

# Part B

## Opportunity sites – Housing

DWT is commenting primarily on considerations regarding *Natural environment and ecology*

Our comments on specific sites follow:

Site Reference	Appendix and page no	Settlement	Comments
LA/BEAM/003,004,006,007	A7	Beaminster	<p>This site has more than doubled compared with the preferred site option proposed as part of the 2021 Options consultation.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach also includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>In addition to the identified amber risk zone for Great Crested Newt, other factors include that part of the site falls within the Existing and Higher Potential Ecological Network, there are records for dormice in the area, there is a watercourse present on site and part of the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial photographs. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. A buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m should also be maintained.</p>
LA/BEAM/008,009	A10	Beaminster	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows but this should also include wooded tree lines which contribute significantly to the ecological value of the currently closely managed hedgerows. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>This site lies within 200m of two SNCIs to the north, both of which are selected for their species-rich grassland interest with further SNCI grassland sites highlighting the value of this habitat in the local area. The majority of the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial</p>

			<p>photographs. Creation of green space on this site which would be expected if the site is taken forward should seek to expand and increase the connectivity of important grassland habitats in this area.</p> <p>The proposed approach also includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>In addition to the identified amber risk zone for Great Crested Newt, other factors include that part of the site falls within the Existing and Higher Potential Ecological Network, there are records for dormice in the area, and there is a watercourse with associated trees and wooded linear habitat present on site. The wooded boundary on the eastern edge of the site is also significant in its role within local ecological networks providing good connectivity to further habitats to the north and south. Implementation of a suitable buffer to protect the functionality of these habitats for wildlife is recommended along with an appropriate lighting strategy to minimise impacts. A buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m should also be maintained.</p>
LA/BERE/003	A14	Bere Regis	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain and buffer existing hedgerows. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach must also include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>DWT support the requirement for Nutrient Neutrality and appropriate mitigation for heathland sites.</p>
LA/BERE/010	A16	Bere Regis	<p>DWT support the requirement for Nutrient Neutrality and are pleased to see that the nearby SNCI (less than 100m to the south) is recognised and agree with proposed approaches including use of buffers, and design of the site to create and maintain green corridors and ecological connectivity. This should include retention of existing hedgerows. This should all be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p>

			<p>The nearby SNCI is selected for its species-rich grassland and broad-leaved woodland interest with further SNCI woodland sites highlighting the value of this habitat in the local area. The majority of the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial photographs. Creation of green space on this site which would be expected if the site is taken forward should seek to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area. A buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m should also be maintained.</p> <p>The proposed approach also includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>As the site adjoins the 400m heathland buffer and lies within the 5m zone, mitigation for impacts to heathlands is essential and the provision of heathland infrastructure project must be considered in the context of all other anticipated development within the area is this allocation is taken forward.</p> <p>The site is also very visible from Dorset Wildlife Trust's Wild Woodbury community rewilding project. Although the visual impact summary identifies the site as well hidden, this is from the road side and from wider views within the village. As it slopes down to the watercress beds to the east, any development here is likely to significantly impact visual amenity within the SANG area.</p>
LA/BISH/002	A19	Bishop's Caundle	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows and tree lines within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which applies to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, and deliver wider benefits through the creation of corridors for wildlife connectivity to existing woodland to the north.</p>
LA/BISH/003	A21	Bishop's Caundle	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key</p>

			<p>features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy. A mitigation strategy will be required for all priority and protected species identified through further ecological surveys, not just Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which applies to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
LA/BISH/004	A23	Bishop's Caundle	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which applies to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>It is noted that the adjacent LA/BISH/005 is also proposed as a site for development, and if developed together, these would result in the small field to the west of this site becoming completely isolated. Development of either of these potential sites therefore should ensure that ecological connectivity is retained between the small field and undeveloped habitats to the south and west through the provision of suitable habitat corridors.</p>
LA/BISH/005	A25	Bishop's Caundle	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which applies to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>It is noted that the adjacent LA/BISH/004 is also proposed as a site for development, and if developed together, these would result in the small field to the north-east of this site becoming completely isolated. Development of either of these potential sites therefore should ensure that</p>

