

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM1

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

Poor grammar so is ineffective and therefore unsound. Otherwise support.

3. Please set out the changes you think are needed to make this modification(s) legally compliant and sound, in respect to the issues you have raised in Question 2. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording. Please be as precise as possible.

Suggested change.... This Plan replaces *in its entirety* the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan ~~in its entirety, which was~~ adopted in 2013 and takes into account....

.....
Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM2

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

We welcome the commitment to *strategic ecological networks*. Required to comply with Biodiversity Duty and with LNRS.

.....
Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM4 Policy 1 / Para. 3.2, 3.3, 3.6 & 3.14

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

We support the modifications particularly the clarification that cumulative impact should include *previous* minerals development. There are some communities that have been impacted for many decades. Similarly, biodiversity losses resulting from inadequate, failed or delayed restoration of minerals sites (especially on former heathland on the Hampshire/East Dorset boundary) have created significant barriers to ecological networks. This is particularly relevant to the Purple Haze allocation.

.....

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM5 Policy 2 / Para. 4.6 (footnote), 4.8, 4.9 & 4.10

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

We support the modifications particularly

- the reference to soil (soil carbon is a key component of total carbon budget for a site)
 - reduction in use of primary aggregate (para 4.8) (minerals are a non-renewable resource), and
 - commitment to delivery of strategic scale coherent ecological networks including neighbouring Authorities (para 4.10). Biodiversity does not stop at political boundaries.
-

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM6 Policy 3 / Para. 4.15 (footnote), 4.19, 4.22, 4.23, 4.25, 4.27, 4.28, 4.29 & 4.30-4.32

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

i) We welcome the changes to both the Policy and supporting paragraphs. They provide clarity to essential requirements to comply with legislation to deliver coherent strategic ecological networks including across county boundaries, the national and county importance of some species (eg Annex 1 birds and reptiles, other rare and scarce species and LNRS

species) and a commitment to deliver habitat restoration in previously agreed plans (such as Forest Plans).

ii) However, we suggest changes to **para 4.25** which reads
....deliver at least 10% gain in biodiversity above the current baseline and which has to be maintained for a period of at least 30 years. Heathland restoration will require management **in perpetuity**. This should be identified here so that it is obvious to any developer putting forward new areas for consideration as unallocated sites.

iii) Policy 3 Para 4b

With reference to the Purple Haze site, the HCC/NE SocG para 3.16 states, *We consider the wet heath and wet/heath mire transitions within the application site should be viewed as irreplaceable habitat (NPPF definition; ' Habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity'). Drier heathland within the application site could also come into the same category because of the species diversity that it supports. Policy in the NPPF (paragraph 186 c.) is that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists. We have not viewed a compensation strategy to date.'*

Although referred to in para 4.107, it would be helpful if **Para 4b of Policy 3** made it totally clear that the habitats mentioned in NPPF are merely examples and there are other habitats such as heathland that should be considered irreplaceable.

iv) We strongly support the condition that *Any required compensation should be able to be secured prior to harmful impacts arising.* This is essential to ensure delivery of BNG as outlined in para 4.29.

3. Please set out the changes you think are needed to make this modification(s) legally compliant and sound, in respect to the issues you have raised in Question 2. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording. Please be as precise as possible.

Add to para 4.25: ***Heathland restoration will require management in perpetuity.***
Amend para 4b of Policy 3 eg *irreplaceable habitats (such as **but not limited to** Ancient Woodland and ancient or veteran trees).*

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM12 Policy 9 / Para. 4.92 (footnote) & 4.96

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

We welcome the changes that address the need for detailed consideration of how soil restoration, including soil profiles, will be achieved both for high quality agricultural soils and specialist habitat restoration such as heathland.

.....

