

Salford City Council
Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Supplementary
Planning Document
Sustainability Appraisal Final Report

July 2006

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL
PREPARED UNDER REGULATION 18(4)(b) OF
THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2004

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Components that make up the SEA Environmental Report	4
1. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS	
Non-technical Summary	5
How to comment	8
2. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	
Approach adopted	10
Timetable and responsibility	11
Consultation arrangements	11
3. BACKGROUND	
Purpose of Sustainability Appraisal	13
SPD Objectives and Content	13
Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations	14
4. SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT	
Links to other strategies, plans and objectives	15
Baseline Information on Biodiversity Features	15
Key Sustainability Issues for Biodiversity	18
Baseline Information on Other Sustainability Issues	18
5. SA FRAMEWORK AND APPRAISAL OF OPTIONS	
SA Framework	20
Appraisal of Options and Policies	20
Recording of Outcomes	21
6. OUTCOME OF APPRAISAL	
Summary of Strategic Options Outcomes	22
Summary of Detailed “Do Nothing” Option	23
Summary of Detailed “Appraising, Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity” Policies	24
Summary of Detailed “Lowland Raised Bog Restoration” Policy	24
7. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING	
Next Steps	26
 <u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	
Table 1: SEA Directive Signpost Table	4
Table 2: Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks	10
Table 3: Timetable of SA Tasks	11
Table 4: NCBSPD Objectives	13
Table 5: List of Plans, Policies and Strategies reviewed as part of SA	15
Table 6: Potential Indicators	27

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Broad Assessment of NCBSPP Options “Do Nothing” and “Provide SPD”
- Appendix 2: Detailed Assessment of NCBSPP “Do Nothing”
- Appendix 3: Detailed Assessment of NCBSPP “Appraising, Maintaining, Enhancing”
- Appendix 4: Detailed Assessment of NCBSPP “Lowland Raised Bog”

COMPONENTS MAKING UP SEA ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

This Sustainability Appraisal report incorporates the requirements for an Environmental Report under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. These Regulations transpose the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (European Directive 2001/42/EC) into English law.

The places in the Sustainability Appraisal Report where the components which are required in relation to the Environmental Report are signposted in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Signpost of where in this report the different aspects of SEA Directive have been satisfied

Information to be included in an Environmental Report under SEA Regulations	Relevant Sections in the SA Report
An outline of the main objectives and content of the SPD	3.4 – 3.6
Relationship of the SPD with other relevant plans, policies and programmes (and previous Scoping Report)	4.1 – 4.3
The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment in relation to biodiversity	4.4 – 4.10
Likely development without implementation of the SPD	6.2- 6.3, 6.6 – 6.7 Appendices 1, and 2
Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the SPD, including in particular, those relating to any areas of particular environmental importance such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC	4.12 – 4.16
The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the SPD and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	4.1 – 4.3, and original Scoping Report
The likely significant effects on the environment, including issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soils, water, air, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between them of producing SPD	6.4, 6.10 – 6.11 and 6.13 Appendices 1, 3 and 4
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the SPD	6.5, 6.12 and 6.14
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties	5.3 – 5.4
A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring	Section 7
A non technical summary of the information provided above	Section 1

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 This section provides a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report, setting out the SA process and the difference that it has made to the production of the SPD. Contact details are also provided, with information on how to comment on the SA report during the consultation period.

PURPOSE OF NATURE CONSERVATION AND BIODIVERSITY

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

- 1.2 The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Nature Conservation and Biodiversity will advise stakeholders, involved in designing and considering development proposals affecting Salford's key biodiversity resources, about what those biodiversity resources are and what types of information are likely to be needed when submitting a planning application likely to affect them. It will also provide information on the types of mitigation measures that might be necessary to offset potential impacts on biodiversity resources, and give an idea of the potential forms of compensation that it might be appropriate to provide, when mitigation is not possible. It also provides specific information on how lowland raised bog restoration opportunities on Chat Moss will be identified, and the techniques that are likely to be necessary in re-creating this habitat on Chat Moss. It is thought the document will help to ensure consistent and transparent decision-making.

PURPOSE OF SUSTAINABILITY REPORT

- 1.3 The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development through the integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of the SPD. The SA considers the SPD's implications, from an environmental, social and economic perspective, by assessing options and the draft SPD against sustainability objectives for the city and the available baseline data on biodiversity resources within the city.
- 1.4 SA is mandatory for SPDs under the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). SAs of SPDs should also fully incorporate the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC, known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive, which was transposed into English law by the "Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations)".

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS, PROGRAMMES AND OBJECTIVES

- 1.5 The purpose of reviewing other plans, policies and programmes, and sustainability objectives is to ensure that the relationship between those documents and the draft SPD has been fully explored. This will in turn ensure that Salford City Council is able to act on any identified inconsistencies between international, national, regional and local objectives.
- 1.6 A range of national, regional and local policies and strategies were reviewed as part of the SA process and no major inconsistencies were found between policies. The key links identified were with the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna (Habitats Directive) 92/43/EEC, Securing the Future: The UK Sustainable Development Strategy; UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP); Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9): Biodiversity and Geological Conservation; North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS13); Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (GM BAP) and the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan - Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan 2003–2016.
- 1.7 It was not thought that an “Appropriate Assessment” in line with the requirements of the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (Habitats Directive) 92/43/EEC was necessary. This is because there are no Special Areas of Conservation or Special Protection Areas in Salford, and the SPD policies would be very unlikely to have an adverse affect on the Astley and Bedford Moss SAC just across the city boundary in Wigan MBC.

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS FOR BIODIVERSITY

- 1.8 The collection and assessment of information and data about the current and likely future state of the policy area (City of Salford) was used within the SA to help identify sustainability problems and predict the SPD’s effects. The biodiversity assets in Salford are the Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs), areas of national and local priority habitats, protected and priority species, and key areas of search for wildlife corridors.
- 1.9 Some of the key biodiversity issues identified were that although there were known to be a number of statutorily protected, and national and local priority species in Salford, there was little/no published guidance on the type and location of these. In addition, there was little guidance on the type and location of priority habitats, or on how opportunities for re-creating “lowland raised bog” on Chat Moss in Salford would be identified. Following the public consultation period the Wildlife Trust for Lancashire,

Manchester and the North West provided a reference (i.e. Mosslands of the Northwest: State and Extent of Surviving Mossland Habitats by Paul Thomas of the Environment Agency) which the trust indicated had information on the condition, quality and extent of lowland peat bog, and guidance on the management options of different sites for re-creating lowland raised bog.

THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

- 1.10 The approach adopted to undertake the SA was based on the process set out in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) guidance “Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents” November 2005. The establishment of SA objectives and criteria is central to the SA process and provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, assessed and compared. The 25 sustainability objectives (and 6 sub objectives) used for the SA of the SPD were drawn from the sustainability issues identified through analysis of the baseline data and the review of other plans, policies and strategies.
- 1.11 The level of detail and the scope that the SA was intended to cover was agreed by key stakeholders involved in the SA process as part of consultation on a SA Scoping Report relating to the proposed SPD on nature conservation and biodiversity. This current report has been produced to reiterate the proposed approach to the appraisal process and to set out the findings of the SA.

APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS

- 1.12 A key requirement of the SA is to consider reasonable alternatives as part of the assessment process. Given the policy context for biodiversity requires the protection, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity assets, it was thought there was no alternative to the provision of an SPD, which required the protection, enhancement and restoration of these resources. Therefore the 2 main options, which were assessed against the sustainability framework, were:
- Do nothing
 - Provide clear guidance for key stakeholders by way of SPD
- 1.13 These 2 options were firstly assessed against each of the 25 overall sustainability objectives (and the 6 sub objectives) and were given an outcome based on a five-point scale as follows: Major Positive, Minor Positive, Neutral, Minor Negative, Major Negative.

APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS: OUTCOMES

- 1.14 In summary the appraisal of the strategic “Do Nothing” option showed that there was likely to be a negative effect on biodiversity resources because it could result in a lack of identification of the likely impact of development proposals on the existing key biodiversity resources in Salford. This could in turn therefore lead to a lack of identification of appropriate mitigation and compensation measures.
- 1.15 In terms of the appraisal of the strategic “Provide SPD” option, it was thought that provision of the document should lead to a greater identification of the likely impacts of development proposals on key biodiversity resources, followed by better identification of appropriate mitigation and (if necessary and appropriate) compensation measures. It could also contribute positively (although in a minor way) to a range of other sustainability objectives, such as protection of soil and water resources, prudent use of natural resources such as peat, reduced contributions to climate change (through protection and provision of woodland and lowland raised bog habitats which both absorb carbon dioxide), minimization of impacts of climate change on wildlife, and enhancement of the city’s landscape.

