

## **Appendix D - Response from Natural England**

### **Breckland Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies: Proposed Submission Document - February 2009**

#### **Part 1. Your Contact Details**

**Ms Louise Oliver  
Planning and Biodiversity Advisor  
Norfolk and Suffolk Government Team  
Natural England  
Dragonfly House  
2 Gilders Way  
Norwich  
NR3 1UB  
Tel: 0300 060 1981 —dd  
[louise.olivernaturalengland.orguk](mailto:louise.olivernaturalengland.orguk)**

#### **Part 2. Your Representation**

**Having examined the following policies, we consider the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Document to be sound:**

**Policy SS1  
Policy CP 1  
Policy CP 4  
Policy CP 5  
Policy CP 6  
Policy CP 8  
Policy CP 10  
Policy CP 11  
DC 8  
DC 13  
DC 15**

#### **Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document**

In relation to the report entitled 'Habitat Regulations Assessment: Breckland Council Submission Core Strategy and Development Policies Document', dated 2008, and produced by Footprint Ecology, we have the following comments to make:

1. Natural England is satisfied with the datasets of bird distribution in Breckland which have been analysed to determine the effect of housing, roads and other development on stone curlews in the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA).
2. We are satisfied with the quality of the interpretation of this dataset by Footprint Ecology, and support the analysis which recognises a 1500 m zone of impact around the SPA for stone curlew.
3. Natural England welcomes Breckland Council's very strong response to the Footprint Ecology report, which we consider will effectively protect stone curlews, one of the three bird species for which the SPA is designated, from the adverse effects of development.

#### **Other Comments**

## 1.4 Relationship to Appropriate Assessment

1.27 — 1.29 An explanation of what is meant by the term ‘Habitat Regulations Assessment’ (HRA) should be included within this section for clarity and understanding. Otherwise the term ‘HRA’ is used for the first time in 2.47 without any explanation being provided in the document. Neither HRA nor Appropriate Assessment appear in the glossary.

### Policy SS1

p24, penultimate bullet point should read “Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)”  
p25, first bullet point should read “...National Nature Reserves, and ... Local Nature Reserves”

2.37, final sentence, suggest replacing the word ‘constraints’ with the following text  
“...assets, which need to be protected, that surround Thetford....”

2.47 see comment made in relation to 1.4, above.

### Policy CP 6

3.47 should read “... with the requirements of policies CP8: Natural Resources..”  
rather than “...policies CP8: Natural Environment...”.

### Policy CP 8

3.63, second sentence, add an ‘s’ at the end of ‘.. (SAC)’.

### Policy CP 10

p58, second sentence in box under heading ‘Protection of Species’, it should read” . . .  
.of the Breckland SPA rather than “of the Breckland Farmland and Heath SPAs...”

3.72 first sentence, should read “. Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and  
Ramsar sites, are protected

3.72 For clarity it would be better to include a reference to HRA in this paragraph  
rather than just Appropriate Assessment.

### Policy CP 11

3.86, third sentence, suggest this slightly re-worded to read as follows “In the  
Breckland SPA areas of the District

### DC 8

4.39 (p87), third line up from end of paragraph, there is a typo as there is not a  
‘Wensum Valley’ SAC. I think it should read as follows “.. .the Breckland SPA and the  
River Wensum and the Norfolk Valley Fens SACs, will be.....”

Louise Oliver  
16 February 2009