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM13 Policy 10 /Para 4.103-5, 4.108-9 & 4.116

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

i) While supporting the changes to Policy as far as they go, it would be helpful for **Policy 10 1e** to be more specific about a requirement for timescales to ensure no net loss of biodiversity both from the outset and at each phase of the development. Commitments to deliver 10% BNG 20-30 years hence will not address the current ecological crisis and risks irrecoverable biodiversity loss in the meantime.

ii) **Para 4.104** includes the proviso ... *subject to its financial viability*.... This could be taken to suggest that all the listed mechanisms for biodiversity gain could be ruled out on grounds of viability. That would be unacceptable and contrary to legislation. Time and time again we see back tracking by developers with affordable housing provision. It is essential that this wording does not present a loophole to avoid meeting ecological requirements/commitments.

iii) **4.108 While we welcome** the recognition of the issues relating to heathland habitat, the statement should recognise that the diversity of lowland heath is such that it must be identified as an irreplaceable habitat and that management will be required in perpetuity (as evidence by RSPB research previously cited in responses to EiP). As an example, please see footnotes i) and ii) for details of notable/rare plants and invertebrates identified at Purple Haze.

3. Please set out the changes you think are needed to make this modification(s) legally compliant and sound, in respect to the issues you have raised in Question 2. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording. Please be as precise as possible.

i) Ensure no net loss of biodiversity from the outset of a development and at each phase.

ii) Remove the wording “subject to its *financial viability*”

iii) **4.108** Amend penultimate sentence to read: *For example, ancient woodland cannot be recreated and there is a presumption against its loss. Similarly, lowland heath should be regarded as irreplaceable and will require management in perpetuity.*

.....

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM17 Policy 14 / Para. 5.49 & Para. 5.53- 5.56

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

Para 5.54 is particularly relevant to the Purple Haze allocation and the risk of displacement of informal recreation causing harm to Habitats Sites in the area.

.....

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM23 Policy 20 / Para 6.75 - 6.78, 6.82 and 6.83

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

6.77 Typos: Ashley Manor - from 2025+; • Hamble Airfield - from 2025⁴⁺; • Midgham Farm - from 2026+; • Purple Haze - from 2028⁴⁺;

MM23 to para 6.78 not listed in heading.

2. the extraction of identified reserves at the following allocated new sand and gravel extraction sites, provided the proposals address the development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - iv. Purple Haze, Ringwood Forest (soft sand / sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 5) – 4.40 million tonnes

Not legal. Not sound (Not effective). The evidence we have already is that development of Purple Haze will not comply with Development Considerations as:

- i) the heathland is irreplaceable habitat; the site supports 63 forbs, 28 grasses and sedges, 5 ferns, 17 mosses, and 9 lichens. Of these a total of at least 27 are “Dorset Notables” (DN) or rarer; ⁱ
- ii) it will not meet the conservation objectives for SPAs;
- iii) it will have a major adverse impact on EPS reptiles and will fail to maintain their conservation status in their natural range;
- iv) it will have a major adverse impact on an invertebrates assemblage of national conservation importance; ⁱⁱ
- v) there is no evidence of deliverability within the Plan period.

EiP Document M9.26 included in Dr Buss's report the statement,
*26. Obtaining representative field data to do a robust water balance on this bog site, supported by both groundwater and surface water, is non-trivial due to the low contributions from some of the components, the seasonal dynamics and the annual variations across drought/ typical/wet periods and climate change uncertainties. Measurement techniques for low flows are not especially accurate so the repetition of measurements is essential to give confidence in the accuracy of results. Given the current drought conditions a field study without significant uncertainties could need to take **several years**. The prolonged drought followed by recent heavy rainfall creates even more uncertainties that add to the time that will be required **to establish certainty of no harm to Ebblake Bog and/or the Moors River system as required by legislation.***

Suggested change: Remove the Purple Haze allocation from the Plan.

In the event that this advice is not accepted, we request that the recommended changes relating to Purple Haze within MM23 and MM43 detailed below are adopted.

M23 Policy 20

3. opportunities for new soft sand extraction sites in the Preferred Areas, where it can be demonstrated that the development, in line with other policies in this Plan, will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and local communities.
4. Proposals opportunities for new extraction sites in addition to the sites and areas identified above where it can be demonstrated that the site contains viable mineral resources and development, in line with the other policies in this Plan will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment and local communities

Items 3 and 4 Legal and Sound. This part of the policy provides a satisfactory alternative to Purple Haze for the delivery of soft sand so complies with NPPF.