APPRAISAL OF THE DETAILED OPTIONS

- 1.16 For the detailed appraisal, the effects of the “Do Nothing” and 2 groups of SPD policies (i.e. those covering the appraisal, maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity, and that covering lowland raised bog restoration) were appraised in terms of the time period over which they are likely to occur, the degree of certainty as to whether they are likely to occur, their geographical scale, whether the effects are likely to be permanent or temporary, and whether there are likely to be any secondary impacts.

APPRAISAL OF THE DETAILED OPTIONS: OUTCOMES FOR “DO NOTHING”

- 1.17 In general the scale of impact relating to general environmental features such as air quality and landscape were thought to be citywide and in some instances such as loss of naturally occurring soils, were likely to be permanent, because the best chance of re-creating semi natural habitats, is on such soils.

APPRAISAL OF THE DETAILED OPTIONS: OUTCOMES FOR “APPRAISING, MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING BIODIVERSITY” POLICIES

- 1.18 The provision of the detailed policies was thought to clearly demonstrate the benefits of providing the SPD.

APPRAISAL OF THE DETAILED OPTIONS: OUTCOME FOR BOG RESTORATION POLICY

- 1.19 The appraisal has found that implementing the draft SPD will have overall positive benefits on biodiversity in particular, and other sustainability objectives in general. However some instances of the need for wording of the biodiversity policies to take account of other potentially negative impacts have also been identified and taken into account in the consultation draft of the SPD.

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

- 1.20 A key part of the SA process is establishing how any significant sustainability effects of implementing the SPD will be monitored. Some potential indicators have been proposed as a starting point for developing the SPD and the sustainability, monitoring programme. The indicators proposed are based on data already collected by the Council and/or its environmental partners. It is envisaged that the monitoring will be on an annual basis for the indicators relating to SBIs and Areas of National Priority Habitats.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THIS REPORT

- 1.20 Public consultation on the draft SPD: Nature Conservation and Biodiversity, its Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Consultation Statement ran from Friday, 17th February 2006 to Thursday, 30th March 2006.
- 1.21 Comments were submitted by:

Post to: Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD
Spatial Planning Section
Salford City Council
Salford Civic Centre
Chorley Road
Swinton
SALFORD
M27 5BW

Email to: <http://www.salford.gov.uk/spdconsultation>
(Standard Forms can be completed and submitted on line)

- 1.22 All comments received by 4:30pm on Thursday, 30th March 2006 were taken into account.

2. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

APPROACH ADOPTED

- 2.1 The approach adopted in undertaking the SA was based on the process set out in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) “Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents” November 2005 guidance.
- 2.2 Table 2 below sets out the SA stages and tasks, based on those listed in the Government guidance. This SA Report represents the completion of up to Stage C of the SA process.

Table 2 Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks

PRE- PRODUCTION
Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and review other relevant plans, programmes and sustainable development objectives that will affect scope of the SPD • Collect relevant environmental, social and economic baseline information • Identify key sustainability issues for the SPD to address • Develop the SA framework, consisting of sustainability objectives, indicators and targets • Test the SPD objectives against the sustainability objectives and determine whether they are consistent with one another • Produce the Scoping Report and carry out necessary consultation with key stakeholders on the scope of the appraisal, the key issues and possible options for solutions
PRODUCTION
Stage B: Developing and Refining Options
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out appraisal of the SPD options and make recommendations for improvement
Stage C: Appraising the Effects of the Draft SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predict the effects and carry out detailed assessment of the effects of the draft SPD • Propose measures to maximize beneficial effects and mitigate adverse effects • Develop proposals for monitoring • Prepare the final SA report along with the draft SPD
Stage D: Consultation on the SA Report and Draft SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on final SA report along with draft SPD • Carry out where necessary, appraisal of any significant changes made as result of representations
ADOPTION AND MONITORING
Stage E: Adoption of SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform consultees that SPD has been adopted • Issue statement summarizing information on how the SA results and consultees’ opinions were taken into account, reasons for choice of options and proposals for monitoring, including in relation to any recommended changes • Make SPD and SA report available for public viewing
Stage F: Monitoring Implementation of SPD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor significant effects of SPD to identify at early stage any adverse effects • Undertake appropriate remedial action where necessary

TIMETABLE AND RESPONSIBILITY

2.3 The timetable for the key SA tasks is set out in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Timetable of SA tasks

TASK	TIMETABLE
Preparation of the SA Scoping Report (which includes provision of the SA framework against which the draft SPD objectives are being tested)	October 2005
Consultation on the SA Scoping Report	November – December 2005
Consideration of responses to comments from consultees	January 2006
Appraisal of draft SPD options against the SA framework	January 2006
Preparation of draft SA Report	January 2006
Consultation on draft SA Report	February – March 2006
Appraise significant changes to draft SPD arising from consultation against SA framework	March – May 2006
Finalize SA report	May – June 2006
Inform consultees that SPD adopted	August – September 2006
Issue statement of community involvement	August 2006
Monitor effects of SPD to identify adverse outcomes	Ongoing

2.5 The SA is being undertaken by planning officers from Salford City Council.

CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

2.6 In October 2005 an SA Scoping Report was produced to set out the initial context and findings of the SA and the proposed approach to the rest of the appraisal. The aim was to ensure that the SA was comprehensive and addressed all relevant issues and objectives, by enabling input from key stakeholders and consultation bodies at an early stage in the process.

2.7 The Scoping Report set out an initial assessment of:

- The relationship between the SPD and other relevant plans, policies and programmes
- Relevant sustainability objectives established at the national, regional and local level
- The current environmental, social and economic baseline information and any trends in Salford
- The likely key sustainability issues

- 2.8 The Report also set out the proposed methodology for the SA, giving details of its proposed scope and degree of detail.
- 2.9 Comments on the Scoping Report were invited from the four following statutory consultees as required by the SEA Regulations:
- Environment Agency
 - Countryside Agency
 - English Heritage
 - English Nature
- 2.10 In addition, a number of other key organizations were also consulted as follows:
- Government Office for the North West
 - North West Regional Assembly
 - Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
 - Red Rose Forest
 - The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside
 - Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
 - Environmental Services Directorate (Salford City Council).

3. BACKGROUND

PURPOSE OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- 3.1 The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. The objective of this SA is to inform the development of the *Supplementary Planning Document: Nature Conservation and Biodiversity*. The SA considers the SPD's implications in terms of environmental, social, and economic factors by assessing options and the draft SPD against sustainability objectives.
- 3.2 SA is mandatory for Local Development Documents (LDD) under the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These Documents include Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
- 3.3 One requirement of the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (Habitats Directive) 92/43/EEC is to determine whether any SPD needs an "Appropriate Assessment (AA)", to assess whether it would adversely affect the integrity of any site designated as being of European importance in nature conservation terms (i.e. one of the Natura 2000 sites). Although there are no such sites within Salford, there is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (based on Astley and Bedford Mosses) in Wigan. That site has been identified because it is considered to be one of the best areas in the UK of degraded lowland raised bog, which is still capable of natural regeneration. Such a habitat requires specific conditions for its survival and restoration, two of the most important of which are the retention/provision, both of an acidic water supply, and of a high water table throughout the year. The types of development and activities that could potentially impact on the SAC, are mineral extraction, and extensive areas of tree planting adjacent to the site, either of which could potentially draw down the water table in the local area.
- 3.4 In terms of any adverse impacts from potential tree planting in Salford (as part of any landscaping scheme or provision of a priority habitat in accordance with Policy NCB 3 of the SPD), it is not thought that there will be any because the majority of the SAC lies well over 750 metres away from the council boundary. Therefore, it is considered that the provisions of this SPD would be very unlikely to have an adverse effect on the SAC, and an AA is not thought to be necessary in this case.

- 3.5 This SA Report is the key output of the SA process, documenting the work carried out during the appraisal of the SPD.

