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Executive Summary

Introduction

This report explains the process of screening and assessment that has been adopted for the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the New Forest District Council Core Strategy, submission consultation draft. It has been prepared by New Forest District Council with technical advice from officers at the New Forest National Park Authority.

European sites are areas of international nature conservation importance that are protected for the benefit of the habitats and species they support. The following sites have been included in this study because they could be at risk of experiencing negative impacts as a result of the plan:

- River Avon SAC
- Avon Valley SPA
- Avon Valley Ramsar
- Dorset Heathlands SAC
- Dorset Heathlands SPA
- Dorset Heathlands Ramsar
- The New Forest SAC
- New Forest SPA
- The New Forest Ramsar
- Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC
- Solent Maritime SAC
- Solent and Southampton Water SPA
- Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar
Findings

Using methodologies which reflect current best practice and advice from Natural England, the assessment has screened the submission policies and found that 22 policies are not likely to have significant effects alone or in-combination as they do not give rise to relevant impact, are adequately mitigated by consideration in the policy and consenting regimes or the quantum and location of effects is to be determined by lower tier Development Plan Documents (DPD) which will be able to more appropriately assess effects.

Three policies are identified as having uncertain effects in-combination in relation to disturbance effects on the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar site as they may result in an increase in visitor recreational pressure. Evidence suggests the catchment for visitors to the New Forest and designated sites is extensive and the risk cumulative effects could be significant. Whilst effects can be mitigated, the effectiveness of measures is uncertain. Given the opportunity for in-combination effects and the levels of uncertainty the assessment has adopted a precautionary approach and considered effects further in an appropriate assessment. This concludes that a range of mitigation and avoidance measures are available. These are reflected in the submission Core Strategy and so it is concluded that it is possible to demonstrate the plan will not adversely the designated sites.

The assessment identifies that further partnership work is required to deliver mitigation, and establish a framework for its implementation. Successful progress with the PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy and commitment through Multi Area Agreements is necessary to give the mitigation the necessary weight within the assessment process.
1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The New Forest District Council is in the process of producing a Core Strategy. The Council carried out public consultation on its preferred options for the strategy in autumn 2007. During their formulation the preferred options were the subject of iterative assessment for their impact on sites designated as being of European nature conservation importance, which reached its conclusion in an interim Preferred Options screening statement\(^i\). The assessment focused on the possible effects of the plan on the interest features of the following sites identified following consultation with Natural England and a stakeholder workshop:

- River Avon SAC
- Avon Valley SPA
- Avon Valley Ramsar
- Dorset Heathlands SAC
- Dorset Heathlands SPA
- Dorset Heathlands Ramsar
- The New Forest SAC
- New Forest SPA
- The New Forest Ramsar
- Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC
- Solent Maritime SAC
- Solent and Southampton Water SPA
- Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar

Rationale for the selection of sites is provided in Section 2.1.

\(^i\) New Forest District Council (2007). Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Statement for New Forest District Council Core Strategy Preferred Options.
Since the end of the public consultation the New Forest District Council has been undertaking further development of the Core Strategy policies in the light of comments received and further analysis of the evidence base.

1.2 **Purpose of this Report**

This report addresses the policies that are proposed following public consultation of the preferred options in autumn 2007 and sets out the District Council’s record of assessment for final consultation.

There have been some further policy development and changes since the previous HRA Screening report and thus the report has updated the screening process for the final submission policies to ensure conclusions have not changed.

The report also reviews consultation responses relevant to HRA issues and highlights how these and the issues identified in the interim HRA have been addressed in the development of the Core Strategy policies.

1.3 **Background to the Plan**

The New Forest District Core Strategy is the key part of the Local Development Framework (LDF), which will comprise a series of Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents to guide the spatial planning of the area. Other documents, which will include a more detailed site allocation document, will need to comply with the Core Strategy. The programme for the preparation of these documents is set out in New Forest District Council’s Local Development Scheme.

This Core Strategy Submission Document follows an extensive process of consideration of issues, evidence gathering, appraisals of options, and formal and informal public consultation. The key stages are summarised in Figure 1.

**Fig. 1: The Core Strategy Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy Issues and Options - Future Matters</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options Document</th>
<th>Core Strategy Submission document preparation</th>
<th>Submit Plan to Secretary of State and Examination</th>
<th>Public Examination and Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public and stakeholder participation</td>
<td>Public consultation</td>
<td>Public Representations</td>
<td>We are here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Conclusions of the interim Habitats Regulations Assessment

During the process of drafting the Core Strategy, the New Forest District Council has sought to reflect best practice advice from Natural England by subjecting various stages of draft plans and options to iterative Habitats Regulations Screening. A draft HRA Screening Statement was produced and published as part of the Preferred Options consultation and is referred to in this document as the interim Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

The Screening Statement of the interim HRA concluded that in the New Forest District Council’s considered opinion the New Forest District Council Core Strategy Preferred Options would not require full appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations, because both alone and in-combination they were not likely to have significant effects on the European sites. However this conclusion was reliant on consideration and inclusion of strategic avoidance and mitigation such as the delivery of Green Infrastructure as part of the assessment in order to avoid in-combination effects.

The interim HRA conclusions also acknowledged that in due course Local Development Documents that flowed from the Core Strategy would need to reflect recommendations in the assessment and provide detail for delivery of strategic mitigation.

The interim assessment highlighted uncertainties with the provisions of regional Spatial Strategies and concluded further consideration of in-combination effects would be required as details became available. Subsequent to the interim report the Government’s Proposed Modifications were published in July 2008 and are considered in more detail in section 3.2.1 of this report.

The conclusion also referred to work by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) to produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy which was still in progress but was identified as being an important element of mitigation. Issues relating to this strategy are considered further in section 3.2.4.

The interim HRA also noted that research work relating to visitor impacts and regional growth was being carried out and would be essential to inform later stages of policy production and HRA.

1.5 Policies within the Core Strategy

The submission Core Strategy proposes 25 policies (see Appendix 2). The formulation of policy has been informed by an ongoing process of assessment and awareness of the issues relating to European sites. It should be noted that the order and numbering of policies in the submission consultation differs from the previous Preferred Options document.

In the course of work on the Preferred Options Habitats Regulations Assessment, the main potential effects likely to arise from new development in the Plan area were identified as:
- Visitor pressures on sensitive habitats, in particular the New Forest and coastal Special Protection Areas for birds
- Water abstraction to serve new development
- Water pollution e.g. arising from sewage and effluent disposal
- Air pollution and noise disturbance, in particular from traffic

A number of the policies were introduced specifically in response to these potential impacts and include:

CS1, Sustainable Development principles: A basic sustainability objective is to maintain and enhance local, national and international nature conservation interests. CS1 reflects this by seeking development locations that minimise damage to areas of high nature conservation value such as European sites or their feature interest wherever they occur.

CS3, Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature conservation): seeks to apply national legislation to protect and enhance sites of international, European, national and local nature conservation interest. Retains and enhances green infrastructure networks. Proposes protection and enhancement through production of New Forest Biodiversity Action Plan.

CS4, Energy and Resource Use: promotes efficient use of water in line with sustainable construction standards. Has regard to recommendations arising from the Appropriate Assessments of the South East and South West Plans by placing particular emphasis on water efficiency.

CS7, Open Space, Sport and Recreation: to help relieve pressures on sensitive areas by seeking improvements to local open space, and to help produce a Green Infrastructure strategy for the South Hampshire sub-region.

CS19, Tourism: supports sustainable tourism including avoidance of damage to sensitive habitats through diversionary avoidance measures and car-free tourism initiatives.

CS23 &24, Transport: promotes use of alternative modes of transport

In addition, policy outlines have been included that recognise directly the need to protect nature conservation interests, including the promotion of land management practices relevant to these, for example:

CS21, Rural Economy: includes a commitment to working with the National Park Authority and other stakeholders to protect essential back-up grazing land to support the commoning regime that underpins nature conservation interests within the National Park
2 European Sites

2.1 Scope of the Study

The following European sites are wholly or partially within the area covered by the plan, or close to it, and therefore considered in the assessment. They were identified in the Preferred Options HRA report and consultation responses were supportive that other relevant sites had not been omitted:

- River Avon SAC
- Avon Valley SPA
- Avon Valley Ramsar
- Dorset Heathlands SAC
- Dorset Heathlands SPA
- Dorset Heathlands Ramsar
- The New Forest SAC
- New Forest SPA
- The New Forest Ramsar
- Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC
- Solent Maritime SAC
- Solent and Southampton Water SPA
- Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar

Figure 2 shows these sites and how they relate to the area in question.

2.2 Site Descriptions

Site descriptions for the sites considered as part of this assessment can be found in Appendix 3

2.3 Qualifying Features

The qualifying features of each site (that is, the reasons for which the sites were designated) are reproduced in Appendix 4. This information is derived from templates...
agreed with Natural England and by Tesserae Environmental Consultants on behalf of the PUSH Partnership, as well as information from the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) website.ii

Figure 2: Relationship of European Sites to Core Strategy area

ii www.jncc.gov.uk/protectedsites
2.4 Conservation Objectives

All SACs and SPAs have agreed nature conservation objectives, and progress towards these objectives can be taken as an indicator of favourable condition at the site. Ramsar sites do not have agreed conservation objectives, but in the case of those considered in this assessment, overlap with SPAs.

The conservation objectives of the above listed sites are contained in Appendix 5 and have been agreed with Natural England as part of the PUSH Partnership study. These were also subject to consultation in the interim HRA and responses did not record any omissions or suggested changes.

2.5 Vulnerabilities and Opportunities

Every European site has distinctive characteristics that make it vulnerable to a variety of impact-inducing activities. Many sites, due to their location or condition, also offer various opportunities for improvement.

The vulnerabilities of the sites and have been agreed with Natural England as part of the PUSH Partnership study. As with the conservation objectives, these were identified in the Preferred Options HRA and subject to consultation. Responses did not identify any omissions or modifications. They have been used to undertake the screening and are listed as part of the screening matrix in Appendix 6.

Of the vulnerabilities and impacts identified during the process of assessment to date it has been found that the following have emerged as being potentially key for a range of the sites considered, and they have therefore formed the focus of further policy development:

- Increased abstraction, water levels and hydrology e.g. through increased water demand from new development
- Point source nutrient inputs/ changes in nutrient loading e.g. through increased water treatment required by new development
- Non physical disturbance (noise and visual) e.g. as a result of policies that could increase visitor pressure
- Physical damage, abrasion/erosion e.g. as a result of policies that could increase visitor pressure
3 Effects of the Plan

3.1 Background

The interim Habitats Regulations Assessment identified that the majority of policies were not considered to have likely significant effects on the European sites, alone or in-combination. Six policies were highlighted which had potential effects on the vulnerabilities of the European sites (please refer tables 1 & 2 overleaf). Recommendations were made for avoidance and mitigation and the preferred options/policies were found to deliver the required commitments.
Table 1 - Summary of conclusions of interim HRA of the Preferred Options Core Strategy - effects alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / proposal in question</th>
<th>Site(s) affected</th>
<th>Nature of effect</th>
<th>Avoidance/Mitigation recommended by interim HRA</th>
<th>Response in draft Core Strategy</th>
<th>Conclusion of interim HRA - are policies screened as having likely significant effect?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS2/3/4/5/6/7 Development locations</td>
<td>New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar</td>
<td>Some potential for limited increases in recreational pressures, and in traffic leading to some potential increases in air pollution.</td>
<td>Commitment to formulation and secure delivery of Green Infrastructure Strategy within LDF to provide alternative recreational opportunities. Policy provision within LDF for adequate open spaces in design of new development. Commitment to measures to support appropriate management of designated sites and wider biodiversity resource to ensure their resilience and enhance integrity. Commitment to implement mitigation of transport derived pollution through delivery of transport strategies and measures to ensure modal shift to alternative means.</td>
<td>Policy Outline CS26 Policy Outline CS26 Policy Outline CS24 Policy Outline CS10</td>
<td>No – provided mitigation is secured and effectively monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Avon SAC/SPA/Ramsar</td>
<td>Limited potential for increases in water abstraction and water pollution from sewage disposal.</td>
<td>Commitment within the LDF to ongoing partnership with Environment Agency, Natural England and water companies to ensure adequate resources are delivered concurrent with new demand and requirements for high levels of efficiency are enshrined in policy</td>
<td>Policy Outline CS11 &amp; CS12</td>
<td>No– provided mitigation is secured and effectively monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solent Maritime</td>
<td>Some potential for limited increases in recreational</td>
<td>Commitment to formulation and secure delivery of Green Infrastructure Strategy</td>
<td>Policy Outline CS26</td>
<td>No– provided mitigation is secured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| SAC          | Solent & Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar | pressures, and water pollution from sewage and effluent disposal. | within LDF to provide alternative recreational opportunities Policy provision within LDF for adequate open spaces in design of new development Commitment within the LDF to ongoing partnership with Environment Agency, Natural England and water companies to ensure adequate capacity is delivered concurrent with new demand | Policy Outline CS26 | Policy Outline CS11 & CS12 | and effectively monitored |

| New Forest SSSI/ SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar Solent Maritime SAC Solent & Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar | Limited potential for very minor increases in recreational pressures and water pollution from sewage disposal (scale limited due to numbers of dwellings) | As above | As above | As above | No— provided mitigation is secured and effectively monitored |
### Table 2: Summary of conclusions of interim HRA of the Preferred Options Core Strategy - effects in-combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / proposal in question</th>
<th>Site(s) affected</th>
<th>Nature of effect</th>
<th>Other plan / project in question</th>
<th>Nature of effect</th>
<th>Possible combined effect</th>
<th>Conclusion of interim HRA – are policies screened as having likely significant effect?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solent Maritime SAC Solent &amp; Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar</td>
<td>Recreational pressures Water pollution</td>
<td>Draft South East &amp; South west Plan proposals for growth</td>
<td>Recreational pressures Water pollution</td>
<td>Growth in South Hampshire could lead to an increase in recreational pressures on the coastal environment, and to potential water pollution arising from sewage and effluent disposal.</td>
<td>Uncertain/yes unless delivery of mitigation within other plans/projects New Forest District Council can ensure delivery through partnerships and Core Strategy commitments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 **Contextual and evidential changes since the Preferred Options consultation and interim HRA**

3.2.1 **The Regional Spatial Strategy - the ‘South East Plan’**

Since the New Forest District Council formulated the Preferred Options and undertook the Preferred Options Habitats Regulations Assessment the Secretary of State has published Proposed Changes to the Draft South East Plan. The Proposed Changes have themselves been the subject of a Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment which adopted an approach of addressing the strategic effects and issues rather than a policy-by-policy methodology. The assessment for the proposed changes identified the following issues and associated recommendations relevant to sites considered as part of this assessment:

**Table 3: Habitats Regulations Assessment recommendations for the Proposed Changes of the South East Plan and Secretary of State response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation/HRA comment</th>
<th>Secretary of State response</th>
<th>Change to Regional Spatial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td><strong>Greenspace provision</strong>&lt;br&gt;Policy NRM 6 should not specifically apply just to Thames Basin Heaths but rather apply to all European sites (in order to direct LPAs to seek provision of accessible natural greenspace necessary to mitigate effects on European sites).</td>
<td><strong>NRM5 already includes policy on possible use of mitigation measures for alternative recreation land if appropriate. Therefore considered to address these recommendations.</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access management</td>
<td><strong>Strengthen NRM6 to address access management for all European sites</strong></td>
<td><strong>NRM5 is considered to address this issue with sufficient clarity.</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality</td>
<td><strong>Encourage Water Companies to plan for delivery of infrastructure to discharge treated effluent to areas outside the Solent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy SH8 now states:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Local Authorities will work with the Environment Agency and Water Companies to ensure that discharges from wastewater treatment into marine waters are in accordance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>Proposed changes should require high levels of water efficiency (CSH level 6), at least from 2016, if not earlier, in areas where it cannot be demonstrated that the development will not affect the integrity of a European site.</td>
<td>Not accepted. This is a matter for national regulation through the Building regulations and application of Code for Sustainable Homes not RSS. However changes have been made to Policy CC4, such that it encourages new development to seek highest possible sustainability rating., subject to economic viability.</td>
<td>Following amendments to Policy CC4: The design and construction of all new development buildings and redevelopment and refurbishment of existing building stock, will be expected to adopt and incorporate sustainable construction standards and techniques. This will include: i. Consideration of how all aspects of development form can contribute to securing high standards of energy and water efficiency. Where local planning authorities anticipate opportunities for levels of building sustainability in advance of those set out nationally they must be able to clearly demonstrate the local circumstances that warrant and allow this and set requirements out in Development Plan Documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal squeeze</td>
<td>SoS should discourage Local Authorities from relying on the Exception Test as an argument to permit the above policy to be bypassed</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>The following amendment and criterion added to policy: Avoid built development on the undeveloped coast unless it specifically requires a rural coastal location, meets the sequential test set out in Planning Policy Statement 25 and does not adversely affect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environmental, cultural and recreational resources. In particular, development must not compromise the ability to preserve the interest features of Natura 2000 sites through managed retreat of coastal habitats in response to sea level rise.

3.2.2 South West Regional Spatial Strategy

The Government has also published proposed changes to the South West regional Spatial Strategy on 22 July 2008. The Habitats Regulations Assessment for the South West Plan changes concludes that there was remaining uncertainty with respect to:

- Avon Valley SPA and Ramsar site (Water abstraction & Water quality)
- Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar site (Water abstraction, Air quality)
- River Avon SAC (Water abstraction, Water quality and Air quality)
- The New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar (Air quality)
- Solent & Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC (Air quality)
- Solent Maritime SAC, Solent & Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar (Air quality)

Recreational impacts on the New Forest were only identified in respect of the New Forest SAC only and were excluded for the New Forest SPA/Ramsar and Solent Maritime SAC and Solent & Southampton Water SPA Ramsar sites. Policy G11 however allows for the provision of mitigation and concludes that there are no adverse effects, subject to successful delivery of the necessary mitigation and monitoring to trigger further action if required. The policy highlights sites with particular risks but the Plan and HRA does not exclude action for other sites if required. Policy G11 reads:

“The Habitats Regulations Assessment of the RSS identified a number of international nature conservation sites which are particularly vulnerable to harm from recreational activities as a result of their proximity to urban areas or their attractiveness for recreation to local residents or tourists.

The relevant authorities will need to work jointly and with Natural England to secure and implement appropriate and deliverable measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects from
recreation at these sites, such as the use of Section 106 funding to secure provision of alternative greenspace or improve habitat management.

Providing new areas of appropriate greenspace (as set out in Policy GI1) is likely to mitigate potential adverse effects in many locations. However, management of activities and access on these sites may also be required. If following investigation of mitigation options by local authorities and partners, provision of appropriate greenspace and/or management measures is not possible, restrictions may need to be put in place on the type, scale and/or location of development (e.g. through implementation of ‘no development’ buffer zones) within LDDs in proximity to these sites. Particular sites at risk from recreational pressure are: ........................................ The New Forest SAC.

South West Plan - Air Quality Issues

The Plan and HRA of Proposed Changes noted the diffuse nature of air pollution effects and difficulties in quantifying impacts with the current level of information available. The New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar were identified as being at risk.

The Plan states that there is suggestion from Government advice 3 that NOx emissions are likely to reduce due to improvements in vehicle technologies. In reviewing approaches elsewhere in UK plans the South West Plan HRA highlighted that the East of England Plan had been able to demonstrate that any predicted increase due to development was mitigated by this reduction, however it also noted that caution was required as reductions could be smaller. The HRA therefore concluded that there was a need to include mitigatory policies which have been included in the Proposed Changes. Policy SR4 requires any development permitted to secure adequate improvements in air quality or reductions to balance any impacts.

South West Plan - Water abstraction and water quality

The HRA for the Draft South-West Plan had previously noted possible effects on the Avon Valley SPA, Ramsar sites and River Avon SAC. The updated HRA considers that following consultation with the Environment Agency and Natural England there are adequate statutory safeguards to avoid adverse effect and that nutrient stripping at sewage treatment works can potentially mitigate impacts of new development. However to address residual uncertainty the Proposed Changes accept the HRA recommendations of incorporating policy text requiring strategic review of capacity to deliver the necessary improvements. With such measures in place the Plan concludes adverse effects on integrity can be avoided.

3.2.3 **New Research on Recreational Impacts**

**New Forest SPA/SAC & Ramsar**

The Preferred Options HRA noted research work was being commissioned by the District Council in partnership with Natural England, Forestry Commission and The New Forest National Park Authority. This was to inform consideration of visitor pressures, in particular likely changes during the plan period and their likely effect on three Annex 1 breeding species relevant to the New Forest SPA.

The study\(^4\) reported in spring 2008. It predicts that housing development in the period 2006-2016 within 50km of the New Forest will result in an additional 1.05 million person visits per annum. Of this much will come from relatively close to the National Park boundary, an estimated 764,000 from within 10km.

The report suggests that there is some evidence that at existing visitor levels, there is a degree of avoidance of particularly high visitor pressure areas by Annex 1 bird species, particularly woodlark. However, the statistical significance of the findings are at present uncertain and further work is required to try understand what the impacts currently are, or are likely to be in the future.

The study drew comparisons with the Thames Basin Heaths and Dorset Heathlands and found significant differences in the origin of visitors, their behaviour and density within the sites.

Visitor numbers are predicted to increase as a result of housing growth by the research. These figures are estimates based on the modelling utilised which uses specific assumptions on household size. Although predictions can be made as to the likely quantum and scale of effects, there are a number of complex variables involved and it is important to recognise the context and methodology of the modelling work (e.g. see section 5.2 of the report). In relation to the effects of development resulting from the Core Strategy that is the subject of this assessment, the District Council considers it is important to highlight that:

- The provision for residential development reflects changing requirements for household size as opposed to an increase in population
- The Chelmer study which forms part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy suggests over the plan period there will be a decrease in total population and a demographic of increasing age within the population. Actual population is estimated to fall from approx 141,000 to 133,000. This may have implications for the level of recreational activity and visit generation, although at present there is little evidence to inform how visitor levels may actually change.

Although the majority of local day visits are from the Hampshire area, the Dorset area makes a significant contribution of 29% of day visits. Further analysis of this contribution is required and will be informed by work being undertaken by the Dorset Heaths Partnership.

Coastal access and Solent European Marine Sites Research

Natural England has recently questioned the evidence base in respect of the likely effects of human disturbance on the interest features of the Solent European Marine Sites. Whilst there is some thought that present levels of activity do not constitute likely significant effect, the combination of the possible increased visitor pressure resulting from regional growth and the coastal access corridor resulting from forthcoming marine legislation has led stakeholders to question the possible impacts.

In response to these concerns stakeholders including local authorities, the Environment Agency and Natural England have commissioned research which is due to report interim findings in autumn 2008. However conclusions will not be possible until later in 2009. In the interim Natural England advise a precautionary approach should be adopted, although to date representations have not indicated that likely significant effects cannot be avoided.

3.2.4 Emerging policy framework for the New Forest National Park

Since the Preferred Options consultation and Preferred Option HRA the New Forest National Park Authority has developed and published the draft National Park Management Plan and Core Strategy. It has also concurrently published a draft Recreation Management Strategy. These seek to manage effects of activities and development within the National Park and in particular European sites. They propose partnership working and actions both within and outside the Park to manage impacts.