6.78

The exact timings of new sites allocations coming on stream being developed will depend on the market conditions, extraction at other sites in the nearby area and planning permission being granted for the development. The Purple Haze allocation has a potential total yield of 4.4 million tonnes. However, further investigations are required to determine whether the north of the site can be extracted without hydrological impact on the nearby Ebblake bog. These investigations may identify that extraction may need to be limited or possibly excluded in some areas. Therefore, the yield is specified as 'up to 4.4 million' but it is acknowledged that this could be less depending on the outcome of the investigations.

Not sound (Not effective)

Pre-empts findings of hydrology related studies for and omits any reference to Moors River System SSSI.

Suggested changes (in bold):

*The exact timings of new sites allocations coming on stream being developed will depend on the market conditions, extraction at other sites in the nearby area and planning permission being granted for the development. The Purple Haze allocation has a **maximum** potential total yield of 4.4 million tonnes. However, further investigations are required to determine **how much whether the north** of the site can be extracted without hydrological impact on the nearby Ebblake **Bog and/or the Moors River system**. These investigations may identify that extraction may need to be limited or possibly excluded in some areas. Therefore, the yield is*

specified as 'up to 4.4 million' but it is acknowledged that this could be less depending on the outcome of the investigations.

6.83 Legal.Sound. Identifies the potential need for other soft sand allocations should some or all of Purple Haze not be deliverable.

New para(p66) starting *Opportunities for new soft sand extraction sites are expected to be in the Soft Sand Preferred Areas. Legal and sound.*

.....
Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM41 Appendix A Midgham Farm

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

Development considerations

4. We assume the issue of nutrient enrichment relates to both leaching and run-off from existing soils. If not, it should be made clear in the wording. The issue also needs to be addressed as part of the restoration to agricultural land (see comment on **14** below).

5. **Unsound (Not effective)** It would be helpful to identify risks and thus the requirements of buffering. Any buffer should ensure that there are no risks of nutrient enrichment or silt deposition. These woodlands should be included in the hydrological/hydrogeological assessments.

Suggested change

Hydrological/hydrogeological assessments are required to determine the risk to and appropriate protection of ~~consider whether proposed works will affect~~ nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars, and SSSIs, **and Ancient Replanted Woodland and Ancient & Semi-Natural Woodland** ~~including the issue of nutrient enrichment~~ **to ensure they are not at risk from hydrological changes, nutrient enrichment or silt deposition.**

14. Both extraction and restoration should ensure no deposition of silt or run-off/leaching of excess nutrients to R Avon/Avon Valley

3. Please set out the changes you think are needed to make this modification(s) legally compliant and sound, in respect to the issues you have raised in Question 2. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording. Please be as precise as possible.

Dev Con. 4: Add ...*and siltation*

Dev. Con. 5: Add ... *to ensure they are not at risk from hydrological changes, nutrient enrichment or silt deposition*

Dev.Con.14: Both extraction and restoration should ensure no deposition of silt or run-off/leaching of excess nutrients to R Avon/Avon Valley.

Typo: 11. A dust, noise, and lighting management plan and monitoring ~~is~~ are required. Or rephrase to read . *A dust, noise, and lighting management and monitoring plan is required.*

.....

Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM43 Appendix A Purple Haze

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

i) **Existing Land Use** The revised description of the existing land use recognises that this is heathland much of which was overplanted with low yield conifers. **Sound.**

ii) **Total Mineral Resource** The statement on the available resource is unclear so **not sound (Not effective)**. Does the 2.6 million tonnes available in the Plan period include estimates of both soft sand and coarse sand/gravel? What assumptions are being made on the extent (area and depth) of the site to be developed? The extra focussed hearing on this potential allocation identified that, in the absence of further hydrology related data (requirements now detailed in subsequent development considerations), it was unsafe to assume anything more than the very southernmost part of the site might be suitable for mineral extraction (proposed phases 15-20) as those phases were unlikely to affect the hydrology of Ebblake Bog. However, mineral extraction from even that southernmost area could impact on the Moors River System SSSI (high water table): compliance with the Water Framework Directive is required. It would also result in loss of irreplaceable lowland heath, adversely affecting heathland species including SPA birds, nationally significant EPS reptile populations and a nationally important invertebrate assemblage. Pl see also comments below on Dev. Cons. 4.