			ecological connectivity is retained between the small field and undeveloped habitats to the south and west through the provision of suitable habitat corridors.
LA/LALB/001	A28	Blandford	<p>DWT support the need for appropriate bat activity survey to be undertaken in relation to the Bryanston GHS bat SSSI zone and the retention and buffering of existing suitable habitat and suitable lighting strategy. However, it is essential that a comprehensive enhancement and mitigation strategy for the bats is also implemented which seeks to enhance habitats on the site in order to increase resources and improve connectivity for bats in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, given the scale of the possible development the layout should include significant informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p>
LA/PIMP/006	A30	Blandford	<p>DWT support the need for appropriate bat activity survey to be undertaken in relation to the Bryanston GHS bat SSSI zone and the retention and buffering of existing suitable habitat and suitable lighting strategy. However, it is essential that a comprehensive enhancement and mitigation strategy for the bats is also implemented which seeks to enhance habitats on the site in order to increase resources and improve connectivity for bats in the wider landscape.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, given the scale of the possible development the layout should include significant informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required</p>
LA/BOUR/002,003	A33	Bourton	<p>We welcome the identification of significant tree lines and hedgerows on site and recognition of the ecological network contributions of habitats in the southern part of the site. The proposed approach should retain these and this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>All developments are required to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain and this is not specific to this site.</p> <p>The proposed approach should also application of the mitigation hierarchy, which should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats and protected species. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>In addition to the identified amber risk zone for Great Crested Newt, other factors include that there are records for GCN and water vole in the area, there is a watercourse present on site and the entirety of the site appears to comprise permanent grassland from aerial photographs. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural</p>

			green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.
LA/ALLI/001	A38	Bridport	We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing wildlife habitats and retention and buffering of boundary habitats including hedgerows and trees and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.
LA/ALLI/002	A40	Bridport	We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing wildlife habitats and retention and buffering of boundary habitats including hedgerows and trees and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.
LA/ALLI/003	A42	Bridport	We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing wildlife habitats and retention and buffering of boundary habitats including hedgerows and trees and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.
LA/BOTH/004	A44	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing wildlife habitats and retention and buffering of boundary habitats and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>In addition to the identified records of priority species and priority habitat to the south, other factors include that part of the site falls within the Higher Potential Ecological Network, and part of the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial photographs. There are also several SNCI grassland sites in the surrounding area, with the closest being species-rich road verges on the Burton Road. Creation of green space on this site which would be expected if the site is taken forward should seek to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area.</p>
LA/BOTH/005	A46	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing wildlife habitats and retention and buffering of boundary habitats and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>In addition to the identified records of priority species and priority habitat to the south, other factors include that part of the site falls within the Higher Potential Ecological Network, and part of the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial photographs. There are also several SNCI grassland sites in the surrounding area, with the closest being species-rich road verges on the Burton Road. Creation of green space on this site which would be expected if the site is taken forward should seek to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area.</p>
LA/BOTH/006	A48	Bridport	We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats for priority species and retention and buffering of boundary habitat but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the

			<p>outer boundary. Aerial photography also shows a band of linear scrub and trees following the watercourse through the centre of the site which will provide valuable habitat and should be retained. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>The site also lies very close to Jellyfields Nature Reserve, a Local Nature Reserve and part of which is recognised as an SNCI for its species-rich neutral grassland habitat. This is well connected to the proposed site by a public bridleway and a development of this scale in this proximity to sensitive habitats has significant potential to impact the value of this site for wildlife. A contribution towards the maintenance and management of this existing site may be required in order to mitigate additional impacts from development. In addition, the southern edge of the site falls within the Existing and Higher Potential Ecological Network, and the majority of the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial photographs. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area. A buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m should also be maintained.</p>
LA/BRAD/001	A50	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats for priority species and retention and buffering of boundary habitat but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. The site lies adjacent to the River Asker and aerial photography also shows a band of linear scrub and trees. This river corridor and the southern part of the site are within the Existing Ecological Network and a buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m should also be maintained. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and</p>

