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1. **Introduction**

1.1 This statement sets out the Isle of Wight Council’s (the council) determination under Regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (which transposed EC Directive 2001/42/EC) on whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required for the Godshill Parish Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

1.2 Under separate legislation (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated Regulations), the council is also required to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for all Development Plan Documents (DPDs). This process is designed to consider the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposed plan/document.

1.3 Whilst the Planning Act 2008 and Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 removed the requirements for a SA to be produced for all SPDs, the council is still required to screen its SPDs to ensure that the legal requirements for sustainability appraisals are met where there are impacts that are not covered in the appraisal of a parent DPD or where an assessment is required by the SEA regulations. This statement also sets out whether or not a SA is required for the SPD.

1.4 In addition to SEA and SA, the council is also required to consider Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to determine whether the plan would have significant adverse effects upon the integrity of internationally designated sites of nature conservation importance. The need for a HRA is set out within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (which transposed EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC).
2. **Background of the Draft Godshill Parish SPD**

2.1 The Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared by Godshill Parish Council. The parish council has led on work to prepare the document and this has been supported by the council.

2.2 The draft SPD has been **formally approved** by the parish council and submitted to the council to be adopted as an SPD.

2.3 This will enable applicants and decision-makers to be aware of how the community would like to see the policies of the Island Plan Core Strategy applied to the parish of Godshill, and formalise it within a planning document.

2.4 The settlement of Godshill is identified as a Rural Service Centre as defined in the Isle of Wight Core Strategy adopted in March 2012. The core strategy explains that “These are all settlements with a population of around 3,000 or less. Not only do they provide important facilities for their residents, they also support a wider range of nearby smaller, more rural villages and hamlets”.

2.5 The SPD sets out the community’s preference for the general location of potential housing development schemes. It also encourages new businesses and tourism and supports the rural community and cottage industries.

2.6 In addition it is important to identify the features, designations and characteristics which are valued by the community, contribute positively to the character of Godshill and should be protected or enhanced in any development management decisions.

**Table 2.1: Extracts from the adopted (March 2012) Island Plan Isle of Wight Core Strategy which the Draft Godshill Parish SPD seeks to implement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy Policy</th>
<th>Relevant extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP1 Spatial Strategy</td>
<td>Unless a specific local need is identified, development proposals outside of, or not immediately adjacent to the ... defined settlements will not be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2 Housing</td>
<td>The strategy provides for 8,320 dwellings for the Isle of Wight in the period 2011 – 2027, which is an average of 520 dwellings per year. These will be delivered broadly in accordance with the following distribution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 980 through smaller-scale development at the Rural Service Centres and wider rural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3 Economy</td>
<td>Economic growth on the Island over the plan period will be focussed upon employment, retail and high quality tourism ... Sustainable growth in the rural economy will be supported ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4 Tourism</td>
<td>To reflect the special tourism offer of the Isle of Wight, proposals for tourism related development should utilise the unique characteristics of the historic and natural environments, without compromising their integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SP5 Environment | The Council will support proposals that protect, conserve and/or enhance the Island’s natural and historic environments. All development proposals will be expected to take account of environmental capacity of an area to accommodate new development and, where appropriate and practicable, to contribute to environmental conservation and enhancement.  
Development that has a demonstrable adverse impact on the Island’s natural, historic and built environments should be avoided.  
The Council will support proposals that positively conserve and enhance the special character of the Island’s historic and built environments. Development that has an adverse impact on the Island’s historic and built environments should be avoided. All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how they have taken into account the historic and built environment. |
| SP7 Travel | The Council will support proposals that ... help reduce the impact on air quality ... Development proposals should not negatively impact on the Island’s Strategic Road Network, nor on the capacity of lower level roads to support the proposed development. If negative impacts are identified, appropriate mitigation measures are expected. |
| DM2 Design Quality for New Development | The Council will support proposals for high quality and inclusive design to protect, conserve and enhance our existing environment whilst allowing change to take place.  
Development proposals will be expected to:  
1. Provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe and adaptable built environment with a sense of place.  
2. Optimise the potential of the site but have regard to existing constraints such as adjacent buildings, topography, views, water courses, hedges, trees, wildlife corridors or other features which significantly contribute to the character of the area.  
3. Be appropriately landscaped to provide an attractive setting for the development that integrates with the surroundings.  
4. Complement the character of the surrounding area, particularly in Conservation Areas and AONB, as defined in Conservation Area Appraisals, Village Design Statements or other Supplementary Planning Documents that define locally distinctive areas.  
Development proposals which preserve or enhance a Heritage Asset or the setting of a Heritage Asset will be supported. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM8 Economic Development</th>
<th>Support proposals for rural economic development opportunities and farm diversification schemes that contribute to the sustainability of the wider countryside.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM10 Rural Service Centres and the Wider Rural Area</td>
<td>The Council will support proposals that contribute to the vitality and viability of rural service centres and the wider rural area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DM11 Historic and Built Environment | The Council will support proposals that positively conserve and enhance the special character of the Island’s historic and built environment.  
The demolition or substantial harm to non-designated heritage assets and their settings, which make a positive contribution to the special character and/or identity of an area, will be resisted. |
| DM12 Landscape, Seascape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity | The Council will support proposals that conserve, enhance and promote the landscape, seascape, biodiversity and geological interest of the Island. Development proposals will be expected to: … Reflect the aims and objectives of the AONB Management Plan, the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment, Historic Landscape Characterisation and any further relevant landscape assessment. |
| DM13 Green Infrastructure | The Council will support proposals that protect, enhance and manage a diverse network of multi-functional Green Infrastructure (GI) assets across the Island. |
| DM17 Sustainable Travel | The Council will support proposals that increase travel choice and provide alternative means of travel to the car. Development proposals will be expected to: ... Provide and improve accessibility for pedestrian, cycling, equestrian and public transport when they: ...create sustainable routes between urban and rural areas; provide safer routes to schools.  
Demonstrate they are well-related to the Island’s Strategic Road Network and that the network has adequate capacity to accommodate the development. |
3. **The Strategic Environmental Appraisal Process**

3.1 The first stage of the process is for the council to determine whether or not the draft SPD is likely to have significant effects on the environment. This screening process includes assessing the SPD against a set of criteria (as set out in Schedule 1 of the regulations). The results of this have been set out in Table 5.1 of this statement. The aim of this statement is to provide sufficient information to demonstrate whether the SPD is likely to have significant environmental effects.