iii) **Restoration. Sound** We support the revised summary of Restoration for the site. This area was heathland prior to planting with very low yield conifers much of which is scheduled in the 2009 Forest Plan to be returned to Open Habitat and should be restored **now** to support the rare and protected heathland species identified in the ecological surveys.

iv) Development considerations

1. The location of the site on the Hampshire/Dorset border and the need to consider the potential for impacts beyond the Plan boundary.

1. Sound. We strongly support this recognition of the potential significant adverse impact on Dorset in the short, medium and long term.

*2. Ensure no significant adverse impact on the integrity of the Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, Avon Valley SPA and Ramsar, and the River Avon SAC (and the New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar in relation to recreational displacement)**

2. Sound. This clarifies what is required to comply with legislation

It is essential that displacement of informal recreation onto the areas identified is avoided.

This part of Ringwood Forest is becoming even more popular with walkers, runners, dog walkers and cyclists with the growth of housing developments in the area, increased dog ownership, encouragement for people to “get out into nature” and the introduction of car park charges in the New Forest. In addition to Moors Valley Country Park publicity, the following are examples of websites found in a quick on-line search for local walks:

<https://www.komoot.com/guide/2722470/hiking-in-ringwood-forest>

<https://hiiker.app/hikes/england/dorset/ringwood-forest-long-loop>

<https://www.alltrails.com/en-gb/trail/england/hampshire/ringwood-forest-short-circular>

3. Ensure no significant adverse impact on the offsite roosting, foraging, and breeding areas of the qualifying bird species of nearby SPAs/Ramsars, and on their functional linkage

3. Not legal, not sound. While we welcome the acknowledgement of the functional linkage of the site with the SPA, it fails to recognise that it is part of the core ecological network in its own right.

This development consideration is not sufficiently explicit to clarify what is required to comply with legislation and case law (Rufford) as discussed at EiP (13.2.2025). Further it does not comply with NERC Act 2006, Species of Principal (Conservation) Importance, Reg 9a of Habitats Regs which requires LPAs to apply all reasonable endeavours to avoid the deterioration of wild bird habitat (including that of nightjar and woodlark) when exercising their statutory functions. The presence of either or both species and any effects on them is a material consideration when considering planning applications, regardless of whether the area is put forward for classification as an SPA in due course.

Absolute certainty is required that the proposed development will not harm the integrity of the area used by the qualifying species. The regulations state, *The conservation objectives for the SPAs require maintaining the structure, function, and supporting processes of the habitats used by the qualifying species, including off-site feeding and roosting areas.* Deterioration of the habitat for these species during and for some years afterwards would be inevitable.

We suggest the following change but defer to RSPB for their advice on appropriate wording. **Meet the conservation objectives for the SPAs by maintaining at all times the structure, function, and supporting processes of the habitats used by the qualifying species, including off-site breeding, feeding and roosting areas.**

4. Hydrological/hydrogeological ~~assessment~~, hydrochemical and ecohydrological assessments ~~is~~ are required to ~~consider~~ determine the risk and appropriate protection of ~~whether proposed works will affect~~ nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars and SSSIs. ~~including~~ This includes the issue of nutrient enrichment, and including the protection of the water quality and recharge of the underlying aquifer, groundwater and surface water and safeguarding the hydrological/ecohydrological regimes of Ebblake Bog and Moors River System Sites of Special Scientific Interest potentially through the limiting or exclusion of extraction in the north of the site*

4. **Unsound.** The extra focussed EiP hearing on this potential allocation identified that in the absence of further hydrology related data it was unsafe to assume anything more than the very southernmost part of the site might be suitable for mineral extraction if impact on the hydrology of Ebblake Bog is to be avoided. The development as a whole has to comply with the Water Framework Directive and avoid adverse impact on all water bodies in the catchment of Ebblake Bog and the Moors River System.