			<p>priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>The development of this site is likely to further constrain the ecological corridor which follows the River Asker. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area</p>
LA/BRAD/006	A52	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats for priority species and retention and buffering of boundary habitat but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>In addition to the identified amber risk zone for Great Crested Newt, there are records for dormice in the area. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p>
LA/BRAD/007	A54	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats for priority species and retention and buffering of boundary habitat. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p>
LA/BRAD/008	A56	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to buffer the ecological networks present on the southern edge of the site and to retain boundary habitat but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Development of this site risks leaving the prominent habitats of Watton Hill isolated so design of the site must include consideration of creating enhanced connectivity from Watton Hill to the wider landscape to the west.</p>
LA/BRAD/010	A58	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain and buffer existing habitats for priority species. Boundary habitats and hedgerows should also be retained and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p>

LA/BRID/010	A60	Bridport	<p>This site lies within 100m of two SNCIs recognised for their neutral grassland and sea cliff habitats respectively. It is also less than 100m from part of the West Dorset Coast SSSI which is further adjacent to other SSSI grasslands. It also lies adjacent to the River Brit.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain a buffer to the boundary of the SSSI to the west and to create a buffer adjacent to the river. In both these areas, the priority should be to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p>
LA/SYMO/001	A62	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats and maintain connectivity for priority species. This should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site. Aerial photography also shows a band of linear scrub and trees following the watercourse through the centre of the site which will provide valuable habitat and should be retained. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>The site also lies very close to Allington Hill, which supports a range of habitats for wildlife. And is becoming increasingly isolated as development extends around it. Surrounded by development to the east and south, and by arable farmland to the north, it is essential that any development of this proposed site includes consideration of creating enhanced connectivity from Allington Hill to the wider landscape to the west.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area and contribute to the connectivity of the existing ecological network on the site. A buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m should also be maintained.</p>
LA/SYMO/002	A64	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats and maintain connectivity for priority species, as well as implement a watercourse buffer and lighting strategy. This should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site. Aerial photography also shows a band of linear scrub and trees following the watercourse through the centre of the site which will provide valuable</p>

			<p>habitat and should be retained. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
LA/SYMO/004	A66	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats and boundary habitats. This should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Aerial photography also shows a band of scrub and trees which comprise part of the ecological network in the northern part of this site and this is well connected to Eype Down to the west and further to SSSI and SNCI habitats in the wider landscape. It is essential that any development of this proposed site includes consideration of retaining and enhancing the connectivity of habitats here to Eype Down as it contributes to the permeability of the landscape for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area and contribute to the connectivity of the existing ecological network on the site.</p>
LA/SYMO/005	A68	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing habitats for priority species. Boundary habitats and hedgerows should also be retained and this should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of</p>

			<p>the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required</p>
LA/SYMO/010,011	A70	Bridport	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain a buffer to the boundary of the SNCI supporting priority habitats to the west and to create a buffer adjacent to the watercourse. The priority should be to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats in this area.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p>
LA/BRWK/003,006	A73	Broadmayne	<p>It is noted that a smaller site comprising the southern part of this proposal was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands and retain and buffer boundary hedgerows and treeline. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p>

			<p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Braodmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/BRWK/004	A75	Broadmayne	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands and retain and buffer boundary hedgerows and treeline and mature trees within the site. It is essential to retain existing habitats and maintain connectivity for priority species.</p> <p>This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>Aerial photography shows that the western part of the site supports permanent grassland. As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features including priority species and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Braodmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>

LA/BRWK/007,012	A77	Broadmayne	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands and retain and buffer boundary hedgerows and woodland. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>The allotments and woodland at the western edge of the site form part of the existing ecological network. As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Broadmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/BRWK/009	A79	Broadmayne	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands and retain and buffer boundary hedgerows and treeline. The site is within 100m of an SNCI ancient woodland site to the south-east and is well connected via a footpath which passes through this woodland. We support the identified need to assess the potential for impact on this site and habitats. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p>

			<p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>The area of the site closest to Knighton Lane appears from aerial imagery to comprise mixed scrub, representing the highest value habitat present on the site and forming part of the ecological network. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area, particularly toward the network of woodland and heathland habitats to the east.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Broadmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/BRWK/014	A82	Broadmayne	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands and retain and buffer boundary hedgerows. We support the need to explore opportunities to form links, particularly to build ecological connectivity between the site and the wider countryside. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Broadmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and</p>