3.2 The council also has to consult the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England on this screening statement. A final determination cannot be made until the three statutory consultation bodies have been consulted. This statement was sent to those bodies for their comments over the period Friday 10 April 2015 until midday Tuesday 26 May 2015 (see Section 7 for further details on responses to this screening statement consultation).

3.3 Where the council determines that a SEA is not required then under Regulation 9(3) the council must prepare a statement setting out the reasons for this determination. **This statement is the Isle of Wight Council’s Draft Regulation 9(3) statement.**
4. **Sustainability Appraisal**

4.1 Whilst there is no statutory reason to undertake a SA of SPDs, the council has considered whether a SA of this SPD is required. The council has determined that the SPD is unlikely to have significant environmental, social or economic effects beyond those of the policies it supplements.

4.2 In coming to this conclusion the council is mindful that this SPD does not create new policies and serves only to expand on existing policy within its ‘parent DPD’, the Island Plan Core Strategy (which has already been subject to SA incorporating SEA). There are no impacts beyond those assessed in the SA of the ‘parent’ development plan document.

4.3 This judgement is based upon the fact that the SPD seeks to apply parts of Core Strategy policies to enable applicants and decision-makers to be aware of how the community would like to see these (Core Strategy) policies implemented at the local level of the parish of Godshill. Table 4.1 below highlights key parts of the Core Strategy SA, notably that the preferred policy approach in terms of likelihood of delivering the most sustainability benefits (when assessed against the Core Strategy SA Objectives), are clearly related to the policies of the draft SPD. Therefore the SPD can be considered to be inconformity with the ‘parent’ plan and accompanying SA, through implementation.
Table 4.1: SA Summary Findings identified in the SA of the Core Strategy that the draft Godshill SPD is seeking to implement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy Policy</th>
<th>Core Strategy SA Summary Extract</th>
<th>Draft SPD Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP1 Spatial Strategy</td>
<td>The overall spatial strategy adopted for development on the Island will have positive and neutral effects on a number of objectives. Concentrating new development in and around key regeneration areas and smaller regeneration areas as well as rural service centres is considered positive as these areas are likely to help protect the countryside and avoid direct effects upon designated areas. This strategy also helps to improve accessibility and ensure an efficient use of land and protection of soil.</td>
<td>GP4 sets out the community’s preference for the general location of potential housing development schemes. The locations identified are SP1 compliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2 Housing</td>
<td>Overall approach of this policy is likely to have a positive or neutral effect on a number of objectives. Concentrating the majority of new development on previously-developed land in and around key regeneration areas and smaller rural service centres is considered positive as these are likely to avoid highly sensitive areas, improve accessibility and enable the efficient use of land and protection of soil</td>
<td>GP4 sets out the community’s preference for the general location of potential housing development schemes. The locations identified are SP2 compliant, having been assessed as ‘deliverable’ which includes taking into account various environmental constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3 Economy</td>
<td>The general approach should lead to positive effects for social and economic objectives. Any negative effects associated with environmental objectives will be mitigated through other policies in the plan.</td>
<td>GP7 has a positive approach to encouraging new businesses in the parish. The (Parish) Council will support proposals that lead to a diversification of businesses whilst supporting the rural community and existing cottage industries. This proportionate approach to potential employment development is in conformity with SP3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4 Tourism</td>
<td>Overall the policy contributes positively to economic objectives. This approach is likely to help maintain and protect cultural traditions and activities thus performing well against objective 10. The policy does require proposals to utilise the unique characteristics of the historic and natural environments....</td>
<td>Policy GP7 seeks to support the local economy, including the promotion of tourism and the diversification of business uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP5 Environment</td>
<td>... the policy scores positively against the range of environmental objectives including those which focus on water, biodiversity, landscape and soil and land use as it seeks to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment. In addition, the policy is likely to contribute positively to objectives relating to climate change adaptation ... There are also likely to be a number of indirect benefits on some of the social objectives as a result of protecting natural and historic designations ...</td>
<td>Policies GP1, GP2 and GP3 will all positively contribute to supporting core strategy policy SP5 through the protection and enhancement of the environment (including the AONB), protecting existing open (green) spaces, and design principles that are supportive of both the natural and historic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP7 Travel</td>
<td>The policy performs well particularly against objectives relating to climate change, health, access and air quality. The policy is promoting alternative modes of travel to the car as well as ensuring the road network is improved to cater for new development therefore improving accessibility and healthier travel options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2 Design Quality for New Development</td>
<td>...likely to have a number of positive effects. It scores well in relation to all environmental objectives as it requires consideration to be given to various ecological, archaeological and landscape constraints. It also performs positively in relation to social objectives as it seeks to protect local amenity...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM8 Economic Development</td>
<td>This policy performs well against economic and social objectives as it encourages economic development across the Island and also seeks to protect employment areas. Any potential negative environmental effects from development will be mitigated against by other relevant policies of the Plan against which all planning applications will need to be considered...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM10 Rural Service Centres and the Wider Rural Area</td>
<td>...positive on a number of objectives including indirectly on soil and geology, on cultural distinctiveness, material assets, social exclusion and economic performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies GP5 and GP6 will positively contribute to the objectives of this policy by supporting an acceptable level of use on the road network while seeking measures to reduce impacts from any increases, including the management of parking to keep carriageways clear and alleviate traffic issues at key times of the day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy GP3 sets out criteria by which development proposals are expected to demonstrate consideration of, including existing environment, density and built form, visual impact and views/landscape, street scene and landscaping. In doing so it supports the objectives of the core strategy policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy GP7 seeks to support the local economy, including the promotion of tourism and the diversification of business uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SPD as a whole supports the overarching objective of this core strategy, being to support proposals that contribute to the vitality and viability of rural service centres and the wider rural area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM11 Historic and Built Environment</strong></td>
<td>The policy scores ++ in relation to objectives 4 (landscape, archaeology and heritage) and 10 (cultural and local distinctiveness) as it seeks to protect and enhance the Island’s built and historic environments. There are also likely to be some indirect positive effects in relation to the social and economic objectives.</td>
<td>Policy GP1 seeks to both protect and enhance Godshill’s natural and historic environments while policy GP3 supporting text makes reference to both the conservation area and AONB designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM12 Landscape, Seascape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity</strong></td>
<td>... scores positively against the range of environmental objectives including those which focus on biodiversity, landscape and soil and land use.</td>
<td>Policy GP1 supports the objectives of this core strategy policy by seeking to both protect and enhance Godshill’s natural and historic environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM13 Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>... has a number of positive effects. This is due to the multi-functional benefits of Green Infrastructure. These include effects on environmental objectives such as landscape and historic environment, biodiversity, soil and climate change adaptation. GI is likely to have positive social effects on health, accessibility and culture as well as positive effects on business investment and the economy.</td>
<td>Policy GP2 seeks to both maintain existing ‘open spaces’ and seek formal Local Green Space designation and therefore contributes positively to the aims of this core strategy policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM17 Sustainable Travel</strong></td>
<td>Overall this policy performs well against environmental and economic objectives. The policy performs well against landscape as there is specific reference to proposals considering the capacity and sensitivity of the landscape of the Island...</td>
<td>Policies GP5 and GP6 will positively contribute to the objectives of this policy by supporting ‘traffic calming’ measure, seeking to improve pedestrian access and seeking measures to reduce impacts from any increases, including the management of parking to keep carriageways clear and alleviate traffic issues at key times of the day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **SEA Screening Procedure**

