

Mansfield  
District Council

## Local Plan Preferred Development Sites 2017

Interim Habitat Regulations Assessment –  
strategic and edge of settlement sites



August 2017

In partnership with **AECOM**

[www.mansfield.gov.uk](http://www.mansfield.gov.uk)



**Mansfield**  
District Council

## Contents

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Introduction	3
2. Background	3
3. Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (Natura 2000 site)	4
4. Possible Potential Sherwood Special Protection Area (ppSPA)	4
5. Scoping Report Conclusions	5
6. Analysis of implications of potential site allocations (strategic and edge of settlement sites) for Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and Sherwood Forest ppSPA	6
7. Next Steps	7
<b>Appendices - Maps and Tables</b>	
A. Assessment Results	8
B. Supporting Maps	21



## **1. Introduction**

1.1 Mansfield District Council consulted on its draft local plan in 2016 which included preferred housing and employment sites, policies and a proposals map (Regulation 18 consultation stage). In response to comments received during the consultation and additional evidence commissioned, the preferred housing and employment sites, and the vision and objectives have been revised and the council is re-consulting on these. These are shown within the Preferred Option Consultation Document (2017).

1.2 As part of Mansfield District Council's preferred options consultation on its local plan, this interim Habitat Regulations Assessment Scoping Report identifies potential impacts from preferred development sites on the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and a possible potential Sherwood Special Protection Area.

1.3 It is important to note that only strategic sites and edge of settlement sites have been assessed within this interim report. The 2016 HRA Scoping Report already identifies in-combination issues which confirmed that these issues are related more to the total quantum of new development in Mansfield District rather than the locations of individual potential development sites. Rather, it focuses on where the scale or proximity of a particular development site may mean a site-specific recreational pressure effect (for example) could arise.

1.4 Following this public consultation (Regulation 18) on the revised preferred sites, an updated HRA scoping assessment will take place to help inform the Publication Draft stage (Regulation 19) of the local plan, taking into account any necessary revisions to the plan's policies and significant impacts (alone and in-combination). This will form part of the local plan's extended evidence base.

1.5 The HRA Scoping assessment of the Mansfield District Draft Consultation Local Plan (2016) is also available on the council's website <http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/localplan>. This report demonstrates the overall HRA scoping approach taken which is supported by Natural England.

## **2. Background**

2.1 As part of the Draft Consultation Local Plan (2016), a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Scoping Report was prepared which was put out for public consultation on in 2016. This report assessed the impact of the local plan, alone and in combination, on the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is a European protected site within the Sherwood Forest.

2.2 An HRA is required under the Habitats Regulations (2010 as amended) in line with the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). Under the Habitats Directive, Mansfield District Council is required to carry out an assessment of whether a plan or project is likely to significantly affect the integrity of a European site (Natura 2000 sites), in relation to its vulnerabilities and conservation objectives. Assessments should be

carried out on all plans and projects that are not directly connected with or necessary for the management of the site. The Mansfield District Local Plan is one of these.

2.3 The 2016 report (*Local Plan Consultation Draft Habitat Regulations Assessment – likely significant effects screening report*) addressed the screening or ‘likely significant effects stage’ of the HRA process. This took into account draft allocations and policies and made recommendations as to whether a further, more formalised assessment, known as an Appropriate Assessment was required.

2.4 Also, based on guidance from Natural England, this report also included a separate scoping exercise which assessed impacts on a possible potential Sherwood Special Protection Area (ppSPA).

2.5 The conclusions from these assessments are summarised in Section 5 of this document.

### **3. Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (Natura 2000 site)**

3.1 The role of the HRA Scoping exercise is to assess the likely significant effects (negative impacts) on nearby Natura 2000 sites of European importance. There are no Natura 2000 sites within the district. The nearest one, Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC, is located within close proximity (approximately 0.7km from the Mansfield district boundary) within Newark and Sherwood district near Edwinstowe within the Sherwood Forest Natural Area.

3.2 The nearest settlement to this SAC within Mansfield district is Market Warsop, approximately 3 km to the west. The greater Mansfield urban area (including Mansfield town or central area, Forest Town and Mansfield Woodhouse) is located 5.8km to the south-west.