The modification ... *potentially through the limiting or exclusion of extraction in the north of the site* is too prescriptive, pre-empting the findings of the additional specified assessments of impact on both Ebblake Bog and the Moors River system. To comply with legislation, the further work has to demonstrate that **there will be no harm**.

Published groundwater monitoring data for the southern section for the period 1.5.19-16.6.21 are inconclusive as boreholes are on the periphery of the site and not within the areas that would be extracted: no raw data showing dates of testing have been made available. Water table depths of 0.63-1.76m and 1.36-3.08m bgl are recorded for boreholes PZ4 and PZ5 on the SE boundary. Mineral testing reported damp sand/gravel at c.6m for M5, M7 and M8.

As part of the planning application it was established that there must be no extraction below the water table: this is re-iterated in para 2.16 of the latest HCC/NE SoCG. <https://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/EX41-Natural-England-Statement-of-Common-Ground-Post-Hearing.pdf>. This requirement should be included in the Development Considerations, either as a stand-alone requirement or possibly under this one (**Dev Con 4**).

To remove all uncertainty, we recommend the Plan should specify the depth of mineral resource that should be retained above the highest watertable (with allowances for climate change) to ensure no hydrological changes.

Table 1 below shows monthly rainfall distribution (Hurn Airport data) and illustrates the considerable variability: this will be reflected in the depth of the water table. Decisions must not be made on the basis of mean data. Reports for the area are that January 2026 rainfall is at least double what would normally be expected. To date, February appears to be similar.

Table 1. Rainfall data (mm)

	1995-2018 mean*	2004 **	2018 **	2019 **	2020 **	2021 **	2022 **	2023 **	2024 **	2025 **	2026 **
J	97.8	103.4	76.4	40.7	109.0	94.4	31.6	114.2	85.4	134.0	205.8
F	69.4	35.4	42.4	55.5	130.6	75.6	70.0	12.2	146.6	58.8	
M	52.1	51.6	148.3	80.0	54.6	37.0	54.0	122.6	113.0	10.0	
A	59.9	74.4	75.4	54.0	51.8	12.8	26.8	65.6	71.2	39.4	
M	52.9	38.6	39.6	37.0	0.2	106.4	57.0	51.4	84.6	20.6	
J	49.4	23.8	0.4	74.4	59.6	83.8	48.2	23.2	11.4	47.0	
J	52.9	46.0	27.2	34.4	29.8	104.8	0.0	93.4	70.4	31.2	
A	63.4	75.2	64.0	43.4	103.4	21.2	15.4	72.2	49.4	40.4	

S	58.8	52.2	42.8	125.0	36.0	41.8	67.8	92.8	164.6	83.2	
O	100.4	154.2	44.8	135.6	170.8	141.6	82.6	194.4	106.6	96.2	
N	115.8	27.8	124.0	113.8	65.2	5.6	204.4	141.0	103.2	85.2	
D	106.5	72.8	139.4	144.4	140.4	84.0	110.6	139.0	54.6	114.2	
Total	889.3	755.4	824.7	938.2	950.8	809.0	768.0	1122.0	1061.0	760.20	

* from Applicants' report ** from Hurn data

(2025 are provisional figures)

<https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/pub/data/weather/uk/climate/stationdata/hurndata.txt>

Suggested changes

- i) Amend final sentence to read *potentially through ~~the~~ limiting or excluding ~~the~~ areas of extraction. ~~in the north of the site.~~*
- ii) Add *Mineral extraction will only take place above the highest water table level (including a realistic allowance for climate change) leaving in situ an adequate and proven depth of dry sand and gravel to preclude hydrological changes and support habitat restoration objectives.*

With these exceptions this Development Consideration modification is **sound** and clarifies what is required to comply with legislation.