5.1 It is the responsibility of the Responsible Authority (the Isle of Wight Council) to determine whether the plan or programme under assessment is likely to have a significant adverse environmental effect. This assessment must be made taking account of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and in consultation with the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.

5.2 Where the Responsible Authority determines that a plan or programme is unlikely to have significant effect, and therefore, does not need to be subject to a full Strategic Environmental Assessment, the Responsible Authority must prepare a statement showing the reason for this determination. This is set out in Table 5.1 below.

### Table 5.1: SEA Screening for the Godshill Parish SPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria (Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004)</th>
<th>Isle of Wight Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics of the plan or programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provides a parish level interpretation of adopted strategic plan policies, enabling applicants and decision-makers to be aware of how the community would like to see the policies of the Island Plan Core Strategy applied to the parish of Godshill. It will not in itself determine projects/developments, or their, size or nature. Whilst the plan identifies the community’s preferred potential locations for development, they are not allocations and therefore do not provide the same level of certainty of delivery. Furthermore, the preferred potential locations for development are located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and therefore comply with Core Strategy policy SP1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources.</td>
<td><strong>The guidance provided by the SPD is in conformity with the strategic objectives, spatial vision and policies of the Isle of Wight Island Plan Core Strategy – which has been subject to full SA and SEA.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria (Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004)</td>
<td>Isle of Wight Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development.</td>
<td>The SPD contributes to delivering the aims and objectives of the ‘parent plan’ (i.e. the Core Strategy), which itself has been subject to SA/SEA and HRA and is therefore likely to deliver certain sustainability benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme.</td>
<td>The SPD will not introduce or increase any environmental problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of community legislation on the environment (for example, plans and programmes, linked to waste management or water protection).</td>
<td>The plan has no direct relevance to the implementation of community legislation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected**

| (a) the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects. | There are no effects. |
| (b) the cumulative nature of the effects. | There are no effects. |
| (c) the trans-boundary nature of the effects. | There are no effects. |
| (d) the risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents). | There are no effects. |
| (e) the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected). | The plan will apply to the area of Godshill Parish, but will extend no further and is not anticipated to have effects beyond the parish boundary. |
| (f) the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to (i) special natural characteristics or cultural heritage (ii) exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values; or (iii) intensive land-use. | There are potential positive effects. |
| (g) the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community or international protection status. | There are potential positive effects. |
6. **Habitats Regulations Assessment**

6.1 In addition to SEA and SA, the council is also required to consider Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). HRA is the process used to determine whether a plan or project would have significant adverse effects upon the integrity of internationally designated sites of nature conservation importance, known as European sites or European offshore marine sites. The need for a HRA is set out within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (which transposed EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC).

6.2 The Regulations state the council must assess the potential effects of its land use plans, in this case the SPD, against the conservation objectives of any sites designated for their nature conservation importance. A HRA has been carried out on the ‘parent DPD’, the Island Plan Core Strategy.

6.3 Table 6.1 below details extracts from the core strategy HRA for each core strategy policy that can be identified as a ‘parent policy’ to the policies within the draft SPD.

**Table 6.1: Extracts from the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Isle of Wight Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment Report (April 2011) on the assessment of Core Strategy policies relevant to the draft Godshill Parish SPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy Policy</th>
<th>Relevant HRA extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP1 Spatial Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy directs development within or immediately adjacent defined settlement boundaries in three Key Regeneration Areas, two Smaller Regeneration Areas and eleven Rural Service Centres. Development outside but not immediately adjacent these defined settlements will not be supported unless there is a specific local need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Policy Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the policy directly establishes the broad areas where development may take place there is the potential (either alone or in-combination) for significant effects on European and Ramsar sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SP2 Housing | Policy Summary  
The policy sets out that 8,320 dwellings will be delivered over the plan period of the Core Strategy (2011 – 2027). 3,765 of these will be provided through existing permissions and commitments. Of the remaining new dwellings (4,555), the policy sets out that these will be provided primarily in the AAP areas, with 852 in the Rural Service Centres and wider rural area.  

Potential Policy Effects  
The potential effects associated with new residential dwellings supported by the policy are the same as those set out for SP1. Detailed allocations for residential development will be in the AAPs and the Management and Delivery DPD, which will be subject to further HRA. |
| SP3 Economy | Policy Summary  
The policy sets out the Council’s approach to supporting economic growth on the Island. At least 42ha of employment land is to be delivered over the plan period, with no more than 809,000ft² of net retail floorspace being provided over the plan period, which will primarily be located within the Primary Retail Areas, Town Centres or Key Regeneration Areas.  