SPD OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT

- 3.6 The City Council recognizes that some development proposals within Salford are likely to have an impact on key biodiversity resources found within the city. In seeking to determine these proposals the City Council needs to consider the type and potential location of those biodiversity resources, the degree of impact on them that arises from development proposals, the mitigation measures needed to avoid or reduce the impact of such proposals, and the type of compensation measures that might be appropriate if mitigation is not possible. To enable appropriate consideration therefore, this SPD has been produced.
- 3.7 There are 5 key objectives of the SPD as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 4 NCBSPD Objectives

1. To enhance the biodiversity and nature conservation interest of Salford
2. To support the maintenance, restoration and expansion and management of designated sites and priority habitats
3. To safeguard both protected and priority species
4. To protect and improve wildlife corridors and stepping stones as a means of enhancing the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of species
5. To promote where appropriate, biodiversity as a recreational and educational asset

- 3.8 The SPD is split into 8 sections as follows:

- Introduction
- Importance of Biodiversity
- Salford's Biodiversity Resources
- Policy Context
- Issues and Objectives
- SPD Policies
- Implementation
- Monitoring and Review

COMPLIANCE WITH THE SEA DIRECTIVE/REGULATIONS

- 3.9 In accordance with the Government's guidance on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), SAs of SPDs should also fully incorporate the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC, known as the SEA Directive. The requirements of this Directive were transposed into English law by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations). While SEA and SA are separate and distinct processes, the intention of this SA is to adopt an approach to appraisal, which also meets the requirements of the SEA Directive and Regulations.

4. SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT

LINKS TO OTHER STRATEGIES, PLANS AND OBJECTIVES

- 4.1 The purpose of reviewing other plans, policies and programmes and sustainability objectives is to ensure that the relationship between these documents and the draft SPD has been fully explored. This will in turn ensure that Salford City Council is able to act on any identified inconsistencies between international, national, regional and local objectives.
- 4.2 Table 4 below shows a list of the plans and strategies that were reviewed as part of the SA and the main points from which were outlined in the Scoping Report.

Table 5: List of Plans, Policies and Strategies reviewed as part of the SA

INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna (Habitats Directive) 92/43/EEC• Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation• Minerals Planning Guidance MPG1 General Considerations• Minerals Planning Guidance MPG13 Restoration of Damaged Peatlands• Securing the Future: The UK Sustainable Development Strategy• Working with the Grain of Nature: a Biodiversity Strategy for England• Biodiversity: The UK Action Plan• Biodiversity: The UK Steering Group Report (and website)• Biodiversity by Design: A Guide for Sustainable Communities• Providing Accessible Natural Greenspace in Towns and Cities
REGIONAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West
LOCAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Greater Manchester Habitat Action Plans• Salford Community Plan 2001 – 2006• City of Salford Unitary Development Plan – Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan 2003 - 2016

- 4.3 No inconsistencies between policies were found. The key links identified were with Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation; Minerals Planning Guidance MPG13 Restoration of Damaged Peatlands; Biodiversity: The UK Steering Group Report (and website); Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West; Greater Manchester Habitat Action Plans and the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan - Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan 2003–2016.

BASELINE INFORMATION ON BIODIVERSITY FEATURES

- 4.4 Sources for the baseline biodiversity data included: Register of Sites of Biological Importance (managed by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit); 3 Phase 1 Habitat

Surveys (partial and complete and undertaken in 1989, 2000 and 2005); Greater Manchester Biodiversity Audit (2000); Incidental records held by GMEU on protected and priority species.

- 4.5 The GM Biodiversity Audit 2000 and records held by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) show that 15 protected species are known to occur in Salford but the size/condition of the populations of these species is unknown. The same data sources show that 19 priority species are known to occur in Salford. Again, the size/condition of the populations of these species is unknown. It should be noted that as there are some 391 national priority species, there are potentially a good number of additional priority species that occur in Salford (especially insects which are not generally well recorded) than the 19 known to date.
- 4.6 There are no internationally important sites in Salford but there is potential for development on sites in the city to affect the internationally important Astley and Bedford Mosses in Wigan, which is part of the Manchester Mosses Special Area of Conservation. In addition there are no nationally important sites in Salford but there is a potential Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in Botany Bay Wood. The nature conservation importance of this potential SSSI relates to the presence of a very large heronry within the wood, rather than to the importance of the wood itself.
- 4.6 Since publication of the Scoping Report in November 2005, it has become apparent that there are differences between the definitions used to identify national priority habitats, those used to identify local priority habitats and those used in SBIs, even though the same "title" may be used in all three. The differences arise due to the level of survey undertaken in each case. The national priority habitats are identified using the National Vegetation Classifications (which differentiate habitats depending on a detailed assessment of plant species present), while the local priorities are generally based on the standard classifications for Phase 1 Habitat Surveys (which is a more general assessment, although based on the presence of certain "indicator" species). The degree of survey effort used to identify SBIs lies between that used to identify national priorities and that to identify local priorities. To add to these different definitions, there is also sometimes an issue that different ecologists may identify the same piece of habitat as falling within different classifications.
- 4.7 Generally speaking the best examples of any habitats in Salford are identified as Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs). According to the Register of SBIs managed by the GMEU, there were 33 SBIs covering 421.05 hectares (ha) in Salford at the end of December 2003. At the end of December 2004 there were 33 SBIs covering 474.68 ha.

4.8 Given the differences in habitat definitions as explained in Para 4.6, it is difficult to establish the extent of national priority habitats present in Salford from the Phase 1 Habitat Surveys for the city undertaken in 1989 and 2000, and therefore a difficulty in establishing any trends in the extent of these priorities. Unfortunately the Scoping Report produced in November 2005, equated the definition of habitats from the Phase 1 Habitat Surveys with national priorities, and this was therefore in error. Since then the council has received the results of work commissioned from the Environmental Consultancy for the University of Sheffield (ECUS). This work has indicated that the following type and area of national priority habitats are found in Salford:

- Wet Woodlands 5.19 ha
- Lowland Dry Acid Grassland / Lowland Heathland 25.21 ha
- Eutrophic Standing Waters 18.42 ha

From information supplied by English Nature and ECUS it is also estimated that there is the following additional national priority habitat in Salford:

- Degraded Lowland Raised Bog capable of restoration within 30 years 249.69 ha

4.9 Although it has not been possible to establish the extent of national priority habitats from the 1989 and 2000 Phase 1 Habitat Surveys, it has been possible to establish the type / extent of local priority habitats (*although it should be borne in mind that the figures below for woodland and acid grassland incorporate the areas of the wet woodland and lowland dry acid grassland national priority habitats given the difficulties in habitat definitions*). From the previous 2 surveys it has been established that the following occur / occurred in Salford at the given dates. (*Because there were area / time constraints on the work undertaken by ECUS, which resulted in an inability to undertake a full field survey on areas of local priority habitats outside the Key Areas of Search for Wildlife Corridors, comparisons of 2005 data with past surveys is not possible*):

Local Priority Habitats in 1989

- Lowland Broadleaved Woodland 203.5 ha
- Acid Grassland 114.6 ha
- Unimproved Neutral Grassland 115.85 ha
- Marsh / Marshy Grassland 24.7 ha
- Dry Modified / Bare Peat 216.7 ha
- Canals 8.9 ha

- Ponds and Lodges (Area not recorded)

Local Priority Habitats in 2000

- Lowland Broadleaved Woodland 375.75 ha
- Acid Grassland 66.5 ha
- Unimproved Neutral Grassland 43.3 ha
- Marsh / Marshy Grassland 32.3 ha
- Dry Modified / Bare Peat 238.3 ha
- Canals 8.9 ha
- Ponds and Lodges (Area not recorded)

- 4.10 The above figures demonstrate that for the woodland there has been an increase of 172.25 ha, which is probably due to the natural development of some older plantation woodland and areas of scrub, into more mature woodland. For the acid grassland there has been a decrease of 48.1 ha. This is due primarily to losses through the gradual encroachment of other species, and the subsequent development of the grassland into scrub. For the unimproved neutral grassland there has been a decrease of 72.55 ha between the dates of the 2 surveys. This apparent loss may be as a result of development but it may also be due to a reclassification of previous grassland types by different ecologists. For the marsh /marshy grassland there has been a slight increase of 7.6 ha. The slight increase in the amount of dry modified / bare peat in the 2000 survey is due to the loss of a small area of scrub woodland on the edge of the Little Woolden peat extraction site, resulting in its inclusion with the peat extraction area (as part of an early planning permission in the 1950s).

KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES FOR BIODIVERSITY

- 4.11 Some of the key sustainability issues for Salford in relation to biodiversity are considered to be as follows:
- The need to protect the key biodiversity assets (i.e. protected and national priority species, SBIs, national and local priority habitats, wildlife corridors and stepping stones), in Salford
 - Where appropriate need to use mitigation measures to protect existing biodiversity assets
 - Where appropriate need to use compensation measures to enhance existing natural features through appropriate management and expand areas of existing, national priority habitats, and provide for their future management
 - Where appropriate need to improve the information basis on which planning decisions are made

BASELINE INFORMATION ON OTHER SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

- 4.12 Given that it is thought that an improvement in biodiversity can contribute to improving the overall quality of the city's environment and improving the general quality of life for residents (although it would be difficult to measure the scale of any influence), it is worth noting a few other sustainability issues in Salford. The paragraphs below look briefly at air quality, health and population levels.
- 4.13 In terms of air quality, the Environmental Protection Act 1995 required local authorities to review air quality in their areas. In undertaking the review the government set a number of air quality objectives (based on expert medical advice) for 7 types of pollutant. The most recent assessment for Salford completed in 2004/05 showed that the objectives for nitrogen dioxide and particulates were both exceeded. The worst areas are across the more urbanised areas of the city, and along the motorways, which probably reflects that much of the issue rests with volumes of traffic.
- 4.14 According to the 2004 mid year population estimates for Salford there were 216,400 people living in Salford. This represented a decrease of 144,000 (6.2%) since 1991. The comparative figures for the northwest and Great Britain were an increase of 15,800 (0.23%) and 2,293,200 (4.1%) respectively, on the figures for 1991. This indicates that there was a significant decline in Salford compared to increase in both the regional and national figures. This would appear to indicate that there are a number of factors leading to people living the city.
- 4.15 The Salford Annual Baseline Review 2004 indicated that in 2001 life expectancy in men in Salford was 73.2 years, a reduction of 2.7 years compared to the average for England and Wales. For women life expectancy was 78.1, a reduction of 2.5 years compared to England and Wales. The main killers are heart disease and cancers.
- 4.16 The Salford Greenspace Strategy has found that greenspace covers 1,958 ha (or 20% of Salford's overall land area). Of this, 1,096.5 ha (56%) overlaps with key areas of search for wildlife corridors and 12% is designated as Sites of Biological Importance. 415 ha (84%) of identified Strategic Greenspace Sites and 601 ha (64%) of Local Greenspace sites also fall within the key areas of search for wildlife corridors. The key areas of search for wildlife corridors themselves cover 1,560 ha.

5. SA FRAMEWORK AND APPRAISAL OF OPTIONS

SA FRAMEWORK

- 5.1 The establishment of SA objectives and criteria is central to the SA process and provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, assessed and compared. The sustainability objectives used for the SA of the SPD were drawn from the sustainability issues identified through analysis of the baseline data and review of other plans and strategies.
- 5.2 There were 25 objectives used in total covering social and economic objectives, as well as environmental ones. The objectives covered a broad range of issues, including: to maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna; to maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape and townscape; to reduce contributions to climate change, and to minimize its impacts; to protect resources such as soil, air and water; to improve the health of the population; and to maximize sustainable economic growth. In addition there were an additional 6 sub objectives relating to biodiversity alone.

APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS AND POLICIES

- 5.3 A key requirement of the SA is to consider reasonable alternatives as part of the appraisal process. The options that were assessed were based on the Council's intention to provide transparent guidance relating to nature conservation and biodiversity in Salford for key stakeholders in the development planning and control process, while seeking to take account of the requirements of the latest policy guidance.
- 5.4 The latest national policy guidance requires the council to protect existing biodiversity assets and to enhance and restore nature conservation sites, areas and features. In the light of this guidance, there would appear to be "no acceptable" different "options" for the proposed SPD that the council could suggest other than the policies in the proposed SPD. These policies seek (as required by policy guidance), the identification (through appraisal) of biodiversity features, the protection (through mitigation) of those features, and compensation (through provision of new features). Therefore only 2 options for the form of the proposed SPD have been assessed in this sustainability appraisal.
- 5.5 The 2 main options assessed were:
- Do nothing

- Provide clear guidance for key stakeholders by way of SPD

5.4 In addition to the broad appraisal of the 2 main options, it was also decided to undertake a more detailed appraisal of both the “Do Nothing” and then the 2 main policy groupings of the SPD (i.e. “Appraising, Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity” and “Lowland Bog Restoration”). In terms of the more detailed assessment, each of the Do Nothing/2 Policy Group options, were appraised against the objectives, according to the timescales, certainty, scale and permanence of effect. Possible cumulative outcomes/synergies were also recorded.

RECORDING OF OUTCOMES

5.5 The potential outcomes of the appraisal process were recorded on a five point scale as follows:

Scale of Outcomes

++	MAJOR POSITIVE
+	MINOR POSITIVE
0	NEUTRAL
—	MINOR NEGATIVE
— —	MAJOR NEGATIVE
?	UNCERTAIN

5.6 The 3 timescales chosen were 0 – 3 years, 3 – 10 years and 10 + years. The anticipated certainty of effect was recorded as “High”, “Medium” or “Low”, while the scale was recorded as “Citywide” or “Site” based. The permanence was recorded as “Yes” or “No” and any potential additional benefits were recorded as “Positive or Negative” Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic effects.

6. OUTCOME OF APPRAISAL

- 6.1 The detailed outcome of the broad appraisal on the 2 main options (i.e. “Do nothing” or “Provide SPD”) is given in Appendix 1 of this report. The detailed outcome of the detailed appraisal of the “Do Nothing” is given in Appendix 2. The detailed outcome of the “Appraising, Maintaining, Enhancing Biodiversity” SPD policies is given in Appendix 3, while the detailed outcome of the “Lowland Raised Bog Restoration” policy is given in Appendix 4.

SUMMARY OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS OUTCOMES

- 6.2 Generally the appraisal of the main “Do Nothing” option showed that this was likely to have a negative effect on biodiversity resources in Salford because it could result in a lack of identification of the likely impact of development proposals on the existing key biodiversity resources in Salford. This in turn could therefore lead to a lack of identification of appropriate measures to mitigate any potential impacts on those resources, and a loss of opportunities to seek appropriate compensation measures for any development proposals the impacts of which could not be adequately mitigated.
- 6.3 The appraisal also demonstrated that there could potentially be a negative impact (albeit minor) on a number of other environmental sustainability objectives such as the protection of soil and water resources, improving air quality, minimising the impacts of climate change on wildlife, ensuring prudent use of natural resources and maintaining and enhancing the quality and character of landscape and townscape. Additionally opportunities might be missed to use the re-creation of a local priority habitat such as woodland, as a means of helping to minimise noise and light pollution. It was also thought in terms of other sustainability objectives such as improving physical and mental health not having the SPD would also have a minor negative effect. For other objectives such as those relating to community cohesion, reducing crime and enhancing economic inclusion the effects were likely to be neutral.
- 6.4 The strategic appraisal of the “Provide SPD” showed the converse of the effects of the “Do Nothing” option. Therefore it was thought that provision of an SPD should lead to a greater identification of the likely impacts of development proposals on key biodiversity resources, followed by better identification of appropriate mitigation and (if necessary) compensation measures. It was thought that provision of the SPD could contribute (albeit in a minor way) to greater protection of environmental resources such as soil and water, prudent use of mineral resources such as peat,

reduced contributions to climate change (through protection and provision of woodland and lowland raised bog habitats which both absorb carbon dioxide), minimization of impacts of climate change on wildlife and enhancement of city's landscape. On the basis of the anticipated benefits to the overall landscape, it was thought that provision of the SPD could also improve perceptions of the city and people's general sense of wellbeing.

- 6.5 Although provision of an SPD could provide a range of positive impacts, in some cases there is a need to ensure that the actions proposed within the SPD take account of other factors. For example, if new tree planting took place on areas of other types of national and/or local priority habitats, resulting in a loss of those priorities that would be unacceptable. (In the case of tree planting and bog restoration sites, care needs to be taken to ensure that any proposed tree planting would not lead to a dewatering of the bog). In addition, any new areas of habitat creation proposed would need to take account of local circumstances, to establish the "right" type of habitat and whether the site on which it was proposed had the "right" physical conditions. For any new areas of habitat created there would also be a need to ensure that these were appropriately managed, otherwise they would be unlikely to develop into a "good quality" habitat in the future. It is in order to address issues such as these that the SPD policies require the involvement of appropriately qualified ecology consultants.

SUMMARY OF DETAILED "DO NOTHING" OPTION

- 6.6 Generally speaking the anticipated negative effects as expressed in Para 6.2 and 6.3 above, were thought to remain as minor over a 0 – 10 year timescale, although it should be noted that the degree of certainty in some cases was thought to be low, low to medium. In some cases the scale of impact relating to the protection and enhancement of general environmental features such as air quality and landscape were thought to be citywide. The scale of effects on other environmental objectives such as prudent use of natural resources (i.e. peat) were likely to be negative only on a site by site basis.
- 6.7 In terms of the likely degree of permanence of the effect, this was not thought to be "permanent" in most cases because presumably as some point in future, an SPD could still be produced. However, the scope for significantly enhancing biodiversity within built up areas (as opposed to simply putting up bat/bird boxes etc) as part of the development control process, (i.e. other than through land management) is generally dependent on redevelopment of sites.