5. Protection of populations and conservation status of rare and notable species including Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Coral Necklace*

5. Not Sound. Not Effective.

- a) ARC has advised in the strongest possible terms that mineral development here will have a significant adverse impact on nationally important populations of European Protected Species (EPS) sand lizard and smooth snake. Reptile population studies must accord with best practice and include survey of adjacent land. Many of the survey refugia within the red line boundary are still visible from footpaths and are being disturbed by visitors and dogs so yielding inaccurate data and, illegally, risk of damage to individual reptiles. To deliver minimum 10% BNG the Plan should require enhancement of EPS reptiles.
- b) Coral Necklace is included as a species "of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity" under Section 41 (England) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.
- c) Surveys identified that the site meets SSSI criteria for its exceptional and nationally important invertebrate assemblage (ii).

Suggested changes:

5a) Maintain and enhance favourable conservation status (range, population and habitat) of European Protected Species (sand lizard and smooth snake) in their range.

5b) Protect and enhance populations and conservation status of other rare and notable species including Coral Necklace and invertebrates.

6 Mitigate the impact on Ringwood Forest and Home Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, ensuring that temporary and long-term impacts to habitats and habitat connectivity are compensated, if required.

6. Unsound. Not Effective (Incomplete). We advise that this should follow the mitigation hierarchy ie avoid, minimise, mitigate and compensate.

The HCC/NE SoCG (3.15) confirms that *the wet heath and wet/heath mire transitions within the application site should be viewed as irreplaceable habitat and drier heathland within the application site could also come into the same category because of the species diversity that it supports.*

At the very least these identified areas should be avoided to comply with NPPF. The Development Consideration should ensure the impact on the SINC and the rare and protected species it supports is minimised, with appropriate mitigation and as a last resort compensation.

Either this Development Consideration or the next (item 7) should include a requirement for phasing of extraction **to be** designed and implemented to avoid loss of habitat connectivity and minimise temporary habitat loss. This is essential given the ecological crisis.

Suggested change

Amend wording to: ***Minimise the impact on Ringwood Forest and Home Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, ensuring that irreplaceable habitats are avoided, temporary and long-term impacts to habitats and habitat connectivity are mitigated and, as a last resort, compensated if required. Phasing of extraction must be designed and implemented to avoid loss of habitat connectivity and minimise temporary habitat loss.***

*7. Restoration must include habitats creation to compensate for habitats lost from within the development footprint, expand expansion of those within the designated sites and relate to the wider landscape and enhance ecological networks including those set out in the Forest Plan**

7. Unsound (Not Effective). We support the intention of this modification but recommend that it should include reference to use of locally sourced seed with the same range of plant species that the site currently supports (i). The BNG requirements cannot be met unless this is implemented.

Suggested change

Restoration must include habitats creation ***using only locally sourced seed*** to compensate for habitats lost from within the development footprint, expand those within the designated sites and relate to the wider landscape maintaining and enhancing ecological networks including those set out in the Forest Plan*

8. Typo: *A dust, noise, and lighting management plan and monitoring ~~is~~ are required.*
Otherwise **sound.**

12. We welcome the insertion of ***legally***. To be consistent with the Restoration aim, *woodland* should be excluded from this Development Consideration. **[Wording at the end](#)**

of the para should be amended to agree with that in MM 44 (p125) Amend to read, *Recreational displacement must be carefully managed recognising existing informal access. Management arrangements to legally secure short and long term objectives for amenity and biodiversity including heathland, ~~woodland~~, acid grassland and ~~protected species~~ **that are legally protected or otherwise notable****.

Otherwise sound.

~~17 Specialist soil handling, management, and monitoring is required to ensure restoration to heathland habitats.
Importation of material as part of the restoration would need appropriate supporting investigations and risk assessment.~~

17. Unsound. Not Effective We welcome the requirement for specialist soil handling, management and monitoring to attempt heathland restoration. Considerations should include a requirement for safe and legal disposal of waste silt and clay elsewhere: little if any should be used in on site restoration.