The Recreation Management Strategy in particular seeks to maximise visitor experience whilst minimising pressure on the most fragile areas, promoting behaviour that respects stewardship of the area and working with others to provide destinations that provide attractive alternatives for everyday recreational activity. Meeting such strategic aims will provide significant mitigation for the effects of visitors that may arise in the future although it identifies partnerships and joint working as being key to delivery.

3.2.5 PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy

At the time the Preferred Options were drafted and interim HRA carried out, work was underway to produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the PUSH area which includes a large proportion of the New Forest Council District Plan Area. The strategy was seen as a significant tool to address mitigation of visitor and recreational pressure resulting from growth. In particular the strategic aims for the strategy included establishing a shared vision, the identification of potential new infrastructure, associated costs and sources of funding and providing a focus for cohesive partnership across the area to ensure delivery.
A draft strategy was published for consultation in January 2008. Since this time it has become clear that this document is not suitable for immediate adoption as a shared strategy and the draft currently has no formal status. Partners and stakeholders have identified deficiencies that need to be addressed if the final strategy is to satisfy strategic aims and in particular if the strategy is to delivery the necessary mitigation for recreational impacts that stakeholders expected from it. The appropriate assessment for the Proposed Changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East notes that without the coordination and commitment of a joint strategy, there is a risk that green infrastructure will not adequately deliver the necessary mitigation for recreational impacts.

The PUSH partnership has responded to these concerns by commissioning further work to produce the final joint strategy. Work is due to start later in the autumn of 2008. New Forest District Council is committed to ensuring the strategy meets the needs for open space provision to mitigate effects of recreational pressure and expresses this in section 6.7 of the submission Core Strategy.

Most recently Natural England has proposed that measures to deliver Green Infrastructure forms part of a Multi Area Agreement with the PUSH authorities (Andy Gordon, Natural England pers comm). This offers the opportunity to establish a legal framework which will ensure successful delivery and therefore adds to the weight that can be ascribed to the mitigation potential of the process.

3.2.6 Responses to Preferred Options Consultation

Overall the responses to the interim HRA were positive for the majority of policies and respondents did not highlight the need for changes or that there were omissions. However responses from Natural England and the Royal Society for Protection of Birds expressed concerns regarding:

- Policies promoting increased access to the coast
- Development of employment and business uses within the waterside and possible consequences for disturbance or development impact on Solent European Marine Sites
- Mitigation measures for in-combination effects of recreational pressure and the uncertainty in the policies relating to transport improvements

These have prompted liaison between the parties concerned which also involved staff from the New Forest National Park Authority. A meeting in January 2008 facilitated discussion and shared understanding of the issues. Draft results from the New Forest visitor study were available to inform the meeting. Various options for improving the policies were discussed and where possible the New Forest District Council has responded in the submission Core Strategy document.
3.2.7 Policy development since the Preferred Options consultation

In the light of the issues identified in the Preferred Options HRA and raised in responses, policy development has given regard to issues raised and relevant coverage within the submission document is evidenced as follows:

Table 4: Summary of coverage of key issues within the submission Core Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Relevant coverage and within Core Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recreation - Greenspace provision | Policy CS2 requires development to provide appropriate green spaces  
Policy CS3: Development control process will ensure development protects features of biological interest and provides for appropriate management of these. Ensures development appropriately mitigates unavoidable impacts including impacts on international nature conservation designations outside the plan area  
Policy CS7: Increases minimum standards of public open space. The policy states that the District Council will rely on partnerships with PUSH, the National Park Authority and other local authorities to develop green infrastructure strategies. New provision should contribute to open space objectives including enhancing local biodiversity  
Accompanying text acknowledges the need to alternative sites to relieve pressures on European sites.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Recreation - Access management | CS25: Developers contributions will be required for the provision or improvement of infrastructure needed to meet community or environmental needs. Accompanying text includes nature conservation and wildlife mitigation measures, environmental improvements and recreation provision.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Water Quality             | CS1: Development principles include ensuring development does not put unreasonable burden on existing infrastructure. Mitigation may be required to address infrastructure needs relating to sensitive areas such as national nature conservation designations.  
CS4: Promotes use of sustainable drainage technique and requires development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Water resources           | As above                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Coastal squeeze           | CS6: Flood protection measures should minimise damage to nature conservation and biodiversity interests. Further policy will be                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
established through the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan which will identify opportunities for establishing replacement habitat to mitigate that lost through coastal squeeze due to the maintenance of sea defences.

3.3 Screening of the submission consultation draft Core Strategy

Since the interim Habitats Regulations Assessment report for the Preferred Options there have been modifications and refinements to the policies in response to representations. This report has therefore considered the full range of policies in a new screening process, informed by the results and rationale of the interim assessment, advice from respondents such as Natural England and RSPB as well as the changes in regional policy and evidence base.

The following updated policies (Table 5) have been assessed as not having likely significant effects for the European sites. In reaching this decision regard has been given to advice by David Tyldesley to Natural England, results of the Preferred Options HRA for similar policies and associated representations to the Preferred Options consultation.

Table 5: Submission Policies assessed as having no likely significant effect alone or in combination or where effects can be more appropriately be assessed a lower levels of Development Plan Document production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Sustainable development principles</td>
<td>Policy does not lead to development but establishes standards for sustainable design and location which includes steering development to avoid impacts on areas of importance for nature conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Design Quality</td>
<td>Will not lead to development, relates to design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Protecting and enhancing our special environment</td>
<td>Policy intended to protected natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>Energy and resource use</td>
<td>Will not lead to development, policy relates to incorporation of water and energy efficiency measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS5</th>
<th>Safe and healthy communities</th>
<th>Policy intended to protect human and natural environment and improve public safety. Will not in itself lead to development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>Development is limited to previously developed land within defined settlements and establishes that flood protection measures should minimise damage to nature conservation interests. Policy subject to the findings of North Solent Shoreline Management Plan and the scale of that plan will more appropriately assess site specific aspects of effects on European sites. Notwithstanding this lower tier assessment, at the Core Strategy level development is not facilitated that would effect European sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>Open space, sport and recreation</td>
<td>Policy establishes requirements for open space. New open space will be identified in subsequent Development Plan documents. These LDDs will be subject to lower tier assessment if they give rise to likely significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS8</td>
<td>Community Services and infrastructure</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>Possible housing development to meet a local housing need</td>
<td>Provides estimates for locations for local needs housing but reserves the identification of specific sites to subsequent local development documents. Assessment of specific site impacts will be more appropriately left to lower tier documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13</td>
<td>Housing types, sizes and tenure</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14</td>
<td>Affordable housing provision</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS15</td>
<td>Affordable housing contribution requirements from developments</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS16</td>
<td>Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development and criterion takes into account impact on designated sites in the development of later DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS20</td>
<td>Town, village and local centres (retail)</td>
<td>Policy establishes spatial pattern of retail provision and modest proposals for expansion within existing centres. Policy itself will not lead to development and will be subject to development DPD which will more appropriately assess any impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS21</td>
<td>Rural economy</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development and seeks to support rural activity that helps support management of European sites (e.g. Commoning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS22</td>
<td>Affordable housing for rural communities</td>
<td>Policy itself does not identify specific locations for development. The impact of any site specific allocations will be more appropriately left to lower tier documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS23</td>
<td>Strategic transport proposals</td>
<td>Criterion requires improvements to demonstrate development will not have an unacceptable impact on environment. Majority of improvement/development remote from designated sites and within built-up areas or likely to comprise of measure such as public transport, prioritisation of bus transport within existing infrastructure and limited pedestrian routes. Improvements to Hythe ferry (identified in Natural England’s response to preferred options) clarified to comprise interchange improvements with public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS24</td>
<td>Local Transport Considerations</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development or location of development is not definable spatially at this level of strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS25</td>
<td>Developers’ contributions</td>
<td>Policy itself will not lead to development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining policies were considered further as part of the HRA process (Table 6):

**Table 6: Policies where there is a risk of likely significant effects and that have been subject to further screening against site vulnerabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Rationale - effect to be considered/tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>Settlement Hierarchy</td>
<td>Establishes a spatial hierarchy defining towns where most new development will be directed as well as where development will be limited. Establishes the appropriate scale in these zones. Does not in itself lead to development but needs to be considered in connection with spatial strategy and allocations (CS10, 11, 12, 17 &amp; 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10</td>
<td>The Spatial Strategy</td>
<td>In connection with CS9 and subsequent detailed policies, defines the spatial pattern of development, locating it primarily within towns and larger villages. Provides a target of minimum 3,920 new dwellings through existing allocations, development in towns, up to 250 dwellings on greenfield sites (see CS11), and up to 850 dwellings adjacent to towns and larger villages provided they contribute to local affordable housing needs. Policy criterion (d) states that development management will ensure appropriate mitigation measures for impacts on sensitive areas of nature conservation value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>New housing land allocations</td>
<td>Allocates two greenfield sites at Ringwood (150 dwellings) and Totton (100 dwellings). Criteria require mitigation measures to address environmental impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17</td>
<td>Employment and economic development</td>
<td>Reserves majority of existing allocations for employment. Encourages the future identification and protection of opportunities for marine-related business. Possible sites are listed in accompanying text but allocations not made in policy and will be subject to lower tier development documents. Accompanying text acknowledges marine business is likely to be located in existing employment sites and that impacts on nature conservation interests will have to be avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CS18 | New provision for industrial and office development and related uses | New allocations for industrial and office development made for Totton, New Milton and Ringwood in addition to existing allocations. Policy to be implemented through lower tier development documents that would identify suitable sites.

CS19 | Tourism | Supports provision of new serviced accommodation and improved quality of recreational opportunities, including access to the coast. Also requires provision is consistent with environmental objectives and supports measures to relieve tourist pressures on sensitive areas of the National Park and vulnerable habitats.

3.3.1 Screening of policies CS9, CS10, CS11, CS17, CS18, CS19

A screening matrix (Appendix 6) was used to screen the remaining policies. This matrix was used for the Preferred Options stage and reflects advice from Natural England. Tables 7 & 8 below summarise the screening conclusions. As policies CS9,10 and 11 will operate together for the purposes of defining housing development for the purposes of presenting screening and summary they have been combined. CS17 and 18 are also combined as they are linked, although substantial elements of CS17 do not relate to built development, at section (d) the policy does provide for allocations for employment sites.

The screening concludes that many of the effects of policies are not significant, either alone or in combination. In several cases in-combination effects can be avoided but require the delivery of mitigation such as open space/Green Infrastructure or transport improvements to air quality through policies within the plan itself or partnership strategies. New Forest District Council has acknowledged HRA recommendations such as mitigation in its Core Strategy and has adopted policies which commit it to the necessary partnerships for effective delivery.

Whilst the majority of policies are therefore screened as not having likely significant effects on the relevant European sites, with the current level of evidence an uncertain assessment is recorded at this stage for policies which could give rise to an increase in recreational visits as a result of housing growth (CS9,10,11) for the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. This conclusion reflects the coarse nature of the likely significant effect test and the legal presumption that absence of effect must be proved to a reasonable level and the extensive opportunities for in-combination effects due to the effects of other plans and their associated uncertainties. The conclusion has also been informed by ongoing liaison with Natural England staff (Appendix 1) which recommended appropriate assessment would be required to address the uncertainty of significance.
Table 7: Summary of screening conclusions from Screening Matrix (Appendix 6)- Can it be concluded that policies alone will have no likely significant effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relevant effects and vulnerabilities identified</th>
<th>Avon Valley SAC</th>
<th>Avon Valley SPA</th>
<th>Dorest Heathlands SAC</th>
<th>Dorest Heathlands SPA</th>
<th>New Forest SAC</th>
<th>New Forest SPA</th>
<th>Solent Lagoons SAC</th>
<th>Solent Maritime SAC</th>
<th>Solent &amp; Soton Water SAC</th>
<th>Solent &amp; Soton Water SPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS9,10,11 - Housing</td>
<td>Impacts on water abstraction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts on water quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts on air quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational impacts (disturbance/erosion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildfires</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predation - domestic animals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17 &amp; CS 18 - Employment</td>
<td>Coastal squeeze</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water abstraction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS19-Tourism</td>
<td>Recreational impacts (disturbance/erosion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Summary of screening conclusions from Screening Matrix (Appendix 6)- Can it be concluded that policies will have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS9,10,11 - Housing</td>
<td>Impacts on water abstraction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts on water quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts on air quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational impacts (disturbance/erosion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildfires</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predation - domestic animals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17 &amp; CS 18 - Employment</td>
<td>Coastal squeeze</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water abstraction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS19-Tourism</td>
<td>Recreational impacts (disturbance/erosion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Appropriate Assessment in respect of recreational effects likely to arise from Policies CS9, 10 and 11 for the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

4.1 Background of appropriate assessment

As a result of the screening assessment and advice from Natural England it was considered that due to the lack of conclusive evidence at that stage of the screening process it was not possible to conclude no likely significant effects in respect of policies CS9,10,11 due to recreational effects that they could occur in combination. Further more detailed appropriate assessment was required as a result of Regulation 85B of the Habitats Regulations.

Wherever possible the New Forest District Council has acknowledged issues arising from interim Habitats Regulations Assessments within its iterative policy development and adopted avoidance and mitigation measures such as changes to policies and the incorporation of mitigation and avoidance measures. It had been anticipated at the Preferred Options stage that this was likely to allow a successful conclusion to the likely significance test. However availability of recent research and updated advice and views from Natural England (Andy Gordon pers comm) has changed the position. At this stage of the policy development process opportunities for further extensive policy change are not considered possible, subject to the results of appropriate assessment.

4.2 What is to be assessed?

The appropriate assessment has considered the disturbance effects thought to be associated with recreational activity arising from the quantum and spatial pattern of housing proposed and facilitated within policies CS9,10 and 11 of the submission Core Strategy of New Forest District Council, both alone and in-combination with other relevant plans and projects.

The disturbance effects have been tested against the interest features and conservation objectives for the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites in order to ascertain whether there will be an adverse effect on the integrity of the sites. The interest features and conservation objectives used are summarised in Appendix 4 & 5.

The integrity of a designated site has commonly been defined as coherence of the site’s ecological structure and function, across its whole area, or the habitats, complex of habitats

---


and/or populations of species for which the site is or will be classified. An adverse effect on integrity is likely to be one which prevents the site from making the same contribution to favourable conservation status for the relevant feature as it did at the time of its designation.

### 4.3 Defining the effects of the policies

The policies CS9, 10 & 11 provide for additional housing within the Plan area to meet at least the requirements of the South East Plan (3,920 additional dwellings 2006-20026, equivalent to 196 dwellings per year). If additional allocations in respect of affordable housing are also delivered in the later plan period and subsequent DPD, the total quantum of housing delivered by the Plan during its period will amount to up to 4,770 units.

The three policies operate together at a strategic level to establish the overall delivery of housing. Policy CS9 establishes the settlement hierarchy and CS10 the Spatial Strategy: Development is concentrated in existing towns and villages, utilising the completion of existing permissions and allocations in addition to other development including the provision of new greenfield sites identified in Policy CS11. The appropriate assessment therefore considers the possible recreational effects of this level of additional development.

Whilst visitor studies can provide modelling and estimates of the possible implications of housing for recreational effects these are based on assumptions such as average occupancy which are subject to change over time. In the absence of evidence to inform consideration of whether population, or the quantum of households drives recreational effects, the assessment has given weight to the approach adopted in local research which is based on principles tested at the South East Plan Inquiry and in various assessments relating to the Thames Basin Heaths designated sites. This has assumed an average occupancy of 2.5 people per residential unit.

However it is considered useful to review the likely changes to inform the sensitivity of the predicted effects. Using the above assumptions the planned housing growth of 4,770 units could theoretically lead to an increase in capacity for a population of 11,925. The Core Strategy evidence base however suggests that due to the reduction in household size the existing population of the Plan Area is likely to fall from 141,000 to under 135,000 during the Plan period due to an aging population. Current occupancy is approximately 2.2 people per dwelling based on the 64,000 dwellings presently estimated within the Plan areas. With the current demographic projects and housing growth proposed the average occupancy may fall to under 2 people per dwelling by the end of the plan period.

Given these variations this assessment suggests that modelling predictions should be interpreted as an indicator of direction and general quantum of change as opposed to precise estimates. Whilst the local research (Sharp, J et al 2008) demonstrates overall visitor pressures are likely to increase, the effects of particular developments and plans are difficult

---


to disaggregate and the report has not been able to provide such an analysis. It is noteworthy that even recent visitor surveys have varied in their estimates of the current numbers of visitors. For the purposes of this assessment it is considered appropriate to assume from the evidence base available that:

- Without mitigation the growth in dwellings within the New Forest District could result in an increase in visitor numbers, possible due to an increase in households and demographics of the populations as opposed to a population increase per se. It is possible that housing development within 10km of the National Park boundary will result in an estimated 764,000 person visits per annum\(^9\). A relatively small proportion of this pressure may arise from new dwellings in the New Forest District Plan area. The increase in dwellings elsewhere in the region could result in an overall increase in visits and an in-combination effect.

- As a proportion of the development in the New Forest District Core Strategy is within 5 miles of the designated sites in places (particularly the waterside) research suggests that this could particularly add to day-visitor pressure. Such visits may be frequent, tend to occur across the year and may comprise a higher proportion of dog-walkers than tourists and non-local day visitors (please refer Tourism South East (2006) and Figure 1 in Sharp, J et al (2008)\(^{10}\))

4.4 Evidence of current and future effects of non-physical disturbance on feature interests

New Forest SPA

The principle source of local evidence is research undertaken to investigate the changing pattern of visitor numbers, with particular reference to the New Forest SPA\(^9\). This research suggests that Annex 1 species nightjar, woodlark and Dartford warbler avoid areas where estimated visitor pressure is very high. In particular woodlark showed that visitor pressure was having some impact on distribution but this was not found to be statistically significant.

The research also modelled changes to visitor patterns as a result of predicated growth in the south east and south west utilising existing visitor survey data. It concluded that housing development in the period 2006-2026 within 50km of the New Forest will result in an additional 1.05 million person visits per annum. Development relatively close to the boundary of the site will result in more additional visits than that further away, but compared to other heathland sites where effects have been predicted such as the Thames Basin Heaths, the catchment area for visitors is far wider.


It is therefore not possible to conclude that visitor numbers will not have some form of effect as various studies (e.g. Liley & Clarke 2003\textsuperscript{12}, Langston et al 2005\textsuperscript{13}, Mallord 2005\textsuperscript{14}) demonstrate disturbance effects can influence bird distribution and behaviour and local evidence (Sharp, J et al 2008) concludes an uncertain result which suggests similar impacts may occur within the New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites. Further it cannot be shown for certain that housing growth will not lead to a degree of additional visits as studies such as Tourism South East 2005\textsuperscript{15} and Sharp, J et al 2008 demonstrate that local other day visits comprise up to 60\% of visitors to the New Forest National Park and a significant proportion of these include visits within the designated sites.

The risk of significant effects of current levels of recreational pressure on interest features is considered to be low however, and is supported by the current opinion from Natural England such as the Natura 2000 Data Form (May 2006) which states that the woodlark population in the New Forest is currently at a high level. Overall Annex 1 populations are considered to be at levels commensurate with that at designation (Andy Gordon, Natural England pers comm.) Breeding bird surveys and census of the New Forest carried out in the period 2005/2006 showed increases in nightjar pairs and declines in woodlark and Dartford warbler since surveys in the 1990s (please refer Table 13 in Sharp, J et al 2008). It is suggested that site management and survey effort may play a significant part in explaining these declines (Diana Westerhoff/Andy Gordon, Natural England pers comm.). However it is noted that the recorded presence of pairs does not necessarily mean populations are in favourable condition as factors such as disturbance or predation may mean they are not raising young successfully.

**New Forest SAC**

Effects on the New Forest SAC interest features may be generated by visitors causing erosion of designated habitats such as heathland due to verge parking and other forms of erosion resulting in sward or soil damage. However data to quantify this form of impact is lacking and the component SSSI condition assessments are the main evidence currently available. These have been provided by Natural England in email correspondence to the National Park Authority dated 6 June 2008. Analysis of the assessment tables at that time indicates that of those units classified as unfavourable, only two note reasons that are related to public access and erosion. These two units seem to reflect particular problems with specific pressures in these areas from verge parking and campsites as opposed to levels of general access.

---


As part of the LIFE 2 programme a study was conducted to determine the degree of erosion evident across the New Forest. Twelve areas were identified as having significantly high levels of recreational use. The research contributed to action to mitigate these impacts via the Forestry Commission’s management and was reviewed in the SAC Management Plan\textsuperscript{17} in order to produce management prescriptions.

The apparent favourable condition of the SAC in respect of compacted/eroded bare ground should in part be expected as the New Forest has a very successful track record in recreational management by agencies including the Forestry Commission and Verderers. Compared to other heathland sites in the south of England there is an unprecedented area available to spread visitor pressure and over the last four decades step changes have resulted in delivery of significant management infrastructure such as car parks and tracks. The SAC Management Plan notes the current contribution of access management to maintaining favourable condition and notes activities such as horse riding and cycling are most significant risk in causing sward or soil damage. Theses activities are tightly controlled by Forest Byelaws and planning controls and the SAC Management does not state that the activities are currently causing harm.

However despite the lack of empirical data, concern is still expressed regarding the potential for erosion from activities where they might become concentrated (e.g. Diana Westerhoff/Andy Gordon, Natural Englandpers comm). With the current level of evidence available this assessment has concluded that current levels of visitor pressure are not causing adverse effects on integrity of the SAC habitats, however caution must be exercised in making predictions of the effects of future changes to pressure and the capacity of existing levels of control to mitigate this and a precautionary approach is recommended.

4.5 Mitigation and avoidance measures and other controls of non-physical disturbance

Within the submission Core Strategy

Policies CS 9, 10 & 11 are implemented in the context of controls provided within the Core Strategy’s other policies and other strategies. This assessment has considered the following measures that will assist mitigation of possible visitor pressure:

- Policy CS7 seeks to provide alternative natural greenspace for informal recreational use in order to help relieve pressure on sensitive sites
- Policy CS7 establishes a commitment for the New Forest District to work with other local authorities via the PUSH partnership to produce a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the South Hampshire sub-region


\textsuperscript{17} English Nature (2001). New Forest SAC Management Plan
• Policy CS25 establishes a contributions framework that allows for the financial contributions from development to support the provision of green infrastructure and recreational opportunities to relieve pressure on sensitive sites and meet environmental needs. Maintenance of new facilities is also enabled through the policy.

Within Regional Spatial Strategies

• South West Plan: Policy G11 provides for the protection of European sites through joint working and the use of planning agreements to secure the provision of alternative greenspace or improved management of activities and access.

• South East Plan: Policy NRM5 establishes the highest level of protection for national and international sites. Policy CC8 promotes the role of green infrastructure in spreading recreational activity.

Within the regions

• The Partnership For Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) has established a clear commitment to produce and implement a Green Infrastructure Strategy. Although the content of this is still being developed its development and delivery is likely to form part of a Multi Agency Agreement with stakeholders such as Natural England.

• The Dorset Heaths Partnership has been operating an interim strategy to mitigate urban effects of recent housing development. It is currently consulting on a draft DPD to formalise the strategy into relevant LDFs in the region. The current strategy has been successful at delivering site access management of the designated heaths and also provides enhancement of alternative greenspaces to provide avoidance measures for recreational pressures. These are likely to also provide mitigation for a certain proportion of potential visits to the New Forest.