3.3 The general character of the site is heathland scrub and dry grassland and broad-leaved oak woodlands with notable invertebrate fauna and diverse fungal assemblages.

### **4. Possible Potential Sherwood Special Protection Area (ppSPA)**

4.1 A portion of the Sherwood Forest area is currently being considered as a possible potential Special Protection Area, with regard to birds of European importance (nightjar and woodlark) that this area supports. It is referred in this document as a ppSPA.

4.2 If the area were to be formally proposed as a potential Special Protection Area (pSPA), meaning it is on its way to becoming a formally classified SPA, plans and projects would have to be subject by law to the provisions under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 that apply to assessment of impacts on all European sites.

4.3 This is because the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012, paragraph 118) requires authorities to afford the same protection to pSPAs as they do to formal SPAs.

4.4 Until the Sherwood Forest area is formally proposed by government as a pSPA there is no legal obligation to undertake HRA. However, Natural England (NE) still advises that in order to reduce future risks should the site ever be proposed, it is logical for Local Authorities to satisfy themselves that current planning applications contain ‘sufficient objective information to ensure that all potential impacts on the breeding nightjar and woodlark populations have been adequately avoided or minimised’. In doing so, NE advises that this should be done through a risk-based approach ‘using appropriate measures and safeguards’, in order to ‘ensure that any future need to review outstanding permissions under the 2010 Regulations is met with a robust set of measures in place’ (letter from Natural England, 28 June 2010 updated July 2011 and March 2014).

4.5 An informal boundary of the Sherwood ppSPA shows that this area extends along the eastern and southern sides of Mansfield district extending into the nearby districts of Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood, Ashfield and Gedling (see map included in this document).

## **5. Scoping Report Conclusions**

5.1 Conclusions from the HRA Scoping Report of the consultation draft Local Plan 2016 are summarised below. Greater detail is provided in the Local Plan Consultation Draft Habitat Regulations Assessment – likely significant effects screening report (February 2016).

### **5.2 Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC)**

Key issues identified and assessed for the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC included:

- air quality
- tourism and recreation and
- water abstraction.

5.3 It was concluded that no likely significant effects on the SAC would arise from the Mansfield Local Plan either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. For example, the district’s urban areas and proposed locations for development are sufficiently far enough that no significant urbanisation effect would arise. Residents also have good access to accessible woodland and green infrastructure networks.

5.4 Since no likely significant effects will arise, no Appropriate Assessment is required.

## 5.5 Sherwood ppSPA

Key issues identified and assessed for the nightjar and woodlark and a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) in the Sherwood area included:

- air quality
- tourism and recreation
- habitat fragmentation
- water abstraction and
- proximity of development in relation to impacts from cats and density of development.

5.6 It was concluded that, subject to some proposed changes to policy (NE7 and NE8), no adverse effects would arise from the Mansfield Local Plan either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

5.7 It was also recommended that, with regard to urbanisation and development within 400m of the ppSPA, the following housing and employment sites should be subject to application-specific assessment in line with the proposed additional wording for Policy NE7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity):

Table 5.1

Location of development	2017 preferred site reference	2016 preferred site reference
Clipstone Road East (residential)	101	M3(m)
Helmsley Road (residential)	Not included	M3(i)
Sherwood Avenue (residential)	27a	M3 (aa)
Ratcher Hill Quarry- south east (employment)	Not included but near to 40, 139, 150 and 151	M4(b)
Ratcher Hill Quarry- south west (employment)	40 (also near to 139, 150, 151)	M4(d)
Ransom Wood Business Park (employment)	Not included but near to near to sites 40, 139, 150, 151).	M4(c)

## 6. Analysis of implications of potential site allocations (strategic and edge of settlement sites) for Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and Sherwood Forest ppSPA

6.1 It must be noted that this assessment focusses on site-specific issues; in other words it examines whether potential allocated sites are constrained by the SAC or ppSPA and if so to what extent. A simple grading is used to classify sites based on a

sliding scale of 0 (no constraint posed) to 3 (probable showstopper i.e. issues are presented that are likely to be irresolvable).