- 6.8 In terms of where effects were thought to be permanent, it was thought this was likely where undisturbed naturally occurring soils/substrate are lost as a result of development. This reduces the chances of re-creating a semi natural habitat on that site, given the well-known difficulties of being able to re-create semi natural habitats of a reasonable quality within reasonable timescales. This is the case for both peat and any other semi natural habitat.
- 6.9 Because of the increasingly generally held belief that a good quality environment (which would include “soft” as well as “hard” landscape) can improve people’s perception of the area in which they live and their quality of life, then it is thought that the “Do Nothing” option is bound to have at least some minor negative impacts.

SUMMARY OF DETAILED APPRAISAL OF “APPRAISING, MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING BIODIVERSITY” POLICIES

- 6.10 Generally the anticipated minor positive effects as expressed in Para 6.4 above, were thought to remain as minor over a ten-year timescale. Again as with the “Do Nothing” option the scale of effects was generally thought to be citywide for general environmental features but only on a site-by-site basis for others.
- 6.11 In terms of the degree of permanence of effect, there is a need to recognise that even if biodiversity resources such as national and local priority habitats are enhanced, and / or re-created as part of mitigation / compensation, then those benefits are only likely to remain if the site where the works have taken place, is appropriately managed in the future.
- 6.12 In terms of needing to take account of other factors arising from a consideration of how the SPD would perform against other sustainability objectives, in addition to the approach explained in Para 6.5 above, the SPD is also thought to address these points as follows. In the case of seeking to protect peat as an important natural resource, whilst still enabling its extraction, there is a separate policy relating to peat extraction and the conditions necessary for lowland raised bog restoration within the SPD.

SUMMARY OF DETAILED APPRAISAL OF “LOWLAND RAISED BOG RESTORATION” POLICY

- 6.13 Generally this policy performs very well against the environmental sustainability objectives in the sustainability framework, especially those relating to the naturally occurring resources such as protecting biodiversity, soil, peat (which is a mineral resource) and water. Provided that the policy indicates the most appropriate location

for any restored sites, it should also provide a positive impact in helping wildlife dependent on bog habitats for survival, to cope with the effects of climate change. With respect to other objectives referring to improving health and increasing appreciation of city's landscape, it is thought bog restoration will be beneficial as it might encourage residents to explore the diversity of the city's landscape and thereby increase their perception of that landscape. Against a range of other objectives, such as those relating to light and noise pollution, crime, economic inclusion, improving knowledge base, it was thought the impacts would remain neutral.

- 6.14 This paragraph considers how the wording of the policy should address the issues raised when considering effects against the objectives (i.e. how the policy should mitigate for the anticipated effect). Given that lowland raised bog is a particularly sensitive habitat, then it is important that the policy on lowland raised bog restoration, clearly indicates the techniques necessary for successful restoration within reasonable timescales. In relation to trying to minimise the impacts of climate change on wildlife dependent on bog for its survival, then the wording of the policy needs to make clear the most appropriate locations for re-creation of this habitat. (These locations being as much as possible, in close proximity to other similar sites). With respect to ensuring the long term future for areas of re-created bog habitat, there is a need to ensure that the SPD policies allow for this by requiring "management" of these sites.

7. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

- 7.1 The implementation of the SPD will be monitored to determine its impacts and to help identify any unforeseen negative effects that might arise and that might require remedial action.
- 7.2 The Council is required to prepare Annual Monitoring Reports to assess the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which policies in the Local Development Documents (which include SPDs) are being achieved.
- 7.3 Given the difficulties of securing reliable information on the biodiversity resources (including accurate details of the extent of a habitat) in Salford as explained in section 4 of this report, and which would have to be determined on an annual basis, it is thought the main indicators should relate to those features, that are regularly reviewed (although not on an annual basis) by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. These features are the Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs).
- 7.4 In addition given that the Environmental Consultancy for the University of Sheffield has now identified (from a combination of 2005 field survey and existing data review) the type, location and extent of the areas of the national priority habitats in Salford, then because of their relatively limited extent, it should be possible to check visually (by a non ecologist) on an annual basis as to whether the area of these habitats has been affected by any type development. *(This would not be an annual check on the type/condition of a habitat, which without appropriate management could gradually develop into another type of habitat).* The type and condition of the areas of national priority habitats should then be reviewed by ecologists every 5 years.
- 7.5 In terms of accurately identifying the extent of the local priority habitats (which are very much more extensive than the national priorities and for which the accuracy of past surveys cannot be guaranteed) there is more difficulty. Although the areas of canals, ponds, lodges, mossland (included as national priority) and woodland could be checked as to whether any areas had been affected by development relatively easily, and by a non ecologist, the areas of grassland are very extensive.
- 7.6 Given the difficulties of accurately establishing the extent of areas of habitats, it is difficult to establish meaningful trends, except for the SBIs and the areas of national priority habitats.
- 7.7 Table 7 below shows potential indicators that could be used to monitor the effects of implementation of the SPD.

Table 6 Potential Indicators

1. Number, grade and extent of Sites of Biological Importance (end December)
2. Area of each national priority habitat (based on ECUS figures) (end December) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wet woodlands• Lowland dry acid grassland/lowland heathland• Lowland raised bog• Eutrophic standing waters

NEXT STEPS

7.8 Once formal consultation on the draft SPD and the SA report is complete the next steps will involve:

- Appraising any significant changes proposed to the draft SPD, in light of the consultation
- Publishing a statement following adoption of the SPD, which sets out:
 - The changes to the SPD in response to the full SA process
 - The ways in which responses to consultation on the SA have been taken into account
 - Confirmation of the monitoring arrangements
- Monitoring the significant effects of the SPD

APPENDIX 1: Broad Assessment of NC&BSPD Options

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
Environmental Objectives				
To protect and enhance biodiversity	---	Not having an SPD could lead to the loss of opportunities for protecting, enhancing and if necessary re-creating biodiversity resources (both species and habitats) within Salford that would be directly and/or indirectly affected by development proposals, and thereby a danger that those resources are either diminished in quality and extent as a result of allowing development without appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures	++	Having an SPD will provide guidance to key stakeholders on the need to take account of both indirect and direct impacts on biodiversity resources when considering the location, design and implementation of development proposals, and should therefore provide the best opportunities to protect, enhance and if appropriate re-create those biodiversity resources that might be affected through mitigation, and if necessary compensation measures
To protect and improve soil and land resources	-	Not having an SPD could result in a loss in quality and extent of biodiversity resources (including habitats) in line with comments above, and this in turn could result in a loss of the more natural soil types underlying the priority/semi natural habitats	+	Having an SPD will provide the best opportunities to protect biodiversity resources (including habitats) in line with comments above, and this in turn would help to protect the underlying usually more natural soil types (although some habitats can occupy contaminated sites)

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To protect and enhance water resources	—	Given that semi natural habitats generally occur on less nutrient rich soils, and that the lack of an SPD could result in a loss in extent of those semi natural habitats and their underlying soil types as indicated above, then this could mean a slight increase in the nutrient content of water underlying and draining off sites which previously supported semi natural habitats, thereby leading to a deterioration in quality	+	Given that semi natural habitats generally occur on less nutrient rich soils, and that an SPD is likely to result in a greater degree of protection for the habitats lying over those soils, then the provision of the SPD would help to protect the quality of the water underlying and draining off sites which support semi natural habitats by preventing their enrichment by nutrients from fertilizers
To improve air quality	—	Given that trees can absorb particulates from the atmosphere, and that the lack of an SPD could result in a loss in extent of existing habitats (including woodlands), then this could mean a slight deterioration in air quality	+	Given that trees can absorb particulates from the atmosphere, and that an SPD is likely to provide better opportunities for protecting existing areas of woodland, and if appropriate, re-creating woodland habitat, then this is likely to result in a minor positive impact on air quality. However, tree-planting schemes need to take account of the presence of any national priority habitats that may be present, and neighbouring uses.