The Soil Handling Strategy submitted with the planning application estimated that the *silt content would average c5% of the recoverable mineral reserve* ie would be included in what is sold. No data were reported for estimated waste silt or clay although the applicant's website <https://purplehazequarry.com/about-our-proposals/methods-of-working/> identifies 500,000 tonnes clay across the whole site. As confirmed in EX 38 para.5, *if clay is used, it could reduce infiltration and alter post- restoration hydrology. This potential impact has not been assessed.* Both clay and silt are unsuitable substrates for heathland restoration: silt is particularly damaging to heathland habitats and the protected/priority species they support.

Thus, at the very least, more than 0.5 million tonnes of waste will need to be disposed of offsite. The location and environmental impact of this waste disposal will require detailed assessment. The additional haulage of this waste should be included in the transport assessment for Purple Haze.

We suggest this should either be added to this Development Consideration or included as a stand-alone requirement.

At no stage during the construction, operational or restoration phases should there be any risk of harm due to suspended solids in run-off.

Please note that RSPB research has demonstrated that heathland is irreplaceable habitat. Land currently under plantation here will revert to heathland when clear felled but will need appropriate management.

Suggested changes:

- i) *Specialist **heathland** soil handling, management, and monitoring is required **at all stages to avoid suspended solids in run-off and to ensure restoration to heathland habitats.***
- ii) Add ***Off-site disposal of waste silt and clay is required to ensure no***

harm to existing or restored habitats on, adjacent to or potentially impacted by the site.

19. Typo final sentence Road no is **B3081** (also needs to be corrected in HRA).

22. Hydrological/Hydrogeological Assessment is required to ensure that any impacts on water quantity and quality are considered and mitigated where needed.

22. Not legal, Not sound. Not Effective. The hydrology of the area and the potential adverse impact of any changes on Ebblake Bog and the Moors River system are crucial. *Consideration* and then *mitigation* are inadequate. The risks must be identified and quantified and then assessment made following the mitigation hierarchy.

Suggested change: *Hydrological/Hydrogeological Assessment is required to ensure identify and quantify potential changes to ~~any impacts on water quantity and quality~~, and how they can be avoided, minimised or mitigated ~~are considered and mitigated where needed to ensure no adverse impact~~.*

23. Construction and Operational Surface Water Management Plans are required*.

23. Not sound. Not Effective. The Jacob's report (EX38) specified that both must be detailed to manage surface water runoff and suspended solids. We have provided evidence of where suspended solids have caused major adverse impact in Dorset. There must be no risk of this here.

We recommend that both Management Plans should include details of disposal of waste water both operational (including wheel washing) and domestic (catering and washroom/toilet facilities) to ensure no suspended solids or contamination of the site including disposal of alkaline, chlorinated mains water onto acid soils.

Suggested change

Detailed Construction and Operational Surface Water Management Plans are required to manage surface water and avoid suspended solids and pollutants*.

24. On-site water use should be sourced from boreholes in the south of the site or from a mains water supply*.

24 Sound

Please include in the Development Considerations the explanatory HRA footnote *The Asterisk denotes that development cannot be permitted if it may negatively affect the integrity of International protected sites and the development requirements for maintaining this integrity must be addressed.* This does not appear to have been stated anywhere else.

.....
Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM44 Appendix C / Policy 2

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this:

a. and, where relevant, impacts on soil ecosystems)

We support the recognition of this major component of total ecosystem carbon

c. Expansion of tree and woodland cover, where appropriate - to strengthen woodland habitat networks, protect soils, provide shade whilst capturing additional carbon from the atmosphere [...] Where tree or woodland expansion is proposed, consideration should be given to the Forestry Commission's Guidance: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/713805/england-open-habitats-policy-march-2010.pdf

We welcome recognition of the Open Habitats policy and that woodland is not always appropriate.

.....
Main, Additional, and/or Policies Map Modification(s) that you are responding to:

MM44 Appendix C / Policy 3

1. Do you consider this/these modification(s):

Legally compliant (prepared in accordance with legislation) Yes No

Sound (fit for purpose) Yes No

2. If you do or do not consider the above modification(s) to be legally compliant and/or sound, please explain your reasons for this.

Not Effective. The final paragraph (p125) should include reference to heathland requiring management in perpetuity. Otherwise **Sound**.