Potential Policy Effects  
The use of the term ‘primarily’ within the policy text implies that some employment and retail allocations may be delivered in other areas, but the policy does not spatially identify or allocate these areas. It is likely that any such developments outside those areas included in Policy SP1 Spatial Strategy will be relatively minor, such as those associated with farm or other rural enterprises or will be located on the edge of settlements. It will be possible for such development to avoid likely significant effects on European and Ramsar sites, primarily through ensuring development is not located on or immediately adjacent to European or Ramsar sites. Where relevant, development will be assessed at the project phase against the protective elements of Policy SP5 and DM13, which include the protection of European and Ramsar sites. |
| SP4 Tourism | **Policy Summary**  
The policy sets out the Council’s overarching approach to tourism, which is to support sustainable growth in high quality tourism and to utilise the unique characteristics of the historic and natural environments of the Island. Green and new niche tourism products are encouraged, as well as proposals that extend the tourism season.  
**Potential Policy Effects**  
Recreational pressures arising from new tourism development have the potential to impact upon the interest features of European sites. However SP4 recognises this by seeking to promote tourism which utilises the unique characteristics of the natural and historic environments, without compromising their integrity. Together with the protective elements set out in Policies SP5 and DM12, it is considered that likely significant effects are unlikely and that the policy can be screened out of the need for further HRA. |
| SP5 Environment | **Policy Summary**  
The policy seeks to conserve and protect the natural, historic and built environment and sets out that development will be expected to respect European designated sites.  
**Potential Policy Effects**  
This policy is the Core Strategy’s strategic approach towards environmental issues and treatment of designations. Therefore, it is not likely to have significant effects on European or Ramsar sites. |
| SP7 Travel | **Policy Summary**  
The policy sets out the overall strategic approach to travel on the Island, relevant to the Core Strategy. There are a number of different elements to the policy as follows: (a) supporting alternatives to car travel; (b) protecting the Island’s roads from negative impacts associated with development proposals; (c) safeguarding land identified for infrastructure improvements from other development; (d) supporting development associated with the Highways PFI project, in line with the other policies of the Core Strategy; (e) supporting proposals to maintain cross-Solent travel; and (f) supporting proposals to improve key interchange areas that link the Island to the mainland. |
| DM2 Design Quality for New Development | Potential Policy Effects  
The HRA was able to screen out all potential effects of this policy, although this did require further assessment of the locationally specific elements of the policy, i.e. point (c). |
| DM8 Economic Development | Policy Summary  
The policy sets out a number of design criteria for development proposals including policy elements relating to setting, safety, landscape, wildlife, conservation, heritage assets, consumption of resources and pollution.  
Potential Policy Effects  
This policy is an overarching policy relating to design criteria and will not in itself lead to development. The policy has therefore been assessed so having no effect on European or Ramsar sites. |
| DM10 Rural Service Centres and the Wider Rural Area | Policy Summary  
The policy sets out the Council’s proposals for village and rural centres, particularly in relation to retail development over the plan period. It supports development proposals that contribute to vitality and viability of village and rural centres.  
Potential Policy Effects  
...this policy seeks to support proposals in existing centres. As such it is expected that most retail development over the plan period will take place in or at the edge of village and rural centres, with some potential for development on the edge of settlements and for farm shops. As it does not spatially allocate development and is subject to the protective elements set out in Policies SP5 and DM13 no likely significant effects have been assessed and the policy can be screened out of the need for further HRA. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy Summary</th>
<th>Potential Policy Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM11 Historic and Built Environment</td>
<td>The policy seeks to conserve and enhance the historic and built environment.</td>
<td>The policy seeks to ensure the continued use of existing historic assets and is not supportive of development proposals which could damage the historic value of a site. The protective nature of the policy has allowed it to be assessed as having no effect on European or Ramsar sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM12 Landscape, Seascape, Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>The policy seeks to conserve, enhance and promote the landscape, seascape, biodiversity and geological interest of the Island. It includes elements which specifically protect European designated sites ...</td>
<td>As the policy specifically sets out protection measures for nature conservation sites it can be assessed as not being likely to lead to a significant effect on any European sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM13 Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>The policy supports proposals that protect, enhance and manage Green Infrastructure (GI) assets across the Island. Supporting text sets out that ‘of particular importance is ensuring that development does not result in negative impacts upon Natura 2000 sites across the Island arising from recreational pressure. The Green Infrastructure Strategy will provide further guidance on the approach that developers should take to mitigation’.</td>
<td>The policy seeks to improve GI, which will incorporate sites to be managed for biodiversity. Consequently, the policy can be assessed as having an overall beneficial effect on biodiversity. Benefits could include enhancements to European and Ramsar sites, for example through measures to provide additional habitat that will benefit species located on these protected sites and so to reduce visitor pressure, where this is adversely affecting sites’ interest together with visitor management control measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM17 Sustainable Travel</td>
<td>The policy supports proposals that increase travel choice and provide alternatives to the car and sets out a number of expectations which development proposals will be expected to meet such as meeting the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan and implementing maximum parking standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 While most of the policies above, from the ‘parent DPD’ were determined as having no likely significant negative effect on the integrity of European sites, both policies SP1 Spatial Strategy and SP2 Housing were assessed as having potential (either alone or in combination) significant effects on such sites. This was because the policies directly establish the broad areas where development may take place and support new residential dwellings.

6.5 This is significant to this screening assessment as policy GP4 gives further spatial direction to the core strategy policies by indicating preferences for housing development in certain general locations. While specific sites are not allocated and there is no indication of quantum, such policy direction does require further screening to ensure compliance with the Directive.

6.6 While the (core strategy) assessment states that the detailed assessment of effects will take place at the lower tier plan level where allocations are made, “Detailed allocations for residential development will be in the AAPs and the Management and Delivery DPD, which will be subject to further HRA.” the council made the decision to carry out further work on the HRA of the (core strategy) plan in order to be certain of compliance with the Habitats Directive. The main part of this work was further assessment, as far as can be reasonably made at that strategic plan level, of all potential development sites.

6.7 This screening assessment draws on the further assessment work carried out for the core strategy as each of the three locations identified in the draft SPD policy have been included in that work. The purpose of the assessment work (which was recently reviewed and updated for the review of core strategy policy SP2 Housing) was to ascertain which development that may significantly, whether alone or in combination, impact upon the designations. Sites that are identified where there is likely to be an impact are looked at in more detail to determine whether these can be mitigated. The following table (6.2) summarises this assessment in relation to the 3 areas identified as preferable by the draft Godshill Parish SPD.