6.2 The HRA Screening Report for the Consultation Draft Local Plan (2016) (Reg. 18) identified a number of strategic ‘in combination’ issues such as recreational pressure and air quality. However, that analysis confirmed that these issues are related more to the total quantum of new development in Mansfield District rather than the locations of individual potential development sites. Such strategic issues are not therefore discussed in this table as they would not be useful in discriminating between sites, except where the scale or proximity of a particular development site may mean a site-specific recreational pressure effect (for example) could arise. As discussed in the introduction of this document, an assessment of in-combination impacts will be reviewed once the final allocated development sites and policies are confirmed for inclusion in the next stage of the Local Plan (i.e. Publication Draft or Regulation 19 stage).

6.3 No sites have been identified as ‘3’ (probable irresolvable issues) but the site referred to as ‘Land off Jubilee Way’ (reference 76) has been identified as ‘2’, meaning that there are significant issues regarding the proximity of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA (and a constituent SSSI) that would not necessarily rule out the development in principle but would require careful design of buffer zones and protective measures.

6.4 Please note that areas identified with potential for habitat creation (e.g. heathland or acid grassland), and thus potential to support nightjar and/or woodlark, are based on whether an area is situated within existing coniferous woodland, former mineral sites (including disused mineral railway lines), open space or within areas identified by the RSPB as being a ‘heathland priority area’. These are referred to as ‘*HAG Opportunity Areas*’. It is assumed that HAG opportunity areas located within the urban area are unlikely to support nesting sites due to high levels of existing human disturbance (e.g. recreational pressure and close proximity of development). A map of these areas referred to can be found in this document.

6.5 In line with the Mansfield HRA screening report for the consultation draft local plan (2016) approach, information used to inform this assessment includes: 2016 aerial photography, submitted background information from the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA 2016); expected development yields, and 2015-16 bird data.

## **7. Next Steps**

7.1 Following the public consultation on the preferred sites, the next step will be to consider comments and to formalise these as ‘allocated development sites’ for inclusion within the publication draft stage of the local plan (the next step).

7.2 It is important to understand that the HRA process is a rolling one, continually updated as changes in the local plan arise, until the Local Plan is submitted for adoption. This includes accommodating changes and re-test modifications where and when necessary (i.e. in relation to mitigating identified likely significant effects, alone and in-combination).

7.3 As such, the HRA scoping assessment of the preferred and alternative sites in this report helps inform the overall local plan process.

7.4 An updated HRA Scoping report will be published alongside the publication draft of the local plan which will be informed by: 1) the overall recommendations provided within the 2016 HRA Scoping report; 2) comments on the 2016 Local Plan consultation draft; 3) any additional recommendations following this 2017 preferred options consultation; and 4) any changes to revised sites and policies based on consultation comments and updated evidence.

## Appendix A: Assessment Results

Site	Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)	Discussion	Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)
<p>Pleasley Hill Farm (western Mansfield): sites 52, 74,170</p> <p>Expected yield of 925 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography, all four parcels appear to be arable land and thus are at considerably less risk of supporting nesting nightjar or woodlark than heathland, acid grassland or plantation woodland<sup>1</sup>. They are located 5km from the Sherwood Forest ppSPA on the opposite side of Mansfield town and 3km from the nearest HAG opportunity area. As such, they appear to be a considerable distance from the most suitable nightjar or woodlark nesting habitat and thus are unlikely result in a significant reduction in nesting opportunities. There appear to be data suggesting breeding nightjar have been found in the vicinity of Pleasley village<sup>2</sup> notwithstanding the absence of plantation, heathland or acid grassland. From examining aerial photography there appears to be little suitable habitat within the vicinity of sites 52, 74b and 74c. Thus, the site is likely to be too far away to have a significant negative impact on nesting sites.</p> <p>The site is 10km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p>	<p>0</p>

<sup>1</sup> Woodlark in particular will theoretically use any habitat that is structurally suitable and has adequate sightlines, such that fallow farmland or field margins could be used for nesting (although actual cereal crops are unlikely to be suitable due to the tall dense vegetation). However, they are much less likely to be found in these habitats than in heathland, acid grassland and plantation clearings