			<p>Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/BRWK/015	A85	Broadmayne	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands and retain and buffer boundary hedgerows but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. We support the need to explore opportunities to form links, particularly to build ecological connectivity between the site and the wider countryside. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p> <p>In addition, the site is within 100m of Broadmayne Churchyard which is recognised as an SNCI due to its species-rich calcareous grassland. The site is accessible via a public right of way which runs past the SNCI churchyard and adjacent fields. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area by creating and enhancing corridors for wildlife which will ensure that areas of green space and habitat are not left isolated.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Broadmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/WEKN/003	A88	Broadmayne	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, provide mitigation for impacts to heathlands, retain existing scrub and woodland habitat on site and buffer existing hedgerows and tree planting.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value</p>

			<p>and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Broadmayne being taken forward is up to 1170 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. Currently the majority of walking routes and public rights of way from Broadmayne head east, with a network of paths and bridleways including the Jubilee Trail and Hardy Way which provide access to Warmwell Heath and circular walks. The establishment of suitable SANG provision at Broadmayne will be essential to taking these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/BROA/001	A91	Broadwindsor	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>It is identified that the site contains areas of potentially priority habitat. It is essential that the site is subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Impacts to priority habitat must be avoided and seek instead to enhance and connect them. Hazel Dormouse has also been recorded in this area.</p> <p>The site lies within 200m of an SNCI woodland to the west, and a public right of way passes through the SNCI from the site. The PRoW also provides easy access to the SNCI at Lewesdon Hill and Burstock Down which supports a range of priority habitats. Additional residential development and increased levels of access may put pressure on these sites and consideration must be given to the mitigation of these impacts. A contribution towards the maintenance and management of these local sites may be required in order to mitigate additional impacts from development.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the</p>

			connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.
LA/BURT/001	A94	Burton Bradstock	<p>It is identified that the site contains areas of potentially priority habitat. It is essential that the site is subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Impacts to priority habitat must be avoided and seek instead to enhance and connect them.</p> <p>The site is well connected to public rights of way which provide access to the Coast and National Trust open access land which form part of the West Dorset Coast SSSI. Additional residential development and increased levels of access may put pressure on these sites and consideration must be given to the mitigation of these impacts.</p>
LA/BURT/002,003	A96	Burton Bradstock	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should also application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>In addition to the identified amber risk zone for Great Crested Newt, part of the site also falls within the Higher Potential Ecological Network, and the site appears to be permanent grassland from aerial photographs. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and</p>

			features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required.
LA/CHTR/002	A99	Charlton Down	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows, buffer woodland to the south and ensure nutrient neutrality. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p>
LA/CHTR/008	A101	Charlton Down	<p>Boundary not shown in 2021 plan map but the site name matches (Forston Clinic) – found in Vol 2, Central Dorset, p172. No previous response from DWT.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach also includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p>
LA/CHTR/009/a	A103	Charlton Down	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows, buffer priority habitats and ensuring nutrient neutrality. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to</p>

			<p>allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p>
LA/CHTR/003, 004	A107	Charminster	<p>It is noted that part of this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to retain existing hedgerows but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. The need to ensure nutrient neutrality and buffer and connect habitats to maintain wildlife corridors is also supported. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required</p>
LA/CHTR/014	A109	Charminster	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, retain existing hedgerows, trees and woodland and provision of wildlife buffers to priority habitat. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the</p>