6.8 As can be seen from Table 6.2, none of the 3 locations identified as preferable for housing development in the draft Godshill Parish SPD have been identified as having any potential effects on European sites. This is why there is no mitigation identified as being required.
6.9 As the draft SPD goes no further than the Core Strategy in identifying potential sites for housing development and that the 3 locations identified in the draft SPD have been assessed as having no effect, it is reasonable to assume that the same conclusion as that of the HRA of the core strategy can be reached;

“The HRA has concluded there are no likely significant effects as a result of the strategic-level Core Strategy policies. It also demonstrates, through the higher level Appropriate Assessment that in relation to European and Ramsar sites, the identified level of development can be accommodated within the broad locations...”

6.10 Should any of the three sites identified in the draft SPD be considered for formal allocation through the plan process, then they will have to undergo further environmental assessment (including SA/SEA and HRA). Should any individual proposal come forward independent of the plan process then it will be assessed against all the relevant Local Plan policies, and should it be of sufficient nature as to have a potential environmental impact (this could be wider than those assessed through the HRA process, such as landscape, heritage or human health) then a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment would be required.

Table 6.2: Screening of potential sites identified in the draft Godshill Parish SPD through the SHLAA process within the Smaller Regeneration Areas, Rural Service Centres and Wider Rural Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Site size (ha)</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Proximity to European and Ramsar site (km)</th>
<th>Potential effects on European and Ramsar sites</th>
<th>Category of impact²</th>
<th>Is it likely that potential effects can be mitigated?</th>
<th>Appropriate to consider through the AAP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDF564</td>
<td>Land adjoining Scotland Farm and Tresslewood Care Village, Scotland Corner</td>
<td>Godshill</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF049</td>
<td>Land at Deacons Nursery</td>
<td>Godshill</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>4535.48</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF061</td>
<td>Land at Munsley Farm</td>
<td>Godshill</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11 As the purpose of this SPD is to provide further detail on Core Strategy policies through an approach already identified as preferable in the Core Strategy SA/SEA (i.e. as set out in Table 2), and the locations identified in the SPD have already been screened out as having any effect on European sites through the HRA of the core strategy, the council has determined that a HRA of the SPD is not required. Adopting an SPD that is in general

² See Appendix 1: Categories of Potential Effects
conformity with the Core Strategy will not lead to any significant adverse impacts on European and Ramsar sites. Furthermore, there is a likelihood that the SPD, if adopted and implemented, may contribute positively to achieving the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy.

7. Screening and consultation outcome

7.1 Based on the above screening it is clear that the Godshill Parish SPD is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment. Drafts of both the SPD and this screening statement were consulted on over the period Friday 10 April 2015 until midday Tuesday 26 May 2015.

7.2 Table 7.1 below sets out comments received regarding this screening report for the draft Godshill Parish SPD and the likely effects on the environment.

Table 7.1: Comments received from the Statutory Consultees on the Draft Screening Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Consultee</th>
<th>Statutory Consultee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>No comments were made on the environmental screening report. No objections were raised to the draft SPD, with the main comments made being summarised as;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... pleased to see that the proposed allocation areas have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1 in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 100-102. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We would have concerns if development is allocated in this flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are pleased to see the inclusion of Policies GP 1 – Environment to help ensure the conservation and enhancement of the Parish and GP 2 – Open Spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally, we also support the approach set out within Section 7.2 where Brownfield sites are favoured over that of Greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>No comments were made on the environmental screening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A full version of each statutory consultee’s response is available in Appendix 2: Statutory Consultee Responses.
report. No objections were raised to the draft SPD, with the main comments made being summarised as;

...it would be helpful if the SPD identified to which policies of the Island Plan it related (other than Policy SP1). We also have the following detailed comments.

Paragraph 2.5 – it would be more accurate to say that part of the village and parish is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy GP 1 – Historic England welcomes and supports this policy, particularly the reference to Godshill’s historic environment. However, it is not clear to us what additional detail the policy adds to existing Island Plan Policies DM11 and SP5. ...

... protecting all views and vistas within the AONB and Conservation Area could be considered to be too restrictive. We suggest that perhaps key views for that part of the AONB within Godshill and the Conservation Area be identified and that these be protected through Policy.

Paragraph 3.3 – ... on what basis these “important architecturally” highlights have been identified.

... a character appraisal for the Godshill Conservation could underpin a policy for the conservation and enhancement of the Area, adding detail to Policy DM11 of the Island Plan and helping reduce the risks to its special architectural and historic interest.

Policy GP 2 – Historic England welcomes and supports the principle of protecting important open spaces and wooded areas, and we see the link to Policy DM13 of the Island Plan, but again protecting all such spaces and areas may be considered too restrictive. ...

Policy GP 3 – welcome and support the principle of this Policy, but feel that this policy has nothing specific to Godshill and therefore adds little ... Policy GP 3 really should highlight what design characteristics are important for Godshill, ...

Policy GP 4 – it is unfortunate that the preferred housing areas are not identified on a map and we are not sure exactly where
| **Natural England** | There they are to check for their proximity to designated heritage assets.  
If these locations are correct, then it would appear that development here would not affect any designated heritage assets, except perhaps the grade II listed Bow Bridge. However, the Historic Environment Record for the Island should be checked for the presence of any non-designated heritage assets on these sites.  

*Policy GP 5 – Historic England notes the proposal to introduce traffic calming measures within the village centre. Whilst we appreciate the benefits of traffic calming to historic streets and conservation areas ... care should be taken to avoid intrusive management features.* ... |

| **Screening amendments to the Draft SPD** | Natural England does not consider that this plan and any subsequent proposed development poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment for which we would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation. |

### 7.3 The council has prepared a separate consultation statement setting out who has been consulted in preparing the Godshill Parish Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a summary of the issues raised and how those issues have been addressed in the final SPD (as required by Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012).

### 7.4 A number of minor changes have been made to the document following discussions between the council and the parish council, to reflect the content of the representations and to cover editorial changes (such as correcting typographical errors and factual updates). The changes have been screened to determine the potential for any significant effects on the environment (taking into account the requirements of SA/SEA and HRA) and this is set out in Appendix 3.

