed masterplan. A high quality development will be sought, particularly in the event that Riverside development is sought.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that wording is added stating: “The masterplan and mitigation strategy will need to ensure that direct and indirect negative impacts on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar Site are avoided. In particular, provision of alternative Natural Green Space will be required, in line with the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. Provision and funding for the green infrastructure will be provided by the developer(s). It is anticipated that the green infrastructure provision would include creation of a new Public Open Space, for which the design and management plan should aim for quality suitable for designation as a Local Nature Reserve.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residents of Brantham. It would also provide Babergh Council</td>
<td>with control over the publicity provided for the site, to allow it to act as an alternative recreational area without increasing the risk that it could act to draw additional visitors from further afield to the Stour. This assessment cannot, and is not intended to, confirm the level of development acceptable at Brantham or the area of accessible natural greenspace that would need to be provided. Nevertheless, it is sufficient to indicate that the brownfield site within this village could accommodate an element of new housing development, with appropriate greenspace provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3 – The Delivery of Growth, Provision of Infrastructure and Monitoring**

**CS7 Sustainable Development**

Proposals for development must respect the local context and character of the different parts of the district, and should demonstrate how the proposal addresses the key issues and contributes to meeting the objectives of the Babergh Core Strategy. All new development within the district, will be required to demonstrate the principles of sustainable development, and in particular, and where appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal, should:

- respect the landscape, landscape features, streetscape/townscape, important spaces and historic views;
- make a positive contribution to the local character, shape and scale of the area;
- protect or create jobs and/or strengthen or diversify the local economy;
- ensure an appropriate level of services, facilities and infrastructure are available or provided to serve the proposed development;
- retain, protect or enhance local services and facilities and rural communities;
- protect and enhance biodiversity, prioritise the use of brownfield land for development, and use and greenfield land and scarce resources efficiently;
- address climate change through design, adaptation, mitigation and by incorporating or producing sources of renewable energy;
- make provision for open space, amenity, leisure and play through providing, enhancing and contributing to the green infrastructure of the district;
- create green spaces and/or extend existing green infrastructure to access to shady outdoor space within new developments and increase the connectivity of habitats and the enhancement of biodiversity and mitigate some of the impacts of climate change e.g. enhancement of natural cooling and reduction in the heat island effect, provision of pollution sequestration for the absorption of greenhouse gases, and through the design and incorporation of flood water storage areas, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
- minimise both the risk of flooding as well as the risk from flooding to people and property, and incorporate, where appropriate, flood mitigation and/or flood resilience measures;
- minimise surface water run-off and incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) where appropriate;

No

**Policy Type A3:** Policy intended to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have a negative effect on a European site.

This policy includes an expectation that development should “protect and enhance biodiversity”. Government policy recommends that Core Strategy policies should not duplicate national ones, such as the protection afforded to European sites in PPS9. However, PPS9 was published prior to the ruling that HRA is required for Local Development Documents. Natural England advises that Plans should now make it clear that any development would not be in accordance with the plan if it could have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site. While risks can be reduced by the amendments to individual policies, as explained above, clarification should be provided in the supporting text for Policy CS7 to explain that biodiversity includes, but is not limited to, legally protected sites. With regard to SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites, additional text should be provided stating that:

- Any development proposal that would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will be subject to assessment under the Habitats Regulations at Site Allocation and / or project application stage. The HRA for this Core Strategy does not obviate the need for such assessment. If it cannot be ascertained that there would be no adverse effects on site integrity the project will be refused unless it passes the tests in Regulation 62, in which case any necessary compensatory measures will need to be secured in accordance with Regulation 66; and
- Any development that would have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects would not be in accordance with the Core Strategy.

It would not be appropriate to name the individual...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               |              | • minimise waste (including waste water) during construction, and promote and provide for the reduction, re-use and recycling of all types of waste from the completed development.  
• be designed to make the best use of the site in terms of solar energy, passive heating and cooling, natural light and natural ventilation;  
• use sustainable building methods that optimise energy and water efficiency, and use techniques, methods and materials resilient to climate change (e.g. resilience to high winds and driving rain);  
• be accessible to people of all abilities including those with mobility impairments;  
• seek to minimise the need to travel by car using the following hierarchy: walking, cycling, public transport, commercial vehicles and cars) thus improving air quality; and  
• where appropriate to the scale of the proposal, provide a transport assessment and Travel Plan showing how car based travel to and from the site can be minimised.  

Development Briefs/Masterplans will be required for the New Directions of Growth, sites defined in the Site Allocations DPD, and for sites which by virtue of size, location or proposed mix of uses are determined by the local planning authority to require a master planning approach. A landscape/townscape appraisal, multifunctional Green Infrastructure strategy, and Design Concept statement will be essential components for Development Briefs and Masterplans.  

Proposals for development must ensure adequate protection and enhancement is given to local distinctive features which characterise Babergh's landscape and heritage assets of the built and natural environment, but are outside boundaries of designated sites covered by statutory legislation. In particular proposals should;  

• Protect and where possible enhance the landscape and heritage areas including habitats and features of landscape, historic, architectural, archaeological, biological, hydrological and geological interest. Adaptation or mitigation will be required if evidence indicates there will be damaging impacts if a proposal is otherwise acceptable and granted planning permission.  
• Mitigation, adaptation and enhancement will need to reflect the existing landscape character and / or historic pattern / characteristics and provide relevant features appropriate to the specific area / location including habitat type, respecting the bio-diversity, geodiversity or historic character of the location affected.  

European sites in this text, as additional sites could be designated in the future and such a list could be interpreted as pre-judging the sites that could be affected by an individual development proposal. | No | Policy Type A2: Policy intended to protect the natural environment, in this case from the effects of climate change. | No specific recommendations are made for this Policy. |
|               |              | Larger scale residential developments, particularly those within the future directions for growth, will be expected to achieve the Building For Life Silver Standard.  
All new non-residential developments will be expected to achieve, as a minimum, the BREEAM “Very Good” standard or equivalent. | No | | |