<sup>2</sup> Personal communication from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust to Mansfield District Council, April 2017

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Mansfield Woodhouse/Forest Town (north of River Maun): Warren Farm : sites 30, 31, 53, 55 and 56</p> <p>Expected yield of 1,635 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes (excluding site 56)</p>	<p>Includes two previous allocations, as site references M3(ad) and M3(ae). These were not singled out for discussion in the HRA Screening Report (2016) due to their distance from the ppSPA or SAC; no negative impacts identified.</p> <p>From examination of aerial photography, most of the site is arable land and thus are at considerably less risk of supporting nesting nightjar or woodlark than heathland, acid grassland or plantation woodland. Parcels 30, 31, 53 and 55 all appear to be rough grassland. They are thus not suitable for nightjar or woodlark nesting habitat.</p> <p>At its closest point of location, parcel 56 is 400m away from the ppSPA (Peafield Plantation, an area of plantation woodland within an area of relict heathland) but the vast majority of the parcel is much further away. The whole parcel is also on the opposite side of the River Maun, such that this may act as a physical deterrent for facilitating direct access to the ppSPA. There are two tracks which run north across the river from the site. These are recognised as important pathways within the Strategic Green Infrastructure network facilitating access to the east/west green corridor</p>	<p>1</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>along the River Maun and the north/south green corridor from Clipstone to Warsop (including a PROW that goes along the southern edge of Peafield Plantation).</p> <p>Parcel 56 is also immediately adjacent to an area of plantation (Garibaldi Plantation) that is identified as a HAG opportunity area, although this is not actually part of the ppSPA. Nightjar/woodlark surveys of this plantation are advisable for a planning application, along with consideration of the forestry felling cycle and thus the potential for the plantation to support nightjar and woodlark in the future. A landscaped buffer may need incorporating within the design of the development site in order to adequately manage potential negative recreational impacts if this plantation is potentially suitable, or could become suitable, for nesting nightjar or woodlark. The size of the whole potential development site is such that a suitable buffer (for example, 200m width) could potentially be included.</p> <p>The site is 5km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
<p>Mansfield Woodhouse/Forest Town (north of River Maun):</p> <p>Peafield Lane sites 48, 50, 67</p> <p>Expected yield of 788 dwellings</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography, parcels 50 and 67 are arable fields and thus are at considerably less risk of supporting nesting nightjar or woodlark than heathland, acid grassland or plantation woodland. Parcel 48 appears to be rough grassland. It is thus not suitable for nightjar or woodlark nesting habitat.</p> <p>This group of parcels is 663m from the ppSPA (Peafield Plantation) at its closest point (parcel 50), which is also the nearest HAG opportunity area. Although this is the closest distance, the majority of parcels 48, 50 and 67 are more than 700m from the ppSPA. All three parcels are thus sufficiently distant from the ppSPA that they are unlikely to lead to site-specific effects.</p> <p>The site is 5.7km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Land off Jubilee Way: site 76</p> <p>Expected yield of 800 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>It is understood that this proposed site is an intended built/leisure development area, with landscape buffering and habitat creation. The developable area is planned within the western sections near to Jubilee Way North and Eakring Road. Thus, the built footprint is intended to be considerably smaller than the total parcel footprint at c. 40ha (including</p>	<p>2</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>residential, employment, rugby club, golf club, a possible primary school and open space).</p> <p>This site as a whole is within a HAG opportunity area based on recommendations from the HRA Screening Report (2016) aimed at encouraging the linkage of existing heathland/woodland areas through habitat creation. It also contains, and is adjacent to, blocks of woodland and heathland within the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. The ppSPA parcel to the south is Strawberry Hill Heath SSSI, which does present suitable habitat for nightjar and woodlark. Although it is within the red line of parcel 76, it is understood that it is not actually proposed for development. The ppSPA also extends to the north and to the east of Site 76. Sherwood Forest Golf Course SSSI lies immediately north-east of the site, while Oak Tree Heath (also part of Strawberry Hill Heath SSSI) lies on the opposite side of Jubilee Way South.</p> <p>The proposed footprint of the built development appears to avoid the majority of the ppSPA falling within the proposed gross area site boundary. Sections of the ppSPA that fall within the proposed developable boundary (net area) include a 10 hectare section within the existing golf course and a larger section falling within the Crown Farm industrial site and the restored Mansfield colliery. As discussed in the HRA Screening Report (2016), Crown Farm isn't likely to support nightjar and woodlark nesting habitat. The restored Mansfield Colliery is also not known to currently support</p>	