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To reduce contributions to climate change	—	Lowland raised bog and trees can help to absorb carbon dioxide. Therefore not having an SPD which could result in a loss in extent of existing biodiversity resources (including woodlands and lowland raised bog habitats) and a reduction in opportunities to expand/re-create semi natural habitats, could have a minor detrimental impact on climate change.	+	Given that lowland raised bog and trees can absorb carbon dioxide, then having an SPD which is likely to result in a greater degree of protection for lowland raised bog and woodlands, and greater opportunities to re-create these habitats, is therefore likely to have a minor positive impact on climate change. However, tree-planting schemes need to take account of the presence of any national/local priority habitats that may be present, and neighbouring uses.
To minimise the impacts of climate change	—	It is considered that the most appropriate means for enabling biodiversity features to adapt to climate change is by making them as resilient as possible, and by maximizing the opportunities for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of species. Not having an SPD which as argued above is likely to lead to a loss of opportunities for protecting, enhancing and if appropriate, expanding and re-creating habitats is therefore likely to have a detrimental impact in relation to climate change.	+	Having an SPD, which will provide advice on how to address the impact of development proposals on key biodiversity resources, should help to prevent a further reduction in the quality and extent of those resources. In addition, advice on the location of areas of re-created habitat should help to address their fragmentation and thereby increase opportunities for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of species thereby helping to reduce the impact on habitats/species.

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	— —	These comments relate to use of minerals, which are a natural resource. Peat is currently the only mineral extracted in Salford. Without the SPD (which includes specific advice in relation to peat extraction) there is a danger that its future extraction could be unsustainable and result in the loss of a large element of its biodiversity value	+ +	As explained opposite the SPD has guidance on peat extraction, which aims to allow appropriate future extraction whilst protecting its biodiversity value. Therefore provision of the SPD is likely to have a major positive impact by helping to protect the “environmental/biodiversity” value of the peat, as well as its “economic” value
To protect and enable the appreciation of the city’s heritage	—	It is considered that the former lowland raised bogs (which were a very characteristic feature of the north west and Salford area as recognised by English Nature) could be considered a key element of the city’s heritage (albeit natural rather than built). Therefore without the SPD which includes guidance on opportunities/techniques to re-create this habitat there is likely to be a minor negative impact on both protecting and enabling appreciation of the city’s heritage	+	As explained opposite the SPD has guidance on protecting opportunities for bog restoration and techniques for re-creating it, where it was formerly a key feature of the Salford area, therefore without the SPD these opportunities could be lost thus resulting in a minor negative impact in relation to “natural” heritage. Unfortunately the peat deposits in Salford have been significantly “damaged” as a result of agricultural use and peat extraction, and therefore do not have a continuous archaeological record from when they were first laid down. However, they are thought to retain some archaeological interest

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To maintain and enhance the quality and character of landscape and townscape	— —	It is thought that the presence of semi natural habitats (which include features such as open water and woodlands), adds to the variety of the city's landscape. Given that the lack of an SPD could lead to loss of those habitats as referred to above, then it is thought that there could be a significant negative impact	+ +	Given that having an SPD is thought to increase the chance of protecting and enhancing semi natural habitats, and (if appropriate) re-creating those which are thought to be an important element of the city's landscape, then there is thought to be a major positive impact
To ensure light levels are appropriate to the situation	—	Given that trees can help to shield features from sources of light in certain locations, and that the lack of an SPD could result in a loss of existing woodland habitat and opportunities to re-create it in future, then there could be a minor negative impact	+	Given the benefits of trees and light as explained opposite, then the provision of an SPD could lead to a minor positive impact
To minimise noise pollution	—	Given that trees can help to muffle sources of noise, and that the lack of an SPD could result in a loss of existing woodland habitat and opportunities to re-create it in future, then there could be a minor negative impact	+	Given the benefits of trees in relation to noise as explained opposite, then the provision of an SPD could lead to a minor positive impact
To reduce traffic volumes	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	+	It is thought that if biodiversity assets within the city are enhanced then this may result in less need to travel further a field to experience these assets, thereby resulting in less traffic

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES				
To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way
To maximise sustainable economic growth	0 / -	Given that semi natural habitats are thought to enhance the city’s landscape and thereby encourage economic investment in the city, and that the lack of an SPD could lead to a loss of those features, then there is likely to be a minor / negative effect	+	Given the benefits of semi natural habitats in relation to landscape/economic investment as explained opposite, the provision of an SPD is thought to have a minor beneficial effect
To enhance economic inclusion	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way
To increase prosperity	0 / -	See comments in relation to economic growth above	+	See comments in relation to economic growth above
To improve the city’s knowledge base	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way
To secure a sustainable increase in the city’s population	0 / -	Given that semi natural habitats are thought to enhance the city’s landscape and thereby enhance it as a place to live, and that the lack of an SPD could lead to a loss of those features, then there is likely to be a minor / negative effect	0 / +	Given the benefits of semi natural habitats in relation to landscape/enhancement of city as place to live, as explained opposite, the provision of an SPD is thought to have a minor beneficial effect
SOCIAL OBJECTIVES				
To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To improve physical and mental health	0 / -	It is thought that an attractive landscape, which would be enhanced by the presence of semi natural habitats, would be beneficial to mental health, and would encourage residents to experience its benefits. Therefore a lack of the SPD which could lead to a minor / negative impact	+ +	Given the benefits of semi natural habitats in relation to mental/physical health, as explained opposite, then provision of an SPD is thought to have a major beneficial effect
To improve accessibility to key facilities	0 / -	It is thought that the retention/provision of semi natural habitats and biodiversity features in the Salford area could reduce the need for residents to travel further to experience those features. Therefore lack of SPD could lead to a minor / negative impact	+	Given the benefits of semi natural habitats as explained opposite, then provision of an SPD is thought to have a minor beneficial effect
To reduce the need to travel	0 / -	See above	+	See above
To improve community cohesion	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way
To increase involvement in decision-making	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way	0	Neutral effect – likely to be little impact either way

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To improve perceptions of the city	-- --	See comments in relation to landscape above	+ +	See comments in relation to landscape above
Sub-Objectives:				
To retain, enhance and (where appropriate and possible) increase the number, area and grade of Sites of Biological Importance	-- --	Not having an SPD could lead to the loss of opportunities for mitigating impacts on existing SBIs, and the loss of opportunities for both enhancing existing semi natural habitats and re-creating new areas (both of which could in time lead to the development of new SBIs) through compensation measures if appropriate	+ +	Having an SPD should lead to the greater protection of existing SBIs through appropriate mitigation measures, and in time to greater opportunities for creating new SBIs, both as a result of compensation measures involving enhancement of existing semi natural habitats and new habitat creation. To try to ensure the best possible opportunities of achieving SBI status, the new habitats should be appropriately managed

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To retain, enhance/restore and (where appropriate and possible) increase the total area of Priority Habitats	-- --	Not having an SPD could lead to the loss of opportunities for mitigating impacts on existing areas of priority habitats, and the loss of opportunities for both enhancing existing areas of priority habitats and re-creating new areas through appropriate compensation measures	+ +	Having an SPD should lead to the greater protection of existing areas of priority habitats through appropriate mitigation measures, and to greater opportunities for re-creating new areas through compensation measures if appropriate. (see also management comments above)
To retain, enhance/restore and (where appropriate and possible) increase the total area of semi-natural habitats	-- --	Not having an SPD could lead to the loss of opportunities for mitigating impacts on existing areas of semi natural habitats, and the loss of opportunities for both enhancing existing areas of habitats and re-creating new areas through compensation measures if appropriate	+ +	Having an SPD should lead to the greater protection of existing areas of semi natural habitats through appropriate mitigation measures, and to greater opportunities for re-creating new areas through compensation measures if appropriate (see also management comments above)
To retain, enhance/restore and (where appropriate and possible) increase the total area of GM BAP habitats	-- --	Not having an SPD could lead to the loss of opportunities for mitigating impacts on existing areas of GM BAP habitats, and the loss of opportunities for both enhancing existing areas of these habitats and re-creating new areas through compensation measures if appropriate	+ +	Having an SPD should lead to the greater protection of existing areas of GM BAP habitats through appropriate mitigation measures, and to greater opportunities for re-creating new areas through compensation measures if appropriate (see also management comments above)
To increase the area of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 residents	-- --	LNRs are usually centred on sites of at least SBI quality. Therefore see comments as for SBIs above in relation to creating new SBIs	+ +	LNRs are usually centred on sites of at least SBI quality. Therefore see comments as for SBIs above in relation to creating new areas which could contribute to meeting this objective