**CS8**  
Reducing Carbon Dioxide Emissions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</th>
<th>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</th>
<th>Justification of Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Development within the New Directions of Growth, and other large-scale development proposals will be expected to use on-site renewable energy sources, decentralised renewable or low carbon energy sources with the aim of achieving 15% of the predicted carbon reductions of all types of development. In other cases the Council will support proposals for development that includes on-site low and zero carbon technologies including, where appropriate, proposals to retro-fit existing buildings as part of schemes to extend or convert those buildings. Opportunities for incorporating renewable energy provision into new development, and/or producing renewal energy may be identified in the Site Allocations DPD. In all cases, the Council will encourage and support community initiatives, including linking with/contributing to the provision of local off-site renewable energy sources and the use of energy service companies (ESCOs) or similar energy saving initiatives.</td>
<td>Unknown; confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required.</td>
<td>This could be interpreted as <strong>Policy Type A2</strong>: Policy intended to protect the natural environment, in this case from the effects of climate change. However, while it does not promote specific development types, one of the main forms of renewable energy project being built at present is wind turbines.</td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 above are made to the supporting text, Policy CS9 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Existing green infrastructure will be protected and enhanced. In new developments green infrastructure will be a key consideration and on the larger sites it will be central to the character and layout of development. All new development will make provision for high quality, multi-functional green infrastructure. Particular consideration will be given to ensuring new provision establishes links with existing Green infrastructure, providing a well connected network of green infrastructure in urban and rural areas. Specific requirements, characteristics and standards of GI provision within strategic sites and larger site allocations will be identified in the Site Allocations DPD and where appropriate through master planning mechanisms.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Policy Type A3: Policy intended to conserve or enhance the natural environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site. For example, Green Infrastructure associated with a new housing development should contribute to reducing recreational pressures on European sites and highly unlikely to increase them.</td>
<td>No specific recommendations are made for this Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>Local Economic Strategy</td>
<td>The Council's strategy is to encourage and promote proposals that strengthen the local economy and provide a diversity of employment opportunities. The following existing business sectors are identified as major employers in the district:  - manufacturing  - port related logistics/warehousing and distribution  - ICT (Information and Communications Technology)  - Non-B Use Class businesses including tourism, leisure and hospitality, education, health and welfare</td>
<td>Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required.</td>
<td>This policy could be interpreted as <strong>policy type A1</strong>, as it does not in itself lead to specific development. However, it does encourage specific types of development. While there is no information to allow them to be assessed at the Core Strategy stage, provision is required to ensure that European Sites are protected.</td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 above are made to the supporting text, Policy CS11 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Number</td>
<td>Policy Title</td>
<td>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</td>
<td>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</td>
<td>Justification of Finding</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>The Rural Economy</td>
<td>Historic villages such as Lavenham and Long Melford and coastal villages such as Chelmondiston and Slepey play an important role in tourism and leisure within the district, and appropriate new development that supports this role will be encouraged. The economy in the rural area will be supported through the encouragement of proposals for farm diversification, the re-use of redundant rural buildings, tourism and leisure based businesses, the protection of small rural businesses and, where appropriate, farm shops and farmers markets.</td>
<td>Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required.</td>
<td>This policy could be interpreted as policy type A1, as it does not in itself lead to specific development. However, it does state that &quot;appropriate&quot; developments will be encouraged, and the coastal villages are, by definition, close to the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA / Ramsar site. While there is no information to allow such developments to be assessed at the Core Strategy stage, provision is required to ensure that these European sites are protected.</td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 above are made to the supporting text, Policy CS12 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13</td>
<td>Mix and type of dwellings</td>
<td>All new housing developments will be expected to contribute towards providing a mix of dwelling types and sizes to provide for the accommodation needs of the whole population of Babergh district, including those of vulnerable groups (such as the elderly and those with special needs), where such local needs exist, and at a scale appropriate to the size of the development. The mix, type and size of the housing development proposed on all sites will be expected to reflect established needs in the Babergh district. Development on strategic housing sites or mixed use developments with a substantial residential element will be required to make provision for the accommodation needs of vulnerable or identified groups of people, as reflected in established local needs. New pitches will be provided at an appropriate level and in suitable locations to meet the identified needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the district.</td>
<td>Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation proposals required.</td>
<td>This policy could be interpreted as policy type A1, as it does not in itself lead to specific development. However, it does encourage specific types of development. General development proposals are set out, and assessed, under Policies CS2 to CS6 above. The one exception where specific development would occur as a result of this Policy is the provision of additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the district. While there is no information to allow this provision to be assessed at the Core Strategy stage, some measure is required to ensure that European Sites are protected.</td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 above are made to the supporting text, Policy CS12 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>In order to promote achievement of Babergh's medium-term target of 500 new affordable homes by 2015-6 (and thereafter its revised target) all residential development will be required to provide a minimum of 35% affordable housing. Individual targets may be set for New Directions of Growth and in Core Villages in Area Action Plan and Site Allocation DPDs. Where the proposed development is for a single dwelling, and where affordable housing cannot be provided on site, a commuted sum will be required. The tenure types, mixes and sizes of affordable housing will reflect established needs in the District. Where proven, issues of development viability and tenure mix will be considered to determine appropriate affordable housing requirements on site or appropriate levels of commuted sums.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Policy Type A1: A policy that will not itself lead to development</td>
<td>No specific recommendations are made for this Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS15</td>
<td>Rural Exception Sites</td>
<td>The Council will take a flexible approach to the location of rural exception sites in the district, and will allow proposals adjacent, or well related to the settlement development boundaries of Core and</td>
<td>Unknown – confirmation regarding mitigation</td>
<td>This policy could be interpreted as policy type A1, as it does not in itself lead to specific development. However, it does state situations in which development would be acceptable.</td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 above are made to the supporting text, Policy CS15 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Number</td>
<td>Policy Title</td>
<td>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</td>
<td>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</td>
<td>Justification of Finding</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinterland Villages where:</td>
<td>proposals required</td>
<td>While there is no information to allow them to be assessed at the Core Strategy stage, provision is required to ensure that European Sites are protected.</td>
<td>amended to cross-refer explicitly to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the proposed development by virtue of its size, scale and type will not exceed the identified local need (including need identified in other settlements within the same or adjacent/adjoining functional cluster); • the type of dwellings to be provided are consistent with the needs identified by the housing needs survey and agreed in advance by the District Council; and where • the proposed development is appropriate to the size/scale and character of the village, and is acceptable in terms of other detailed considerations such as site location and circumstances, design, layout, materials, landscaping, biodiversity, impacts on the countryside, amenity, and access, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure Provision</td>
<td>The District Council will work with service providers, developers and other partners to develop sustainable places in the Babergh District with safe and healthy communities and secure the appropriate social, physical and green infrastructure needed to support these places and safeguard the environment. Developers must make full and proper proposals to meet these needs.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>This policy refers to a table listing proposed infrastructure schemes. Those lists at the time of writing this report (June 2011) are limited to Sudbury / Great Conard and in this location, over 20km from any European site, likely significant effects are not predicted. However, this Policy will require assessment when the details of planned Infrastructure Delivery are known.</td>
<td>Assessment is required when specific infrastructure schemes are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS16</td>
<td></td>
<td>The District Council will work with service providers, developers and other partners to develop sustainable places in the Babergh District with safe and healthy communities and secure the appropriate social, physical and green infrastructure needed to support these places and safeguard the environment. Developers must make full and proper proposals to meet these needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the amendments suggested for Policy CS7 above are made to the supporting text, Policy CS11 should be amended to cross-refer to CS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council will protect, safeguard and enhance existing services, facilities and amenities that are important to the sustainability of local communities. New housing and commercial development will be required to be supported by and make adequate provision for appropriate infrastructure, services and facilities to ensure that the development is sustainable and of a high quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 2011 update – the policy was amended to provide generic guidance on the delivery of infrastructure, including green infrastructure, rather than a list of individual infrastructure proposals. Therefore, assessment of individual proposals is not required, but the revised policy is assessed in section 10 with the update on other policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic as well as local infrastructure requirements will be planned for. Those infrastructure items currently foreseen are identified in Table 7. Other items will come forward as the detailed planning of development progresses and must be provided for. New development may need to be appropriately phased to ensure the proper provision of all infrastructure needed to support the development. Where appropriate the Council will seek on-site provision of infrastructure by the developer. Alternatively, financial contributions may be required to ensure timely off-site or on-site delivery of all types of infrastructure, according to agreed timetables which will be co-ordinated to relate to the advancement of the development. Arrangements for the ongoing maintenance of facilities will be required. The Council will secure the co-ordinated provision of Infrastructure elements with development timetables through planning conditions, and Section 106 Agreements attached to the planning permissions for developments, and/or through a Community Infrastructure Levy programme. A Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared setting out the mechanisms that will be used for taking development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Number</td>
<td>Policy Title</td>
<td>Wording of Policy (Taken from May 2011 Working Draft Core Strategy)</td>
<td>Will Policy have Likely Significant Effects on the European Sites?</td>
<td>Justification of Finding</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contributions, including the scope for pooling of contributions secured within the functional clusters, together with further details of the types and priorities of infrastructure provision. Planning applications which do not make proper provision to secure and maintain the necessary infrastructure will be refused.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Type A1: policy will not itself lead to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Annual monitoring will track the delivery of development of new jobs and homes. It will assess the effectiveness of the Core Strategy Policies and identify any unintended impacts. Any critical shortfalls or damaging unintended impacts will be addressed through management and review as set out in the Annual Monitoring Report. Phasing of development will be closely monitored in Sudbury, where Policy CS3 provides a trigger for the new direction of growth to advance sooner, if the Chilton proposal has not progressed sufficiently. The impacts of the Babergh Core Strategy on adjoining districts will also be monitored, as will any impacts of Strategies of adjoining authorities on Babergh. The results of this monitoring will be taken into account in the implementation of the Core Strategy, in informing other Development Planning Documents, including Development Management Policies and will provide evidence for any future reviews of all or any part of this CS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>While this policy will not influence development directly, it sets out Babergh Council’s commitment to monitoring and reporting on progress towards meeting the Plan’s objectives and identifying any unintended impacts. It is recommended that this includes reporting on (1) progress by Babergh and neighbouring Councils with the proposals in the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy, and (2) reviewing information from Natural England, the Wetland Birds Survey and organisations monitoring visitor pressure and, when appropriate, supplementing this with monitoring disturbance of wintering birds in the Stour and / or Orwell estuaries. This would help the Council to take account of progress in providing mitigation for recreational pressures in the programming of development and in assessing individual planning applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C
Details of Designated Sites
1. Site Identification:

1.1 Type A

1.2 Site code UK9020286

1.3 Compilation date 200108

1.4 Update

1.5 Relationship with other Natura 2000 sites

1.6 Respondent(s) International Designations, JNCC, Peterborough

1.7 Site name Sandlings

1.8 Site indication and designation classification dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date site proposed as eligible as SCI</th>
<th>Date confirmed as SCI</th>
<th>Date site classified as SPA</th>
<th>Date site designated as SAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Site location:

2.1 Site centre location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 26 33 E</td>
<td>52 04 44 N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Site area (ha) 3391.8

2.3 Site length (km)

2.5 Administrative region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUTS code</th>
<th>Region name</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK403</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Biogeographic region

- Alpine
- Atlantic X
- Boreal
- Continental
- Macaronesia
- Mediterranean

3. Ecological information:

3.1 Annex 1 habitats

Habitat types present on the site and the site assessment for them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex 1 habitat</th>
<th>% cover</th>
<th>Representative habitat</th>
<th>Relative surface</th>
<th>Conservation status</th>
<th>Global assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
UK SPA data form

3.2 Annex I birds and regularly occurring migratory birds not listed on Annex I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Species name</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Migratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A234</td>
<td>Caprimulgus europaeus</td>
<td>109 P</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A246</td>
<td>Lullula arborea</td>
<td>154 P</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Site description:

4.1 General site character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat classes</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine areas, Sea inlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal rivers, Estuaries, Mud flats, Sand flats, Lagoons (including saltwork basins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marshes, Salt pastures, Salt steppes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal sand dunes, Sand beaches, Machair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle, Sea cliffs, Inlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland water bodies (standing water, running water)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogs, Marshes, Water fringed vegetation, Fens</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesth, Scrub Macquis and garrigue, Phragmites</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry grassland, Steppes</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humid grassland, Mesophile grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine and sub-alpine grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved grassland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arable land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-leaved deciduous woodland</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniferous woodland</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed woodland</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forest areas cultivated with woody plants (including orchards, groves, vineyards, dehesas)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland rocks, Screes, Sands, Permanent snow and ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land (including towns, villages, roads, waste places, mines, industrial sites)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total habitat cover</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Other site characteristics

Soil & geology:

Geomorphology & landscape:

4.2 Quality and importance

ARTICLE 4.1 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)

During the breeding season the area regularly supports:

*Caprimulgus europaeus* 3.2% of the GB breeding population

Count as at 1992

*Lullula arborea* 10.3% of the GB breeding population

Count as at 1997

ARTICLE 4.2 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)
4.3 Vulnerability

Sandlings SPA comprises six SSSIs. Sandlings Forest SSSI, the largest of these, is dominated by commercial forestry. Within the forest, large areas of open ground suitable for woodlark and nightjar were created by storm damage in 1987. Maintenance of open areas in the future relies on clear felling as the main silvicultural practice and the maintenance of some areas earmarked for woodlark and nightjar habitat. These objectives are included in the East Anglia Forest District Strategic Plan.

On the heathland SSSIs, lack of traditional management has resulted in the heathland being subjected to successional changes with the consequent spread of bracken, shrubs and trees. This is being addressed through habitat management work under the Countryside Stewardship Scheme and Tomorrow's Heathland Heritage, and is resulting in the restoration of more typical heathland habitat favourable to both nightjar and woodlark.

Human influences on the site include the frequent presence of travellers’ caravans. This is a longstanding problem, and a variety of mechanisms are utilised to keep them from the heathland, the digging of trenches and construction of earth barriers around the borders of sites is proving effective.

5. Site protection status and relation with CORINE biotopes:

5.1 Designation types at national and regional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK04 (SSSI/ASSI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UK SPAs data form

Natura 2000
Standard Data Form
For Special Protection Areas (SPA)
For sites eligible for identification as Sites of Community Importance (SCI)
And
For Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)

1. Site identification:
   1.1 Type [ ]
   1.2 Site code [UK9009121]
   1.3 Compilation date [199407]
   1.4 Update [200505]
   1.5 Relationship with other Natura 2000 sites
   1.6 Respondent(s) [International Designations, JNCC, Peterborough]
   1.7 Site name [Stour and Orwell Estuaries]

   1.8 Site indication and designation classification dates
   Date site proposed as eligible as SCI
   Date confirmed as SCI
   Date site classified as SPA [199407]
   Date site designated as SAC

2. Site location:
   2.1 Site centre location
      Longitude [01 09 38 E]
      Latitude [51 57 16 N]
   2.2 Site area (ha) [3676.92]
   2.3 Site length (km) []

2.5 Administrative region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUTS code</th>
<th>Region name</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK54</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK403</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>51.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Biogeographic region

[ ] Alpine
[ ] Atlantic
[X] Boreal
[ ] Continental
[ ] Macaronesia
[ ] Mediterranean

3. Ecological information:

3.1 Annex I habitats
Habitat types present on the site and the site assessment for them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex I habitat</th>
<th>% cover</th>
<th>Representative site</th>
<th>Relative surface</th>
<th>Conservation status</th>
<th>Global assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Stour and Orwell Estuaries
Standard Natura 2000 Data Form
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3.2 Annex I birds and regularly occurring migratory birds not listed on Annex I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Species name</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Migratory</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
<th>Global</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A054</td>
<td>Anas penelope</td>
<td>3979 I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A051</td>
<td>Anas strepera</td>
<td>397 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A159</td>
<td>Amanura interpres</td>
<td>680 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A056</td>
<td>Branta bernicla bernicla</td>
<td>2027 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A067</td>
<td>Boscothia clangula</td>
<td>213 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A140</td>
<td>Calidris alpina alpina</td>
<td>19114 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A143</td>
<td>Calidris canuta</td>
<td>3970 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A137</td>
<td>Charadrius hiaticula</td>
<td>630 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A137</td>
<td>Charadrius hiaticula</td>
<td>372 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A156</td>
<td>Limosa limosa islandica</td>
<td>2559 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A160</td>
<td>Numenius arquata</td>
<td>2153 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A017</td>
<td>Phalacrocorax carbo</td>
<td>321 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A141</td>
<td>Pluvialis squatarola</td>
<td>3201 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A005</td>
<td>Podiceps cristatus</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A133</td>
<td>Recurvirostra avosetta</td>
<td>21 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A049</td>
<td>Taigaetus alba</td>
<td>2955 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A162</td>
<td>Tringa totanus</td>
<td>3687 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A162</td>
<td>Tringa totanus</td>
<td>2588 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A142</td>
<td>Vanellus vanellus</td>
<td>6242 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Site description:

4.1 General site character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat classes</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine areas. Sea inlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal rivers, Estuaries, Mud flats, Sand flats, Lagoons (including saltwater basins)</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marshes, Salt pastures, Salt steppes</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal sand dunes, Sand beaches, Machair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle. Sea cliffs. Inlets</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland water bodies (standing water, running water)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogs. Marshes. Water fringed vegetation. Fens</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath. Scrub. Mosquus and garrigue. Phygrains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry grassland. Steppes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humid grassland. Mesophila grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine and sub-alpine grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arable land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-leaved deciduous woodland</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniferous woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forest areas cultivated with woody plants (including orchards, groves, vineyards, dehesas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nekd rocks. Screes. Sands. Permanent snow and ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land (including towns, villages, roads, waste places, mines, industrial sites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total habitat cover</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1 Other site characteristics

Soil & geology:
Alluvium, Clay, Mud, Neutral, Sand, Shingle

Geomorphology & landscape:
Coastal, Estuary, Intertidal sediments (including sandflat/mudflat), Lagoon, Lowland, Subtidal sediments (including sandbank/mudbank)

4.2 Quality and importance

ARTICLE 4.1 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)
During the breeding season the area regularly supports:

*Recurrensta avosetta*
(Western Europe/Western Mediterranean - breeding) 3.6% of the population in Great Britain
5-year peak mean 1996-2000

ARTICLE 4.2 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)
Over winter the area regularly supports:

*Aqua acuta* 1.2% of the population

*Branta bernicla bernicla* 1.2% of the population
(Western Siberia/Western Europe) 5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000

*Caelidris alpina alpina* 1.4% of the population
(Northern Siberia/Europe/Western Africa) 5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000

*Calidris canutus* 1.3% of the population

*Limosa limosa islandica* 7.3% of the population

*Pluvialis squatarola* 1.3% of the population

*Tringa totanus* 2.8% of the population

On passage the area regularly supports:

*Tringa totanus* 2% of the population

ARTICLE 4.2 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC): AN INTERNATIONALLY IMPORTANT ASSEMBLAGE OF BIRDS

Over winter the area regularly supports:

63017 waterfowl (5 year peak mean 1995/96-2000/2005)

Including:

Podiceps cristatus, Phalacrocorax carbo, Branta bernicla bernicla, Tadorna tadorna, Anas penelope, Anas strepera, Anas acuta, Bucephala clangula, Charadrius hiaticula, Pluvialis squatarola, Vanellus vanellus, Calidris canutus, Calidris alpina alpina, Limosa limosa islandica, Numenius arquata, Tringa totanus, Arenaria interpres.
4.3 Vulnerability

There is pressure for increased port development and marine recreation in this area. Marine recreation is being addressed within the Estuary Management Plan. Port development is being considered by public inquiry. Maintenance dredging of the River Stour and River Orwell poses potential threats to the SPA but the activity is being addressed through the provisions of the Habitats Regulations. The saltmarsh is eroding, partly as a result of natural coastal processes; the beneficial use of dredgings is taking place to try to combat these processes.

5. Site protection status and relation with CORINE biotopes:

5.1 Designation types at national and regional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK04 (SSSI/ASSI)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Further information and guidance in support of Ramsar site designations are provided in the Strategic Framework for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Wise Use Handbook 7th edition, as amended by COP9 Resolution IX.1 Annex B). A 3rd edition of the Handbook, incorporating these amendments, is in preparation and will be available in 2006.
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1. Name and address of the compiler of this form:

   Joint Nature Conservation Committee
   Monkstone House
   City Road
   Peterborough
   Cambridgeshire PE1 1JY
   UK
   Telephone/Fax: +44 (0)1733 – 562 626 / +44 (0)1733 – 555 948
   Email: RIS@JNCC.gov.uk

2. Date this sheet was completed/updated:
   Designated: 13 July 1994

3. Country:
   UK (England)

4. Name of the Ramsar site:
   Stour and Orwell Estuaries

5. Designation of new Ramsar site or update of existing site:
   This RIS is for: Updated information on an existing Ramsar site

6. For RIS updates only, changes to the site since its designation or earlier update:
   a) Site boundary and area:

   Importance note: If the boundary and/or area of the designated site is being restricted/reduced, the Contracting Party should have followed the procedures established by the Conference of the Parties in the Annex to COP9 Resolution IX.6 and provided a report in line with paragraph 28 of that Annex, prior to the submission of an updated RIS.

   b) Describe briefly any major changes to the ecological character of the Ramsar site, including in the application of the Criteria, since the previous RIS for the site:

Ramsar Information Sheet: UK11967

Produced by JNCC: Version 3.0, 13/06/2008
7. **Map of site included:**

Refer to Annex III of the *Exploratory Notes and Guidelines*, for detailed guidance on provision of suitable maps, including digital maps.

a) A map of the site, with clearly delineated boundaries, is included as:

i) **hard copy** (required for inclusion of site in the Ramsar List): *yes ✓ or no ☒*

ii) **an electronic format** *(e.g. JPEG or ArcView image)*: *yes ✓ or no ☒*

iii) a GIS file providing geo-referenced site boundary vectors and attribute tables: *yes ✓ or no ☒*

b) **Describe briefly the type of boundary delineation applied:**

E.g. the boundary is the same as an existing protected area (nature reserve, national park etc.), or follows a catchment boundary, or follows a geopolitical boundary such as a local government jurisdiction, follows physical boundaries such as roads, follows the shoreline of a waterbody, etc.

The site boundary is the same as, or falls within, an existing protected area.

For precise boundary details, please refer to paper map provided at designation.

8. **Geographical coordinates (latitude/longitude):**

051 57.16 N 001 09.38 E

9. **General location:**

Include in which part of the country and which large administrative region(s), and the location of the nearest large town.

Nearest town/city: Felixstowe

The Stour Estuary forms the south-eastern part of Essex/Suffolk boundary.

The Orwell Estuary is a relatively long and narrow estuary with extensive mudflats and some saltmarsh, running from Ipswich in the north, southwards towards Felixstowe.

**Administrative region:** Essex, Suffolk

10. **Elevation** (average and/or max. & min.) (metres): 11. **Area** (hectares): 3876.92

- **Min.** -1
- **Max.** 3
- **Mean** 0

12. **General overview of the site:**

Provide a short paragraph giving a summary description of the principal ecological characteristics and importance of the wetland.

The Stour and Orwell Estuaries is a wetland of international importance, comprising extensive mudflats, low cliffs, saltmarsh and small areas of vegetated shingle on the lower reaches. It provides habitats for an important assemblage of wetland birds in the non-breeding season and supports internationally important numbers of wintering and passage wildfowl and waders. The site also holds several nationally scarce plants and British Red Data Book invertebrates.

13. **Ramsar Criteria:**

Circle or underline each Criterion applied to the designation of the Ramsar site. See Annex II of the *Exploratory Notes and Guidelines* for the Criteria and guidelines for their application (adopted by Resolution VII.11).

2, 5, 6

14. **Justification for the application of each Criterion listed in 13 above:**

Provide justification for each Criterion in turn, clearly identifying to which Criterion the justification applies (see Annex II for guidance on acceptable forms of justification).