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>potential nesting habitat, although surveys of these would need to be carried out to confirm this.</p> <p>It would be wise to consider the potential disturbance pathways and impacts on nesting nightjar/woodlark within the adjacent parts of the ppSPA (i.e. those that lie to the north and to the east of Site 76). These could arise from both recreational activity and general proximity of development. This is advisable, in case the ppSPA does progress to European or national designation at some future date, which could be prior to completion of this development (currently planned for completion in 2032). If any of the ppSPA areas were to be designated as Special Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSI) of national significance, then the assessment of impacts would fall outside the HRA process but in practice would be very similar.</p> <p>Nightjar/woodlark surveys of the entire site and also areas adjacent to the site should be undertaken to help inform potential impacts on nightjar and woodlark, including scope for confirming if these areas could support nesting habitat.</p> <p>If evidence of nesting nightjar and woodlark is found, then this could mean that ‘compensatory habitat’ would need to be created nearby in order to offset any loss to development. However, proposals to create over 17ha of heathland within the restored Mansfield colliery and habitat buffering of</p>	

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>sensitive areas may address this issue, depending on how it is balanced with recreational use of that heathland (for example, by the golf academy).</p> <p>As per conversations with Natural England, it is considered that a minimum 200m undeveloped buffer should be put in place adjacent to the Sherwood Forest Golf Course SSSI and Strawberry Hill Heath SSSI. Further discussion with Natural England may be necessary as to whether a similar buffer may be required for Oak Tree Heath as this could affect the developable area of the site. However, given the existing urban nature of Oak Tree Heath and that it falls outside the ppSPA boundary, such a buffer may not be considered essential (i.e. nightjar and woodlark may not nest here due existing recreational pressures).</p> <p>It is understood that there have been anti-social behaviour issues with motor bikes and 4x4 vehicles along both the eastern and western boundaries (Jubilee Way, sewage works, Earking Rd). Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) has put in barriers on public rights of way to Strawberry Hill Heaths (off Jubilee Way). Consideration may need to be given to extending these barriers and designing in landscaping buffers to ensure there is no easy access from the development site into any adjacent SSSI parcel.</p> <p>It is noted that development of this site also provides opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to better defend the western boundary by installing gate across</li> </ul>	

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>Eakring Rd to Sherwood Forest Golf Course, potentially providing dedicated/alternative dog walking areas within development site to reduce recreational visits to the SSSIs/ppSPA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to deliver improved habitat connectivity between created areas of heathland and adjacent SSSIs, including 17.6ha of heathland creation. Much of the heathland creation appears to be intended to take place in the same location as the golf academy and nearby open space. If so this may limit the ability of that heathland to support nesting nightjar or woodlark, which may in turn limit its ability to serve as mitigation if nesting nightjar and woodlark are found within, or adjacent to, the development footprint of the site.</li> </ul> <p>NWT is understood to be in conversation with the land owners about the management of potential new habitats.</p> <p>This site clearly has some deliverability concerns given its proximity to three SSSIs the ppSPA but it appears that any issues, while requiring considerable work and probably a reduction in developable area (and thus potentially in maximum housing yield), are likely to be resolvable.</p> <p>The site is 6km from Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC so poses no identified risk of likely significant effects.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-</p>	