Within the designated sites

• The New Forest National Park has recently published a consultation draft of a Recreation Management Strategy which provides policies to manage recreational pressure within the National Park, including the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.

• The National Park Authority is also consulting on the Management Plan for the Park which establishes a clear strategic framework to respond to the pressures and opportunities facing the Park, including recreation and partnerships to address them.

• The Forestry Commission has published its Crown Lands Management Plan for the next plan period. This establishes a clear role for the Commission and other partners in recreational management, monitoring changes and the implementation of pilot measures identified in projects such PROGRESS.
4.6 Are the current controls and proposed mitigation sufficient to ensure that proposed growth will not adversely affect the integrity of the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar?

The issues of recreational pressure present particular challenges when conducting an appropriate assessment due to uncertainties in defining pressures, and in the case of the New Forest sites this is exacerbated by a number of factors: The sites are unique in their coherence, size and level of recreational management in the UK context, which has in no doubt contributed to their ability to support the feature interests in spite of current visitor pressure. Unlike other European sites where recreational pressures have been a subject of concern such as the Thames Basin Heaths, the New Forest is not subject to such intensity of direct ‘urban’ effects, benefiting from careful controls and planning decisions in the past which have restricted development both within and close to the sites.

However on the other hand, and as reflected by its status as a National Park, the area has an immense draw for visitors which extend considerable distances (as evidenced in Sharp, J. et al 2008) and there is therefore potential for pressures to significantly increase when effects are considered in combination.

Assessment and mitigation therefore has to address effects which are difficult to quantify and which have significant levels of uncertainty in their modelling. Unlike some other forms of impact it is difficult to assess the contribution of mitigation such as alternative greenspace empirically and scientifically as much of its success is dependent on human behaviour and could be affected by factors that are not currently known or capable of modelling. Whilst the provision of alternative greenspace as an avoidance and mitigation measure has been accepted and used in the Thames Basin Heathlands and Dorset Heathlands, to date the long term effectiveness of the measures in reducing pressures on the sites has not been tested. Given that the approach has been tested at Inquiry however it is reasonable to ascribe weight to the potential of enhanced open spaces to reduce visitor pressure, particularly for the types of local day visits that may arise from development in the New Forest District Plan area.

In terms of assessment it is therefore proposed that at this time the only method of assessing whether sufficient mitigation/avoidance is available within a strategic Plan is testing it to determine whether it and other Plans establishes an adequate strategic policy framework to deliver key mitigation responses. In reviewing the evidence base presently available, and current best practice elsewhere such as the Dorset Heaths and Thames Basin Heaths, this assessment considers the following to be necessary:

1. Adequate protection of international sites from all direct and indirect effects of development which would allow control of development if adverse effects were identified in the future, with particular reference to in-combination effects of visitor pressure

2. Promotion of the role of green infrastructure and commitment to resourcing its delivery across a wide area (e.g. the PUSH area) to reduce in-combination effects (i.e. provision of new country parks or other informal open space attractions)
3. Appropriate levels of open space provision within new development and addressing shortfalls in existing provision and meet local greenspace needs. In particular for development areas close to the designated sites, measures to improve open space to avoid regular day visits such as dog walkers

4. Management of the sites to address additional recreational pressures and the ability to secure resources from new development to contribute to this where necessary. This need may be triggered if local greenspace needs cannot be satisfactorily delivered or where it is reasonable to predict that despite other local greenspace being available, the designated sites have such a draw that they will be used for regular local greenspace recreation.

5. Measures to establish a monitoring strategy for the interest features of the sites and at the strategic Core Strategy level these measures provide the necessary policy tools to ensure that adverse effects on integrity do not occur

6. Commitment to active partnership working with key stakeholders in the region to deliver the necessary open space, green infrastructure and site access management measures

At this time it is not possible to define the quantum of open space required or specific site management measures. This will be more appropriately defined as lower tier Development Plan Documents are developed and further monitoring is available. Sufficient flexibility must therefore be available within the Core Strategy to allow future DPD respond accordingly.

As part of this assessment the above requirements for mitigation have been considered against available provisions within the Core Strategy submission plan and the planning policy framework in which it will operate. Table 9 summarises the results of this consideration.

### Table 9: Provision of required mitigation within Core Strategy submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required mitigation mechanism</th>
<th>Related provisions within the Core Strategy and regional planning frameworks</th>
<th>Does the appropriate assessment consider the Core Strategy submission document meets mitigation requirements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequate protection of international sites from all direct and indirect effects of development</td>
<td>CS1, CS3 SE Plan NRM5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion of the role of green infrastructure and commitment to resourcing its delivery across a wide area</td>
<td>CS7 SE Plan CC8, SW Plan G1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Appropriate levels of open space provision within new development and addressing shortfalls in existing provision and meet local greenspace needs  

| CS7 | SE Plan CC8, SW Plan GI1 | Yes |

4. Management of the sites to address additional recreational pressures and the ability to secure resources from new development to contribute to this where necessary  

| CS25 | Yes |

5. Measures to establish a monitoring strategy for the interest features of the sites  

| CS3 provides for survey and more general partnership working with National Park Authority. | Yes - though role is limited as designated site is outside of the NFDC plan area. Reliance is placed on partnership with National Park Authority and Natural England and delivery through National Park Management Plan. |

6. Commitment to active partnership working with key stakeholders in the region to deliver the necessary open space, green infrastructure and site access management  

| CS3, CS7 | SE Plan CC8, SW Plan GI1 | Yes |

It has therefore been concluded that within the context of wider policies and controls, the submission Core Strategy provides adequate policy basis for the delivery of necessary mitigation for recreational effects. The mitigation can effectively control effects so that the conservation objectives are not compromised. As a result it is possible to conclude that the plan will not adversely affect the integrity of the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites in relation to increased recreational impacts.
5 Screenin g Statement and record of appropriate assessment

Based on the information given above, and current levels of knowledge of the sites and effects it is New Forest District Council’s considered opinion that the New Forest District Council Core Strategy submission policies, with the exception of recreational effects of CS 9, 10 and 11 do not require full appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations, because in themselves or in-combination they are unlikely to have a significant impact on the integrity of European sites.

This conclusion is reliant on consideration and inclusion of strategic avoidance and mitigation such as the delivery of green infrastructure as part of the assessment. Effective and timely delivery of mitigation is therefore key to the ability to reach this conclusion. New Forest District Council is committed to working with partners to ensure the necessary strategies are put in place, resources are made available and that their delivery is monitored. It is recommended that New Forest District Council work in partnership with others, including the PUSH partnership, the National Park Authority and other adjoining authorities, to ensure that necessary regional mitigation is delivered in addition to that required for effects stemming from its own policies.

Recreational effects of policies CS 9, 10 and 11 have been subjected to appropriate assessment as insufficient robust evidence was available at the time of screening to provide definitive evidence of the absence of significant effects, particularly in-combination with other growth in the south east and south west. The assessment has concluded that with delivery of the mitigation identified within the submission Core Strategy and other plans and strategies, the policies will not adversely affect the integrity of the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites alone and in-combination.

In order to reach this conclusion the following recommendations must be implemented through the Core Strategy and subsequent Development Plan Documents:

- Adequate protection of international sites from all direct and indirect effects of development, which would allow control of development if adverse effects were identified in the future, with particular reference to in-combination effects of visitor pressure

- Promotion of the role of green infrastructure and commitment to resourcing its delivery across a wide area (e.g. the PUSH area) to reduce in-combination effects (i.e. provision of new country parks or other informal open space attractions)

- Appropriate levels of open space provision within new development and addressing shortfalls in existing provision. In particular for development areas close to the
sites, measures to improve open space to avoid regular day visits such as dog walkers

- Management of the sites to address additional recreational pressures and the ability to secure resources from new development to contribute to this where necessary

- Measures to establish a partnership monitoring strategy for the interest features of the sites to inform management measures and trigger additional mitigation if required

- Commitment to active partnership working with key stakeholders in the region to deliver the necessary open space, green infrastructure and site access management measures

This opinion is subject to consultation with Natural England and other key stakeholders and the public and may be revised in light of any comments given, as well as any additional evidence such as recently commissioned research on coastal disturbance.
**APPENDIX 1**

**Record of advice from Natural England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Advice Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial advisory meeting - 19 July 2006</td>
<td>Establishing changes to Habitats Regulations and need for assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Inception Meeting - 12 Jan 2007</td>
<td>Developing HRA approach, best practise case studies. Need for integration os HRA with policy development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Liaison Meeting - 12 March 2007                                           | Scoping of sites
|                                                                                  | The need to consider airport expansion
|                                                                                  | Format of matrices
|                                                                                  | Relevant data |
| Stakeholder Workshop - 19 April 2007                                             | Additional information to be added to matrices |
| Draft Advisory Meeting                                                           | Formatting of matrices
|                                                                                  | Requirement to show consideration during iterative phases and demonstrate incorporation of mitigatory policies |
| Response to Draft Consultation meeting - 4 January 2008 (Rachel Green/Sarah Wiggins Natural England and representatives of RSPB) | Clarification required for employment impacts at coast, transport improvements and mitigation for recreational pressure, particularly in-combination effects with regional growth. |
| Dorset Heaths issues and South-west regional growth implications for recreational pressure mitigation - meeting 29 May (Nick Radford, Natural England SE team, Douglas Kite SW team, Christchurch Borough Council & New Forest District Council ) | Dorset contribution to visitor pressure on sites needs to be addressed. The current Interim strategy for the Dorset heaths may be offering mitigation (e.g. enhancements to open spaces) for some impacts on New Forest. A package of GI mitigation and New Forest site management may be sufficient to allow likely significant or adverse effects to be avoided. |
| Liaison with respect to recreational/visitor impact research - ongoing 2008, most recent advice Andy Gordon, Natural England | Evidence base provided by Footprint report suggests likely significant effects cannot be concluded due to risks and uncertainty. It may be possible to ascribe mitigation weight to recreational management of the sites and GI/Open space strategies. |
Natural England response to Preferred Options consultation

Dear Ms Evans,

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) – Preferred Options document, Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment

Thank you for your letter dated 26th October 2007 asking for Natural England's comments on the above documents. We have laid out our comments in turn for each of the three documents;

Core Strategy Development Plan Document – Preferred Options

Overall Natural England feels that this is a well put together and clear document we have some specific comments in relation to the various sections as laid out below and on the comment form enclosed.

Section 1 - Introduction – Gives a good and brief overview of the background and context of the DPD.

Section 2 - The Plan Area – 2.1 to 2.19 gives a good commentary of the main issues in the area, it would be useful if the possible consequences of each of the issues could have been drawn out in bold or underlined. We agree with how the tree areas are split up and are pleased to see the level of detail the environmental context of the three areas is given in the description. As the plan mentions several times due to the location and juxtaposition between rural and urban conurbations 2.24-2.29 the relationship and integration for implementation of policies between other plans will be key to the success of the New Forest District Council (NFDC) Local Development Framework (LDF).

Section 3 – National and Regional Context – It is our opinion that this is sufficient. We support recommendations in the South East Plan to “develop supportive land management policies within the zone of the “New Forest Communing Activity”, including protection of grazing land outside the National Park which is needed to support National Park purposes”, we will expect to see strong policies for implementation and mechanisms for protecting this resource.

Section 4 – Key Issues – We are please to see that environmental issues are being considered so fully in many of the Key Issues. We agree with the Key Issues Indicated. Just Key Issue 6, the contribution to the PUSH strategy it is our opinion that there should also mention how the PUSH strategy might have to think about the effects it is going to have on the New Forest area and should be working with NFDC and NF NPA to deliver any mitigation needed.

Section 5 – Vision Statement – We generally agree with the vision, 5.2 is very visionary however we feel that 5.3 needs to be improved. 5.3 should have the same vision for the environment within the NFDC as well as in the National Park, if the Core strategy is implemented fully the environment within the plan area should be healthier, better connected and more rigorously protected by 2026.

Section 5 – Strategy Objectives - We support and agree with the objectives of the plan, it gives a rounded approach to a sustainable future for the plan area, we are particularly pleased to see clear objectives on climate change, leisure and recreation, Biodiversity and Landscape, the countryside and travel. We would just comment that objective 8 should be more distinct between the areas within the plan area and the impacts on the adjoining National Park, it is our opinion that this could be done by putting a full stop after “in the Plan Area.” and then starting the next sentence “Also to avoid”. We think that table
5.9 very succinctly demonstrates the relationships between the key issues, objectives and core strategy policies.

Section 6 – Spatial Strategy

Section 6 – CS1 - agree

Section 6 – CS2 - agree

Section 6 – section (e) – 6.22 We would prefer if the wording said “afforded protection by statutory designations” rather than “affected by” in order that designations are not perceived by readers of the plan as a negative entity. It would probably be good to link to CS24 here so that people know this will be implemented through another policy and then through development control policies. Similarly sections 6.25 and 6.27 and those in sections g and l could mention the related spatial strategy policy outline further on in the document.

Section 6 – CS3 – We agree with the council’s decision to choose a refined option 3 for their preferred option, we support the way in which this was chosen using all the available assessments and balances all the requirements within the issues and constraints.

Section 6 – CS4 – Agree - This approach is safe if it is in keeping with CS3.

Section 6 – CS5 – Natural England currently disagrees with this outline policy – In the previous consultation about the now delayed employment sites DPD Natural England indicated that some of the sites now indicated in CS5 would need an appropriate Assessment, the current Habitats Regulations Assessment for the core strategy does not take this into account. This preferred outline policy cannot be taken forward and could make the whole plan unsound unless it can be concluded that there would be no likely significant effect from development for employment at these sites. (please find attached our previous comments about each of these sites)

Section 6 – CS6 – Agree – we strongly support the continuance of support for local shops and facilities in rural locations.

Section 6 – CS7 – Agree – we are particularly pleased that this development will be based around existing infrastructure and centres and that any proposals outside the current development envelopes would be subject to the most rigorous sequential tests.

Section 6 – CS8 – Agree – we will comment in more detail through the Sites and Designations Development Plan

Section 6 – CS9 - We agree with and support this approach

Section 6 – CS10 – We largely agree with this policy however before submission some of the implications of the proposals, so far undefined, will have to be assessed and restrictions or mitigation for the schemes in principal established. These preferred options are the improvements to A35 and A326, improvements to Hythe Ferry and improved access to the southern coastal towns. We do however strongly support the finalisation of the strategic cycle network and the need to mitigate for adverse traffic impacts on the New Forest National Park. We feel that better management of parking should also lead to better enforcement of fines and notices for those off road parking on sensitive areas.
Section – Local Implications – We are in full support of the plans recommendations to leave Dibden Bay as a strategic gap and concur with the findings and conclusions made by the NFDC’s Sustainability Appraisal.

Section 7 – Core Policies

Section 7 – CS11 – We agree and support the preferred option for this policy, we are especially pleased to see clear guidance on what should be expected in terms of standards relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Section 7 – CS12 – Agree - It is Natural England’s opinion that this is a particularly good policy outline, we strongly endorse the need for utilities companies to make decisions based on environmental sustainability as well as cost.

Section 7 – CS13 – Agree – for the coast and flood risk this is the key policy and we support the partnership approach to the Shoreline Management process. We concur that managed retreat is likely when sea defences are no longer economically viable. We would also advise that it is highly probable that replacement habitat in mitigation for continuing to maintain some sea defences along the NFDCs’ coastline will be necessary in the future where loss of habitat occurs from sea level rise. In relation to limiting new development in accordance with PPS25 Natural England strongly recommends that the NFDC make provision for specific development control policies that deal with existing structures and infrastructure that could be affected by sea level rise, for example we would advocate an agreed strategic approach to dealing with replacement Beach Huts as previous local plans had. This policy should also bear reference to the Catchment Flood Management Plan and Water Level Management Plans for the area.

Section 7 – CS14 – We have no remit to comment specifically however the wording for this outline policy is the least clear of all the policies and we are unsure as to the implications of implementing this so we agree but with caution.

Section 7 – CS15 – We agree with this outline policy, an important part of delivering a sustainable rural economy will be how this type of provision can link in with an support similar issues and policies within the National Park.

Section 7 – CS16 – We agree with this policy however individual schemes and proposals will be assessed on a site by site basis and this policy needs to be supported by a clear sites map DPD and development control policies DPD.

Section 7 – CS17 – Natural England strongly agrees with this policy in principal however we would recommend that the council has clear development control policies that allow for development built in exceptional circumstances to be controlled by strong conditions and 106 and often agricultural ties as has been the case in the past.

Section 7 – CS18 - We have no remit to comment specifically however proposals will be assessed on a site by site basis and this policy needs to be supported by a clear sites map DPD and development control policies DPD.

Section 7 – CS19 - We agree with this policy however individual schemes and proposals will be assessed on a site by site basis and this policy needs to be supported by a clear sites map DPD and development control policies DPD.
Section 7 – CS20 - Agree

Section 7 – CS21 - Agree

Section 7 – CS22 - We strongly support and agree with this outline policy however we would have expected to see specific mention of measures in line with the recommendations in the South East Plan to “develop supportive land management policies within the zone of the “New Forest Communing Activity”, including protection of grazing land outside the National Park which is needed to support National Park purposes”.

Section 7 – CS23 - We support the aims of this policy, some of the issues need further resolving at the sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations level, however these options are all in the right direction and we look forward to working on a number of them with the council.

Section 7 – CS24 – It is Natural England’s opinion that this preferred option is a very strong baseline from which we expect to see very strong supplementary planning documents and clear development control policies. Compared to other districts we are grateful that the NFDC has taken a robust approach to protecting and enhancing the environment within their area.

Section 7 – CS25 – We strongly support these principals, as is suggested in the preferred option, it is also our opinion that the best design to contribute to landscape and townscape and to preserve historic built heritage is achieved by implementing all the things highlighted in this policy outline at a local level specific to local needs.

Section 7 – CS26 - Currently disagree– This is a very important policy to enable the development of sustainable communities within the plan area and we are fully supportive of the councils overall objectives, we feel that the minimum standards are particularly good. We are currently unconvinced that the Habitats Regulations has assessed fully the implications of improving accessibility to the wider countryside, particularly along the coast, until this has been assessed fully this should not be taken forward. At earlier seminars it was mentioned that the how the needs and provisions would be met would be shown on the sites and designations DPD and there is no mention of this in the outline policy. It is also our opinion that just helping to produce a Green Infrastructure strategy with PUSH will not be enough, we will expect the policy to be stronger than this an will want to see clear mechanisms for implementation.

Section 7 – CS27 – Agree

Section 7 – CS28 – It is our opinion that this is a particularly good policy, we would be interested in the baseline referred to in 7.5.21 and recommend that this is taken into account in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

Section 8 – Developers Contributions – Agree – Natural England is very pleased to see this policy outline in the core strategy, we feel that the list in 8.4 truly reflects the needs of the area.

Section 9 – Implementation and monitoring - Agree

Sustainability Appraisal
It is Natural England’s opinion that this document has been well thought out and well prepared, we are satisfied that all our issues as highlighted in the scoping consultations in 2005 and 2006 have been taken into consideration. There is also considerable proof within the preferred options DPD that the Sustainability Appraisal has been used to inform the choices made. We hope that this document along with the HRA will continue to be used and be “live”, iterative documents that inform the rest of the LDF process.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

This is a very good first draft and we will be continuing to work with the NFDC to make sure that the findings and recommendations within the report are reflected in what goes forward for submission. The HRA now needs to be iterative and be updated with the changes that are made to the policy wording and inform any DPDs and SPDs that are produced. The NFDC also needs to make sure that it is working closely with the surrounding districts to manage any negative impacts from in combination effects. As well as the highlighted items above that have become clear through the preferred options there are other issues that will need to be addressed through the HRA before submission in order that the plan can be declared sound by Natural England. Natural England will obviously be working closely with the NFDC over the coming months to resolve these issues. The combined issues from the preferred options and incomplete data ongoing that need to be addresses are currently highlighted as follows;

- implications of improving accessibility to the wider countryside, particularly along the coast (CS26) needs to be assessed
- in combination effects of housing results from the recreation impact study work needed before no likely significant effect can be verified
- proposed improvements to A35 and A326 needs to be assessed
- proposed improvements to Hythe Ferry needs to be assessed
- improved road access to the southern coastal towns needs to be assessed
- some of the sites now indicated in CS5 would need to be fully assessed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment
- further assessment of water resources and waste water facility capacity may need to be confirmed by the Environment Agency
- closer scrutiny of the background air pollution and effects to designated sites needs following up at the next stage

Additional comments

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the New Forest District Council for working closely with Natural England on the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and housing options from a very early stage. We feel that this approach has helped greatly in increasing better understanding, helping the document be more sound and avoided any conflicts with the October 2005 Habitats
Regulations ruling. We are also grateful that the New Forest National Park allowed support and time for their ecologist to be very closely involved in the creation of the above assessments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss any of our comments further.

Rachel Green
SE Region
Government Team

DD: 02380286425
APPENDIX 2

Core Strategy submission policies

Policy CS1 Sustainable development principles

All new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protecting, and where possible enhancing, the environment within the Plan Area by:

(a) meeting most development needs within existing communities and, where appropriate to meet Core Strategy objectives, providing for some small developments adjoining the main towns and villages;

(b) ensuring a balanced mix of uses where development takes place in environmentally, socially and economically sustainable locations with a good range of services and facilities and is accessible by both car and other transport modes in order that reliance on the private car is minimised (as further developed in Policy CS24) (as further developed in Policies CS2 and CS24);

(c) minimising the risk of damage to areas of importance for nature conservation and/or landscape value, both directly and indirectly (as further developed in Policy CS3);

(d) ensuring building construction and other forms of development adheres to high environmental standards with particular regard to energy efficiency, water efficiency, use of sustainable materials and the minimisation of waste (as further developed in Policy CS4);

(e) ensuring communities are safe and feel safe, are well served by emergency services and the risks from potential hazards are minimised (as further developed in Policy CS5);

(f) avoiding the development of previously undeveloped land which is, or will be, at risk from flooding, and managing and reducing flood risk for development on previously developed land where continuing development has wider sustainability benefits to the community, or where there is no reasonable alternative site compatible with other sustainability considerations (as further developed in Policy CS6);

(g) ensuring accessibility to a good range of services and facilities, and not putting an unreasonable burden on existing infrastructure and services (as further developed in Policies CS7 and CS8);

In order to enable required development to take place, in some cases mitigation measures will be needed to address the impacts of new development on existing infrastructure and on nearby sensitive areas (e.g. international nature conservation designations.)

Policy CS2 Design quality

New development will be required to be well designed to respect the character, identity, and context of the area’s towns, villages and countryside.
All new development will be required to contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place, being appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and its relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape features, and shall not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shading, noise, light pollution or other adverse impact on local character and amenities.

New development will be required to:

(a) provide public and private spaces that are well-designed, safe, attractive, and complement the built form;

(b) be accessible to those with disabilities, and designed to minimise opportunities for anti-social and criminal behaviour;

(c) incorporate well integrated car parking, and pedestrian routes and, where appropriate, cycle routes and facilities; and

(d) provide appropriate green spaces and landscaping (see Policy CS7 below);

New buildings should be flexible to respond to future social, technological and economic needs.

All new buildings should be designed to meet sustainable building standards and utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDS) wherever practical.

New homes should be built to a standard capable of adaptation to enable people to remain in their homes in old age. All new homes constructed after 1st January 2013 (2011 for affordable housing) should be built to Lifetime homes standard.