	Option 1 (Do Nothing)		Option 2 (Preferred Approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ mitigation	Effect	Comments/ mitigation
To increase the area of woodland per 1,000 residents	— —	Dependant on whether they were planted or self sown, woodlands are either a GM BAP or a semi natural habitat. Therefore see relevant comments above in relating to the creation of new areas	+ +	Dependant on whether they were self sown or planted, woodlands are either a GM BAP or a semi natural habitat respectively. Therefore see relevant comments above relating to the creation of new areas which could contribute to meeting this objective
Sustainability summary	<p>The lack of an SPD is thought to be more unsustainable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would result in less guidance on the appropriate means of protecting biodiversity resources, and seeking appropriate compensation measures • It could result in a minor negative impact on a number of other environmental objectives • It could result in a minor negative impact on a number of social and economic objectives 		<p>The provision of the SPD is thought to be the most sustainable approach for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides opportunities for expanding on the Draft UDP policies, which seek to protect biodiversity resources from harm as a result of the development process, and to require appropriate compensation measures when harm cannot be prevented • The general approach in the SPD is also thought to be of benefit in helping to meet soil, water, air, climate change, landscape, natural resources, and noise and light pollution objectives • It is also likely to contribute to helping to meet a number of social and economic objectives 	

APPENDIX 2: Detailed Assessment of NCBSPD “Do Nothing” Option

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative but for very long timescale	Comments / Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years					
ENVIRONMENTAL								
To protect and enhance biodiversity	—	—	—	High	Citywide	Probably Yes for bog, but No for less sensitive ones	Negative synergy / secondary	New development would decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects but over very long time scale
To protect and improve soil and land resources	—	—	—	Medium	A few sites across city	Yes	Negative secondary	A lack of appropriate soil resources would affect ability to recreate habitats characteristic of the Salford area, and which would reduce ability to appreciate what was part of Salford’s natural heritage
To protect and enhance water resources	—	—	—	Low	A few sites across city	No	Negative secondary	Poor water quality would not only affect wildlife but also the wider environment with implications for residents and their perception and enjoyment of the city. However there are other means of improving other sources of water pollution, so impact not likely to be permanent
To improve air quality	—	—	—	Medium	Citywide	No	Negative secondary	Wider environment would gradually decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects but over very long timescale. But could be turned around to some extent in future
To reduce contributions to climate change	—	—	—	High	Citywide but minor/medium impact	No	Negative secondary	Loss of existing areas and no recreation of the 2 habitats (woodlands and lowland raised bogs) which both help to absorb carbon dioxide, would result in increasing contributions to climate change albeit over very long timescale
To minimise the impacts of climate change (on wildlife)	—	—	—	High	Citywide	No but for very long timescale	Negative secondary / synergy	Increasing reduction in quality of wildlife resources would detract from the quality of the overall environment within Salford, and from opportunities to undertake outdoor exercise in attractive surroundings
To ensure the prudent use of natural	—	—	—	High	Peat extraction	Yes re peat loss	Negative secondary	Lack of SPD to provide advice on how peat should be used prudently, in order to safeguard its other role as

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative but for very long timescale	Comments / Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years					
resources					sites on Chat Moss			an important biodiversity / pale logical resource, could lead to a permanent loss of that other role
To protect and enable the appreciation of the city's heritage	—	—	—	High	Peat extract. sites on Chat Moss	Yes in relation to recreation of bog habitat	Negative secondary	Lack of SPD and potential loss of peat (as a mineral resource) could lead to permanent loss of opportunities to appreciate and positively promote “lowland raised bog” as a significant element of the area’s past natural heritage, and Chat Moss as a place to enjoy wildlife as a recreational experience
To maintain and enhance the quality and character of landscape and townscape	—	— —	— —	High	Citywide	No?	Negative synergy / secondary	Wider environment would decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects. Presumably still chance to improve even in longer term although opportunities likely to be less
To ensure light levels are appropriate to the situation	—	—	—	Medium / High	Citywide but mainly in urban area	No?	Negative secondary	Light pollution likely to increase, with less opportunity for its alleviation as areas are built up. Could have negative impacts in residential areas
To minimise noise pollution	—	—	— —	Medium / High	Citywide	No?	Negative secondary	Noise pollution likely to increase, with less opportunity for its alleviation as areas are built up. Likely to have negative impacts in residential areas
To reduce traffic volumes	— / 0	— / 0	— / 0	Low	Citywide	Uncertain	Negative secondary	People might need to travel further a field to experience some biodiversity features
ECONOMIC								
To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
To maximise sustainable economic growth	—	—	— —	Low	Citywide	No	Negative synergy / secondary	Wider environment would decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects
To enhance economic inclusion	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
To increase prosperity	—	—	— —	Low / Medium	Citywide	No?	Negative synergy	Wider environment would decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects
To improve the city's	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative but for very long timescale	Comments / Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years					
knowledge base								
To secure a sustainable increase in the city's population	—	—	— —	Low	Citywide	No?	Negative synergy	Wider environment would decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects
SOCIAL								
To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
To improve physical and mental health	—	—	— —	Medium / High	Citywide	No?	Negative synergy	Wider environment would decrease in quality with knock on, increasingly detrimental social and economic effects. It would become more difficult to improve matters in long term
To improve accessibility to key facilities	—	—	— —	High	Citywide	No?	Negative secondary	Population would increasingly need to travel further to look for opportunities to appreciate biodiversity thus potentially impacting on traffic and wider environment
To reduce the need to travel	—	—	— —	Low	Citywide	No?	Negative secondary	As above
To improve community cohesion	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
To increase involvement in decision-making	—	—	— —	Medium	Uncertain	Uncertain	Negative secondary	Public and nature conservation bodies would have less awareness of reasons for decisions on planning applications, which could lead to less confidence in decisions made for all applications, not just those re biodiversity
To improve perceptions of the city	—	—	— —	Medium / High	Citywide			Increasingly detrimental quality of environment would lead to increasingly poor perception of city

APPENDIX 3: Detailed Assessment of NCBSPD Policies NCB1, 2 and 3 Appraising, Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
Environmental									
To protect and enhance biodiversity	+	+	+	High	Citywide	No (also dependent on appropriate management)	Positive synergy / secondary	Both hard and soft development would gradually improve in visual and environmental terms in the longer term, which in turn would attract greater inward investment and enhance the lives of residents and visitors	Ensure SPD seeks to appraise development proposals for their impacts on biodiversity, so that existing resources are retained as much as possible, and if appropriate opportunities are taken to enhance those resources and compensate for any loss. To ensure continued retention of those resources, management is needed
To protect and improve soil and land resources	+	+	+	Low	A few sites	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Protection of appropriate soil resources would enhance ability to recreate semi natural habitats characteristic of the Salford area, which in turn would enhance ability to appreciate what was part of Salford's natural heritage	Ensure SPD seeks a proper assessment of existing site conditions (including soils/substrate) for recreating semi natural habitats
To protect and enhance water resources	+	+	+	Uncertain	A few sites	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Good water quality would not only benefit wildlife but also the wider environment with good implications for residents and their perception and enjoyment of	

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
								the city	
To improve air quality	+	+	+	High	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Wider environment would gradually increase in quality with knock on, increasingly beneficial social and economic effects but over very long timescale	Include policies promoting woodland planting and bog restoration in SPD
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	High	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Retention/recreation of woodlands and lowland raised bogs (which both help to absorb carbon dioxide), would result in decreasing contributions to climate change albeit over long timescale	SPD to advise on provision of woodland/raised bog recreation opportunities. There is need to take account of neighbouring uses, and to ensure that any tree planting does not have negative impact (through dewatering) on bog habitat sites
To minimise the impacts of climate change (on wildlife)	+	+	+	High	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Protection and enhancement of wildlife corridors and stepping stones would also benefit and improve the “setting” of the more urbanized areas of the city	Include wildlife corridor enhancement measures in SPD
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	+	+	+	High	Peat extraction sites only	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Provision of advice on how peat should be used prudently, should safeguard its other role as an important biodiversity / archaeological resource the interest of which could be promoted to wider public	Include peat protection policy in SPD

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
To protect and enable the appreciation of the city's heritage	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Provision of opportunities to appreciate and positively promote "lowland raised bog" as a significant element of the area's past natural heritage, and Chat Moss as a place to enjoy wildlife as a recreational experience	
To maintain and enhance the quality and character of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	High	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Wider environment would increase in quality with knock on, increasingly beneficial social and economic effects	
To ensure light levels are appropriate to the situation	+	+	+	Medium	Mainly site by site in urban areas	No (see above)		Light pollution could be reduced but would take significant time to have effect on widespread basis	
To minimise noise pollution	+	+	+	Medium	Mainly site by site in urban areas	No (see above)		Noise pollution could be reduced but would take significant time to have effect on widespread basis	
To reduce traffic volumes	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Hopefully an attractive environment in Salford should encourage residents to enjoy it, rather than seeking to travel further a field for opportunities to enjoy wildlife and outdoor recreation activities	