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Fields Farm, Abbott Road (site 58)</p> <p>Expected yield of 200 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of pasture land 1.6km from nearest HAG opportunity area, 2.7km from the Pleasley area (where there are records of nightjar) and over 3.5km from the ppSPA. It is therefore considered that it poses no site-specific risk of impacts on the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 11km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Skegby Lane (site 89)</p> <p>Expected yield of 215 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of pasture land 1km from nearest HAG opportunity area, 3.5km from the Pleasley area (where there are records of nightjar) and 3km from the ppSPA. It is therefore considered that it poses no site-specific risk of impacts on the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 11.1km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p>	<p>0</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Rear of High Oakham Hill (site 59)</p> <p>Expected yield of 39 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of pasture land 200m from the nearest HAG opportunity area, which is currently actively farmed arable land. It is 1.6km from the ppSPA.</p> <p>The collection of plantation woodlands to the south of this site (e.g. Shining Cliff Plantation and Cauldwell Wood) aren't part of the ppSPA but may constitute suitable habitat for nightjar and woodlark if the future forestry felling cycle support opening up clearings within the woodland. As these plantation woodlands are over 500m to south and with no direct pathways from the site they are sufficiently distant that no site-specific impacts should arise. It is therefore considered that it poses no site-specific risk of impacts on the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 10.5km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	<p>0</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
<p>High Oakham Farm (site 171)</p> <p>Expected yield of 275 dwellings</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This site contains actively farmed arable fields and pastureland interspersed with small pockets of trees and scrub on its northern half. It is also adjacent to Cauldwell Brook and ponds. It is just over 1 km from the ppSPA.</p> <p>It is bordered by Shining Cliff Plantation and Cauldwell Wood to the south, a HAG opportunity area.</p> <p>This collection of plantation woodlands to the south of this site (e.g. Shining Cliff Plantation and Cauldwell Wood) aren't part of the ppSPA but may constitute suitable habitat for nightjar and woodlark if the future forestry felling cycle supports opening up clearings within the woodland. Shining Cliff and Cauldwell Wood plantations are Forestry Commission access woodland which means they are open to the public. The nearest access point into Shining Cliff off Derby Road (A611) is approximately 1.8 km (walking distance) away, although there are no existing direct pathways to these woodlands.</p> <p>Shining Cliff Plantation is also part of the strategic green infrastructure network. The proximity of this site to these woodlands could provide an opportunity to link to the strategic green infrastructure network which connects to existing recreational pathways within Ashfield district. If this were to be designed as part of the development of this site, access management measures would need to be carefully designed into any</p>	<p>1</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>scheme, avoiding any potential negative impacts on ground nesting birds. This may include, for example, putting in appropriate boundary management, habitat buffers, the inclusion of good quality open space within the site and coordinating with the forestry management.</p> <p>The site is approximately 10 km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway. Access to woodland on the doorstep may help to encourage the use of nearby woodland, potentially lessening the frequency of visits to the Sherwood Forest. Nightjar/woodlark surveys of this plantation are also advisable for a planning application, along with consideration of the forestry felling cycle and thus the potential for the plantation to support nightjar and woodlark in the future.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Caudwell Road (site 91)</p> <p>Expected yield of 42 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This is likely to form part of a larger development within Ashfield District Council between Caudwell Road and the A617 (Ref- SKA3p, Name – South of West Notts College, Caudwell Road) with an approximate yield of 207 houses within the Ashfield side of the allocation.</p>	<p>1</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>From examination of aerial photography the site within Mansfield appears to consist of an arable field adjacent to a large HAG opportunity area. The ppSPA is located 600m from parcel 91. Shining Cliff Plantation (part of Cauldwell Wood) is 200m to the west and would provide suitable habitat for nightjar and woodlark during the appropriate parts of the forestry cycle. Cauldwell Wood and Shining Cliff Plantation are both accessible to the public, although access is not currently easy. Nightjar/woodlark surveys of this plantation are advisable for a planning application, along with consideration of the forestry felling cycle and thus the potential for the plantation to support nightjar and woodlark in the future.</p> <p>More than half the site is within 400m of Shining Cliff Plantation. The proximity of the plantation is unlikely to pose a fundamental obstacle to delivery of the development since the plantation is already relatively urbanised and only 42 dwellings are proposed on Site 91. The development should, however, be designed to incorporate and connect to nearby green infrastructure corridor(s) (i.e. recreational green corridor), such that it directs people towards alternative green infrastructure, lessening the impact on nearby plantation woodlands (west and south), for example with planned green corridors within the approved neighbouring Lindhurst development to the east across the A60. Additionally, please see notes regarding site reference 171 (High Oakham Farm).</p> <p>The site is 10.7km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p>	