**Policy CS3 Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation)**

Development proposals must protect and, where possible, enhance sites of recognised importance for nature and heritage conservation.

Working with local communities, features of local heritage value which contribute to local distinctiveness will be identified. New development proposals should maintain local distinctiveness and where possible enhance the character of identified features.

Measures will be taken, working with other partners, to secure the enhancement, restoration and creation of biodiversity, including measures to adapt to the consequences of climate change, so as to assist in achieving national, county and local biodiversity targets as set out in the Hampshire and New Forest Biodiversity Action Plans.

The special characteristics of the Plan Area’s natural and built environment will be protected and enhanced through:

(a) applying relevant national and regional policies;

(b) ensuring that new development protects and enhances local distinctiveness (see Policy CS1);
Policy CS4 Energy and resource use

High standards of energy efficiency and efficient water use in existing developments will be promoted wherever possible through retro-fitting.

All new development should be built to a standard which minimises the consumption of resources during construction and thereafter in its occupation and use.

New development will be required to:

(a) demonstrate high standards of energy efficiency;
(b) incorporate energy-efficient passive solar design principles wherever possible;

(c) maximise opportunities for the micro-generation of renewable energy. Renewable, low carbon and de-centralised energy will be encouraged in all development, and developments of more than 10 dwellings or 1000m² of non-residential floorspace will be required to provide at least 10% of their energy from these sources unless (having regard to the type of development involved and its design,) this is not feasible or viable.;

(d) use recycled materials in construction where possible;

(e) achieve a decrease of between 8% and 20% in water use (compared to the national average in 2005) for all new developments and help promote more efficient water use in existing developments and as set out in the South East Plan; and

(f) include sustainable urban drainage systems where feasible;

recognising that these measures may involve the use of innovative building design, styles and techniques.

New homes will be required to meet requirements in the Code for Sustainable Homes, achieving a minimum of Level 3 from 2010 to 2012, Level 4 from 2012 to 2016, and Level 6 from 2016, with particular emphasis on water efficiency.

New commercial buildings over 1000 sq. m. built before January 2012 should will be required to meet the BREEAM 'very good' standards up to 2012, and thereafter the BREEAM 'excellent' standards.

Local opportunities to contribute towards energy supply from renewable and low-carbon technologies will be facilitated where there is no over-riding adverse local impact.

Policy CS5 Safe and healthy communities

Development should not result in pollution or hazards which prejudice the health and safety of communities and their environments, including nature conservation interests and the water environment. Appropriate mitigation measures may be required to enable development.

Development in the vicinity of hazardous sites and uses, known to present risks to public health and safety, will be restricted to ensure that there are no unacceptable risks to people or to nature conservation or other environmental interests.

When the opportunity arises, particularly through development proposals, remedial measures will be taken to address existing problems of land contamination or air quality.

To reduce future threats to public safety, vulnerable development will not be permitted within the defined coastal erosion zone which runs along the cliff tops from the District boundary west of Barton-on-Sea to Milford on Sea.
Development will be planned, designed and managed to create environments in which people feel safe, reducing the fear of crime and opportunities for anti-social behaviour. Encouragement will be given to incorporation of Secured by Design principles in new development and in the design of public spaces. Particular attention will be given to creating places that:

(a) have well-defined routes, spaces and entrances that provide for convenient movement without compromising security;

(b) are structured so that different uses do not cause conflict;

(c) provide adequate surveillance of publicly accessible spaces;

(d) promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility and community;

(e) where appropriate, offer well designed security features giving physical protection;

(f) have a level of activity which is appropriate to the location and creates a reduced risk of crime and a sense of safety at all times; and

(g) are managed and maintained to discourage crime in the present and the future.

Policy CS6 Flood risk

Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk from flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Development should not worsen flood risk elsewhere.

Development may be permitted on previously-developed land within defined settlements which is at risk from flooding, provided:

(a) it is for uses which are not “Highly vulnerable” \(^{\text{xiii}}\);

(b) a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall;

(c) the scheme incorporates appropriate flood resilience and resistance measures;

(d) appropriate flood warning and evacuation plans are in place; and

(e) new site drainage systems are designed taking account of events which exceed the design standard.

Developer contributions may be required towards publicly-funded flood alleviation schemes.

A sustainable and practicable approach to coastal protection and flood defence for the built-up areas, to a level consistent with predicted sea level rise and increased river flows arising from climate change, will be

\(^{\text{xiii}}\) See Table D.2 Planning Policy Statement 25: Annex D
established. This will include identification of opportunities for managed retreat of the coastline where defence is no longer economic, or to provide for replacement habitats in mitigation for continuing to maintain some of the sea defences along the district's coastline.

Flood protection measures should minimise damage to nature conservation and biodiversity interests.

The use of surface materials which increase surface water run-off will be discouraged.

**Policy CS7 Open spaces, sport and recreation**

The aim is to provide, as a minimum standard, the equivalent of 3.5 hectares of public open space per 1000 population within the district's towns and larger villages. This provision will be supplemented by support for the community use of sports pitches on educational land and by private provision.

There will be a presumption against any development that involves the loss of a sport, recreation or play facility except where it can be demonstrated that alternative facilities of equal or better quality will be provided in an equally accessible location as part of the development.

Improvements will be made to enhance recreation, play and sports facilities within communities. Outdoor opportunities to improve the physical fitness of all age groups will be enhanced by providing accessible green spaces within our towns and villages, especially where new development takes place, and by creating safe environments for walking and cycling within and adjoining our towns and villages, where access is compatible with environmental designations.

The improvement of play, sports and other public open space provision will be implemented in the following ways:

(a) through the identification of new sites in other Development Plan Documents;
(b) through requiring all new residential developments to make provision for appropriately designed public open space, either through on site provision of new open space or by financial contribution to enhance or create off-site provision and management of public open space (based on a minimum level of provision of 3.5ha per 1000 population);
(c) through requiring all new residential developments on sites of 0.5ha or over to provide appropriately designed informal public open space on site and to include the provision of designed good quality play spaces;
(d) through giving priority to addressing the shortfall in the provision of play spaces designed for children's play and young people;
(e) by creating new designed play spaces for children and young people within existing informal open spaces;
(f) through the protection and improvement of existing facilities, including changes in open space management to address specific community needs;
(g) through securing more community use agreements with schools; and
through improving informal leisure opportunities created by green infrastructure within settlements.

New open space provision should contribute to wider open space objectives, including enhancing local biodiversity and healthy lifestyles.

Allocations will be made for additional provision of new allotment gardens, to meet local needs identified through community plans.

The Council will work with the Partnership for South Hampshire (PUSH), the National Park Authority and other local authorities to develop Green Infrastructure Strategies; and with landowners and local communities to preserve and enhance green infrastructure and green links between open spaces.

Policy CS8 Community services and infrastructure

New Forest District Council will work with service and infrastructure providers with the aim of ensuring the delivery of adequate infrastructure and services, as set out in the Delivery Plan (see Background Paper 34), to serve existing and proposed development in the plan area and support the local economy, ensuring that any adverse impacts arising are minimised, and that decisions on the provision of such infrastructure are taken on the basis of environmental sustainability as well as cost. Attention will be given to addressing the needs of areas of particular social deprivation.

Proposals for new and improved health care, education and social facilities that result in improvements in meeting the needs of the Plan Area’s population will be supported. These facilities should be well related to public transport infrastructure, and should provide high standards of accessibility to all sectors of the community. In rural communities and other areas with poor public transport, support will be given to innovative schemes to secure the local delivery of public services. Delivery of some services through the use of mobile services and technology will be encouraged where this results in better local provision.

There will be a presumption against any development that involves the loss of education, health, social and other publicly provided community services, except where it is part of a service provider’s plans to provide improved local services in equally accessible locations.

Suitable alternative uses, and environmental improvements, will be sought for major built infrastructure that has reached the end of its useful life (including Fawley Power Station if it should be decommissioned).

Policy CS9 Settlement hierarchy

The settlement hierarchy is defined as follows:

- Level 1 - Larger towns and service centres - Totton & Eling, Hythe & Dibden, Lymington and Pennington, New Milton and Barton on Sea, and Ringwood are the main towns with a wide range of employment, facilities and services. These are the most sustainable locations for most new development (consistent with maintaining and enhancing their character) in terms of access to local services and facilities.
• Level 2 - Small towns and employment centres - Fordingbridge is a smaller town with a limited range of services, and Marchwood has a significant employment base. Both settlements would be suitable locations to accommodate some new development, consistent with maintaining and enhancing their character.

• Level 3 – Defined villages - Ashford, Blackfield & Langley, Bransgore, Everton, Fawley, Hardley and Holbury, Hordle, Milford and Sandleheath provide a limited range of local services and may be appropriate for limited local development. These villages have been defined previously through Local Plans as “built-up areas” primarily because the nature and extent of built development suggests the potential for some further small scale development within them provided it is consistent with maintaining and enhancing their character. Most have access to local facilities and workplaces.

• Level 4 - Breamore, Damerham, Ellingham, Harbridge, Ibsley, Martin, Rockbourne, Sopley and Whitsbury are rural villages of a dispersed, rural nature, with limited access to facilities and workplaces. In these villages, which are not defined as “built-up areas”, but rather in terms of planning policy are considered as ‘countryside’ in this strategy, development will be limited to that which is appropriate to rural areas.

Policy CS10 The spatial strategy

The spatial strategy is to provide for sustainable development to help meet the needs of local communities and the local economy by:

(a) locating new residential development, (in accordance with the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy CS9) primarily within the towns and larger villages, and in doing so securing the provision of affordable housing which meets the local need, and ensuring it retains and enhances the settlement’s character in accordance with Policy CS2;

(b) securing the continued provision of a good range of community facilities and services and leisure facilities within the towns and villages, in accordance with Policy CS8, appropriate to their role in the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy CS9;

(c) ensuring that development is accessible by both car based and other transport modes whilst ensuring that any adverse impact of traffic and parking is minimised (as set out in Policy CS24).

(d) ensuring through development management and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures that the local impacts arising from developments are acceptable, whether on the local services and infrastructure or on sensitive areas of nature conservation value (as further developed in Policy CS25);

(e) providing for a minimum of 3,920 new dwellings within New Forest District between 2006 and 2026 through:

(i) the completion of existing permissions and allocations;
(ii) residential development within the defined towns and villages where it is consistent with maintaining and enhancing their character and quality of life and complies with the criteria in Policies CS1 and CS2;

(iii) the allocation of new greenfield sites for 250 dwellings as set out in Policy CS11.

(f) in addition, making additional provision for up to 850 dwellings within the Plan area (2006-2026) on sites adjoining the towns and larger villages that provide an exceptional contribution towards addressing identified local affordable housing needs (as set out in Policy CS12);

(g) meet the requirement for pitches for gypsy and travelling showpeople through Policy CS16;

(h) retaining existing employment and business sites and allocations for employment uses (as set out in Policy CS17);

(i) encouraging the intensification of the use of existing employment sites where possible, and the presence of knowledge-based industries (as set out in Policy CS17);

(j) having a flexible approach to small businesses (e.g. knowledge-based/design) which are compatible with adjoining land uses (as set out in Policy CS17);

(k) providing new opportunities for employment development in each of the three parts of the Plan Area, (as set out in Policy CS18);

(l) supporting the local tourism industries, as set out in Policy CS19;

(m) maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of centres within the Plan Area to support the following hierarchy of shopping centres (as set out in Policy CS20);

− Town centres: Lymington, New Milton, Ringwood and Totton, which will complement the larger regional/sub-regional centres by providing for bulk convenience food shopping and will provide a reasonable range and choice of comparison shopping facilities and other services;
− District centres: Hythe and Fordingbridge, which will complement the four main towns by catering for bulk convenience shopping and services, but will provide a more limited range of comparison shopping;
− Village and Local centres: the rest, which will serve small localised catchment areas – catering for basket and top-up shopping trips and provide some local services;

(n) securing the future of the rural area’s and countryside as set out in Policies CS20(f), CS21 and CS22;

(o) retaining and supporting the Green Belt (as illustrated on the Key Diagram, Fig. 1, Fig. 18 and Fig.19) in order to:

* check the sprawl of the built-up areas of Lymington, Hordle, Everton, Milford, New Milton, Bransgore and Ringwood and prevent these settlements from merging;
* safeguard the countryside and coast from encroachment by built development;
* preserve the setting of towns and villages, in particular the historic towns of Ringwood and Lymington.

Limited, small scale changes to the boundary of the Green Belt adjoining defined settlements will be considered in a review of the Green Belt inner boundary in a subsequent Development Plan Document. Boundary changes will be considered where
they are necessary to meet the local housing need or employment land needs which could not otherwise be met, as set out in Policies CS12 and CS18. This review will adopt a longer time horizon than the Plan period (2006-2026) and will look ahead to 2031 as required by the South East Plan.

(p) maintaining Local Gaps between the following settlements (as illustrated on the Key Diagram, Fig.16 and Fig. 19) in order to protect their setting and distinctiveness, to prevent coalescence and in the case of those between the Waterside settlements, to maintain valuable countryside links between the National Park and the coast of Southampton Water:

• Totton and Marchwood
• Marchwood and Hythe/ Dibden
• Hythe and Fawley
• Fordingbridge and Ashford
• Ashford and Sandleheath

The detailed boundaries of these gaps will be defined in a subsequent Development Plan Document, based on the existing defined gaps in the adopted Local Plan, but having regard to the development requirements of this Core Strategy;

(q) securing appropriate management and use of the coast and countryside. (See Policies CS1, CS3, CS6, CS7, CS17)

**Policy CS 11 New housing land allocations**

Provision will be made for new housing development in the latter part of the plan period, by the allocation of land previously reserved for residential development at:

a) Crow Lane, Ringwood, for 150 dwellings, (See Fig.20, Section 9) and

b) Durley Farm, Hounsdown, Totton for 100 dwellings, (See Fig. 17, Section 9).

These site allocations may be considered for development, in total or in part, earlier in the plan period if the requirements for affordable housing of Policy CS15(b) are complied with.

At least 50% of the dwellings will be for affordable housing, in accordance with Policy CS12. New areas of public open space, to the full standard set out in Policy CS7 will be provided on site and will include designed and equipped areas for children’s play. Site specific Transport Assessments will be required.

Crow Lane, Ringwood

- Access to the residential development should be via a new road linking to Embankment Way and should include provision of a segregated cycleway.
- The layout of development should be designed to incorporate a road which, in the longer term, is capable of forming part of a possible future new road linking Christchurch Road to the A31, passing through the site from southwest to northeast. This section of road should be completed to the site
boundaries to a timescale agreed with the local planning authority. Until the new road is completed from Christchurch Road to the A31, there should be no new vehicular access (except for buses, cycles and emergency vehicles) from this site to Crow Lane. The site layout should be designed to enable, in the longer term, development in this area to link directly into the new road linking Christchurch Road to the A31.

- The development should provide:
  - appropriate links for pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles from the site to nearby residential and employment areas; and
  - required traffic restriction measures in the Eastfield Lane/ Hightown Road area; and
  - appropriate funding of mitigation measures necessary to address traffic impact of the development on the A31 and the local road network.

- The development should incorporate design measures, including appropriate landscaping, to ensure compatibility between the development and adjoining uses (which includes employment development) and to safeguard residential amenity.

Durley Farm, Hounsdown, Totton

The site layout should:

- safeguard the nature conservation value of the SINC designated on part of the site;
- retain and protect existing trees and hedgerows within the site;
- provide for access by bicycle and on foot to the land to the east and for pedestrian, cycle and (if appropriate) general traffic access to the A35 Main Road to the west.
- incorporate design measures, including appropriate landscaping, to ensure compatibility between the development and adjoining uses and to safeguard residential amenity. Landscaping works will be required to the boundaries of the site with the Totton western bypass and with land to the west, in order to screen the development from the New Forest and protect new dwellings within the site from excessive traffic noise.

**Policy CS12 Possible additional housing development to meet a local housing need**

Additional sites will be identified adjoining the main towns and larger villages to allow for housing to specifically address identified local needs for affordable housing which will not otherwise be met. These sites will be identified through subsequent Development Plan Documents and working with local communities.

These sites could provide for:

(a) up to around 50 dwellings at Totton [in addition to the 100 dwellings proposed under Policy CS10(e)(iii)]

(b) up to around 150 dwellings at Marchwood

(c) up to around 50 dwellings at Hythe

(d) up to around 150 dwellings at Lymington

(e) up to around 150 dwellings at New Milton

(f) up to around 100 dwellings at Fordingbridge

(g) up to around 200 dwellings in total from small sites at the smaller defined villages provided from sites of:
- up to about 30 dwellings at each of Blackfield and Langley, Hardley and Holbury, Fawley, and Milford on Sea,
- up to around about 10 dwellings at each of Hordle, Everton, Bransgore, Ashford and Sandleheath

The total provision under this policy during the period 2006-2026 should not exceed around 850 dwellings.

Development permitted under this policy will be subject to the affordable housing contribution requirements set out in Policy CS15(b) below.

**Policy CS13 Housing types, sizes and tenure**

All new residential development should address the housing needs of local people by:

(a) maximising the provision of additional affordable housing within the overall provision of new residential development;

(b) ensuring new residential development includes housing suitable for newly forming local households;

(c) requiring dwellings, including small dwellings, to be designed to provide flexible accommodation which is capable of future adaptation; and

(d) providing additional family housing in the social-rented sector.

**Policy CS14 Affordable housing provision**

The Council’s housing target of providing 100 additional affordable dwellings per annum within New Forest District will be addressed by:

(a) requiring provision to be made for affordable housing as part of all new developments providing residential accommodation, subject to Policy CS15 below. Affordable housing provided will be integrated into the development and be indistinguishable from other development on the site.

(b) the District Council and Registered Social Landlords or approved Affordable Housing Providers continuing to develop sites which provide 100% affordable housing (primarily social rented housing), both within existing built-up areas and on exceptions sites.

(c) on suitable land in Council ownership within the defined towns and villages, maximising suitable opportunities to increase social–rented housing provision.

(d) encouraging other public sector land owners to review their land holdings with a view to making suitable sites available for affordable housing provision.
Policy CS15 Affordable housing contribution requirements from developments.

Private developments creating new dwellings will be required to contribute towards the provision of affordable house by making provision as set out below, under one of requirements (a) to (d). Affordable housing provision will not be required where the development is:

- a single replacement dwelling
- an agricultural/forestry workers dwelling or commoners’ dwelling (but the removal of an occupancy condition will require an affordable housing contribution)
- the conversion or subdivision (without significant extension) of an existing dwelling
- a residential redevelopment scheme for 4 or less dwellings, involving the demolition of at least 1 dwelling, and where the site size is smaller than 0.1 hectare.

(a) On greenfield housing site allocations (except for those covered by (b) below) the target is 50% affordable housing, of which 35% of the total dwellings will be social rented housing and 15% of the total dwellings will be intermediate housing. At least 50% of the affordable dwellings provided should be family housing.

(b) On greenfield housing sites released specifically to meet an identified local need for affordable housing which will not otherwise be met [under Policy CS12], the target will be a minimum of 70% affordable housing. The development should provide a minimum of 40% social rented housing and 30% intermediate affordable housing. The remainder of the site may be developed for low-cost market housing which could include starter homes and self-build units. At least 50% of the affordable dwellings provided should be family housing.

(c) Within the defined settlements of Lymington, Everton, Hordle and Milford on Sea and Bransgore, the target is for 50% of all new dwellings on the site to be affordable housing, of which 35% of the total dwellings will be social rented housing and 15% of the total dwellings will be intermediate housing.

(d) Within the other defined towns and villages xix, the target is for 40% of all new dwellings to be affordable housing, of which 25% of the total dwellings will be social rented housing and 15% of the total dwellings will be intermediate housing.

Provision will normally be made on site. The affordable housing should reflect the type and size of the development as a whole, and should include family housing if that is provided as part or all of the market provision.

Where it can be demonstrated that provision of the target level of social rented and/or intermediate affordable housing is not economically viable the Council will seek to maximise the potential for affordable

---

xx Totton, Marchwood, Hythe and Dibden, Hardley and Holbury, Blackfield and Langley, New Milton, Ringwood, Fordingbridge, Sandleheath, Ashford
housing contributions from that development by allowing a higher proportion of intermediate housing to be provided to meet the overall affordable housing target.

In the following circumstance the affordable housing contribution may be made by payment of a fixed affordable housing contribution/tariff rather than on site provision. This will be additional to any other planning charges or tariffs (including Community Infrastructure Levy) required by the development.

- On developments of 4 or less dwellings in the defined built-up areas of Totton, Hythe, Lymington, New Milton and Ringwood;
- On developments of 1 or 2 dwellings in all other defined settlements.
- Where the proposed development is a care home.

The contributions will be used to enable additional affordable housing provision on alternative sites, or to subsidise the provision of social rented housing on sites where social rented housing cannot be achieved without public subsidy.

In settlements where the site size threshold for affordable housing provision had previously been set at 15 or more dwellings**, on developments of 14 or fewer dwellings, the above affordable housing contributions will be applied subject to a 50% discount in the affordable housing provision required until 31 December 2010.

Policy CS16 Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople

The Council will work with neighbouring local authorities, the National Park Authority, Hampshire County Council, local communities, Hampshire Constabulary, and other stakeholders to ensure that the identified need for pitch provision (both permanent and transitory) for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, for this part of Hampshire are met. The need is being identified through a partial review of the South East Plan.

The following considerations will be taken into account in the determination of locations for gypsy, traveller and showpeople sites:

1. The impact on landscape character and/or sites/areas of nature conservation value.
2. The site should be well located on the highway network and provide safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and adequate parking, and not result in a level of traffic generation which is inappropriate for roads in the area.
3. The site must provide adequate on site facilities for parking, storage, play and residential amenity (including basic essential services).
4. In the case of permanent sites, there should be reasonable and convenient access to schools, medical services, shops and other community facilities.
5. The site should not be visually intrusive nor detrimental to amenities of adjacent occupiers.

** Totton, Marchwood, Hythe and Dibden, Hardley and Holbury, Blackfield and Langley, Lymington, Hordle, New Milton, Milford on Sea, Ringwood, Fordingbridge
6. Adequate levels of privacy and residential amenity for occupiers should be provided.

**Policy CS17 Employment and economic development**

The strategy is to:

(a) encourage a greater presence of high value and knowledge-based businesses in the Plan Area;

(b) encourage small-scale and start-up businesses including through the provision of additional managed workspace\(^{xxi}\);

(c) encourage the redevelopment and intensification of existing employment sites, particularly those sites located within the main towns and those with good access by a variety of transport modes;

(d) keep all existing employment sites\(^{xxii}\) and allocations for employment use (including the sites listed in Fig.13 above), except for the few small sites identified for release in the Employment Land Review, and provide for new employment land allocations as set out in Policy CS18;

(e) encourage and make provision for office development within the town centres where this is appropriate to the scale and role of the centres in the settlement hierarchy;

(f) support visitor-based service sector jobs and the local tourism industry as set out in Policy CS19;

(g) identify and protect opportunities suitable for marine-related business;

(h) improve workforce skills by:
   - working with local education and skills agencies, and local business organisations to establish training facilities to enhance workforce skills
   - encouraging the provision of new training facilities on employment sites

(i) encourage flexible working by:
   - encouraging home-working where there is no adverse impact on residential amenities and as part of Green Travel Plans associated with new employment development
   - allowing the development of live-work units on residential and mixed use sites subject to the retention of the employment element and safeguarding of residential amenities
   - allowing the development of child care facilities on suitable employment sites.