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
ECONOMIC									
To reduce crime and the fear of crime	○	○	○	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To maximise sustainable economic growth	+	+	+	Medium	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Wider environment would increase in quality with knock on, increasingly beneficial social and economic effects	
To enhance economic inclusion	○	○	○	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To increase prosperity	+	+	+	Low / Medium	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Wider environment would increase in quality with knock on, increasingly beneficial social and economic effects	
To improve the city's knowledge base	○	○	○	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To secure a sustainable increase in the city's population	+	+	+	Low / Medium	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Hopefully a good quality environment should encourage residents to continue to live within the city	
SOCIAL									
To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	○	○	○	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To improve physical and	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Hopefully an attractive environment in Salford	

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
mental health								should encourage residents to enjoy it, and undertake recreational opportunities thereby enhancing their health	
To improve accessibility to key facilities	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Hopefully an attractive environment in Salford provides better access for residents to enjoy it	
To reduce the need to travel	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	As above, so less need to travel	
To improve community cohesion	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To increase involvement in decision-making	+	+	+	Low / medium	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Public and nature conservation bodies would have more awareness of reasons for decisions on planning applications, which should lead to more confidence in decisions made for all applications, not just re biodiversity	
To improve perceptions of the city	+	+	+	Low / medium	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Hopefully a more attractive environment should lead to residents seeing city in more positive light, and being more encouraged to use facilities within it	

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
Biodiversity Sub Objectives									
To retain and (where appropriate and possible) enhance and increase the number, area and grade of Sites of Biological Importance	++	++	++	High	SBIs across the city	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Protection and improvement in quality of SBIs should eventually lead to improvements in wider environment. However, as with most biodiversity resources there is a need to undertake future management to maintain any enhancement	SPD policy should seek appropriate management of existing semi natural habitats, as a means of enhancement, and future management to maintain that enhancement. It may take a long time for any enhancement to be adjudged successful enough to be identified as a new SBI. New SBIs may come forward as a result of the creation of new areas of priority habitat but this is likely to take a long time.
To retain and (where appropriate and possible) enhance and increase the total area of National Priority Habitats	++	++	++	High	Areas of National Priority Habitat	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Protection and improvement in quality of areas of national and local priority habitats should lead to improvements in wider environment. Also see comments on management as above.	Comments as for SBIs above. For maximum benefits any newly created areas of priority habitat should where possible be located within wildlife corridors and be linked to existing habitats
To retain, enhance/restore and (where appropriate and possible) increase the total area of GM BAP habitats	++	++	++	High	Areas of Local Priority Habitat	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	As for national priority habitats above	As above

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
To increase the area of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 residents	+	+	+	Medium	Some sites	No (see above)			
To increase the area of woodland per 1,000 residents	+	+	+					Woodland is one of local priority habitats, therefore see above	

APPENDIX 4: Detailed Assessment of NCBSPD Policy NCB4 Lowland Raised Bog Restoration

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
Environmental									
To protect and enhance biodiversity	+	+	+	High	Peat extraction sites on Chat Moss, and possibly a few other sites, which have not be subject to intensive agricultural use	No (also dependent on appropriate future management)	Positive synergy / secondary	Readily restorable lowland raised bog is one of the national priority habitats, and is particularly sensitive in the physical conditions it requires for survival. It can only be re-created within reasonable timescales on areas of existing ombrotrophic peat, with a high water table close to surface of the peat for most of the year. Bog restoration should provide opportunities to view wildlife	Ensure SPD provides advice on identification of bog restoration opportunities and the appropriate techniques for restoration
To protect and improve soil and land resources	+	+	+	Low	A few sites	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Protection of appropriate soil resources (which would include peat) would enhance ability to recreate lowland raised bog, which was formerly a key natural characteristic of the Salford area.	Ensure SPD seeks a proper assessment of existing site conditions (including appropriate type/depth of peat) for recreating lowland raised bog habitat
To protect and enhance water resources	+	+	+	High	A few sites	No (see above)	Positive	Bog restoration requires a clean acidic water quality and therefore would contribute in a minor positive way	Ensure SPD seeks a proper assessment of existing site conditions (including appropriate acidic water supply) for recreating lowland raised bog habitat

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
To improve air quality	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	High	A few sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Retention/recreation of lowland raised bogs (which help to absorb carbon dioxide), would result in a decreasing contribution to climate change albeit over a long timescale	
To minimise the impacts of climate change (on wildlife)	+	+	+	High	A few sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive	To maximise the benefits of bog restoration schemes and the species dependent on them, and to try to allow a greater chance of success, bog restoration proposals should where possible be linked together	Include appropriate wording within policy on most appropriate location of bog restoration proposals
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	+	+	+	High	Peat extraction sites only	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Provision of advice on how peat should be worked prudently, should enable its continued extraction for horticultural purposes and safeguard its other role as an important biodiversity resource and future potential recreational attraction	Include appropriate wording within policy on what depths of peat should be retained in order to safeguard its other roles
To protect and enable the appreciation of the city's heritage	+	+	+	Medium	Sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Provision of advice on identifying bog restoration opportunities and techniques should enable opportunities to appreciate and positively promote "lowland raised bog" as a significant element of the area's past natural heritage,	Include appropriate wording within policy on identifying bog restoration opportunities on Chat Moss

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
								and Chat Moss as a place to enjoy wildlife as a recreational experience	
To maintain and enhance the quality and character of landscape and townscape	+	+	+	Medium	Sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Provision of lowland raised bog habitat on Chat Moss would enhance its quality and character, and this could enhance the overall impressions of the city	
To ensure light levels are appropriate to the situation	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To minimise noise pollution	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To reduce traffic volumes	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
ECONOMIC									
To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To maximise sustainable economic growth	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To enhance economic inclusion	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To increase prosperity	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To improve the city's knowledge base	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To secure a sustainable increase in the	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
city's population									
SOCIAL									
To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To improve physical and mental health	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive	Hopefully an attractive environment (which includes habitats such as bog) in Salford should encourage residents to enjoy it, and undertake recreational opportunities thereby enhancing their health	
To improve accessibility to key facilities	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive	Hopefully an attractive environment in Salford provides better access for residents to enjoy it	
To reduce the need to travel	+	+	+	Low	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive	As above, so less need to travel	
To improve community cohesion	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A
To increase involvement in decision-making	+	+	+	Medium / High	Citywide	No (see above)	Positive secondary	Public and nature conservation bodies would have more awareness of reasons for decisions on planning applications involving bog restoration, which should lead to more confidence in decisions made for all applications, not just re biodiversity	
To improve	+	+	+	Low /	Citywide	No (see	Positive	Hopefully a more attractive	

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
perceptions of the city				medium		above)	secondary / synergy	environment should lead to residents seeing city in more positive light, and being more encouraged to use facilities within it	
Biodiversity Sub Objectives									
To retain and (where appropriate and possible) enhance and increase the number, area and grade of Sites of Biological Importance	++	++	++	High	A few sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	One area of existing bog restoration on Chat Moss has been identified as an SBI. It is believed that in time, any bog restoration schemes, should, with appropriate management, reach the status of at least an SBI	SPD policies should seek appropriate management of areas of bog restoration
To retain and (where appropriate and possible) enhance and increase the total area of National Priority Habitats	++	++	++	High	A few sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	Protection and re-creation of lowland raised bog, which is a national priority habitat, should contribute towards an improvement in wider environment. Also see comments on management as above.	Comments as for SBIs above. For maximum benefits any newly created areas of priority habitat should where possible be physically linked to other areas of existing/possible bog restoration
To retain, enhance/restore and (where appropriate and possible) increase the total area of GM BAP habitats	++	++	++	High	A few sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)	Positive secondary / synergy	As for national priority habitats above	As above
To increase the area of Local Nature Reserve	+	+	+	Medium	A few sites on Chat Moss	No (see above)		Successful bog restoration schemes on Chat Moss, could eventually lead to the	

OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent	Secondary cumulative synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0 – 3 years	3 – 10 years	10 + years						
per 1,000 residents								designation of future LNRs (although public access would need to be handled in a careful way)	
To increase the area of woodland per 1,000 residents	0	0	0	N / A	N / A	N / A	N / A	Although bog restoration would not contribute to this sub objective, there is a need to ensure that any woodland planting schemes did not have a detrimental effect on any bog restoration schemes	SPD policies need to take account of potential detrimental impacts on bog restoration schemes from woodland/tree planting