**Ramsar criterion 2**

Contains seven nationally scarce plants: stiff saltmarsh-grass *Puccinellia maritima*; small cord-grass *Spartina maritima*; perennial glasswort *Sarcocornia perennis*; lax-flowered sea lavender *Limonium vulgare*; and the celandrines *Zostera angustifolia*, *Z. marina* and *Z. noltei.*
Contains five British Red Data Book invertebrates: the muscid fly *Pheoncia finca*; the horsefly *Haematopota grandis*; two spiders, *Aretosa furcata* and *Baryphema dufayi*; and the Endangered spire snail *Mercury confusa*.

**Ramsar criterion 5**

**Assemblages of international importance:**

**Species with peak counts in winter:**

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

**Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation):**

**Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:**

Common redshank, *Tringa totanus totanus,* 2588 individuals, representing an average of 2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

**Species with peak counts in winter:**

Dark-bellied brent goose, *Branta bernicla bernicla,* 2627 individuals, representing an average of 1.2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Northern pintail, *Anas acuta,* NW Europe 741 individuals, representing an average of 1.2% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)


Red knot, *Calidris canutus islandica,* W & Southern Africa (wintering) 5970 individuals, representing an average of 1.3% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Dunlin, *Calidris alpina alpina,* W Siberia/W Europe 19114 individuals, representing an average of 1.4% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Black-tailed godwit, *Limosa limosa islandica,* Iceland/W Europe 2559 individuals, representing an average of 7.3% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Common redshank, *Tringa totanus totanus,* 3687 individuals, representing an average of 2.8% of the population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Contemporary data and information on waterbird trends at this site and their regional (sub-national) and national contexts can be found in the Wetland Bird Survey report, which is updated annually. See www.bto.org/survey/wbs/wbs-alerts-index.htm. Details of bird species occurring at levels of National importance are given in Section 22.
15. **Biogeography** (required when Criteria 1 and/or 3 and/or certain applications of Criterion 2 are applied to the designation):

Name the relevant biogeographic region that includes the Ramsar site, and identify the biogeographic regionalisation system that has been applied.

a) biogeographic region:

Atlantis

b) biogeographic regionalisation scheme (include reference citation):


16. **Physical features of the site:**

Describe, as appropriate, the geology, geomorphology, origin - natural or artificial, hydrology, soil type, water quality, water depth, water permanence, fluctuations in water level, tidal variations, downstream area, general climate, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil &amp; geology</th>
<th>shingle, sand, mud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geomorphology and landscape</td>
<td>lowland, coastal, valley, subtidal sediments (including sandbank/mudflat), intertidal sediments (including sandflat/mudflat), estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity</td>
<td>brackish / mesosaline, fresh, saline / eutraline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water permanence</td>
<td>usually permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. daily temperature</td>
<td>13.0°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. daily temperature</td>
<td>7.0°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of air frost</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall</td>
<td>576.3 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrs. of sunshine</td>
<td>1535.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General description of the Physical Features:**

The Stour and Orwell estuaries include extensive mudflats, low cliffs, saltmarsh and small areas of vegetated shingle on the lower reaches. The site also includes an area of low-lying grazing marsh at Shotley Marshes on the south side of the Orwell.

17. **Physical features of the catchment area:**

Describe the surface area, general geology and geomorphological features; general soil types; general land use, and climate (including climate type).

The Stour and Orwell estuaries include extensive mudflats, low cliffs, saltmarsh and small areas of vegetated shingle on the lower reaches. The site also includes an area of low-lying grazing marsh at Shotley Marshes on the south side of the Orwell.

18. **Hydrological values:**

Describe the functions and values of the wetland in groundwater recharge, flood control, sediment trapping, shoreline stabilization, etc.

**Sediment trapping**

19. **Wetland types:**

Inland wetland, Marine/coastal wetland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tidal flats</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Salt marshes</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Estuarine waters</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seasonally flooded agricultural land</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sand / shingle shores (including dune systems)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. General ecological features:
Provide further description, as appropriate, of the main habitats, vegetation types, plant and animal communities present in the Ramsar site, and the ecosystem services of the site and the benefits derived from them.

Orwell is a relatively long and narrow estuary with extensive mudflats bordering the channel that support large patches of eelgrass Zostera sp. The saltmarsh tends to be sandy and fairly calcareous with a wide range of communities. There are small areas of vegetated shingle on the foreshore of the lower reaches. Grazing marshes adjoin the estuary at Shoebury. The Stour estuary is a relatively simply structured estuary with a sandy outer area and a mudflack inner section. The mud is rich in invertebrates and there are areas of higher saltmarsh. The shoreline vegetation varies from salt-dominated wooded cliffs, through scrub-covered banks to coarse grasses over seawalls, with reed-filled borrow dykes behind.

Ecosystem services

21. Noteworthy flora:
Provide additional information on particular species and why they are noteworthy (expanding as necessary on information provided in 12. Justification for the application of the Criteria) indicating, e.g. which species/communities are unique, rare, endangered or biogeographically important, etc. Do not include here taxonomic lists of species present – these may be supplied as supplementary information to the RIS.

Nationally important species occurring on the site.

Higher Plants.
Puccinellia maritima (nationally scarce); Spartina maritima (nationally scarce); Salicornia rubra (nationally scarce); Linum maritimum (nationally scarce); Zostera angustifolia (nationally scarce); Zostera marina (nationally scarce);

22. Noteworthy fauna:
Provide additional information on particular species and why they are noteworthy (expanding as necessary on information provided in 12. Justification for the application of the Criteria) indicating, e.g. which species/communities are unique, rare, endangered or biogeographically important, etc., including count data. Do not include here taxonomic lists of species present – these may be supplied as supplementary information to the RIS.

Birds
Species currently occurring at levels of national importance:
Species regularly supported during the breeding season:
Pied avocet. Recurvirostra avosetta, W Europe 21 pairs, representing an average of 2.8% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995-2000)

Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:
Ringed plover. Charadrius hiaticula, Europe/Northwest Africa 638 individuals, representing an average of 2.1% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995-2000)

Species with peak counts in winter:
Great crested grebe. Podiceps cristatus cristatus, NW Europe 245 individuals, representing an average of 1.5% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995-2000)

Great cormorant, Phalacrocorax carbo carbo, NW Europe 232 individuals, representing an average of 1% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995-2000)
Common shelduck, *Tadorna tadorna*, NW Europe
2955 individuals, representing an average of 3.8% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Eurasian curlew, *Numenius arquata arquata*, N. a. arquata Europe (breeding)
1824 individuals, representing an average of 1.2% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

Ruddy turnstone, *Arenaria interpres interpres*, NE Canada, Greenland/W Europe & NW Africa
690 individuals, representing an average of 1.4% of the GB population (5-year peak mean 1995/96-1999/2000)

### Species Information

**Nationally important species occurring on the site.**

**Invertebrates.**

*Phoxia fusc., Heteroptera grandis* (Meigen) (RDB3); *Arctosa fulvilinea* (RDB3); *Batyphylla dufreyi* (RDB3); *Mercuria (=Pseudanamala) confusa* (RDB1).

### 23. Social and cultural values:

Describe if the site has any general social and/or cultural values e.g. fisheries production, forestry, religious importance, archaeological sites, social relations with the wetland, etc. Distinguish between historical/archaeological/religious significance and current socio-economic values.