**Policy CS18 New provision for industrial and office development and related uses**

The strategy is to make new provision for industrial and office development, and related uses, by:

\(^{xxi}\) A managed workspace is a property development which provides serviced premises from which small businesses can trade. The core shared services that they are likely to provide include: office management, central reception, supply of equipment and security.

\(^{xxii}\) Employment sites can include sui-generis land uses where there is employment and business activity.
(a) making provision for new employment sites, for development over the 2006-2026 period:

   (i) adjoining Totton (up to around 5 hectares);

   (ii) east of Caird Avenue New Milton, (up to around 5 hectares);

   (iii) west of Crow Lane Ringwood (up to around 5 hectares, including the existing reserve site of 3 hectares) (See also Policy CS11 and Fig.20).

(b) making provision for new employment floorspace by identifying sites in subsequent Development Plan Documents:

   (i) within town centres and on other suitable sites for offices to meet local requirements;

   (ii) specifically, to provide for an additional 16,000 sq. metres of office floorspace in Totton and the Waterside, to meet the South Hampshire PUSH requirement for the Plan area;

   (iii) specifically to provide for an additional 10,000 sq. metres of warehousing floorspace on existing employment sites through the redevelopment and intensification of sites currently used for open storage and low-density employment uses at Totton and Marchwood, to meet the South Hampshire PUSH requirement for the Plan area.

In particular

(c) the South Hampshire sub-regional requirement for the eastern part of the Plan Area will make an important contribution to the regeneration of Totton town centre;

(d) encouragement will be given to the redevelopment and intensification of existing low density, underused or poor quality employment sites where suitable for higher-value employment uses, particularly within the towns and villages;

(e) sites suitable for the provision of managed workspace will be identified in Lymington and Ringwood; and

(f) sites suitable to accommodate marine industries will be identified.

Policy CS19 Tourism

The strategy is to support the local tourism industry by:

(a) encouraging tourism and provision for visitors which is appropriate to the district’s settlements and countryside and consistent with environmental objectives;

(b) retaining and enhancing existing serviced accommodation and supporting the provision of new serviced accommodation in towns and villages;

(c) maintaining and enhancing existing tourist and visitor facilities;
(d) supporting new tourist provision and initiatives in towns and villages, and in the countryside through the reuse of existing buildings or as part of farm diversification, particularly where these would also benefit local communities and support the local economy;

(d) supporting measures within the plan area which would relieve tourist pressures on the most sensitive areas of the New Forest National Park and which would protect and enhance vulnerable habitats and landscapes;

(e) enhancing the visitor appeal of coastal environments and the coastal settlements of Barton, Milford, Lymington, Hythe and Eling. Improve the quality of recreational opportunities and managed access to the coast where this would be consistent with the protection of nature conservation interests;

(f) continuing to support the development and promotion of New Forest Marque produce;

(g) supporting car-free tourism initiatives that benefit tourists and local communities.

**Policy CS20 Town, District, Village and Local Centres**

The strategy is to:

(a) Create safe, attractive and accessible town and district centres, providing a good range of shopping, food and drink uses, services, offices, and entertainment and leisure facilities, and high quality public spaces.

(b) Protect the primary retailing role of the defined primary shopping areas in town and district centres, within the context of maintaining a broader mix of uses, including service, office, entertainment, leisure uses, and appropriate visitor facilities within town and district centres. Within the primary shopping areas there will be a presumption against the loss premises in an A1 retail use, except where it can be demonstrated that an alternative use proposed would be complementary to the retailing function and would enhance the overall vitality of the centre.

(c) Maintain active ground floor frontages, within town centres, district centres and local centres with appropriate town centre uses.

(d) Strengthen the vitality and viability and enhance consumer choice in town and district centres by making provision for additional retail floorspace consistent with their scale and function, as set out below:
Proposed distribution of additional retail floorspace 2005-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Large Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350sq.m</td>
<td>1700sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350sq.m</td>
<td>800sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymington</td>
<td>850sq.m</td>
<td>2200sq.m</td>
<td>2000sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Milton</td>
<td>850sq.m</td>
<td>1500sq.m</td>
<td>1300sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1400sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordingbridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600sq.m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Require major shopping, commercial or service development (including large extensions to existing stores) outside the four town centres and two district centres to comply with the sequential approach to site selection which prioritises development in existing centres, then edge-of-centre sites, and only then out-of-centre sites which are accessible by a choice of means of transport. There will be a requirement demonstrate that the proposed development will have no unacceptable impact including cumulative impact on existing centres.

(f) Within Village and Local Centres, ensure active ground floor frontages are maintained and permit new retail and other commercial, service and leisure uses that help meet the day to day needs of the local community and are of a scale appropriate to the role of the centre in the shopping hierarchy and proportionate to its size.

Policy CS21 Rural economy

The strategy for the rural economy is to:

(a) encourage agricultural, horticultural and forestry enterprises and farm diversification projects where this would be consistent with maintaining and enhancing the environment, and contribute to local distinctiveness;

(b) keep existing employment sites, and encourage improvements and redevelopments that will help maintain and enhance the environment, and contribute to local distinctiveness;

(c) allow small scale-built development for employment purposes in rural settlements (CS9, Level 3 settlements);
(d) support local business development through the conversion of existing buildings, with particular encouragement of enterprises that have little adverse environmental impacts (e.g. design/research activities);

(e) support the local delivery of services and the retention of local shops and pubs;

(f) work with the New Forest National Park Authority and other neighbouring authorities to protect essential back-up grazing land to support commoning; and

(g) allow developments essential to support a rural workforce, including agricultural workers dwellings and rural community facilities.

Policy CS22 Affordable housing for rural communities

New residential development will only be permitted in rural areas (i.e. beyond that provided for within the defined towns and villages, or in Policy CS12 as allocated small extensions to towns and larger villages) where it is for small scale affordable housing developments (as defined in Annex B of PPS3,) developed to meet the identified needs of local people unable to meet their housing needs in the housing market.

Suitable sites will be located within or adjoining an (undefined) village which either provides a range of local services and facilities, or has good accessibility to larger settlements nearby which provide a wider range of services and facilities. Sites particularly suitable to address a community’s need for affordable housing may be allocated for that purpose. The District Council will work with local communities to identify suitable sites, which may also be identified through Parish Plans.

Sites developed under this policy will be subject to controls on the occupancy of the housing provided to ensure it continues to provide affordable homes which address local housing needs in perpetuity.

Policy CS23 Strategic transport proposals

The strategy is to support improvements that reduce congestion, improve accessibility and improve road safety including the strategic transport proposals set out in the table below, providing they can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment and communities.

High priorities for improvement are:

(a) A31 Ringwood area;

(b) A35 east of A326 (in particular, capacity improvements on A35 Rushington – Millbrook, including bus priorities);

(c) A326 (in particular, capacity improvements including bus priorities on A326 between Dibden and Totton Western Bypass)

The Council will seek improvements to public transport provision in the plan area by:
(e) giving support to infrastructure and other improvements which increase scope for public transport services, unless there are overriding environmental objections;

(f) supporting improvements to public transport interchanges and facilities in Town and District Centres. Existing provision at Hythe Ferry Head, Ringwood Meeting House Lane Interchange, and Lymington High Street Bus Station will be maintained unless alternative improved facilities for users and bus and coach operators are provided.

(g) seeking the reinstatement of passenger services on the Waterside branch railway, safeguarding land for the provision of new passenger railway stations on the Waterside branch railway, together with associated works and facilities, including pedestrian and cycle links at:

- Jacob’s Gutter Lane, Hounsdown
- Plantation Drive, Marchwood
- New Road car park (Southern end) Hythe; and

(h) keeping the safeguarding for a new railway station at Bartley Park, West Totton.

**Policy CS24 Local transport considerations**

The spatial strategy seeks to promote improvements in the quality and sustainability of local transport infrastructure in the following ways.

To minimise the impact of new development on the existing transport infrastructure, where appropriate, development proposals will be required to:

(a) include a range of appropriate mitigating transport measures, particularly aimed at improving accessibility by non-car modes and reducing the adverse impact of traffic;

(b) ensure that adequate lorry access routes are available and suitable;

(c) ensure necessary transport improvements are addressed prior to development;

(d) produce and implement Transport Assessments and Site Travel Plans, as appropriate.

New land allocations should be in locations where good pedestrian routes can be provided to the town or local centre. Where appropriate the development shall make provision for improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes running alongside or through the site.

Walking and cycling will be promoted by:

- Safeguarding land for improvements to pedestrian and cycle networks.
- Ensuring all development has safe and convenient links to:
  - existing pedestrian and cycle routes
  - proposed pedestrian and cycle routes including those on adjacent developments

Contributions will be sought to improve local pedestrian and cycle routes and assist public transport to improve accessibility by non-car modes.

Development proposals will be assessed in relation to the Council’s published parking standards. These set out the maximum provision to be made for different types of development proposals.
Management measures will ensure town centre car parks are used efficiently and effectively, and in the interests of maintaining the vitality of the town centre.

Measures to improve pedestrian and road safety will be supported, including by ensuring new development accords with Government and Highway Authority design guidance related to road safety.

Policy CS25 Developers’ contributions

Development proposals will be required, through planning contributions, to meet the reasonable costs of on-site and off-site new infrastructure required to support the development, including the mitigation of the impact of cumulative developments on existing community interests.

Where the provision or improvement of infrastructure or other works or facilities is needed to meet community or environmental needs associated with new development or to mitigate the impact of development on the environment or existing communities, standard charges and/or standard formulae as appropriate will be imposed for the payment of financial contributions towards such infrastructure, works or facilities to ensure that all such development makes an appropriate and reasonable contribution to the costs of provision.

The requirement to pay the standard charges and/or standard formulae might be re-assessed and modified where appropriate, in cases where actual provision of infrastructure, works or facilities normally covered by standard charges is provided as part of the development proposal.

The planning contributions will need to provide for maintenance.

The mechanism by which developers’ contributions are achieved will be reviewed in the light of changes in national policy. Tariff-based approaches and, subject to legislation, the Community Infrastructure Levy will be considered where this would simplify procedures and better ensure the provision of necessary social, physical and green infrastructure.
APPENDIX 3: European Site Descriptions

Southampton and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC

The Solent on the south coast of England encompasses a series of Coastal lagoons, including percolation, isolated and sluiced lagoons. The site includes a number of lagoons in the marshes in the Keyhaven ? Pennington area, at Farlington Marshes in Chichester Harbour, behind the sea-wall at Bembridge Harbour and at Gilkicker, near Gosport. The lagoons show a range of salinities and substrates, ranging from soft mud to muddy sand with a high proportion of shingle, which support a diverse fauna including large populations of three notable species: the nationally rare foxtail stonewort Lamprothamnium papulosum, the nationally scarce lagoon sand shrimp Gammarus insensibilis, and the nationally scarce starlet sea anemone Nematostella vectensis. The lagoons in Keyhaven ? Pennington Marshes are part of a network of ditches and ponds within the saltmarsh behind a sea-wall. Farlington Marshes is an isolated lagoon in marsh pasture that, although separated from the sea by a sea-wall, receives sea water during spring tides. The lagoon holds a well-developed low-medium salinity insect-dominated fauna. Gilkicker Lagoon is a sluiced lagoon with marked seasonal salinity fluctuation and supports a high species diversity. The lagoons at Bembridge Harbour have formed in a depression behind the sea-wall and sea water enters by percolation. Species diversity in these lagoons is high and the fauna includes very high densities of N. vectensis.

Solent Maritime SAC

The Solent encompasses a major estuarine system on the south coast of England with four coastal plain estuaries (Yar, Medina, King's Quay Shore, Hamble) and four bar-built estuaries (Newtown Harbour, Beaulieu, Langstone Harbour, Chichester Harbour). The site is the only one in the series to contain more than one physiographic sub-type of estuary and is the only cluster site. The Solent and its inlets are unique in Britain and Europe for their hydrographic regime of four tides each day, and for the complexity of the marine and estuarine habitats present within the area. Sediment habitats within the estuaries include extensive estuarine flats, often with intertidal areas supporting eelgrass Zostera spp. and green algae, sand and shingle spits, and natural shoreline transitions. The mudflats range from low and variable salinity in the upper reaches of the estuaries to very sheltered almost fully marine muds in Chichester and Langstone Harbours. Unusual features include the presence of very rare sponges in the Yar estuary and a sandy ?reef? of the polychaete Sabellaria spinulosa on the steep eastern side of the entrance to Chichester Harbour.

Solent Maritime is the only site for smooth cord-grass Spartina alterniflora in the UK and is one of only two sites where significant amounts of small cord-grass S. maritima are found. It is also one of the few remaining sites for Townsend's cord-grass S. x townsendii and holds extensive areas of common cord-grass Spartina anglica, all four taxa thus occurring here in close proximity. It has additional historical and scientific interest as the site where S. alterniflora was first recorded in the UK (1829) and where S. x townsendii and, later, S. anglica first occurred.

The Solent contains the second-largest aggregation of Atlantic salt meadows in south and south-west England. Solent Maritime is a composite site composed of a large number of separate areas of saltmarsh. In contrast to the Severn estuary, the salt meadows at this site are notable as being representative of the ungrazed type and support a different range of communities dominated by sea-purslane Atriplex portulacoides, common sea-lavender Limonium vulgare and thrift Armeria maritima.
As a whole the site is less truncated by man-made features than other parts of the south coast and shows rare and unusual transitions to freshwater reedswamp and alluvial woodland as well as coastal grassland. Typical Atlantic salt meadow is still widespread in this site, despite a long history of colonisation by cord-grass Spartina spp.

**Solent and Southampton Water SPA**

The Solent and Southampton Water are located on the south English coast. The area covered extends from Hurst Spit to Hill Head along the south coast of Hampshire, and from Yarmouth to Whitecliff Bay along the north coast of the Isle of Wight. The site comprises a series of estuaries and harbours with extensive mud-flats and saltmarshes together with adjacent coastal habitats including saline lagoons, shingle beaches, reedbeds, damp woodland and grazing marsh. The mud-flats support beds of Enteromorpha spp. and Zostera spp. and have a rich invertebrate fauna that forms the food resource for the estuarine birds. In summer, the site is of importance for breeding seabirds, including gulls and four species of terns. In winter, the SPA holds a large and diverse assemblage of waterbirds, including geese, ducks and waders. Dark-bellied Brent Goose Branta b. bernicla also feed in surrounding areas of agricultural land outside the SPA.

**Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar**

The area covered extends from Hurst Spit to Gillicker Point along the south coast of Hampshire and along the north coast of the Isle of Wight. The site comprises of estuaries and adjacent coastal habitats including intertidal flats, saline lagoons, shingle beaches, saltmarsh, reedbeds, damp woodland, and grazing marsh. The diversity of habitats support internationally important numbers of wintering waterfowl, important breeding gull and tern populations and an important assemblage of rare invertebrates and plants.

The estuaries and harbours of the Solent are particularly sheltered and form the largest number and tightest cluster of small estuaries anywhere in Great Britain. The Solent and Isle of Wight system is notable for its large range and extent of different habitats.

The intertidal area is predominantly sedimentary in nature with extensive intertidal mud and sandflats within the sheltered harbours and areas of gravel and pebble sediments on more exposed beaches. These conditions combine to favour an abundant benthic fauna and green algae which support high densities of migrant and over-wintering wildfowl and waders. Eelgrass Zostera beds occur discontinuously along the north shore of the Isle of Wight and in a few places along the northern shore of The Solent.

The Solent system supports a wide range of saltmarsh communities. Upper saltmarshes are dominated by sea purslane Atriplex portulacoides, sea plantain Plantago maritima, sea meadow grass Puccinellia maritima and sea lavender Limonium vulgare; locally thrift Armeria maritima and the nationally scarce golden samphire Inula crithmoides are abundant. Lower saltmarsh vegetation tends to be dominated by sea purslane, cord grass Spartina spp., glasswort Salicornia spp. and sea-blite Suaeda maritima. Cord-grasses dominate much of the saltmarsh in Southampton Water and in parts of the Solent and it was the original location of the introduction of Spartina alterniflora and subsequent hybridisation with the
native species.

There are several shingle spits including Hurst spit, Needs Ore Point, Calshot spit and Newtown Harbour spits which support a characteristic shingle flora.

A range of grassland types lie inshore of the intertidal zone including unimproved species-rich neutral and calcareous grasslands, brackish grazing marsh systems and reed dominated freshwater marshes.

The brackish water lagoons associated with grazing marsh systems behind the seawalls, e.g. Keyhaven-Lymington, Gilkicker lagoon, and at Brading Marshes contain internationally important communities of rare and endangered invertebrates and plants.

New Forest SAC

Hatchet Pond in the New Forest in the south of England is in fact three ponds, one of which is an example of an oligotrophic waterbody amidst wet and dry lowland heath developed over fluvial deposits. It contains shoreweed Littorella uniflora and isolated populations of northern species such as bog orchid Hammarbya paludos and floating bur-reed Sparganium angustifolium, alongside rare southern species such as Hampshire-purslane Ludwigia palustris. Hatchet Pond is therefore important as a southern example of this lake type where northern species, more common in the uplands of the UK, co-exist with southern species.

In the New Forest vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or of the Iso?to-Nanojuncetea occurs on the edge of large temporary ponds, shallow ephemeral pools and poached damp hollows in grassland, which support a number of specialist species in a zone with toad rush Juncus bufonius. These include the two nationally scarce species coral-necklace Illecebrum verticillatum and yellow centaury Cicendia filiformis, often in association with allseed Radiola linoides and chaffweed Anagallis minima. Heavy grazing pressure is of prime importance in the maintenance of the outstanding flora of these temporary pond communities. Livestock maintain an open habitat, controlling scrub ingress, and trampling the surface. Commoners? animals also transport seed in their hooves widely from pond to pond where suitable habitat exists. Temporary ponds occur throughout the Forest in depressions capable of holding water for part of the year. Most ponds are small (between 5-10 m across) and, although great in number, amount to less than 10 ha in total area.

The New Forest contains the most extensive stands of lowland northern Atlantic wet heaths in southern England, mainly of the M16 Erica tetralix ? Sphagnum compactum type. M14 Schoenus nigricans ? Narthecium ossifragum mire is also found on this site. The wet heaths are important for rare plants, such as marsh gentian Gentiana pneumonanthe and marsh clubmoss Lycopodiella inundata, and a number of dragonfly species, including the scarce blue-tailed damselfly Ischnura pumilio and small red damselfly Ceriagrion tenellum. There is a wide range of transitions between wet heath and other habitats, including dry heath, various woodland types, Molinia grasslands, fen, and acid grassland. Wet heaths enriched by bog myrtle Myrica gale are a prominent feature of many areas of the Forest. Unlike much lowland heath, the New Forest heaths continue to be extensively grazed by cattle and horses, favouring species with low competitive ability.
The New Forest represents European dry heaths in southern England and is the largest area of lowland heathland in the UK. It is particularly important for the diversity of its habitats and the range of rare and scarce species which it supports. The New Forest is unusual because of its long history of grazing in a traditional fashion by ponies and cattle. The dry heaths of the New Forest are of the H2 Calluna vulgaris ? Ulex minor heath type, and H3 Ulex minor ? Agrostis curtisii heath is found on damper areas. There are a wide range of transitions between dry heath and wet heath, Molinia grassland, fen, acid grassland and various types of scrub and woodland. Both the New Forest and the two Dorset Heath SACs are in southern England. All three areas are selected because together they contain a high proportion of all the lowland European dry heaths in the UK. There are, however, significant differences in the ecology of the two areas, associated with more oceanic conditions in Dorset and the continuous history of grazing in the New Forest.

The New Forest represents Molinia meadows in southern England. The site supports a large area of the heathy form of M24 Molinia caerulea & Cirsium dissectum fen-meadow. This vegetation occurs in situations of heavy grazing by ponies and cattle in areas known locally as ?lawns?, often in a fine-scale mosaic with Northern Atlantic wet heaths and other mire and grassland communities. These lawns occur on flushed soils on slopes and on level terrain on the floodplains of rivers and streams. The New Forest Molinia meadows are unusual in the UK in terms of their species composition, management and landscape position. The grasslands are species-rich, and a particular feature is the abundance of small sedges such as carnation sedge Carex panicea, common sedge C. nigra and yellow-sedge C. viridula ssp. oedocarpa, and the more frequent occurrence of mat-grass Nardus stricta and petty whin Genista anglica compared to stands elsewhere in the UK.

The New Forest, one of three sites selected in southern England, is considered to hold the largest area in England of Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion, in complex habitat mosaics associated primarily with the extensive valley bogs of this site. The habitat type is developed in three situations: in natural bog pools of patterned bog surfaces, in flushes on the margins of valley mires and in areas disturbed by peat-digging, footpaths, tracks, ditches etc. In places the habitat type is rich in brown mosses Cratoneuron spp. and Scorpidium scorpioides, suggesting flushing by mineral-rich waters. The mosaics in which this habitat type occurs are an important location for bog orchid Hammarbya paludosa.

The New Forest is the largest area of mature, semi-natural beech Fagus sylvatica woodland in Britain and represents Atlantic acidophilous beech forests in the most southerly part of the habitat's UK range. The mosaic with other types of woodland and heath has allowed unique and varied assemblages of epiphytic lichens and saproxylic invertebrates to be sustained, particularly in situations where the woodland is open and the tree trunks receive plenty of light. The traditional common grazing in the Forest by cattle and ponies provides opportunities to explore the impact of large herbivores on the woodland system.

The New Forest is the largest area of mature, semi-natural beech Fagus sylvatica woodland in Britain; much of it is a form of W14 Fagus sylvatica ? Rubus fruticosus woodland that conforms to the Annex I type Asperulo-Fagetum beech forests. The mosaic with other types of woodland and heath has allowed unique and varied assemblages of epiphytic lichens and saproxylic invertebrates to be sustained, particularly in situations where the woodlands are open and the tree trunks receive plenty of light. The traditional common grazing in the Forest by cattle and ponies provides opportunities to explore the impact of large herbivores on the woodland system.
The New Forest is representative of old acidophilous oak woods in the southern part of its UK range. It is the most extensive area of active wood-pasture with old oak Quercus spp. and beech Fagus sylvatica in north-west Europe and has outstanding invertebrate and lichen populations. This site was preferred over other sites that lack a succession of age-classes because, although scattered over a wide area, the oak stands are found within a predominantly semi-natural landscape with a more balanced age-structure of trees. The traditional common grazing in the Forest by cattle and ponies provides opportunities to explore the impact of large herbivores on the woodland system. The New Forest has been identified as of potential international importance for its saproxylic invertebrate fauna by the Council of Europe (Speight 1989).

Within the New Forest, in southern England, birch ? willow Betula ? Salix stands occur over valley bog vegetation, with fringing alder Alnus ? Sphagnum stands where there is some water movement. These stands appear to have persisted for long periods in stable association with the underlying Sphagnum bog-moss communities. The rich epiphytic lichen communities and pollen record provide evidence for the persistence of this association. The Bog woodland occurs in association with a range of other habitats for which the site has also been selected.