			<p>site. As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p>
LA/CHIC/002/a, 004/a	A121	Chickerell	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>It is rightly identified that the site is adjacent to Crookhill Brickpit SAC. This is a small sensitive local site, recognised for its important population of Great-crested Newts, one of the largest in Dorset. It is not anticipated to attract visitors from large distances and a dramatic increase in residential development with direct access to this site as a nearby natural greenspace is expected to have a significant impact.</p> <p>The HRA Report commissioned by Dorset Council (Footprint Ecology) identifies that development on this site (and other nearby sites) is anticipated to result in a 35% increase in recreational impacts on the adjacent Crookhill Brick Pit LNR, SSI and SAC.</p> <p>In addition to recreational impacts, Great Crested Newts are expected to use terrestrial habitat well outside the boundary of the site and development of adjacent land will have potential to significantly impact the availability of suitable terrestrial habitat for this species. In addition, drainage and runoff from adjacent development as well as other urban impacts such as lighting , air pollution and introduction of invasive or non-native plants and animals to the ponds will also have potential to significantly harm this site.</p> <p>Appropriate assessment will be required to identify the potential impacts on Crookhill Brickpits, individually and in combination with other proposed sites, as well as for impacts to the Chesil and the Fleet SAC, SPA and Ramsar.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This</p>

			<p>should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout must include substantial natural green space buffering the designated site which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features, and create new habitats which support the features of the designated. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p>
LA/CHIC/011	A125	Chickerell	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>The site is very close to a significant SNCI to the south which is recognised for it's neutral and calcareous grassland interest. The recognition that there is potential for this interest to be reflected on the proposed site is welcome. As for all sites, it must therefore be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood, potential capacity can be properly estimated and viability can be assessed. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure nutrient neutrality, mitigation for recreational pressures on Chesil and the Fleet and retain and buffer important habitats. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout should include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the</p>

			connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.
LA/CHIC/014	A127	Chickerell	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to provide mitigation for recreational pressures on Chesil and the Fleet, retain and buffer important habitats and retain hedgerows, but this should include seeking to retain all hedgerows within the site, not just those marking the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site which must be informed by the survey undertaken in 2021 as part of the evidence base for the Dorset Local Plan being developed at that time.</p> <p>The site lies close to Radipole Lake SSSI, an important wetland site. It will be vital to ensure that any increase in visitor pressure is not harmful to the SSSI.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, the layout must include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site, as well as any formal open spaces required. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area, particularly aiming to support the ecology of Radipole lake and increase the functionality of any wildlife corridor from Radipole Lake into the countryside.</p>
LA/CHIC/019	A131	Chickerell	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to secure mitigation for recreational pressures on Chesil and the Fleet and retain and buffer important habitats. The location within the recognised wildlife corridor identifies the potential for this site to deliver high quality natural green space and enhanced habitat for wildlife. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue this site, development must be limited to a scale which will not impact on the ability of this site to provide this ecological function.</p> <p>The assessment of the site fails to recognise the presence of the SNCI at Bennetts Water Gardens adjacent to the western boundary of the site which is notable for its aquatic habitats and species as well as Chickerell Downs Woodland Trust site which includes young woodland, ponds and wetland. To the east, the site also borders a habitat restoration site where grassland and ponds have been created associated with the Chickerell Link Road. Enhancement of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p>

			<p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy. Public access to neighbouring sites may result in increased recreational pressures, and negatively impacting their habitats and species. A contribution towards the maintenance and management of adjacent sites may be required in order to mitigate additional impacts from development.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. A buffer of at least 10m should be maintained adjacent to the watercourse.</p>
LA/CHIC/024	A133	Chickerell	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to secure mitigation for recreational pressures on Chesil and the Fleet and retain and buffer important habitats. The location within the recognised wildlife corridor identifies the potential for this site to deliver high quality natural green space and enhanced habitat for wildlife. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue this site, development must be limited to a scale which will not impact on the ability of this site to provide this ecological function.</p> <p>To the east, the site also borders a habitat restoration site where grassland and ponds have been created associated with the Chickerell Link Road. Enhancement of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. A buffer of at least 10m should be maintained adjacent to the watercourse.</p>
LA/CHIC/025	A135	Chickerell	<p>We welcome the proposed approach to secure mitigation for recreational pressures on Chesil and the Fleet and retain and buffer important habitats. The location within the recognised wildlife corridor identifies the potential for this site to deliver high quality natural green space and enhanced habitat for wildlife. Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue this site, development</p>