- Aesthetic
- Archaeological/historical site
- Livestock grazing
- Non-consumptive recreation
- Sport hunting
- Tourism
- Transportation/navigation

b) Is the site considered of international importance for holding, in addition to relevant ecological values, examples of significant cultural values, whether material or non-material, linked to its origin, conservation and/or ecological functioning? No

If Yes, describe this importance under one or more of the following categories:

i) sites which provide a model of wetland wise use, demonstrating the application of traditional knowledge and methods of management and use that maintain the ecological character of the wetland;

ii) sites which have exceptional cultural traditions or records of former civilizations that have influenced the ecological character of the wetland;

iii) sites where the ecological character of the wetland depends on the interaction with local communities or indigenous peoples;

iv) sites where relevant non-material values such as sacred sites are present and their existence is strongly linked with the maintenance of the ecological character of the wetland;

### 24. Land tenure/ownership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership category</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organisation (NGO)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority, municipality etc.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 25. Current land (including water) use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature conservation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting of vegetation (small-scale/subsistence)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bait collection</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent arable agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing (unspecified)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting: recreational/sport</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment/disposal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour/port</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport route</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-urbanised settlements</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 26. Factors (past, present or potential) adversely affecting the site's ecological character, including changes in land (including water) use and development projects:

**Explanation of reporting category:**

1. *These factors that are still operating, but it is unclear if they are under control, as there is a lag in showing the management or regulatory regime to be successful.*

2. *These factors that are not currently being managed, or where the regulatory regime appears to have been ineffective so far.*

*NA = Not Applicable because no factors have been reported.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Factor Category</th>
<th>Reporting Category</th>
<th>Description of the problem (Newly reported Factors only)</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
<th>Off-Site</th>
<th>Major Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Natural coastal processes exacerbated by fixed sea defences, port development and maintenance dredging</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For category 2 factors only.

*What measures have been taken / are planned / regulatory processes invoked, to mitigate the effect of these factors? Erosion - Erosion is being tackled through sediment replacement for additional erosion that can be attributed to port development and maintenance dredging. A realignment site has been created on-site to make up for the loss of habitat due to capital dredging. General background erosion has not been tackled although a Flood Management Strategy for the site is being produced.*
27. Conservation measures taken:
List national category and legal status of protected areas, including boundary relationships with the Ramsar site, management practices, whether an officially approved management plan exists and whether it is being implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation measure</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site/ Area of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI/ASSI)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Protection Area (SPA)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owned by a non-governmental organisation for nature</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management agreement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management statement/plan implemented</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Describe any other current management practices:
The management of Ramsar sites in the UK is determined by either a formal management plan or through other management planning processes, and is overseen by the relevant statutory conservation agency. Details of the precise management practises are given in these documents.

28. Conservation measures proposed but not yet implemented:
e.g. management plan in preparation; official proposal as a legally protected area, etc.
No information available

29. Current scientific research and facilities:
e.g. details of current research projects, including biodiversity monitoring; existence of a field research station, etc.

Fauna.
Numbers of migratory and wintering wildfowl and waders are monitored annually as part of the national Wetland Birds Survey (WeBS) organised by the British Trust for Ornithology, Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee.
High tide bird counts.

Environment, Flora and Fauna.
Vegetation, bird and invertebrate surveys/monitoring carried out on NGO reserves.

30. Current communications, education and public awareness (CEPA) activities related to or benefiting the site:
e.g. visitor centre; observation hides and nature trails; information booklets; facilities for school visits, etc.
None reported

31. Current recreation and tourism:
State if the wetland is used for recreation/tourism; indicate type(s) and their frequency/intensity.

Activities, Facilities provided and Seasonality.
A popular area for tourists as it is within an AONB. There are more visitors in the summer. However it is well used throughout the year by walkers, bird watches and for sailing.

32. Jurisdiction:
Include territorial, e.g. state/region, and functional/sectoral, e.g. Dept. of Agriculture/Dept. of Environment, etc.
Head, Nature 2000 and Ramsar Team, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, European Wildlife Division, Zone 1/07, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6EB
33. Management authority:
Provide the name and address of the local office(s) of the agency(ies) or organisation(s) directly responsible for managing the wetland. Wherever possible provide also the title and/or name of the person or persons in this office with responsibility for the wetland.

Site Designations Manager, English Nature, Sites and Surveillance Team, Northminster House, Northminster Road, Peterborough, PE1 1UA, UK

34. Bibliographical references:
Scientific/technical references only. If biogeographic regionalisation scheme applied (see 15 above), list full reference citation for the scheme.

Site-relevant references
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Ogilvie, MA & the Rare Breeding Birds Panel (1996) Rare breeding birds in the United Kingdom in 1993. British Birds, 89, 61–91
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Please return to: Ramsar Secretariat, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland
Telephone: +41 22 999 0170 • Fax: +41 22 999 0169 • email: ramsar@ramsar.org
UK SPA data form

NATURA 2000
STANDARD DATA FORM
FOR SPECIAL PROTECTION AREAS (SPA)
FOR SITES ELIGIBLE FOR IDENTIFICATION AS SITES OF COMMUNITY IMPORTANCE (SCI)
AND
FOR SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION (SAC)

1. Site identification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Type</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Site code</td>
<td>UK9009261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Compilation date</td>
<td>199603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Update</td>
<td>199803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Relationship with other Natura 2000 sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Respondent(s)</td>
<td>International Designations, JNCC, Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Site name</td>
<td>Deben Estuary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Site indication and designation classification dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date site proposed as SCI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>date confirmed as SCI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date site classified as SPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date site classified as SAC</td>
<td>199603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Site location:

2.1 Site centre location

| longitude | 01 20 44 E |
| latitude  | 52 02 31 N |

2.2 Site area (ha) 978.83

2.3 Site length (km)  

2.5 Administrative region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUTS code</th>
<th>Region name</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK403</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Biogeographic region

- Alpine
- Atlantic X
- Boreal
- Continental
- Macaronesia
- Mediterranean

3. Ecological information:

3.1 Annex I habitats

Habitat types present on the site and the site assessment for them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex I Habitat</th>
<th>% cover</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Relative importance</th>
<th>Conservation status</th>
<th>Global assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Deben Estuary

Standard Natura 2000 Data Form
3.2 Annex I birds and regularly occurring migratory birds not listed on Annex I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Species name</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Migratory</th>
<th>Site assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A040a</td>
<td>Bruna bernicla bernicla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A132</td>
<td>Recurvirostra avosetta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Site description:

4.1 General site character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat classes</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine areas. Sea inlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal rivers. Estuaries. Mud flats. Sand flats. Lagoons (including saltwork basins)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marshes. Salt pastures. Salt steppe.</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal sand dunes. Sand beaches. Machair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingle. Sea cliffs. Islets</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland water bodies (standing water, running water)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogs. Marshes. Water fringed vegetation. Fens</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath. Scrub. Maquis and garrigue. Phrygrana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry grassland. Steppe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hound grassland. Mesophile grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine and sub-alpine grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved grassland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arable land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-leaved deciduous woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniferous woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forest areas: cultivated with woody plants (including orchards, groves, vineyards, delousing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland rocks. Scrags. Sands. Permanent snow and ice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other land (including towns, villages, roads, waste places, mines, industrial sites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total habitat cover</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Other site characteristics

**Soil & geology:**
- Mud, Sedimentary

**Geomorphology & landscape:**
- Coastal, Estuary, Intertidal sediments (including sandflat/mudflat), Lowland, Valley

4.2 Quality and importance

**ARTICLE 4.1 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)**

**Over winter the area regularly supports:**

- *Recurvirostra avosetta*  
  (Western Europe/Western Mediterranean - breeding)  
  7.5% of the GB population  
  5 year peak mean 1991/92-1995/96

**ARTICLE 4.2 QUALIFICATION (79/409/EEC)**

**Over winter the area regularly supports:**
UK SPA data form

| Branta bernicla bernicla (Western Siberia/Western Europe) | 0.8% of the population | 5 year peak mean 1991/92-1995/96 |

4.3 Vulnerability

The saltmarsh and intertidal habitats are vulnerable to sea level rise and coastal squeeze. These issues are being addressed through the Environment Agency LEAP, the estuary Shoreline Management Plan and research into possible managed retreat in parts of the site.