The New Forest contains many streams and some small rivers that are less affected by drainage and canalisation than those in any other comparable area in the lowlands of England. Associated with many of the streams, particularly those with alkaline and neutral groundwater, are strips of alder Alnus glutinosa woodland which, collectively, form an extensive resource with a rich flora. In places there are examples of transitions from open water through reedswamp and fen to alder woodland. The small rivers show natural meanders and debris dams, features that are otherwise rare in the lowlands, with fragmentary ash Fraxinus excelsior stands as well as the alder strips. In other places there are transitions to Old acidophilous oak woods with Quercus robur on sandy plains and Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion), for which this site has also been selected.

The New Forest in central southern England is an outstanding locality for southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale, with several population centres and strong populations estimated to be in the hundreds or thousands of individuals and with a long history of records. With Preseli, Dorset Heaths and the River Itchen, it represents one of the four major population centres in the UK.

The New Forest represents stag beetle Lucanus cervus in its Hampshire/Sussex population centre, and is a major stronghold for the species in the UK. The forest is one of the most important sites in the UK for fauna associated with rotting wood, and was identified as of potential international importance for its saproxylic invertebrate fauna by the Council of Europe (Speight 1989).

New Forest SPA

The New Forest is located in southern Hampshire, west of the Solent in southern England. It comprises a complex mosaic of habitats overlying mainly nutrient-poor soils over plateau gravels. The major components are the extensive wet and dry heaths with their rich valley mires and associated wet and dry grasslands, the ancient pasture woodlands and inclosure woodlands, the network of clean rivers and streams, and frequent permanent and temporary ponds. The area supports important populations of breeding birds associated with such habitats, including Nightjar Caprimulgus europaeus, Woodlark
Lullula arborea and Dartford Warbler Sylvia undata. Breeding Honey Buzzard Pernis apivorus and wintering Hen Harriers Circus cyaneus are also notable.

**New Forest Ramsar**

The New Forest is an area of semi-natural vegetation including valley mires, fens and wet heath within catchments whose uncultivated and undeveloped state buffer the mires against adverse ecological change. The habitats present are of high ecological quality and diversity with undisturbed transition zones.

The suite of mires is regarded as the *locus classicus* of this type of mire in Britain. Other wetland habitats include numerous ponds of varying size and water chemistry including several ephemeral ponds and a network of small streams mainly acidic in character which have no lowland equivalent in the UK. The plant communities in the numerous valleys and seepage step mires show considerable variation, being affected especially by the nutrient content of groundwater. In the most nutrient-poor zones, Sphagnum bog-mosses, cross-leaved heath, bog asphodel, common cottongrass and similar species predominate. In more enriched conditions the communities are more fen-like.

**River Avon SAC**

The Avon in southern England is a large, lowland river system that includes sections running through chalk and clay, with transitions between the two. Five aquatic Ranunculus species occur in the river system, but stream water-crowfoot Ranunculus penicillatus ssp. pseudofluitans and river water-crowfoot *R*. *fluitans* are the main dominants. Some winterbourne reaches, where *R*. *peltatus* is the dominant water-crowfoot species, are included in the SAC.

There is an extensive population of Desmoulin’s whorl snail Vertigo moulinesiana along about 20 km of the margins and associated wetlands of the Rivers Avon, Bourne and Wylye. This is one of two sites representing the species in the south-western part of its range, in chalk stream habitat. It occurs here in a separate catchment from the Kennet and Lambourn, within an environment more heavily dominated by arable agriculture.

The Avon represents sea lamprey Petromyzon marinus in a high-quality river in the southern part of its range. There are excellent examples of the features that the species needs for survival, including extensive areas of sand and gravel in the middle to lower reaches of the river where sea lampreys are known to spawn.

The Avon is a high-quality river that represents the southern part of the range of brook lamprey Lampetra planeri. A healthy, stable population occurs in the main river and in a number of tributaries. The main river, and in particular its tributaries, provides clean beds of gravel for spawning and extensive areas of fine silt for juveniles to burrow into.

The Avon in southern England represents a south coast chalk river supporting Atlantic salmon Salmo salar. The salmon populations here are typical of a high-quality chalk stream, unaffected by the introduction of genetic stock of non-native origin. The Avon has an excellent mosaic of aquatic habitats, which include extensive areas of gravels essential for spawning and growth of juvenile fry. There has been limited modification of the river course by comparison with many other southern lowland rivers in England.
The Avon represents bullhead Cottus gobio in a calcareous, relatively unmodified river in the southern part of its range in England. The River Avon has a mosaic of aquatic habitats that support a diverse fish community. The bullhead is an important component of this community, particularly in the tributaries.

**River Avon SPA**

The Avon Valley SPA encompasses the lower reaches of the River Avon and its floodplain on the south coast of England. The site extends for approximately 20 km between Bickton and Christchurch. The River Avon displays wide fluctuations in water level and parts of the valley are regularly flooded in winter. Consequently, the valley includes one of the largest expanses of unimproved floodplain grassland in Britain, including extensive areas managed as hay meadows and grazing marsh under low-intensity agricultural systems. These extensive floodplain grasslands support wintering Bewick's Swans Cygnus columbianus bewickii in numbers of European importance, and Blashford Lakes Gravel Pits within the SPA are particularly important for wintering Gadwall Anas strepera.

**Avon Valley Ramsar**

The site encompasses the lower reaches of the River Avon and its floodplain between Bickton and Christchurch. The River Avon displays wide fluctuations in water level and parts of the valley are regularly flooded in winter. The Avon valley has a greater range of habitats and a more diverse flora and fauna than any other chalk river in Britain. The valley includes one of the largest expanses of unimproved floodplain grassland in Britain, including extensive areas managed as hay meadow.

**Dorset Heaths SAC**

This is a complex site which includes 37 SSSIs, most of which include fine transitions between European dry heaths and wet lowland heathland and mires, as well as other habitats such as woodland, grassland, pools, saltmarsh and reedswamp. The common characteristics of the M16 Erica tetralix - Sphagnum compactum wet heaths are the dominance of cross-leaved heath Erica tetralix, heather Calluna vulgaris and purple moor-grass Molinia caerulea, and the presence of a diverse group of rare species. These include Dorset heath Erica ciliaris (which readily hybridises with E. tetralix), white beak-sedge Rhynchospora alba, brown beak-sedge R. fusca, marsh gentian Gentiana pneumonanthe, great, round- and oblong-leaved sundews Drosera anglica, D. rotundifolia and D. intermedia, and marsh clubmoss Lycopodiella inundata. Typical mosses of the wet heath include Sphagnum compactum, S. pulchrum and S. tenellum. These sites are a stronghold for invertebrates, particularly dragonflies, damselflies, butterflies and spiders, including the Annex II species Southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale. Within the UK, some of these invertebrates are restricted to the Dorset heaths. This site displays fine transitions between Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix, dry heaths and other habitats. Dry heath NVC types include H2 Calluna vulgaris - Ulex minor, H3 Ulex minor - Agrostis curtisii, H4 Ulex gallii - Agrostis curtisii and H8 Calluna vulgaris - Ulex gallii. The area of heathland has been reduced and fragmented, with about 86% lost since the mid-18th century. However, the Dorset heaths represent some of the biggest and finest remaining areas of lowland heathland in the UK. The dry heath occurs on very infertile soils and is not very diverse botanically, but occasionally some nationally scarce plants occur, such as mossy stonecrop Crassula tillaea and yellow centaury Cicerbita filiformis. In places, where heather Calluna vulgaris occurs in mature stands, lichens of the genus Cladonia are very abundant. Uncommon features of the south-eastern heathlands are the localised presence of bilberry Vaccinium myrtillus and the co-existence in some areas of western gorse.
Ulex gallii and dwarf gorse U. minor. The dry heaths support populations of European importance of several species, including rare butterflies (e.g. silver-studded blue Plebejus argus), grasshoppers and spiders. Among birds, the dry heath is very important for woodlark Lullula arborea, European nightjar Caprimulgus europaeus, Dartford warbler Sylvia undata and some migrants such as hen harrier Circus cyaneus and Eurasian hobby Falco subbuteo. All six species of native British reptiles, including the Annex IV species sand lizard Lacerta agilis and smooth snake Coronella austriaca, occur within the Dorset Heaths.

The two Dorset Heaths cSACs, together with the New Forest, support a large proportion of the resource of Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion within England. The habitat is widespread on the Dorset Heaths, both in bog pools of valley mires and in flushes. There are numerous valley mires within the Dorset Heaths, and the habitat type is most extensively represented here as part of a habitat mosaic. This location shows extensive representation of brown-beak sedge Rhynchospora fusca and is also important for great sundew Drosera anglica and bog orchid Hammarbya paludosa.

This site in south-west England, along with Dorset Heaths (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes, represents the Dorset stronghold of southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale. The large size of the two cSACs, and a long history of records indicating well-established populations, should ensure the future viability of the small populations that occur here.

**Dorset Heathlands SPA**

The Dorset Heathlands cover an extensive complex of heathland sites at the western edge of the Hampshire Basin in southern England. The area is centred around the large estuary of Poole Harbour and lies in close proximity to the urban conurbation of Bournemouth and Poole. Past losses of the heathland (an estimated 75% during the twentieth century to development, agriculture and afforestation) have left the remaining heaths in a highly fragmented state. Despite this decline and fragmentation, the heaths show a high degree of ecological cohesion. They contain large areas of dry heath, wet heath and acid valley mire, all habitats that are restricted to the Atlantic fringe of Europe. The examples of the Dorset Heathlands are among the best of their type in the UK. There are also transitions to coastal wetlands and floodplain fen habitats. The whole complex has an outstanding fauna in a European context, covering many different taxa. Many species have a specialist ecology, strongly associated with, or restricted to, heathland. The area is ornithologically important for specialist breeding birds of lowland heathland, as well as for some wintering raptors.

**Dorset Heathlands Ramsar**

Extensive and fragmented, these heathland areas are centred around the estuary of Poole Harbour and are adjacent to the urban conurbation of Bournemouth and Poole. The heathland contains numerous examples of wet heath and acid valley mire, habitats that are restricted to the Atlantic fringe of Europe. These heath wetlands are among the best of their type in lowland Britain. There are also transitions to coastal wetland and fen habitat types. The wetland flora and fauna includes a large assemblage of nationally rare and scarce species, especially invertebrates.
APPENDIX 4 - Qualifying Features

Southampton and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC

qualifying features: Coastal lagoons

Solent Maritime SAC

qualifying features:
- Estuaries
- Spartina swards (Spartinion maritimae)
- Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucoc-Puccinellietalia maritimae)
- Sandbanks - slightly covered by sea water all the time
- Mudflats and sandflats - not submerged at low tide
- Annual vegetation drift lines
- Perennial vegetation of stony banks
- Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand
- Shifting white dunes with Ammophila arenaria
- Coastal lagoons
- Desmoulin's whorl snail Vertigo moulinsiana

Solent and Southampton Water SPA

qualifying features:
- Little Tern Sterna albifrons, 49 pairs representing at least 2.0% of the breeding population in Great Britain (5 year peak mean, 1993-1997)
- Sandwich Tern Sterna sandvicensis, 231 pairs representing at least 1.7% of the breeding population in Great Britain (5 year peak mean, 1993-1997)
- Common Tern Sterna hirundo, 267 pairs representing at least 2.2% of the breeding population in Great Britain (5 year peak mean, 1993-1997)
- Mediterranean Gull Larus melanocephalus, 2 pairs representing at least 20.0% of the breeding population in Great Britain (5 year peak mean, 1994-1998)
- Roseate Tern Sterna dougallii, 2 pairs representing at least 3.3% of the breeding population in Great Britain (5 year peak mean, 1993-1997)
- Black-tailed Godwit Limosa limosa islandica, 1,125 individuals representing at least 1.6% of the wintering Iceland - breeding population (5 year peak mean, 1992/3-1996/7)
- Dark-bellied Brent Goose Branta bernicla bernicla, 7,506 individuals representing at least 2.5% of the wintering Western Siberia/Western Europe population (5 year peak mean, 1992/3-1996/7)
- Ringed Plover Charadrius hiaticula, 552 individuals representing at least 1.1% of the wintering Europe/Northern Africa - wintering population (5 year peak mean, 1992/3-1996/7)
Teal Anas crecca, 4,400 individuals representing at least 1.1% of the wintering Northwestern Europe population (5 year peak mean, 1992/3-1996/7)

Birds Directive Assemblage Qualification (the area qualifies by regularly supporting at least 20,000 waterfowl): - Over winter, the area regularly supports 51,361 individual waterfowl (5 year peak mean 1998) (cf 53,948 individual waterfowl (5 year peak mean 1991/2 - 1995/6))

Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar

qualifying features:

Ramsar criterion 1: several outstanding wetland habitat types, including unusual double tidal flow, a major sheltered channel, saline lagoons, saltmarshes, estuaries, intertidal flats, shallow coastal waters, grazing marshes, reedbeds, coastal woodland and rocky boulder reefs

Ramsar criterion 2: nationally rare species assemblage

Ramsar criterion 5: winter assemblage of 51,343 waterfowl (5 year peak mean 1998/99 - 2002/03)

Ramsar criterion 6: Ringed plover , Charadrius hiaticula, Europe/Northwest Africa, 397 individuals, representing an average of 1.2% of the (on passage) GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9 - 2002/3)

Ramsar criterion 6: Black-tailed godwit , Limosa limosa islandica, Iceland/W Europe, 1,240 individuals, representing an average of 3.5% of the over-wintering GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

Ramsar criterion 6: Dark-bellied brent goose, Branta bernicla bernicla, 6,456 individuals, representing an average of 3% of the over-wintering GB population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

Ramsar criterion 6: Eurasian teal Anas crecca, NW Europe, 5,514 individuals, representing an average of 1.3% of the GB over-wintering population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/03)

New Forest SAC

qualifying features:

Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix
European dry heaths
Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae)
Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (Quercion robor-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion)
Asperulo-Fagetum beech forests
Old acidophilous oak woods with Quercus robur on sandy plains
Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)
Bog woodland
Alkaline fens
Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion
Transition mires and quaking bogs
Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae)
Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or of the Iso?to-Nanojuncetea
Southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale
Stag beetle Lucanus cervus
Great crested newt Triturus cristatus

New Forest SPA

qualifying features:
Dartford Warbler Sylvia undata, 538 pairs representing at least 33.6% of the breeding population in Great Britain
Honey Buzzard Pernis apivorus, 2 pairs representing at least 10.0% of the breeding population in Great Britain
Nightjar Caprimulgus europaeus, 300 pairs representing at least 8.8% of the breeding population in Great Britain
Woodlark Lullula arborea, 184 pairs representing at least 12.3% of the breeding population in Great Britain (Count as at 1997)
Hen Harrier Circus cyaneus, 15 individuals representing at least 2.0% of the wintering population in Great Britain

New Forest Ramsar

qualifying features:
Southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale
Stag beetle Lucanus cervus
Great crested newt Triturus cristatus
Bullhead Cottus gobio
Brook lamprey Lampetra planeri
Dartford Warbler Sylvia undata, 538 pairs representing at least 33.6% of the breeding population in Great Britain
Hen Harrier Circus cyaneus, 15 individuals representing at least 2.0% of the wintering population in Great Britain
Ramsar criterion 1: outstanding valley mires - bog woodland
Ramsar criterion 1: outstanding valley mires - depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion
Ramsar criterion 1: outstanding wet heaths
Ramsar criterion 2: nationally rare species assemblage
Ramsar criterion 3: species assemblage of importance to maintaining
River Avon SAC

qualifying features: Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitriche-Batrachion vegetation
Bullhead Cottus gobio
Brook lamprey Lampetra planeri
Sea lamprey Petromyzon marinus
Atlantic salmon Salmo salar
Desmoulin's whorl snail Vertigo moulinesiana

Avon Valley SPA

qualifying features: Bewick's swan Cygnus columbianus bewickii, 135 individuals representing an average of 1.9% of GB overwintering population (5yr peak mean 1991/92-1995/96)
Gadwall Anas strepera, 667 individuals representing an average 2.2% of the population GB overwintering population (5 year peak mean 1991/92-1995/96)

Avon Valley Ramsar

qualifying features: Ramsar criterion 1: greater range of habitats than any other chalk river in Britain, including fen, mire, lowland wet grassland and small areas of woodland.
Ramsar criterion 2: diverse assemblage of wetland flora and fauna including several nationally-rare species.
Ramsar criterion 6: Gadwall Anas strepera strepera, NW Europe, 537 individuals, representing an average of 3.1% of the GB over-wintering population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)
Ramsar criterion 6: Northern pintail Anas acuta, NW Europe, 715 individuals representing an average of 1.1% of the over-wintering population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)
Ramsar criterion 6: Black-tailed godwit, Limosa limosa islandica, Iceland/W Europe, 1142 individuals, representing an average of 3.2% of the over-wintering population (5 year peak mean 1998/9-2002/3)

Dorset Heaths SAC
### Qualifying Features:

- Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix
- European dry heaths
- Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae)
- Old acidophilous oak woods with Quercus robur on sandy plains
- Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae
- Alkaline fens
- Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion
- Southern damselfly Coenagrion mercuriale
- Great crested newt Triturus cristatus

---

**Dorset Heathlands SPA**

### Qualifying Features:

- Dartford Warbler Sylvia undata, 418 pairs representing at least 26.1% of the breeding population in Great Britain (three count mean, 1991/2 & 4)
- Nightjar Caprimulgus europaeus, 436 pairs representing at least 12.8% of the breeding population in Great Britain (two year mean 1991-2)
- Woodlark Lullula arborea, 41 pairs representing at least 6.8% of the breeding population in Great Britain (three count mean 1991-2 & 4)
- Hen Harrier Circus cyaneus, 20 individuals representing 2.7% of the wintering population in Great Britain (Count 1991/2)
- Merlin Falco columbarius, 15 individuals representing 1.2% of the winter population in Great Britain (Count 1991/2)

---

**Dorset Heathlands Ramsar**

### Qualifying Features:

- Ramsar criterion 1: particularly good example of northern Atlantic wet heaths with cross-leaved heath Erica tetralix
- Ramsar criterion 1: particularly good example of acid mire with Rhynchosporion
- Ramsar criterion 1: largest example in Britain of southern Atlantic wet heaths with Dorset heath Erica ciliaris and cross-leaved heath Erica tetralix.
- Ramsar criterion 2: 1 nationally rare and 13 nationally scarce wetland plant species, and at least 28 nationally rare wetland invertebrate species.
- Ramsar criterion 3: high species richness and high ecological diversity of wetland habitat types and transitions, and lies in one of the most biologically-rich wetland areas of lowland Britain, being continuous with three other Ramsar sites: Poole Harbour, Avon Valley and The New Forest.
APPENDIX 5 - Conservation Objectives

Southampton and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC

**Conservation Objectives:**

**Gilkicker Lagoon**
The conservation objective for the European interest on the site is, subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition, the: lagoon
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Brading Marshes to St Helen's Ledges**
The conservation objective for the European interest on the site is, subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition, the: lagoon
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Langstone Harbour**
The conservation objective for the European interest on the site is, subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition, the: lagoon
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Hurst Castle & Lymington River Estuary**
The conservation objective for the European interest on the site is, subject to natural change, maintain* in favourable condition, the: lagoon
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

---

Solent Maritime SAC

**Conservation Objectives:**

**Medina estuary**
Subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated:
- Littoral sediment
(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.

**Yar estuary**
Subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated:
- Littoral sediment
- Coastal lagoon
(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.
Boulder and Hamstead Cliffs
Subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated:

- Littoral sediment

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

Chichester Harbour
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Chichester Harbour estuary in favourable condition, in particular:

- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal sandflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities

Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucophyta - Puccinellietalia) favourable condition*, in particular:

- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities

Subject to natural change, maintain* the Cordgrass swards (Spartinio) favourable condition*, in particular:

- Small cordgrass (Spartina maritima) communities
- Smooth cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora) Communities
- Townsend's cordgrass (Spartina townsendii) Communities

*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Langstone Harbour
Subject to natural change, maintain* the estuary in favourable condition, in particular:

- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal sandflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities

Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucophyta - Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:

- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities

Subject to natural change, maintain*, in favourable condition, the:

- saline lagoons

*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Hurst Castle and Lymington River estuary
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucophyta - Puccinellietalia) favourable condition, in particular:

- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
Subject to natural change, maintain* the saline lagoons in favourable condition
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Eling and Bury Marshes
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco - Puccinellietalia) favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Cordgrass swards (Spartinion) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Smooth cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora) Communities
- Townsend's cordgrass (Spartina townsendii) Communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Hythe to Calshot Marshes
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco - Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Cordgrass swards (Spartinion) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Smooth cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora) Communities
- Townsend's cordgrass (Spartina townsendii) Communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

King's Quay Shore
Subject to natural change, maintain* the estuary in favourable condition, in particular:
- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal sandflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco - Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen estuary
Subject to natural change, maintain* the estuary in favourable condition, in particular:
- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-
Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Linsegrove to Hackett's Marshes
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Estuary in favourable condition, in particular:
- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
Subject to natural change, maintain the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-
Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Lower Test Valley
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-
Puccinellietalia) favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Newtown Harbour
Subject to natural change, maintain*, in favourable condition, the estuary, with particular reference to:
- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
Subject to natural change, maintain*, in favourable condition, the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-
Puccinellietalia), with particular reference to:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
Subject to natural change, maintain*, in favourable condition, the Cordgrass
swards (Spartinion) with particular reference to:
- Small cordgrass (Spartina maritima) communities
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
North Solent
Subject to natural change, maintain* the estuary in favourable condition, in particular:
- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
Subject to natural change, maintain the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco - Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Thorness Bay
Subject to natural change, maintain* the Estuary in favourable condition, in particular:
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Upper Hamble estuary and woods
Subject to natural change, maintain* the estuary in favourable condition, in particular:
- Saltmarsh communities
- Intertidal mudflat communities
- Intertidal mixed sediment communities
- Subtidal sediment communities
Subject to natural change, maintain the Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco - Puccinellietalia) in favourable condition, in particular:
- Pioneer marsh communities
- Low marsh communities
- Mid-marsh communities
- High-marsh communities
- Transitional high marsh communities
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

---

**Solent and Southampton Water SPA**

**conservation objectives:**

**Medina estuary**

Subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated:

**Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)**
- Neutral grassland
- Fen, marsh and swamp
- Broad-leaved woodland
- Littoral sediment
(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.

Yar estuary
Subject to natural change, to maintain the following habitats in favourable condition (*), with particular reference to any dependent component special interest features (habitats, vegetation types, species, species assemblages etc.) for which the land is designated:
Habitat Types represented (Biodiversity Action Plan categories)
- Grazing marsh comprising neutral grassland
- Supra Littoral sediment
- Littoral sediment
- Coastal lagoon
(*) or restored to favourable condition if features are judged to be unfavourable.

Brading Marshes to St Helen's Ledges
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species * of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- boulder and cobble shores
- saltmarsh
- intertidal sand and mudflat
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- boulder and cobble shores
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Lymington River Reedbeds
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species * of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- reedbed
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- reedbed
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Ryde Sands and Wooton Creek
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for populations of migratory bird species * of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal sand and mudflats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Sowley Pond**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
+ teal.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Titchfield Haven**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Reedbeds and open water with marshy grassland and scrub
+ Common Tern.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Reedbed and open water with marshy grassland and scrub
+ teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Reedbed and open water with marshy grassland and scrub
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Hurst Castle and Lymington River**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal with saltmarsh and shingle
+ Mediterranean gull, Sandwich Tern, Common Tern, Little Tern
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal with saltmarsh and shingle
- grazing marsh
- permanent grassland
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal with saltmarsh and shingle
- grazing marsh
- permanent grassland
- reedbed/open water
- vegetated shingle
- saline lagoons
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
condition.