### 7.5 Following this further screening it is possible to conclude that none of the proposed amendments to the draft SPD will result in any significant negative environmental effects.
8. Conclusion

8.1 As discussed above, the Godshill Parish SPD has not been subject to a full Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the following reasons:

- Adopting a local (parish level) plan that does not make any allocations and seeks to protect and potentially improve the existing environment will not lead to any significant impacts;
- There is a likelihood that the majority of the policies of the draft SPD, if adopted and implemented, may contribute positively such as through the protection of existing open spaces and supporting proposals that lead to the diversification of businesses whilst supporting the rural community;
- The plan aims to deliver the preferred option as identified through the ‘parent’ plan SA/SEA and is therefore likely to deliver certain sustainability benefits (primarily against the Landscape, archaeology and heritage, and Cultural and local distinctiveness SA Objectives of the Core Strategy);
- The SA/SEA of the ‘parent DPD’ determined no likely significant effects; and
- The HRA of the ‘parent DPD’ determined no likely significant effects;
- No objections were received from the three statutory consultees on the SPD, with a number of areas of the plan receiving support and/or recommendations;
- Only one comment was received relating to the environmental screening, from Natural England stating that “...Natural England does not consider that this plan and any subsequent proposed development poses any likely or significant risk”;
- None of the amendments identified following consultation are likely to result in significant negative effects on the environment.
Appendix 1: Categories of Potential Effects

The Core Strategy HRA *Coarse-level Assessment of All Potential Development Sites*\(^4\) (para 2.8.1) categorised (A-D, see below) each site’s potential effects, whether it is likely that potential effects can be mitigated and it is appropriate to consider the site through the relevant DPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sites which, if developed, would have no negative effect on a European site at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sites which, if developed, could have an effect, but the likelihood is there would be no significant negative effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other elements of the same plan, or other plans or projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sites which, if developed, could or would be likely to have a significant effect alone and will require the plan to be subject to an appropriate assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sites which, if developed, would be likely to have a significant effect in combination with other elements of the same plan, or other plans or projects and will require the further assessment at the AAP stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) See paragraph 2.8.1 Coarse-level Assessment of All Potential Development Sites, Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Isle of Wight Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment Report April 2011
Appendix 2: Statutory Consultee Responses

Environment Agency

Mr Ollie Boutler - Team Leader, Planning Policy, Conservation and Design
Isle Of Wight Council
Planning & Regulatory Services
Seaclose Fairlee Road
Newport
Isle of Wight
PO30 2QS

Our ref: HA/2006/000096/SD-06/IS1-L01
Your ref: GodshillSPD/Reg 12
Date: 20 May 2015

Dear Mr Boutler

Godshill Parish Draft Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on your draft Supplementary Planning Document for the Parish of Godshill.

We are pleased to see that the proposed allocation areas have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1 in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 100-102.

Should these change and proposed locations fall within areas defined as Flood Zone 2 and/or 3 we would recommend the Sequential Test is undertaken when allocating sites to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. This is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 100-102.

The Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

We would have concerns if development is allocated in this flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.

We are pleased to see the inclusion of Policies GP 1 – Environment to help ensure the conservation and enhancement of the Parish and GP 2 – Open Spaces.

We are also pleased to see in Section 4.7 that ‘Only indigenous species should be used to build new hedges’. Invasive non-native species in our watercourses pose a threat to biodiversity, increase flood risk, affect the state of our water environment and cost the British economy a minimum of £1.7 billion per annum.
Finally, we also support the approach set out within Section 7.2 where Brownfield sites are favoured over that of Greenfield sites. We would recommend that where there is ‘need’ to develop in Greenfield sites, justification should be provided by the developer.

If you have any queries regarding the information set out above please contact me on the details below.

We hope you find this of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Mr Jon Maskell  
Planning Advisor, Environment Agency

Direct dial 01794 834 586  
Direct e-mail PlanningSSD@environment-agency.gov.uk
Historic England

Planning Policy
Isle of Wight Council
Seaclose Offices
Fairlee Road
Newport
Isle of Wight, PO30 2QS.

Our ref: HD/P6001/03/PC5
Your ref: 

Telephone 01483 252040
Fax

15th May 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

Godshill Parish Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft

Thank you for your e-mail of 10th April advising Historic England of the consultation on the draft Godshill Parish Supplementary Planning Document.

We note that Godshill Parish Council is preparing a Parish Plan for Godshill which will cover a range of subjects, not all of which will relate to land-use and planning. We understand that the Parish Council wishes to give some force to its proposed planning policies but through a supplementary planning document (SPD) rather than a neighbourhood plan. The SPD will, of course, not have the same weight as a neighbourhood plan, but we understand that this is the Parish Council's choice.

SPDs are documents which add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan. For the proposed Godshill Parish SPD this is the Island Plan. We consider that it would be helpful if the SPD identified to which policies of the Island Plan it related (other than Policy SP1). We also have the following detailed comments.

Paragraph 2.5 – it would be more accurate to say that part of the village and parish is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy GP 1 – Historic England welcomes and supports this policy, particularly the reference to Godshill’s historic environment. However, it is not clear to us what additional detail the policy adds to existing Island Plan Policies DM11 and SP5. The Policy does include a reference to protecting views and vistas within the AONB and the Conservation Area, the principle of which we support and welcome, but it could be argued that this is new policy as we have not found any reference to views within the AONB or conservation areas in the Island Plan.
Even if considered acceptable, and this is a matter for your Council, protecting all views and vistas within the AONB and Conservation Area could be considered to be too restrictive. We suggest that perhaps key views for that part of the AONB within Godshill and the Conservation Area be identified and that these be protected through Policy.

Paragraph 3.3 – we consider this paragraph is interesting but we are not clear on what basis these “important architecturally” highlights have been identified. We note that, according to your Council’s website, there is no Conservation Area Character Appraisal for Godshill. Historic England promotes character assessments as the basis for understanding the special characteristics of a place and underpinning the policies and proposals of a neighbourhood plan or SPD.

We feel that this is particularly important for conservation areas and a character appraisal for the Godshill Conservation could underpin a policy for the conservation and enhancement of the Area, adding detail to Policy DM11 of the Island Plan and helping reduce the risks to its special architectural and historic interest.

Policy GP 2 – Historic England welcomes and supports the principle of protecting important open spaces and wooded areas, and we see the link to Policy DM13 of the Island Plan, but again protecting all such spaces and areas may be considered too restrictive. A character assessment of the parish would help identify particularly important open spaces and wooded areas, which could then be shown on a map linked to Policy GP 2.

Policy GP 3 – again, we welcome and support the principle of this Policy, but we feel that this policy has nothing specific to Godshill and therefore adds little, if anything, in our view, to Policy DM2 of the Island Plan. We consider that Policy GP 3 really should highlight what design characteristics are important for Godshill, as identified through a character assessment of the parish, a character appraisal of the conservation area and/or a Village Design Statement.