5. Site protection status and relation with CORINE biotopes:

5.1 Designation types at national and regional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>% cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK01 (SSSI ASSE)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notes for compilers:
1. The RIS should be completed in accordance with the attached Explanatory Notes and Guidelines for completing the Information Sheet on Ramsar Wetlands. Compilers are strongly advised to read this guidance before filling in the RIS.

2. Further information and guidance in support of Ramsar site designations are provided in the Strategic Framework for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Wise Use Handbook 7, 2nd edition, as amended by COP9 Resolution IX.1 Annex B). A 3rd edition of the Handbook, incorporating these amendments, is in preparation and will be available in 2006.

3. Once completed, the RIS (and accompanying map(s)) should be submitted to the Ramsar Secretariat. Compilers should provide an electronic (MS Word) copy of the RIS and, where possible, digital copies of all maps.

1. Name and address of the compiler of this form:

   | Joint Nature Conservation Committee |
   | Monkstone House                      |
   | City Road                            |
   | Peterborough                         |
   | Cambridgeshire PE1 1JY               |
   | UK                                  |
   | Telephone/Fax: +44 (0)1733 – 562 626 / +44 (0)1733 – 555 948 |
   | Email: RIS@JNCC.gov.uk               |

2. Date this sheet was completed/updated:
   - Designated: 11 March 1996

3. Country: UK (England)

4. Name of the Ramsar site:
   - Deben Estuary

5. Designation of new Ramsar site or update of existing site:
   - This RIS is for: Updated information on an existing Ramsar site

6. For RIS updates only, changes to the site since its designation or earlier update:
   a) Site boundary and area:

      **Important note:** If the boundary and/or area of the designated site is being restricted/reduced, the Contracting Party should have followed the procedures established by the Conference of the Parties in the Annex to COP9 Resolution IX.5 and provided a report in line with paragraph 25 of that Annex, prior to the submission of an updated RIS.

   b) Describe briefly any major changes to the ecological character of the Ramsar site, including in the application of the Criteria, since the previous RIS for the site:

---

Produced by JNCC, Version 3.0, 12/06/2008
7. Map of site included:
Refer to Annex III of the *Explanation Notes and Guidelines* for detailed guidance on provision of suitable maps, including digital maps.

a) A map of the site, with clearly delineated boundaries, is included as:
   i) **hard copy** (required for inclusion of site in the Ramsar List): yes √ - or - no □
   ii) **an electronic format** (e.g. a JPEG or ArcView image): Yes
   iii) a GIS file providing geo-referenced site boundary vectors and attribute tables yes √ - or - no □

b) Describe briefly the type of boundary delineation applied:
e.g., the boundary is the same as an existing protected area (nature reserve, national park etc.), or follows a catchment boundary, or follows a geographical boundary such as a local government jurisdiction, follows physical boundaries such as roads, follows the shoreline of a waterbody, etc.

The site boundary is the same as, or falls within, an existing protected area.

For precise boundary details, please refer to paper map provided at designation

8. Geographical coordinates (latitude/longitude):
52.02 31 N 01 20 44 E

9. General location:
Include in which part of the country and which large administrative region(s) and the location of the nearest large town.

Nearest town/city: Ipswich
Deben Estuary is located in East Anglia, on the east coast of Suffolk. It extends 18 km from the tidal limit above Wilford Bridge near Woodbridge, south to the mouth of the estuary at Felixstowe.

Administrative region: Suffolk

10. Elevation (average and/or max. & min.) (metres):
   Min. -1
   Max. 4
   Mean 1

11. Area (hectares): 978.93

12. General overview of the site:
   Provide a short paragraph giving a summary description of the principal ecological characteristics and importance of the wetland.
   This estuary is relatively narrow and sheltered. It has limited amounts of freshwater input and the intertidal areas are constrained by sea-walls. The site supports nationally and internationally-important flora and fauna.

13. Ramsar Criteria:
Circle or underline each Criterion applied to the designation of the Ramsar site. See Annex II of the *Explanation Notes and Guidelines* for the Criteria and guidelines for their application (adopted by Resolution VII.11).

   2, 6

14. Justification for the application of each Criterion listed in 13 above:
   Provide justification for each Criterion in turn, clearly identifying to which Criterion the justification applies (see Annex II for guidance on acceptable forms of justification).

Ramsar criterion 2
Supports a population of the mollusc *Vertigo augmentor* (Habitats Directive Annex II (S1014); British Red Data Book Endangered). Martlesham Creek is one of only about fourteen sites in Britain where this species survives.
### Ramsar criterion 6 – species/populations occurring at levels of international importance.

#### Qualifying Species/populations (as identified at designation):

**Species with peak counts in winter:**

Dark-bellied brent goose, *Branta bernicla bernicla*,

- 1953 individuals, representing an average of 1.9% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

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

---

#### Biogeography

- **(required when Criteria 1 and/or 3 and/or certain applications of Criterion 2 are applied to the designation):**
  - Name the relevant biogeographic region that includes the Ramsar site, and identify the biogeographic regionalisation system that has been applied.
  - **a) biogeographic region:** Atlantic
  - **b) biogeographic regionalisation scheme (include reference citation):** Council Directive 92/43/EEC

---

#### Physical features of the site:

Describe, as appropriate, the geology, geomorphology, origin - natural or artificial, hydrology, soil type, water quality; water depth, water permanence; fluctuations in water level; tidal variations; downstream area; general climate, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil &amp; geology</th>
<th>mud, sedimentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geomorphology and landscape</td>
<td>lowland, coastal, valley, intertidal sediments (including sandflat/nanflat), estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient status</td>
<td>eutrophic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>no information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity</td>
<td>saline / eutaline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>mainly mineral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water permanence</td>
<td>usually permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. daily temperature: 13.0°C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. daily temperature: 7.0°C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of air frost: 27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall: 576.3 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrs. of sunshine: 1335.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General description of the Physical Features:**

The Deben Estuary extends south-eastwards for over 12 km from the town of Woodbridge to the sea just north of Felixstowe. It is relatively narrow and sheltered, and has limited amounts of freshwater input. The estuary mouth is the narrowest section and is protected by the presence of shifting sandbanks. The intertidal areas are constrained by sea-walls. The saltmarsh and intertidal mudflats that occupy the majority of the site, however, display the...
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most complete range of saltmarsh community types in Suffolk. The estuary holds a range of swamp communities that fringe the estuary, and occasionally form larger stands. In general, these are dominated by common reed Phragmites australis.

17. Physical features of the catchment area:
Describe the surface area, general geology and geomorphological features, general soil types, general land use, and climate (including climate type).

The Deben Estuary extends south-eastswards for over 12 km from the town of Woodbridge to the sea just north of Felixstowe. It is relatively narrow and sheltered, and has limited amounts of freshwater input. The estuary mouth is the narrowest section and is protected by the presence of shifting sandbanks. The intertidal areas are constrained by sea-walls. The saltmarsh and intertidal mudflats that occupy the majority of the site, however, display the most complete range of saltmarsh community types in Suffolk.

18. Hydrological values:
Describe the functions and values of the wetland in groundwater recharge, flood control, sediment trapping, shoreline stabilization, etc.