**Eling and Bury Marshes**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal mudflat
- saltmarsh and fringing habitats
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition?, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal mudflat
- saltmarsh and fringing habitats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Hythe to Calshot Marshes**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- mixed sediment shores
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- mixed sediment shores
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**King's Quay Shore**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
+ dark-bellied brent goose and teal.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen estuary**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Estuarine habitats
- intertidal mudflats and shingle
- coastal and inundation grasslands
+ Dark-bellied Brent Goose, Teal, Ringed Plover and Black-tailed Godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Estuarine habitats
- intertidal mudflats and shingle
- coastal and inundation grasslands
- reedbeds
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Lindegrove to Hackett's Marshes**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Estuarine and marginal habitats
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Estuarine and marginal habitats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Lower Test Valley**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- marshy grassland/fen meadow
- grazed swamp
- reedbed
- saltmarsh
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- marshy grassland/fen meadow
- grazed swamp
- reedbed
- saltmarsh.
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Newtown Harbour**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- shingle
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- shallow coastal waters
+ Sandwich tern, Common tern, Mediterranean Gull
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
North Solent
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- standing water
- shallow coastal waters
- shingle
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
+ mediterranean gull, sandwich tern, roseate tern, common tern and little tern.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- saltmarsh
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Thorness Bay
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- saltmarsh
- reedbeds
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- mixed sediment shores
+ Dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover, black-tailed godwit
to maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- coastal grassland
- standing water
- saltmarsh
- reedbeds
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- mixed sediment shores
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Upper Hamble estuary and woods
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Estuarine and marginal habitats
+ dark-bellied brent goose, teal, ringed plover and black-tailed godwit.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- Estuarine and marginal habitats
*maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.
Whitecliff Bay and Bembridge Ledges
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory bird species of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- boulder and cobble shores
+ dark-bellied brent goose and ringed plover.
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of waterfowl that contribute to the wintering waterfowl assemblage of European importance, with particular reference to:
- intertidal mudflats and sandflats
- boulder and cobble shores
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar

New Forest SAC

conservation objectives:

Langley Wood and Homan’s Copse
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:
- Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Loosehanger Copse and Meadows
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:
- Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)
- Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae)
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

White Parish Common
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:
- Asperulo-Fagetum beech forests
- Old acidophilous oak woods with Quercus robur on sandy plains
- Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)
- Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion)
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:
- Stag beetle (Lucanus cervus)
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

The New Forest
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:
- Alkaline fens
- Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanaem Salicion albae)
- Asperulo-Fagetum beech forests
- Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrublayer (Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion)
- Bog woodland
- Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhyncosporion
- European dry heath
- Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae)
- North Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix
- Old acidophilous oak woods with Quercus robur on sandy plains
- Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and or of the Isoeto-Naonjuncetea
- Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains: Littorelletalia uniflora
- Transition mires and quaking bogs
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:
- Great crested newt (Triturus cristatus)
- Southern damselfly (Coenagrion mercuriale)
- Stag beetle (Lucanus cervus)
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

Landford Bog
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:
- Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhyncosporion
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:
- Southern damselfly (Coenagrion mercuriale)
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

New Forest SPA

conservation objectives:
The New Forest
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- dry heathland
- dry grassland
- inclosure and pasture woodlands
+ Honey Buzzard, Nightjar, Woodlark, Dartford Warbler, Hen Harrier
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

New Forest Ramsar
River Avon SAC

**conservation objectives:**

**Jones' Mill**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:
- Desmoulin’s whorl snail (Vertigo moulinsiana).
* maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Lower Woodford Water Meadows**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:
- Desmoulin’s whorl snail (Vertigo moulinsiana).
* maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**Porton Meadows**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the population of:
- Desmoulin’s whorl snail (Vertigo moulinsiana).
* maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

**River Avon System**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the:
- river habitat: floating formations of water crowfoot (Ranunculus) of plain and submountainous rivers
the river as a habitat for:
- populations of Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar) and bullhead (Cottus gobio)
- populations of brook lamprey (Lampetra planeri) and sea lamprey (Petromyzon marinus)
and the river and adjoining land as habitat for:
- populations of Desmoulin’s whorl snail (Vertigo moulinsiana)
* maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not in favourable condition.

**River Till**
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the river as a habitat for:
- floating formations of water crowfoot (Ranunculus) of plain and sub mountainous rivers
- populations of Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar)
- populations of bullhead (Cottus gobio)
- populations of brook lamprey (Lampetra planeri)
- populations of sea lamprey (Petromyzon marinus).
and the river and adjoining land as habitat for:
- populations of Desmoulin’s whorl snail (Vertigo moulinsiana).
* maintenance implies restoration, if the feature is not currently in favourable condition.

---

River Avon SPA

**conservation objectives:**

To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of Annex 1 bird species + of European importance, with particular reference to:
- standing water
- marshy grassland
- arable
+ Bewick’s swan
To maintain*, in favourable condition, the habitats for the populations of migratory
bird species of European importance, with particular reference to:
- open water and surrounding marginal habitats.
+ Gadwall
* maintenance implies restoration if the feature is not currently in favourable condition

Avon Valley Ramsar - not available
Dorset Heaths SAC - awaiting data
Dorset Heathlands SPA - awaiting data
Dorset Heathlands Ramsar - not available
Appendix 6:
### Appendix 6: Habitats Regulations Significance Screening Matrix

**Table 1: Avon Valley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</th>
<th>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</th>
<th>Will Core Strategy policies have significant impact on the vulnerability of the Site's qualifying features?</th>
<th>Evidence/justification for impact</th>
<th>Other plans/projects with in-combination effects</th>
<th>Will policies have significant effect in combination with other plans?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| River Avon SAC | Below-average rainfall / drought
Decreased flow velocities and increased siltation (especially affecting Ranunculus cover)
Increased abstractions
Combined effect of low flow with point sources of nutrient inputs producing localised increases in competitive plant growth
Inappropriate stocking with fish populations (intentional or accidental)
Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities)
Inappropriate control of vegetation (as a refuge for fry and juvenile fish)
River channel workings leading to less natural form
Sediment oxygen availability
Toxic contamination - synthetic compounds | Increased abstraction
Point source nutrient inputs(changes in nutrient loading):
Extent of habitat: | No - Possible impacts from policies CS9, 10, 11 considered most relevant. CS19 will promote increased provision for tourism which may increase levels of visitors and use of sites, however the quantum of effect is likely to be small and the policy does provide the test that development must be consistent with environmental objectives.
Water abstraction: The EA Review of Consents process in the south west has found current levels of licensed water abstraction in the River Avon to be having an adverse effect on the site’s integrity.
Development of new houses in the New Forest District and the requirement for greater primary aggregate extraction may result in increased abstraction from the Avon. Abstraction is subject to lower tier consents by the Environment Agency that safeguard the qualifying features of the site. The Environment Agency has not identified that adequate controls are not available in their response to Preferred Options.
The South-east Plan concludes the timing and location of new water resource development are crucial to ensure there are no impacts on designated sites. Provided water resources are in place and predicted water efficiency improvements secured, the plan’s assessment concludes no adverse effect on integrity. Policy CS4 of the New Forest submission plan requires water efficiency measures in line with the Code for Sustainable homes linked to the requirements of the RSS.
Water quality: Development of new houses in New Forest District may result in increased wastewater disposal into the Avon (for example, from Ringwood Sewage Treatment Works) and an associated decline in water quality. However these issues are subject to controls and consents that safeguard the qualifying features of the site. The proposed levels of development are small and provide for only a proportion of housing in proximity to the Ringwood and New area. | Housing allocations within the South west plan.
Allocations in the south east plan
Hampshire and Wiltshire Minerals Plan | No - although effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance in the south-east and south-west plan and lower tier permissions |
| Toxic contamination - non-synthetic compounds | The EA Review of Consents process has found existing licensed discharges to the River Avon from the STW, fish and cress farms and the MOD to be having an adverse effect on the site’s integrity. Any future demands for wastewater treatment capacity to serve the new development are likely to increase this adverse effect.  

The South-east Plan concludes the timing and location of new water resource development are crucial to ensure there are no impacts on designated sites. Provided water resources are in place and predicted water efficiency improvements secured, the plan’s assessment concludes no adverse effect on integrity.  

Increased recreation associated with the new housing development proposed for the surrounding area could also cause trampling and erosion and biological disturbance due to fishing. Scale of visitor increase and impact uncertain.  

Potential improvements to roads could also increase air pollution at the site. However, there is no APIS or EA data available for current pollutant levels or deposition loads at this site. Mitigation and avoidance is delivered through transport policies. |
| Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading |  |
| Non-toxic contamination - changes in organic loading |  |
| Non-toxic contamination - changes in mineral loading |  |
| Non-toxic contamination - changes in thermal regime |  |
| Non-toxic contamination - changes in turbidity |  |
| Biological disturbance - microbial pathogens |  |
| Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction |  |
| Biological disturbance - selective extraction of species |  |
| Food availability |  |

**Avon Valley SPA**

| Water levels and hydology (groundwater, rainwater or floodwater-fed) | Increased abstraction: No |
| Water level management | As above. |
| Water depth (standing water - fresh water, brackish or saline) | Housing and residential use is likely to increase domestic cat numbers. However the risk to qualifying interest feature (Bewick’s swan and Gadwall) is limited. Evidence relating to other habitats suggests small mammals are a preferred prey group and maximum roaming 1500m. The distance of interest feature from new residential development, number of physical barriers including major roads and the low likelihood of cats foraging in the habitats preferred by the interest feature combine to allow conclusion that significant impacts are not likely. |
| Increased abstractions | Housing allocations within the South west plan. |
| Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities) | Allocations in the south east plan. |
| Non-physical disturbance - noise | Hampshire and Wiltshire Minerals Plan |
| | No although effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance in the south-east and south-west plan and lower tier permissions |
| Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance |
| Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction |
| Biological disturbance - selective extraction of species |
| Predation - domestic animals |
| Height/density of vegetative cover (as bird refuge) |
| Obstruction to sight lines |
| Connectivity - between sheltering and foraging habitats |
| Food availability |

| Water levels and hydology (groundwater, rainwater or floodwater-fed) |
| Decreased flow velocities and increased siltation (especially affecting Ranunculus cover) |
| Increased abstractions |
| Inappropriate stocking with fish populations (intentional or accidental) |
| Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities) |
| Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, mowing or clearing of deadwood |
| Succession |
| Isolating barrier - presence and nature |

| Increased abstraction: |
| Point source nutrient inputs/changes in nutrient loading: |
| Extent of habitat: |
| Predation - domestic animals |

| No |
| As above |

| Housing allocations within the South west plan. |
| Housing allocations within the south-east plan |
| Hampshire and Wiltshire Minerals Plan |

<p>| No - although effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance in the south-east and south-west plan and lower tier permissions |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical damage - siltation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic contamination - synthetic compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predation - domestic animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset Heathlands SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dorset Heathlands SPA | Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities) Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, mowing or clearing of deadwood Succession Physical loss - removal Physical damage - selective extraction Non-physical disturbance - noise Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance Predation - domestic animals Height/density of vegetative cover (as | Physical loss - removal
Inappropriate control of vegetation - wildfires through urban effects Predation - domestic animals Non-physical disturbance - noise and visual | No                                                                 | Possible impacts from policies CS9, 10, 11 considered relevant. Policy CS11 allocates land at Ringwood and the spatial pattern CS10 includes Districts such as Fordingbridge and New Milton which in some cases are within 5km of the sites. CS19 will promote increased provision of serviced accommodation which may increase levels of visitors and use of sites, however the quantum of effect is likely to be small and the policy does provide the test that development must be consistent with environmental objectives. The policy is aimed at increasing the proportion of visitors using serviced accommodation rather than an overall increase per se. Physical loss through trampling and wildfires result from urban effects (Liley et al 2006) and are linked to residential development, particularly close enough for regular visits. However the locality of the area where development is directed is over this distance and separated by major roads. Predation by cats can occur up to approx 1500m from domestic dwellings (Liley et al 2006). However the locality of the area where development is directed is over this distance and separated by major roads. Residential development results in disturbance effects (Liley et al 2006). Although an increase quantum of housing is provided for in polices, the | Housing allocations within the South west plan. Allocations in the south east plan Hampshire and Wiltshire Minerals Plan | No - provided mitigation secured - The Dorset Heaths interim delivery plan has been agreed and seeks to provide mitigation for visitor impacts. There is a framework in place to develop this into a DPD approach that will secure the necessary mitigation/avoidance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</th>
<th>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</th>
<th>Will Core Strategy policies have significant impact on the Site’s qualifying features?</th>
<th>Evidence/justification for impact</th>
<th>Other plans/projects with in-combination effects</th>
<th>Will policy have significant effect in combination with other plans?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorset Heathlands Ramsar</td>
<td>Mix of acid and alkaline soil conditions</td>
<td>Physical loss - removal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possible impacts from policies CS9, 10, 11 considered relevant. Policy CS11 allocates land at Ringwood and the spatial pattern CS10 includes Districts such as Fordingbridge and New Milton which in some cases are within 5km of the sites. CS19 will promote increased provision of serviced accommodation which may increase levels of visitors and use of sites, however the quantum of effect is likely to be small and the policy does provide the test that development must be consistent with environmental objectives. The policy is aimed at increasing the proportion of visitors using serviced accommodation rather than an overall increase per se. There is no land take from the sites as a result of policies. Although an increase quantum of housing is provided for in polices, the plan predicts an overall decrease in human residential population with the New Forest District. Impacts arising from residential development proposed in the plan may therefore be reduced. The provision of open space and green Infrastructure via policies within the NFDC submission plan provide avoidance for effects generated by the plan and the contributions policy allows for developer contribution if the Dorset Heaths DPD identifies a requirement.</td>
<td>Housing allocations within the South west plan. Housing allocations in the south east plan</td>
<td>No - provided mitigation secured - The Dorset Heaths interim delivery plan has been agreed and seeks to provide mitigation for visitor impacts. There is a framework in place to develop this into a DPD approach that will secure the necessary mitigation/avoidance measures and that can reasonably be relied upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</td>
<td>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</td>
<td>Will Core Strategy policies have significant impact on the vulnerability of the Site’s qualifying features?</td>
<td>Evidence/justification for impact</td>
<td>Other plans/projects with in-combination effects</td>
<td>Will policy have significant effect in combination with other plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Forest SAC</td>
<td>Mix of acid and alkaline soil conditions</td>
<td>Soil compaction (as a result of recreation)</td>
<td>Uncertain for recreation impacts (abrasion) linked to housing growth (policies CS9, 10, 11) although contribution of New Forest District Submission Core Strategy is limited. Effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance such as that provided in the south-east and south-west plan. Policies within the submission Core Strategy offer mitigation (CS7, CS19) and other plans such as National Park Recreation Management Strategy provide avoidance and mitigation.</td>
<td>Water quality: Development in New Forest District (resulting from policies CS9,10,11, 17,18,19) is unlikely to result in increased wastewater disposal and water quality issues within the SAC, as most effluent from the district discharges into the Solent, Southampton Water and the River Avon. Discharges are controlled by other consents and mechanisms to ensure sites are protected. The Environment Agency did not indicate issues or objections at Preferred options stage</td>
<td>Housing allocations within the South west plan.</td>
<td>Uncertain for recreation impacts linked to housing growth (policies - CS9, 10, 11) although contribution of New Forest District Submission Core Strategy is limited. Effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance such as that provided in the south-east and south-west plan. Mitigation effects are relevant and are provided by other plans such as Recreation Management Strategy for...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</td>
<td>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</td>
<td>Will Core Strategy policies have significant impact on the vulnerability of the Site’s qualifying features?</td>
<td>Evidence/justification for impact</td>
<td>Other plans/projects with in-combination effects</td>
<td>Will policy have significant effect in combination with other plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Forest SPA</td>
<td>Soil compaction</td>
<td>Soil compaction (linked to recreation)</td>
<td>Uncertain for recreation impacts linked to housing growth (policies - CS9, 10, 11) although contribution of New Forest Strategy is limited. Effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance such as that provided in the south-east and south-west</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance (recreational pressures): The plan provides for an increase in number of dwellings within the plan area and thus a risk that there will be associated increases in recreational visits to the site as research (e.g. Tourism South East Survey 2005), shows visits to the site are made by people living in the District area. There is uncertainty with respect to the likely increase in recreational activity as housing growth is not necessarily linked to population increase, however there is no authoritative research to show increased recreation is not a reasonable expectation. Research carried out by Footprint Ecology (2008) suggests that there is some avoidance of high visitor areas within the New Forest SPA by woodlark and other Annex 1 species. The significance of impacts is difficult to establish with the current level of understanding of both species and visitor behaviour and based on current analysis there is insufficient evidence to rule out a possible significant effect. This position</td>
<td>Housing allocations within the South west plan.</td>
<td>Uncertain although contribution of New forest Strategy is limited. Effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance in the south-east and south-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities)</td>
<td>Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, mowing or clearing of deadwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, mowing or clearing of deadwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan provides for additional open space and recreational opportunities to divert activity from sensitive areas (e.g. policy CS 7 and parts of CS19) and much recreational activity relating to existing housing within the District is linked to more robust areas such as Inclusions on the edge of the site (as demonstrated by Tourism South East Survey 2005) where interest features are not impacted. Management of recreation within the site controls the extent of opportunity for erosion/abrasion of features. Policy CS 19 seeks to provide opportunities to divert tourism pressure from sensitive locations and vulnerable habitats.

Wildfires: Arson can be linked to proximity to human populations (Liley et al 2006) and with climate change trends represents a possible threat. The extent and magnitude of impact is limited by the coordination of effective responses by plans such as the Wildfire Plan and National Park Management Plan. Of the development proposed within the New Forest submission Core strategy the majority is provided within existing urban centres and away from proximity to the European sites. Given the spatial pattern of development proposed and mitigatory controls this is considered a de minimus effect.

Toxic/non-toxic contamination: Development facilitated by CS9,10,11 can lead to pollution effects either through direct or diffuse events. Individual developments will be subject to lower level assessments which will secure necessary safeguards. Policy CS5 commits the authority to addressing such issues in partnership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance</th>
<th>Plan.</th>
<th>Local Transport Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction</td>
<td>Predation - domestic animals</td>
<td>West plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological disturbance - selective extraction of species</td>
<td>Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predation - domestic animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height/density of vegetative cover (as bird refuge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has also been advised recently by Natural England.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst the plan provides for growth it also requires that this will be accompanied by the delivery of open space and that adequate green infrastructure is provided to avoid in-combination effects (e.g. CS7) and that development will not be permitted that is harmful (CS3). The plan also recognises that developer contributions may be required to mitigate effects on the environment outside of the District (e.g. National Park) and provision of Green Infrastructure. Thus the plan in its totality already provides for avoidance and mitigation of effects. Possible impacts from policies CS9, 10, 11 considered relevant. CS19 will promote increased provision of serviced accommodation which may increase levels of visitors and use of sites, however the quantum of effect is likely to be small and the policy does provide the test that development must be consistent with environmental objectives. The policy is aimed at increasing the proportion of visitors using serviced accommodation and raising the quality of provision rather than an overall increase per se. Survey research (Tourism South-east 2005) found 40% of visitors to the National Park are staying tourists but only a proportion (21%) were staying in serviced accommodation. Most visitors were staying outside the district with only 3% in the waterside parishes, and 15% in Lymington and the south coast. Predation - Domestic animals: Site specific research on this issue is lacking but predation by cats has been shown to occur up to approx 1500m from domestic dwellings elsewhere (Liley et al 2006). The vast majority of the spatial pattern of development is beyond this distance and in addition there are considerable physical barriers in some cases (main roads/watercourses) and thus effects are considered to be de minimus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Forest Ramsar</td>
<td>Mix of acid and alkaline soil conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil compaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below-average rainfall / drought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water levels and hydrology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, mowing or clearing of deadwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical damage - abrasion/erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain for recreation disturbance impacts on Dartford warbler linked to housing growth (policies - CS9, 10, 11) although contribution of New Forest Strategy is limited. Effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance such as that provided in the south-east and south-west plan. following further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance (recreational pressures):The plan provides for an increase in number of dwellings within the plan area and thus a risk that there will be associated increases in recreational visits to the site as research (e.g Tourism South East Survey 2005), shows visits to the site are made by people living in the District area. Research carried out by Footprint Ecology suggests that there is some avoidance of high visitor areas by Dartford warbler, although it concludes the significance uncertain and could be low. The significance of impacts is difficult to establish with the current level of understanding of both species and visitor behaviour and based on current analysis there is insufficient evidence to rule out a possible significant effect. This position has also been advised recently by Natural England. Whilst the plan provides for growth it also require that this will be accompanied by the delivery of open space and that adequate green infrastructure is provided to avoid in-combination effects (e.g. CS7) and that development will not be permitted that is harmful (CS3). The plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing allocations within the South west plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocations in the south east plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire and Minerals Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Transport Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain for recreational disturbance - although contribution of New Forest Strategy is limited. Effects are dependent on implementation of mitigation and avoidance in the south-east and south-west plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extent of suitable larval habitat (southern damselfly)
Extent of suitable larval habitat (stag beetle)
Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, moving or clearing of deadwood
Succession
River channel workings leading to less natural form
Physical loss - removal
Physical damage - abrasion/erosion
Physical damage - selective extraction
Non-physical disturbance - noise
Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance
Toxic contamination - synthetic compounds
Toxic contamination - non-synthetic compounds
Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading
Non-toxic contamination - changes in organic loading
Non-toxic contamination - changes in mineral loading
Biological disturbance - microbial pathogens
Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction
Biological disturbance - selective extraction of species
Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance
research
also recognises that developer contributions may be required to mitigate effects on the environment outside of the District (e.g. National Park) and provision of Green Infrastructure. Thus the plan in its totality already provides for avoidance and mitigation of effects
Wildfires: Arson can be linked to proximity to human populations (Liley et al 2006) and with climate change trends represents a possible threat. The extent and magnitude of impact is limited by the coordination of effective responses by plans such as the Wildfire Plan and National Park Management Plan. Of the development proposed within the New Forest submission Core strategy the majority is provided within existing urban centres and away from proximity to the European sites. Given the spatial pattern of development proposed and mitigatory controls this is considered a de minimus effect.
Physical damage-abrasion/erosion: Although an increase quantum of housing is provided for in polices, the plan predicts an overall decrease in human residential population with the New Forest District over the plan period. Thus increase in recreational effects e.g. abrasion from the scale of new development cannot be assumed to accompany the additional housing. There however remains uncertainty.
The plan provides for additional open space and recreational opportunities to divert activity from sensitive areas (e.g. policy CS 7 and parts of CS19) and much recreational activity relating to existing housing within the District is linked to more robust areas such as Inclosures on the edge of the site where Ramsar interest features are not impacted. Management of recreation within the site controls extent of opportunity for erosion/abrasion of features. Policy CS 19 seeks to provide opportunities to divert tourism pressure from sensitive locations and vulnerable habitats.
Predation - Domestic animals: Site specific research on this issue is lacking but predation by cats has been shown to occur up to approx 1500m from domestic dwellings elsewhere (Liley et al 2006). The vast majority of the spatial pattern of development is beyond this distance and in addition there are considerable physical barriers in some cases (main roads/watercourses) and thus effects are considered to be de minimus.
Water levels and hydrology: Review of consents and water authority data suggests that capacity for abstraction to supply residential and commercial development is available provided resources measures put in place and predicted efficiency savings are achieved. These are provided for within the current submission plan. Sites identified within the plan for development are remote from the Ramsar site and not hydrologically linked to its interest features.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predation - domestic animals</th>
<th>Height/density of vegetative cover (as bird refuge)</th>
<th>Food availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</td>
<td>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC</td>
<td>Water level management Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities) Coastal defences / coastal squeeze Sea level rise Isolating barrier - presence and nature Toxic contamination - synthetic compounds Toxic contamination - non-synthetic compounds Non-toxic contamination - changes in organic loading Non-toxic contamination - changes in turbidity Non-toxic contamination - changes in salinity</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading Coastal development may result in coastal squeeze if maintenance of coastal defence results. At the current plan level it is not concluded that new defences are a result of the quantum and location of development allocated by the policies. CS6 seeks to minimise harm to nature conservation interests and provides for replacement habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent Maritime SAC</td>
<td>Water level management Water depth (standing water - fresh water, brackish or saline) Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition,). Coastal defences/ coastal squeeze</td>
<td>Extent in habitat cover (linked to algal growth) Coastal development may result in coastal squeeze if maintenance of coastal defence results. At the current plan level it is not concluded that new defences are a result of the quantum and location of development allocated by the policies. CS6 seeks to minimise harm to nature conservation interests and provides for replacement habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetative cover and characteristic communities</td>
<td>Inappropriate control of vegetation - burning, grazing, moving or clearing of deadwood</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession</td>
<td>Changes in creek system pattern</td>
<td>Physical damage - abrasion/erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal defences / coastal squeeze</td>
<td>Sea level rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolating barrier - presence and nature</td>
<td>Sediment oxygen availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentation regime</td>
<td>Physical loss - removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical loss - smothering</td>
<td>Physical damage - siltation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical damage - abrasion/erosion</td>
<td>Physical damage - selective extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic contamination - synthetic compounds</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic contamination - non-synthetic compounds</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in organic loading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in organic loading</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in thermal regime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in thermal regime</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in turbidity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in turbidity</td>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading</td>
<td>Identified as being particularly critical by the Environment Agency’s Review of Consents. The extent of growth facilitated by policies in the submission Core Strategy. This assessment considered that the submission policies will not add significantly to N inputs given the availability of treatment and the provision for infrastructure improvements identified in the SE Plan and policy CS5 and CS 8. Coastal squeeze (policies CS9, 10, 11, 17, 18): The need for new defences is not predicted by the plan and whilst possible are not predicted to flow directly as a result of policies. Policies for coastal sites such as employment (CS 17/18) relate to existing employment sites within built up areas and do not add to the need for defence or by themselves compromise the ability for future realignment. The spatial strategy for housing growth (CS9,10,11) does not facilitate coastal expansion in areas that would require new defences. In addition area allocations DPD and individual schemes will be subject to further scrutiny and assessment will ensure site integrity appropriately at that stage. Physical damage - abrasion/erosion: The interim HRA for Preferred Options did not identify this as a likely significant effect and although representations at the Preferred Options stage did not highlight this as an omission, Natural England are currently advising authorities within the Solent area that further evidence may be required to support this conclusion. Whilst the condition assessment of the component SSSI identifies two units are being unfavourable due to erosion/abrasion these are outside the District area and within the New Forest National Park in the vicinity of Lepe Country Park. Ongoing research, commissioned by a partnership of local authorities and stakeholders facilitated by the Solent Forum, will undoubtedly assist in providing further evidence to base decisions but this will not be available until the end of 2008. Until such time as further evidence is available, this assessment has considered that housing growth as a result of the plan is relatively modest and the majority will be provided in areas away from the site. Mitigation is integrated within the plan in the form of open space provision, commitments to the delivery of Green Infrastructure and protective policies that can control delivery of growth. Regard has also been given to the recreational management that is facilitated by the National Park Recreation Management Strategy and existing wardening of the coast in the New Forest area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</td>
<td>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent and Southampton Water SPA</td>
<td>Water level management</td>
<td>Coastal defences / coastal squeeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water depth (standing water - fresh water, rackish or saline)</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in flow velocity</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of suitable foraging habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in creek system pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal defences / coastal squeeze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sea level rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedimentation regime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical loss - removal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical loss - smothering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical damage - abrasion/erosion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical damage - selective extraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type of impacts that would affect the Site (Vulnerability of features)</td>
<td>Which, if any, of these impacts likely to arise from policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar</td>
<td>Extent and condition of habitat cover (including species composition, vegetative cover and characteristic communities)</td>
<td>Coastal defences / coastal squeeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal defences / coastal squeeze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sea level rise</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedimentation regime</td>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