			<p>must be limited to a scale which will not impact on the ability of this site to provide this ecological function.</p> <p>The assessment of the site fails to recognise the presence of the SNCI at Bennetts Water Gardens adjacent to the western boundary of the site which is notable for its aquatic habitats and species, as well as Chickerell Downs Woodland Trust site which includes young woodland, ponds and wetland. To the east, the site also borders a habitat restoration site where grassland and ponds have been created associated with the Chickerell Link Road. Enhancement of green space on this site would be expected to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, it should be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy. Public access to neighbouring sites may result in increased recreational pressures, and negatively impacting their habitats and species. A contribution towards the maintenance and management of adjacent sites may be required in order to mitigate additional impacts from development.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, which must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. A buffer of at least 10m should be maintained adjacent to the watercourse.</p>
LA/CMUL/002,010	A141	Corfe Mullen	<p>DWT consider that this site is unsuitable for development due to the ecological interest identified which has high potential with other sites in the Waterloo Valley to retain both its ecological function and mitigate the impacts of development on Dorset Heathlands as part of a HIP or strategic SANG.</p> <p>This site was partially surveyed in 2021 as part of the evidence base for the Dorset Local Plan being developed at that time though it is noted that the site being consulted on now has amended boundaries compared with the previous CORM3 site reviewed at that time. The site was identified to have areas of medium to high ecological value comprising mostly unimproved grassland with indicator plant species typical of Lowland Meadows Priority Habitat.</p> <p>It sits within a shallow valley with a patchwork of fields with hedgerows and broadleaved woodland and small watercourses. This ecological corridor includes a group of fields to the south and west of that form the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI and several SNCIs that include deciduous woodland and neutral grassland.</p> <p>The Existing Ecological Network and Higher Potential Ecological Network mapping shows clearly that this area has potential to promote connectivity of extensive</p>

			<p>valuable habitat to the west with extensive habitats comprising SNCI grassland, heathland and woodland and SSSI heathland to the east. Conversely, development of this site would result in increased fragmentation of these vital ecological corridors.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an updated ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We welcome the proposed approach to ensure trees and hedgerows are retained and protected, but this should include all trees and hedgerows on site, not just those on the outer boundary.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, the layout must include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to be substantial and to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/CMUL/003	A143	Corfe Mullen	<p>Reduced site (CORM5 has been split into two new sites, still reduced overall)</p> <p>DWT consider that this site has high potential with other sites in the Waterloo Valley to retain both its ecological function and mitigate the impacts of development on Dorset Heathlands as part of a HIP or strategic SANG.</p> <p>This site was partially surveyed in 2021 as part of the evidence base for the Dorset Local Plan being developed at that time though it is noted that the site being consulted on now has amended boundaries compared with the previous CORM5 site reviewed at that time. The woodland was surveyed as part of the previous CORM5 proposed allocation and identified to be secondary broad-leaved woodland with older trees on boundary banks. Being in a semi-natural state and with notable species including Bluebell and Pignut it was identified as Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat.</p> <p>It sits within a shallow valley with a patchwork of fields with hedgerows and broadleaved woodland and small</p>

			<p>watercourses. This ecological corridor includes a group of fields to the south and west of that form the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI and several SNCIs that include deciduous woodland and neutral grassland.</p> <p>The Existing Ecological Network and Higher Potential Ecological Network mapping shows clearly that this area has potential to promote connectivity of extensive valuable habitat to the west with extensive habitats comprising SNCI grassland, heathland and woodland and SSSI heathland to the east. Conversely, development of this site would resulting in increased fragmentation of these vital ecological corridors.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an updated ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to ensure trees and hedgerows are retained and protected, but this should include all trees and hedgerows on site, not just those on the outer boundary.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, we agree that a substantial buffer to the woodland is a necessity, as well as a lighting strategy.</p> <p>The proposed approach for this site makes no mention of mitigation of recreational and urbanisation impacts on protected heathland. The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/CMUL/005	A145	Corfe Mullen	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to secure mitigation for recreational pressures and urbanisation impacts on Dorset Heathlands and the need for a HIP. We also welcome the proposed approach to retain hedgerows and important ecological features but this should include all hedgerows within the site, not just those on the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p>