Policy GP 4 – it is unfortunate that the preferred housing areas are not identified on a map and we are not sure exactly where there they are to check for their proximity to designated heritage assets. We are also confused by the fact that, on the map of the National Heritage List for England, what we presume to be Deacon’s Nursery appears to be the north-east of the village, Munsley (or, at least, Munsley Farm) is to the north and Scotland Farm is to the west.

If these locations are correct, then it would appear that development here would not affect any designated heritage assets, except perhaps the grade II listed Bow Bridge. However, the Historic Environment Record for the Island should be checked for the presence of any non-designated heritage assets on these sites.

Policy GP 5 – Historic England notes the proposal to introduce traffic calming measures within the village centre. Whilst we appreciate the benefits of traffic calming to historic streets and conservation areas (indeed, we have funded a demonstration project of traffic calming in the Turweston Conservation Area in Aylesbury Vale District) care should be
taken to avoid intrusive management features. We have published advice on caring for historic streets in “Streets for All” (https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all-south-east/south-east-streets.pdf).

We hope these comments are helpful. We have attached a list of links to useful sources of information which the Parish Council might find helpful.

Please contact me if you have any queries about our comments or about historic environment issues in Godshill.

Thank you again for consulting Historic England.

Yours faithfully,

Martin Small
Principal Adviser, Historic Environment Planning
(Bucks, Oxon, Berks, Hampshire, IoW, South Downs National Park and Chichester)

E-mail: martin.small@historicengland.org.uk

Appendix: Sources of Information


Heritage Gateway: includes local records of historic buildings and features www.heritagegateway.org.uk

Heritage Counts: facts and figures on the historic environment http://hc.historicengland.org.uk

http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/ has information on neighbourhood planning and the historic environment.

HELM (Historic Environment Local Management) provides accessible information, training and guidance to decision makers whose actions affect the historic environment. www.helm.org.uk or www.helm.org.uk/communityplanning

Heritage at Risk programme provides a picture of the health of England’s built heritage alongside advice on how best to save those sites most at risk of being lost forever. http://risk.historicengland.org.uk/register.aspx
Placecheck provides a method of taking the first steps in deciding how to improve an area. http://www.placecheck.info/

The Building in Context Toolkit grew out of the publication 'Building in Context' published by EH and CABE in 2001. The purpose of the publication is to stimulate a high standard of design when development takes place in historically sensitive contexts. The founding principle is that all successful design solutions depend on allowing time for a thorough site analysis and character appraisal of context. http://building-in-context.org/toolkit.html

Knowing Your Place deals with the incorporation of local heritage within plans that rural communities are producing, http://www.historicengland.org.uk/publications/knowing-your-place/


Understanding Place series describes current approaches to and applications of historic characterisation in planning together with a series of case studies http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.19604

Oxford Character Assessment Toolkit can be uses to record the features that give a settlement or part of a settlement its sense of place http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decP/CharacterAppraisalToolkit.htm
Planning consultation: Godshill Parish Draft Supplementary Planning Document Consultation
Location: Godshill, Isle of Wight

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 10 April 2015 which was received by Natural England on 10 April 2015.

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

Natural England does not consider that this plan and any subsequent proposed development poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment\(^1\) for which we would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.

The lack of case specific comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of this site in the decision making process.

In particular, we would expect the LPA to assess and consider the possible impacts resulting from this proposal on the following when determining this application:

Protected species
Where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by the proposed development, the LPA should request survey information from the applicant before determining the application (Paragraph 99 Circular 06/05)\(^2\).

Natural England has produced standing advice, which is available on our website Natural England Standing Advice to help local planning authorities to better understand the impact of particular developments on protected or BAP species should they be identified as an issue. The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, local planning authorities should

\(^1\) Cases which might affect a SSSI, Natura 2000 site, National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or a large population of a protected species and/or cases or generic issues which affect a large suite of sites or may set a precedent and thereby affect a significant quantity of habitat across the country.

\(^2\) Paragraph 98 and 99 of ODPM Circular 06/05.
undertake further consultation with Natural England.

Local wildlife sites
If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local wildlife site, eg Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local wildlife site, and the importance of this in relation to development plan policies, before it determines the application.

Biodiversity enhancements
This plan and any subsequent proposed developments may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that ‘Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity’. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that ‘conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat’.

Landscape enhancements
This plan and any subsequent proposed development may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.

If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Taylor
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Coastal Team
## Appendix 3: Screening of Proposed Changes to the Draft Godshill Parish SPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Comments which were made during the consultation</th>
<th>The Isle of Wight Council’s response to the comments</th>
<th>Changes to the SPD</th>
<th>Potential environmental impacts of changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoSPD2</td>
<td>Paragraph 2.5 – it would be more accurate to say that part of the village and parish is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Amend supporting text wording.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSPD4</td>
<td>Paragraph 3.3 – we consider this paragraph is interesting but we are not clear on what basis these “important architecturally” highlights have been identified. We note that, according to your Council’s website, there is no Conservation Area Character Appraisal for Godshill. Historic England promotes character assessments as the basis for understanding the special characteristics of a place and underpinning the policies and proposals of a neighbourhood plan or SPD. We feel that this is particularly important for conservation areas and a character appraisal for the Godshill Conservation could underpin a policy for the conservation and enhancement of the Area, adding detail to Policy DM11 of the Island Plan and helping reduce the risks to its special architectural and historic interest.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Although there is no published conservation area appraisal for Godshill, work has previously been undertaken by the council in draft format. This work has been used by the parish council to inform this section of the document. This information provides local detail further to policy DM11 of the core strategy.</td>
<td>Amend supporting text wording to take account of the previous work undertaken on a conservation area appraisal for Godshill.</td>
<td>Minor positive effect on the historic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSPD7</td>
<td>Policy GP 4 – it is unfortunate that the preferred housing areas are not identified on a map and we are not sure exactly where they are to check for their proximity to designated heritage assets. We are also confused by the fact that, on the map of the National Heritage List for England, what we presume to be Deacon’s Nursery appears to be the north-east of the village, Munsley (or, at least, Munsley Farm) is to the north and Scotland Farm is to the west.</td>
<td>Comment noted. A map will be inserted into the supporting text to show general locations. The map will have a north arrow to orient the locations shown in the policy. Policy wording will be changed to show the orientation of the sites in relation to the village.</td>
<td>Insert map into the supporting text to show general locations. Amend policy wording to show the orientation of the sites in relation to the village.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy GP 5 – Historic England notes the proposal to introduce traffic calming measures within the village centre. Whilst we appreciate the benefits of traffic calming to historic streets and conservation areas (indeed, we have funded a demonstration project of traffic calming in the Turweston Conservation Area in Aylesbury Vale District) care should be taken to avoid intrusive management features. We have published advice on caring for historic streets in “Streets for All” ([https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all-south-east/south-east-streets.pdf/](https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all-south-east/south-east-streets.pdf/)).