subject to visitor management including coverage within the New Forest National Park Management Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical loss - removal</th>
<th>Predation - domestic animals</th>
<th>Obstruction to sight lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical loss - smothering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical damage - abrasion/erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical damage - selective extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-physical disturbance - visual disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic contamination - synthetic compounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic contamination - non-synthetic compounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in nutrient loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-toxic contamination - changes in organic loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological disturbance - non-native species, translocation or introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological disturbance - selective extraction of species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predation - domestic animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height/density of vegetative cover (as bird refuge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction to sight lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity - between sheltering and foraging habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obstruction to sight lines: Although policies CS 17&18 provide for development in the vicinity of the sites these are strategic policies that provide for general land use and it is not possible to predict the design of any built structures at this level. Further levels of assessment can adequately control effects and ensure designs do not obstruct sight lines and current submission policies provide protection (CS1,3)

Shoreline Management Plans
Southampton City Council draft Core Strategy
activities (channel dredging)
APPENDIX 7-

Other Plans and Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects</th>
<th>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</th>
<th>Implications for Strategy</th>
<th>Implications for HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Regional Framework (IRF) for the South East 2004</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sets overall framework for LDF and other plans in area.&lt;br&gt;(This IRF is being replaced by the Regional Sustainability Framework (RSF). A final draft of the RSF has been presented to each of the regional partners for endorsement, including the full Assembly meeting in March 2008).&lt;br&gt;The IRF provides the overarching high-level policy framework for the region. It includes separate sections on the range of strategies in the region and on data and trends for each objective.&lt;br&gt;Overall objective: to establish a shared vision and objectives for integrated working and ultimately sustainable development of the region.&lt;br&gt;Has 25 regional objectives to co-ordinate regional level policy. It provides a shared regional vision which guides development in the region.&lt;br&gt;(The RSF sets a common vision, four priorities and 25 objectives for sustainable development all of which will help guide action in the region. It sets the overarching framework within which all regional strategies and policies should be formulated and implemented).&lt;br&gt;LDF needs to provide for environmental, social and economic spatial dimensions of objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives set strategic sustainability goals for strategic planning documents such as the Core Strategy. Provides for protection of sites; however social and economic aspirations may have adverse impacts if promoted without the balance of true environmental sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft South East Plan submitted March 2006</strong>&lt;br&gt;LDF must be in general contains policies for the protection of the New forest National Park, and for conservation and improvement of biodiversity. Also proposes substantial new development in South East Hampshire which may impact on New Forest National Park through increased LDF must bring into effect proposals of the SE Plan relating to this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conformity with RSS</td>
<td>population and traffic pressures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>recreation demand, water resources, air pollution etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft South West Plan submitted June 2006</td>
<td>Contains policies to protect and enhance biodiversity. Also contains sub-regional development proposals for South East Dorset which may impact on New Forest National Park through increased population and traffic pressures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>HRA should take account of new development across the region and the pressures this may bring in terms of recreation demand, water resources, air pollution etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action for Biodiversity in South East England (South East England Biodiversity Forum, 2001) informs preparation of LDF</td>
<td>Objective: to promote a consensus on biodiversity priorities in the region. This programme sets out the importance of the region’s habitats and provides planners with essential information on regional biodiversity targets.</td>
<td>Will need to make biodiversity a fundamental consideration in policies</td>
<td>Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</th>
<th>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</th>
<th>Implications for Strategy</th>
<th>Implications for HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)</td>
<td>The plan:</td>
<td>Should include policies to protect and encourage appropriate management of habitats / species identified in Hampshire BAP</td>
<td>Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Non-statutory guidance                       | • identifies habitats and species of priority nature conservation concern in Hampshire (including pasture woodland, coast, river valleys, chalk downlands and numerous species)  
• prepares action plans for these habitats and species  
• provides a basis for monitoring  
• identifies issues and actions affecting biodiversity including land management and development. | Should include policies to protect and encourage appropriate management of habitats / species identified in Hampshire BAP | Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed. |
| Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)      | The plan:                                     | Should include policies to protect and encourage appropriate management of habitats / species identified in Wiltshire BAP | Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed. |
| Non-statutory guidance                       | • identifies the distribution of UK Priority BAP species in Wiltshire, and describes the key habitats found in the New Forest.  
• Prepares action plans for these habitats and species (including woodlands, wood-pasture and ancient trees, river and stream habitats, standing open water, arable farmland, hedgerows, lowland calcareous grasslands, unimproved neutral grasslands, bats, and for urban areas).  
• identifies broad landscape areas that have particularly high wildlife value, termed Areas of High Ecological Value (AHEV). Most of the New Forest National Park that lies in Wiltshire has been designated as an AHEV. | Should include policies to protect and encourage appropriate management of habitats / species identified in Wiltshire BAP | Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed. |
<p>| Hampshire County Structure Plan (Remaining ‘saved’) | Maintenance of Strategic Gaps, and the South West Hampshire Green Belt. Establishes the housing provision levels for the New Forest District, and Test Valley Borough. | Provision for meeting housing levels contained in New Forest District Local Plan, and Test Valley Borough Local Plan. The Draft South East Plan contains | HRA should take account of new development and the pressures this may bring in terms of recreation demand, water |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects</th>
<th>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</th>
<th>Implications for Strategy</th>
<th>Implications for HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiltshire County Structure Plan</strong></td>
<td>Safeguarding land for transport scheme – A326. Protection of the historic built heritage</td>
<td>new housing provision. Strategic gaps and the Green Belt provide protection for the ‘setting’ of the National Park.</td>
<td>resources, air pollution etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect and enhance New Forest Heritage Area – no harm to landscape, nature conservation or commoning interests – provision for social &amp; economic interests – no major development proposals unless in national interest. Reclamation/ restoration of spoiled/ derelict land in rural areas to enhance landscape quality Improve recreational use of countryside provided this is consistent with protection of NFHA No caravans/ chalet/ static holiday homes in NFHA Wind farms/ turbines not to detract from character of NFHA Mineral extraction to be permitted only exceptionally in NFHA and AONB provided in public interest. Major telecommunications development in NFHA only if in national interest</td>
<td>Highest priority to protection of character and heritage of New Forest and the AONB</td>
<td>Provides for housing with associated impacts on water resources. Direct impacts on designated sites avoided by policy protection. Measures for avoidance and enhancement of biodiversity promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Guidance for the Solent (Solent Forum)</strong></td>
<td>Maintain, enhance and promote understanding and enjoyment of nature conservation value, landscape character and quality and archaeological &amp; historic heritage of the Solent In shoreline management seek to balance conservation of natural systems with protection of human life and property.</td>
<td>Recognise and protect coastal nature conservation, landscape &amp; archaeological/ historic interests Enable necessary coast protection/ flood defence works subject to environmental</td>
<td>Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed. Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues for LDDs and coastal management plan</td>
<td><strong>Ensure that infrastructure for the management of waste and the extraction of minerals are developed with due regard to the principles of sustainable development.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provide for a supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local requirements including the regional apportionments for recycled and secondary aggregates and land-won sand and gravel, with due regard to geological, environmental and market considerations.&lt;br&gt;Ensure the high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral working and landfill taking into account public access, biodiversity, agricultural and forestry objectives, climate change considerations and aerodrome safeguarding.&lt;br&gt;Protect land with international and national biodiversity designations, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and historic heritage sites and building of national importance from the impact of mineral and waste development.&lt;br&gt;Protect local communities and areas of environmental interest from the adverse impact of mineral, waste and resources developments.</td>
<td>constraints</td>
<td>avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed. Whilst works are promoted these should not adversely affect sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton, and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework ‘Core Strategy’</td>
<td><strong>DC Policies provide specific guidance for the National Park and international designated sites. Planning permission for major proposals, including land-won sand and gravel, non-hazardous landfill and ‘strategic’ recycling, aggregate processing and recovery and treatment facilities, within or likely to impact upon the New Forest National Park will not be permitted. Planning permission for minor proposals will only be granted where these would not prejudice the purpose of the designation or where the reasons for development exceed the likely impacts of development and any adverse impact can be mitigated, provided the development primarily serves the communities within these areas and the development is designed appropriately to a high standard.</strong></td>
<td>HRA should take account of new development and the pressures this may bring in terms of recreation demand, water resources, air pollution etc&lt;br&gt;Consideration of biodiversity within the policies (including the development control policies) will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley Borough Local Plan</td>
<td>‘To protect and conserve the Borough’s natural and built environment, including wildlife, landscapes, natural resources and cultural heritage’ Identified areas include the New Forest National Park area – also Valley of the River Test Heritage Area</td>
<td>Protect and conserve the New Forest Policy for River Test valley to be coordinated with TVBC (subject to review under PPS7)</td>
<td>HRA should take account of new development and the pressures this may bring in terms of recreation demand, water resources, air pollution etc. Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District Local Plan</td>
<td>‘Taking an integrated approach to promoting a high quality and sustainable environment, which conserves and enhances the District’s special environmental qualities, while also addressing the needs of the people who live and work in the District. The strategy has three main elements: development constraint; meeting local needs; conserving and enhancing the environment. Protect and conserve the New Forest whilst attempting to meet local needs through the provision of housing and employment sites.</td>
<td>Conserve and enhance the New Forest whilst ensuring social and economic well-being of the local community</td>
<td>HRA should take account of new development and the pressures this may bring in terms of recreation demand, water resources, air pollution etc. Consideration of biodiversity within the policies will provide a basis for supporting avoidance/ mitigation measures proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan</td>
<td>To maintain and enhance the traditional character of the New Forest through planning policy whilst ensuring the social and economic well-being of all those who live and work in the area. Housing permitted in defined villages Provision for commoners’ dwellings Small scale business development in defined villages Employment development by change of use only outside villages Indoor sport &amp; recreation provision in and on the edge of defined villages Protect and conserve the New Forest whilst ensuring social and economic well-being of the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks to maintain and enhance nature conservation interests including those of the New Forest Ensure thriving rural economy, supports commoning and land management practices which could contribute to enhancing site integrity. Need for essential utilities and transport infrastructure identified but qualified by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No outdoor recreation facilities that increase pressures on New Forest – no golf courses or new riding establishments</td>
<td>Policy for Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs AONB to be coordinated with those of other authorities. Policy for Avon Valley to be coordinated with SDCs</td>
<td>having regard to environmental constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No new tourist facilities/ accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes local open space and recreation opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs AONB – as per national policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Valleys – policies to protect character water quality, amenity, visual quality and public enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton Water and Western Solent Shoreline Management Plan</td>
<td>Provides strategic framework for planning and implementation of coast defence works</td>
<td>Restrict development in areas at risk from coastal erosion and flooding</td>
<td>Promotes objectives and criteria that should minimise impact by restricting development in areas at risk of coastal flooding and/or erosion whilst enabling coast protection and flood defence works necessary to protect existing developed areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan for coastal defences that must be taken into account in LDF and development control</td>
<td>For each section of the coast indicates intention to:</td>
<td>Restrict development likely to give rise to a need for new coast protection/ coastal flood defence works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• do nothing (except to monitor the management unit);</td>
<td>Enable coast defence works/ managed realignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hold the existing defence line by maintaining or changing the standard of protection afforded by existing works;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• advance the existing defence line seawards; or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• retreat the existing defence line to a point further inland (managed retreat).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent European Marine Sites (SEMS) Management Plan</td>
<td>• Achievement/ maintenance of coastal sites subject to European designations in favourable condition</td>
<td>Control of activities likely to have an adverse impact on the coastal SACs/ SPAs</td>
<td>Minimises risk of activities contributing to adverse impacts on site integrity by providing common management framework across the Solent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Control/ management of human activities likely to impact on these sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Lands</td>
<td>• Restoring and sustaining habitats mosaics</td>
<td>Partnership actions for</td>
<td>Seek to maintain and enhance habitats and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</th>
<th>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</th>
<th>Implications for Strategy</th>
<th>Implications for HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan (draft 2008)</td>
<td>• Achieving sustainable woodland management&lt;br&gt;• Contributing to the enjoyment of the Crown Lands and providing opportunities for learning</td>
<td>management of access and promoting education</td>
<td>sustainable management of woodlands. Promote opportunities for management of recreation and enjoyment within Crown Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solent European Marine Sites (SEMS) Management Plan</td>
<td>• Achievement/ maintenance of coastal sites subject to European designations in favourable condition&lt;br&gt;• Control/ management of human activities likely to impact on these sites</td>
<td>Control of activities likely to have an adverse impact on the coastal SACs/ SPAs</td>
<td>Minimises risk of activities contributing to adverse impacts on site integrity by providing common management framework across the Solent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER AGENCIES’ STRATEGIES/ ADVICE

**Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Partnership**

| Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Management Plan       | **Biodiversity**<br>Protect habitats characteristic of AONB and geological/ geomorphological sites | Protect designated nature conservation habitats in the AONB                              | Promotes objectives and criteria that should minimise risk of adverse impacts on habitats and support avoidance/mitigation measures. |

**Environment Agency:**

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects</th>
<th>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</th>
<th>Implications for Strategy</th>
<th>Implications for HRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Forest Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Strategy for management of water resources at a local level. Balances needs of abstractors, water users and the aquatic environment in consultation with community and stakeholders. Manages time limited licences and license practises. Sets out availability of water resource in the catchment.</td>
<td>Current projections indicate existing abstraction licenses can supply anticipated development and demand. However to satisfy likely future demand resource schemes outside the area require investigation e.g. increasing treatment capacity at Testwood, reservoir at Havant Thicket. Policy commitments in South East Plan will require translation into effective action.</td>
<td>Commitments to water resource management, including efficiency savings should be supported and practically implemented through policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hampshire Avon Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy March 2006</strong></td>
<td>Strategy for management of water resources at a local level. Balances needs of abstractors, water users and the aquatic environment in consultation with community and stakeholders. Manages time limited licences and license practises. Sets out availability of water resource in the catchment.</td>
<td>Current projections indicate existing abstraction licenses can supply anticipated development, however these consents are the subject of an ongoing HRA review, the results of which are expected in March 2008.</td>
<td>Commitments to water resource management, including efficiency savings should be supported and practically implemented through policy. Policies should allow for evolution as results of Consents Review become available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES’ PLANS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN CONSIDERING CROSS-BOUNDARY ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Southampton Local Plan</strong></td>
<td>Provision for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shopping – access to sub-regional scale shopping facilities</td>
<td>Ensure sustainable transport links to enable access for shopping, employment, education, health and cultural/ sporting facilities.</td>
<td>Possible increase in trip generation across the National Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Industrial and commercial uses, including Southampton Port</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schemes likely to have impacts on Southampton Water due to uncertain amount of reclamation (Mayflower Park). Individual scheme level assessment likely to be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Life-long learning – including higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes protection and enhancement of the natural environment which may support avoidance/mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to health care – including major hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes targets for housing with consequent consequences for water resources. Water efficiency measures promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural and leisure facilities – sub-regional centre for arts, entertainment and sporting facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dorset County Structure Plan</strong></td>
<td>South East Dorset Green Belt</td>
<td>Basis for location of South West Hampshire Green Belt south of Ringwood</td>
<td>Ensure thriving rural economy, supports commoning and land management practices which could contribute to enhancing site integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of employment at Bournemouth Airport</td>
<td>Assess traffic implications for roads of employment expansion at Bournemouth Airport (e.g. B3347, Avon Causeway)</td>
<td>Needs for essential utilities and transport infrastructure qualified by having regard to environmental constraints. Expansion of air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan/ Programme/ Strategy/ Legislation/ Advice</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies</td>
<td>Policy for Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs AONB to be coordinated with those of other authorities</td>
<td>travel may result in increased trip generation across the National Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dorset Local Plan</td>
<td>South East Dorset Green Belt</td>
<td>Basis for location of South West Hampshire Green Belt south of Ringwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB – as national policies</td>
<td>Policy for Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs AONB to be coordinated with those of other authorities</td>
<td>Ensure thriving rural economy, supports commoning and land management practices which could contribute to enhancing site integrity. Needs for essential utilities and transport infrastructure qualified by having regard to environmental constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Local Plan</td>
<td>South East Dorset Green Belt</td>
<td>Basis for location of South West Hampshire Green Belt south of Ringwood</td>
<td>Establishes targets for housing with consequent consequences for water resources. Water efficiency measures promoted. Needs for essential utilities and transport infrastructure qualified by having regard to environmental constraints. Expansion of air travel may result in increased trip generation across the National Park. Promotes local open space and recreation opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of employment at Bournemouth Airport and associated road proposals</td>
<td>Assess traffic implications for roads of employment expansion at Bournemouth Airport (e.g. B3347, Avon Causeway)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 8 – Other plans and projects</td>
<td>Key objectives of relevant plan/ programme etc</td>
<td>Implications for Strategy</td>
<td>Implications for HRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Poole & Christchurch Bays Shoreline Management Plan | Provides strategic framework for planning and implementation of coast defence works  
For each section of the coast indicates intention to:  
• do nothing (except to monitor the management unit);  
• hold the existing defence line by maintaining or changing the standard of protection afforded by existing works;  
• advance the existing defence line seawards; or retreat the existing defence line to a point further inland (managed retreat). | • Restrict development in areas at risk from coastal erosion and flooding  
• Restrict development likely to give rise to a need for new coast protection/ coastal flood defence works  
• Enable coast defence works/ managed realignment | Promotes objectives and criteria that should minimise impact by restricting development in areas at risk of coastal flooding and/or erosion whilst enabling coast protection and flood defence works necessary to protect existing developed areas |
| Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan | Sustainable provision for:  
• Shopping  
• Industrial and commercial uses  
• Tourism  
• Life-long learning  
• Access to health care  
• Cultural and leisure facilities | Ensure sustainable transport links to enable access for shopping, employment, education, health and cultural/ sporting facilities  
Strong link to tourism – some Bournemouth tourism marketing based on proximity to the New Forest | Establishes targets for housing with consequent consequences for water resources. Water efficiency measures promoted.  
Needs for essential utilities and transport infrastructure qualified by having regard to environmental constraints.  
Promotion of tourism may result in trip generation and visitor disturbance. |
| **Bournemouth Airport Master Plan** | Plan for the expansion of the airport and the aircraft using the airport | Traffic implications for roads used for accessing the airport | Expansion of air travel may result in increased trip generation across the National Park. Low flying aircraft may cause disturbance to designated sites. |
| **Southampton Airport Master Plan** | Plan for the expansion of the airport and the aircraft using the airport | Traffic implications for roads used for accessing the airport | Expansion of air travel may result in increased trip generation across the New Forest National Park. Low flying aircraft may cause disturbance to designated sites. |