No special values known

19. Wetland types:
Marine/coastal wetland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Salt marshes</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tidal flats</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Estuarine waters</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Pearl beds (including peat bogs, swamps, fens)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sand / shingle shores (including dune systems)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. General ecological features:
Provide further description, as appropriate, of the main habitats, vegetation types, plant and animal communities present in the Ramsar site, and the ecosystem services of the site and the benefits derived from them

The estuary supports a highly complex mosaic of habitat types including:

mudflats, lower and upper saltmarsh, swamp and scrub. The composition of the mosaic varies with substrate, frequency and duration of tidal inundation, exposure, location and management.

Ecosystem services

21. Noteworthy flora:
Provide additional information on particular species and why they are noteworthy (expanding as necessary on information provided in 12. Justification for the application of the Criteria indicating, e.g. which species/communities are unique, rare, endangered or biogeographically important, etc. Do not include here taxonomic lists of species present – these may be supplied as supplementary information to the RIS.

Nationally important species occurring on the site.

Higher Plants.
Althaea officinalis, Bupleurum tenuissimum, Lepidium latifolium, Puccinellia fasciculata, Sarcocephalus perennis, Suaeda vera, Zostera angustifolia are nationally scarce plants associated with estuarine habitats.
22. Noteworthy fauna:

Provide additional information on particular species and why they are noteworthy (expanding as necessary on information provided in 12. Justification for the application of the Criteria) indicating, e.g. which species/communities are unique, rare, endangered or biogeographically important, etc., including count data. Do not include here taxonomic list of species present – these may be supplied as supplementary information to the RIS.

**Birds**

**Species currently occurring at levels of national importance:**

**Species with peak counts in spring/autumn:**

- Black-tailed godwit, *Limosa limosa islandica*, Iceland/W Europe: 307 individuals, representing an average of 1.9% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)
- Common greenshank, *Tringa nebularia*, Europe/W Africa: 22 individuals, representing an average of 3.6% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

**Species with peak counts in winter:**

- Bean goose, *Anser fabalis fabalis*, NW Europe - wintering: 5 individuals, representing an average of 1.2% of the GB population (Source period not collated)
- Common shelduck, *Tadorna tadorna*, NW Europe: 832 individuals, representing an average of 1% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)
- Pied avocet, *Recurvirostra avosetta*, Europe/Northwest Africa: 167 individuals, representing an average of 4.9% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)
- Spotted redshank, *Tringa erythropus*, Europe/W Africa: 3 individuals, representing an average of 2.2% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)
- Common redshank, *Tringa totanus totanus*,: 2124 individuals, representing an average of 1.8% of the GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

**Species Information**

Nationally important species occurring on the site.

**Invertebrates.**

- *Vertigo angustior* (Nationally Scarce)
- *Vertigo pusilla* (Nationally Scarce)

23. Social and cultural values:

Describe if the site has any general social and/or cultural values e.g. fisheries, production, forestry, religious importance, archaeological sites, social relations with the wetland, etc. Distinguish between historical/archaeological/religious significance and current socio-economic values.

- Aesthetic
- Fisheries production
- Non-consumptive recreation
- Sport fishing
- Sport hunting
- Tourism
- Transportation/navigation

b) Is the site considered of international importance for holding, in addition to relevant ecological values, examples of significant cultural values, whether material or non-material, linked to its origin, conservation and/or ecological functioning? No

If Yes, describe this importance under one or more of the following categories:
i) sites which provide a model of wetland wise use, demonstrating the application of traditional knowledge and methods of management and use that maintain the ecological character of the wetland:

ii) sites which have exceptional cultural traditions or records of former civilizations that have influenced the ecological character of the wetland:

iii) sites where the ecological character of the wetland depends on the interaction with local communities or indigenous peoples.

iv) sites where relevant non-material values such as sacred sites are present and their existence is strongly linked with the maintenance of the ecological character of the wetland:

### 24. Land tenure/ownership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership category</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organisation (NGO)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/Crown Estate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25. Current land (including water) use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature conservation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting of vegetation (small-scale/subsistence)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing: commercial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing: recreational/sport</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bait collection</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable agriculture (unspecified)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing (unspecified)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting: recreational/sport</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation (incl. agricultural water supply)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-urbanised settlements</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. Factors (past, present or potential) adversely affecting the site's ecological character, including changes in land (including water) use and development projects:

Explanation of reporting category:
1. Those factors that are still operating, but it is unclear if they are under control, as there is a lag in allowing the management or regulatory regime to be successful.
2. Those factors that are not currently being managed, or where the regulatory regime appears to have been ineffective so far.

NA = Not Applicable because no factors have been reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Factor Category</th>
<th>Description of the problem (Newly reported Factors only)</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
<th>Off-Site</th>
<th>Major Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td>Coastal squeeze within the Deben Estuary</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For category 2 factors only.
What measures have been taken / are planned / regulatory processes invoked, to mitigate the effect of these factors?
Erosion - English Nature provides advice to the Environment Agency and coastal local authorities in relation to flood and coastal protection management. This will inform the development of the Suffolk Estuaries strategies and the second generation shoreline management plan.

Is the site subject to adverse ecological change? YES

27. Conservation measures taken:
List national category and legal status of protected areas, including boundary relationships with the Ramsar site; management practices, whether an officially approved management plan exists and whether it is being implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation measure</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Off-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site/ Area of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI/ASSI)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Protection Area (SPA)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owned by a non-governmental organisation for nature conservation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management statement/plan implemented</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Describe any other current management practices:
The management of Ramsar sites in the UK is determined by either a formal management plan or through other management planning processes, and is overseen by the relevant statutory conservation agency. Details of the precise management practices are given in these documents.
28. Conservation measures proposed but not yet implemented:
e.g. management plan in preparation, official proposal as a legally protected area, etc.
No information available

29. Current scientific research and facilities:
e.g. details of current research projects, including biodiversity monitoring, existence of a field research station, etc.

Fauna.
Numbers of migratory and wintering wildfowl and waders are monitored annually as part of the national Wetland Birds Survey (WeBS) organised by the British Trust for Ornithology, Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

30. Current communications, education and public awareness (CEPA) activities related to or benefiting the site:
e.g. visitor centre, observation hides and nature trails, information booklets, facilities for school visits, etc.
None reported

31. Current recreation and tourism:
State if the wetland is used for recreation/tourism, indicate type(s) and their frequency/intensity.

Activities.
Boating and walking locally and bird watching centred on Martlesham Creek and Felixstowe Ferry. Fishing.

Facilities provided.
Moorings along the river at Woodbridge, Waldring Field, Ransholt.

Seasonality.
Activities are predominantly undertaken during the summer especially fishing, as this is when thin-lipped grey mullet Liza ramada enter the estuary.

32. Jurisdiction:
Include territorial, e.g. state/region, and functional/sectoral, e.g. Dept of Agriculture/Dept of Environment, etc.
Head, Natuna 2000 and Ramsar Team, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, European Wildlife Division, Zone 1/07, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6ER

33. Management authority:
Provide the name and address of the local office(s) of the agency(ies) or organisation(s) directly responsible for managing the wetland. Wherever possible provide also the title and/or name of the person or persons in this office with responsibility for the wetland.
Site Designations Manager, English Nature, Sites and Surveillance Team, Northminster House, Northminster Road, Peterborough, PE1 1UA, UK

34. Bibliographical references:
Scientific/technical references only. If biogeographic regionalisation scheme applied (see 15 above), list full reference citation for the scheme.

Site-relevant references


Please return to: Ramsar Secretariat, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland
Telephone: +41 22 990 0170 • Fax: +41 22 990 0160 • email: ramsar@ramsar.org
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