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).	
<p>Three Thorn Hollow Farm (site 73)</p> <p>Expected yield of 190 dwellings</p>	No	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of arable fields approximately 550m from the ppSPA (nearest point is the private land at Ransom Wood) and the nearest piece of HAG opportunity area that would be likely to support nightjar or woodlark. The A617, a busy dual carriageway, is situated between the proposed development site and the ppSPA such that high levels of casual recreational access are unlikely.<sup>3</sup> Overall therefore it is considered that this parcel probably won't pose potential for site-specific impacts on the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 8.8km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no identified site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	0

<sup>3</sup> There is access along Helmsley Road via a PROW which links to the ppSPA via an access bridge to Clipstone Wood. However, this is total walk of approx. 1km walk. There is also access via the Mansfield Way (a disused railway line to the north).

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
<p>Park Hall Farm (site 104)</p> <p>Expected yield of 10 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of an existing farm and its immediate grounds. The site is 2km from the ppSPA at its closest, and a similar distance from the nearest HAG opportunity area. It is therefore unlikely it poses site-specific implications for the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 7km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Stonebridge Lane, Market Warsop (sites 35 and 36)</p> <p>Expected yield of 400 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This proposed development site was a previous allocation in the Consultation Draft Local Plan (2016), referenced as sites W2c and W2d. These were identified as having no site specific negative impacts on the ppSPA or SAC.</p> <p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of arable fields 1.3km from both the ppSPA and the nearest substantial block of HAG opportunity area (there is a thin sliver of HAG opportunity area that runs up to the site but this would not be suitable for nesting ppSPA birds). It is therefore unlikely to poses site-specific implications for the ppSPA.</p>	<p>0</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>The site is 4.6km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Land off Netherfield Lane, Meden Vale (site 51)</p> <p>Expected yield of 120 dwellings</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of arable land. It is situated 1.4km from the ppSPA, but on the opposite side of a river.</p> <p>It is also located immediately south of the nearest HAG opportunity area (the former colliery site north of Meden Vale). The northern area of the former colliery is planned for habitat restoration and public access, including acid grassland/heathland. However, on the Mansfield district side a majority of this site is covered with a solar farm. If heathland was to be created within the closest parcel of HAG opportunity land, it may support nightjar or woodlark but there are no known plans to create heathland on this parcel. For completeness, it is recommended that the decommissioning plans for the solar farm are investigated to ascertain any future restoration plans and any potential for supporting nightjar and woodlark.</p> <p>It is unlikely this proposed development site would pose site-specific</p>	<p>0</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
		<p>implications for the ppSPA based on its distance.</p> <p>The site is 3.2km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Adjacent to 49 Mansfield Road, Spion Kop (site 45)</p> <p>Expected yield of 85 dwellings</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of pasture land situated 1km from the ppSPA and the same distance from nearest HAG opportunity area. It is therefore unlikely it poses site-specific implications for the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 5km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Adjacent to The Gables, Spion Kop (site 57)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>From examination of aerial photography the site appears to consist of pasture land situated 1km from the ppSPA and the same distance from nearest HAG opportunity area. It is therefore unlikely it poses site-specific</p>	<p>0</p>

<b>Site</b>	<b>Preferred development site (i.e. draft allocation)</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Level of constraint posed by the ppSPA on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (probable showstopper)</b>
Expected yield of 8 dwellings		<p>implications for the ppSPA.</p> <p>The site is 5km from the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and there is thus no site-specific impact pathway.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	
<p>Clipstone Road East (site 101)</p> <p>Expected yield of 313 dwellings</p>		<p>This proposed development site was a previous allocation in the Consultation Draft Local Plan (2016), referenced as site M3(m). This was identified as having no site specific negative impacts on the ppSPA or SAC. The analysis is the same as that presented in the HRA report.</p> <p>All development in Mansfield district will contribute cumulatively to in-combination recreational activity on the ppSPA, and possibly the SAC, but this is a strategic issue, rather than a site-specific one, that is already discussed and addressed in the Local Plan HRA Screening Report (2016).</p>	1