Comment noted. Supporting text wording will be updated to incorporate the ‘Streets for All’ advice hyperlink.

Amend supporting text wording to incorporate the “streets for All” advice hyperlink.

Minor positive effect on the historic environment.

**Section 3 + 4 – Environment & Design**
Policy GP 1 – (Environment) The policy indicates that views and vistas within AONB (including the Conservation Area) should, wherever possible, be protected. This policy is generally acceptable, although it should be more proactive in stating that it does not preclude development as a matter of principle (subject to other SPD and Core Strategy Policies). The core focus should be on the protection and/or enhancement Godshill’s natural and historic environment through sensitive or appropriate development that works in harmony with its core aesthetic.

Comment noted. In light of the comment made it is considered the supporting text should be amended to address this point.

Amend supporting text wording to take account of comments made.

Minor positive effects on the landscape and historic setting of the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Comments which were made during the consultation</th>
<th>The Isle of Wight Council’s response to the comments</th>
<th>Changes to the SPD</th>
<th>Potential environmental impacts of changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoSPD 15</td>
<td>Policy GP2 – (Open Spaces) The Parish Council considers that existing open spaces should, wherever possible, be preserved in perpetuity. In my opinion, this is slightly misleading. One would need to consider the quality of the space before determining whether it should be preserved in perpetuity as the local community may determine that all existing space should be retained as a matter of principle, rather than having some correlation to Policy GP1 (Environment), GP3 (Design) and GP4 (Housing). If one refers to the subtext of Policy GP3 (Design), Section 4.2 refers to infill developments seeking to compliment the style and scale of adjacent properties and the setting of the Conservation Area and AONB. This policy recognises that some existing open space will be used which could be contradictory against the communities perception in relation to Policy GP2. The thrust of the Core Strategy and NPPF is to take a proactive approach to development so long as it is high quality and relates to its sense of place.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The draft policy does not attempt to protect all open spaces and wooded areas. Indeed, ‘policy GP 2 – Open Spaces’ refers to existing open spaces and wooded areas and how these “should, wherever possible (emphasis added for the purpose of this document), be preserved in perpetuity”. The reference to ‘wherever possible’ provides flexibility at the site specific planning application stage. In light of the comment made it is considered the supporting text should be amended to address this point.</td>
<td>Amend supporting text wording to take account of comments made.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Comments which were made during the consultation</td>
<td>The Isle of Wight Council’s response to the comments</td>
<td>Changes to the SPD</td>
<td>Potential environmental impacts of changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoSPD 17</td>
<td>Section 7 – Economy</td>
<td>Comment noted. The SPD is not introducing new development plan policies and the approach towards the location of development is already established in the Island Plan Core Strategy Policy SP1 Spatial Strategy. In light of this and other comment made it is considered the supporting text should be amended to address these points.</td>
<td>Amend supporting text wording to take account of comments made.</td>
<td>Minor positive effect with clarification and strengthening of policy (both national and Local Plan) compliant sequential approach to development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ref | Comments which were made during the consultation | The Isle of Wight Council’s response to the comments | Changes to the SPD | Potential environmental impacts of changes
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
<p>| GoSPD 18 | As identified in the document (paragraph 2.5) part of the village and parish fall within the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. We support the aspirations highlighted in GP1, GP2, GP3 which overall aim to ensure that the special characteristics of this part of the designation are conserved and enhanced. These are in accordance with the objectives as detailed in the AONB Management Plan and in particular the following Policies:  • P43: Ensure that AONB objectives are given full regards in the formulation, review and implementation of plans and policies affecting AONB Parishes, for Island Plan documents, neighbourhood plans, etc.  • P44: Work with AONB Parishes and community groups to support local approaches to neighbourhood planning connecting people with the value and active conservation and enhancement of the AONB at the local level.  • P45: Support appropriate development for sustainable communities (services, housing, etc) that complements the character of the area, strengthening its local distinctiveness and has provided robust evidence of need and demand.  Additionally, in support of these approaches we would recommend the use of the recently published East Wight Landscape Character Assessment. This Landscape Character Assessment has been undertaken as part of the development phase of the East Wight Landscape Partnership scheme 'Down to the Coast, using the most up to date guidance and best practice. This details the landscape characteristics and features within the Parish. We would be happy to provide further information on this if required and I can confirm that copies of the East Wight Landscape Character Assessment are available from the Isle of Wight AONB Unit. | Support noted. In light of this and other comments a reference to the East Wight Landscape Character Assessment has been added to Policy GP3-Design and its supporting text. | Amend policy and supporting text wording to take account of comments made. | Minor positive effect on the landscape and setting of the village. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Comments which were made during the consultation</th>
<th>The Isle of Wight Council’s response to the comments</th>
<th>Changes to the SPD</th>
<th>Potential environmental impacts of changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GoSPD 19 | 3.4 English Heritage has warned that Godshill Conservation Area is deteriorating and at risk of losing its special character. Much of the reason for this is attributable to unsympathetic alteration and infill development  
Godshill being included on the at risk register is more to do with the answers given by the LPA to the survey request from EH  
From the 2009 survey the LPA wrote about Godshill village centre conservation area. This is a tourist attraction dominated by gift shops and tea rooms. This results in some conflict with through traffic. Commercial changes and possible redevelopments could affect the character and vitality of the village.  
Answers about replacement window, traffic and also the fact that the conservation area does not have a Character assessment put it on the At Risk Register not any assessment of the design of any infill development. | In light of the comment made it is considered the supporting text should be amended to address this point.  
Amend supporting text wording to take account of comments made. | Minor positive effects on the historic environment. |