3. Please set out the changes you think are needed to make this modification(s) legally compliant and sound, in respect to the issues you have raised in Question 2. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording. Please be as precise as possible.

Suggested change

Applicants should make provisions for the need for long-term aftercare and management of the site including the statutory requirement for long-term management of onsite BNG habitats. For heathland sites this will be in perpetuity.

ⁱ The total number of plant species identified in surveys of Purple Haze were 63 forbs (the reported list includes trees), 28 grasses and sedges, 5 ferns, 17 mosses, and 9 lichens. Of these a total of at least 27 are "Dorset Notables" (DN) or rarer: two lichen species may also qualify.

Table 1: Plant species on Purple Haze site qualifying as Dorset Notables or rarer

Specific name	Common Name	Species status/rarity	Comments
FORBS			
<i>Drosera intermedia</i>	Oblong-leaved sundew	DN	
<i>Galium saxatile</i>	Heath bedstraw	DN	
<i>Gnaphalium sylvaticum</i>	Heath cudweed		Hampshire DBAP
<i>Illecebrum verticillatum</i>	Coral necklace	NR, DRPR, DN	Hampshire DBAP
<i>Leontodon saxatilis</i>	Lesser Hawkbit	DN	
<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	Common bird's-foot trefoil	DN	
<i>Ornithopus perpusillus</i>	Bird's Foot	DN	
<i>Pedicularis sylvatica</i>	Lousewort	DN	
<i>Pilosellus officinarum</i>	Shaggy Mouse-eared Hawkweed	DN	
<i>Plantago coronopus</i>	Buck's-horn Plantain	DN	
<i>Potentilla erecta</i>	Tormentil	DN	
<i>Pulicaria dysenterica</i>	Common Fleabane	DN	
<i>Radiola linoides</i>	Allseed	DS, DRPR, DN	
<i>Spergularia rubra</i>	Sand Spurry	DN	
<i>Ulex gallii</i>	Western gorse	DN	
<i>Veronica officinalis</i>	Heath Speedwell	DN	
GRASSES, FERNS, MOSES & LICHENS			
<i>Agrostis curtisii</i>	Bristle Bent	DN	
<i>Carex panicea</i>	Carnation sedge	DN	
<i>Danthonia decumbens</i>	Heath-grass	DN	
<i>Deschampsia flexuosa</i>	Wavy hair-grass	DN	
<i>Festuca filiformis</i>	Fine-leaved fescue	DN	
<i>Nardus stricta</i>	Mat grass	DR, DRPR, DN	
<i>Rhynchospora alba</i>	White beaked sedge	DN	
<i>Trichophorum cespitosum</i>	Deer grass	DN	
<i>Osmunda regalis</i>	Royal Fern	DN	
<i>Dicranum majus</i>	Greater fork moss	DN	
<i>Plagiothecium undulatum</i>	Waved silk moss	DN	
<i>Cladonia furcata</i>	A lichen		DN if ssp. <i>subrangiformis</i>
<i>Cladonia uncialis</i>	A lichen		DN if ssp. <i>biuncialis</i>

NR= Nationally rare, DR= Dorset rare, DRPR = Listed in the Dorset Rare Plant Register, DS= Dorset scarce, DN= Dorset Notable

ⁱⁱ A total of **511** invertebrate species were recorded from the site of which **55** (10%) are of recognised conservation status including **6 Nationally Rare**, and **39 Nationally Scarce**

About You

Is this your own personal response or on behalf of an organisation or group?

- This is a personal response
 This response is on behalf of an organisation or group

If this response is on behalf of an organisation or group, please tell us a little more about yourself and the organisation you are responding on behalf of:

Please note: anonymous or confidential representations cannot be accepted.

The full name of your organisation or group (required)	East Dorset Environment Partnership
The full address of your organisation or group (required)	██ ████████████████████
Your full name (required)	████████████████████
Your position in the organisation or group (required)	Chairman
Contact email address (optional)	████████████████████

Do you wish to be informed:

When the examination recommendations are published Yes No

When the Plan has been adopted Yes No

Of future minerals and waste policy work Yes No