			<p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an updated ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats and species. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, the layout must include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site. AS proposed, creation of green space on this site would be expected to be substantial and to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites and other sensitive sites including DWT's Corfe Mullen Meadows Nature Reserve. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/CMUL/012a	A149	Corfe Mullen	<p>DWT consider that this site is unsuitable for development due to the ecological interest identified which has high potential with other sites in the Waterloo Valley to retain both its ecological function and mitigate the impacts of development on Dorset Heathlands as part of a HIP or strategic SANG.</p> <p>This site was partly surveyed in 2021 as part of the evidence base for the Dorset Local Plan being developed at that time though it is noted that the site being consulted on now has amended boundaries compared with the previous CORM4 site reviewed at that time. The woodland in the north-east of the site was identified to be Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat while the southern field was identified to support semi-improved grassland with moderate ecological interest and Dorset notable species typical of neutral grassland habitats. The eastern part of this site which includes a watercourse and what appears to be wetland habitat was not been surveyed.</p> <p>It sits within a shallow valley with a patchwork of fields with hedgerows and broadleaved woodland and small watercourses. This ecological corridor includes a group of fields to the south and west of that form the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI and several SNCIs that include deciduous woodland and neutral grassland.</p> <p>The Existing Ecological Network and Higher Potential Ecological Network mapping shows clearly that this area</p>

			<p>has potential to promote connectivity of extensive valuable habitat to the west with extensive habitats comprising SNCI grassland, heathland and woodland and SSSI heathland to the east. Conversely, development of this site would result in increased fragmentation of these vital ecological corridors.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an updated ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We welcome the proposed approach to ensure trees, hedgerows and ditches are retained and protected, as well as other habitats of value.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, the layout must include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to be substantial and to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites and other sensitive sites including DWT's Corfe Mullen Meadows Nature Reserve. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/CMUL/014	A151	Corfe Mullen	<p><b>DWT object to the inclusion of this site for housing due to the potential for harm to Corfe Mullen Meadows SSSI and the existing ecological interest identified on the site.</b> It has high potential with other sites in the Waterloo Valley to retain both its ecological function and mitigate the impacts of development on Dorset Heathlands as part of a HIP or strategic SANG.</p> <p>This site was surveyed in 2021 as part of the evidence base for the Dorset Local Plan being developed at that time though it is noted that the site being consulted on now has amended boundaries compared with the previous CORM5 site reviewed at that time. The site was identified to have areas of moderate ecological value comprising mostly semi-improved grassland with indicator plant species typical of neutral and acid grassland habitats.</p> <p>It sits within a shallow valley with a patchwork of fields with hedgerows and broadleaved woodland and small</p>

			<p>watercourses. This ecological corridor includes a group of fields to the south and west of that form the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI and several SNCIs that include deciduous woodland and neutral grassland.</p> <p>Of particular concern is the impact of this proposed allocation on the Dorset Wildlife Trust Corfe Mullen Meadows Nature Reserve which forms part of the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI (SY99/009). This nature reserve is managed as a traditional hay meadow and is known for its good population of green winged orchids. The reserve is already under recreational pressure, and is showing evidence of trampling of the fragile vegetation and frequent reports of dogs off leads. Whilst Dorset Wildlife Trust wishes to see people enjoy contact with nature and the benefits this brings to wellbeing, we consider that this should not be to the detriment of the biodiversity nature reserves seek to protect. We consider that an increase of population so close to this fragile site would cause an unacceptable increase in footfall and consequent disturbance likely to damage the site to an unacceptable level.</p> <p>At the time of the previous Local Plan consultation a SANG was proposed adjacent to the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI, but the Sustainability Appraisal at the time recognised that <i>providing an area of SANG adjacent to the Corfe Mullen Pastures SSSI may substantially increase the number of people visiting the SSSI site.</i></p> <p>The Existing Ecological Network and Higher Potential Ecological Network mapping shows clearly that this area has potential to promote connectivity of extensive valuable habitat to the west with extensive habitats comprising SINC grassland, heathland and woodland and SSSI heathland to the east. Conversely, development of this site would result in increased fragmentation of these vital ecological corridors.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, the layout must include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site. Creation of green space on this site would be expected to be substantial and to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites and other sensitive sites including DWT's Corfe Mullen Meadows Nature Reserve. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree that if taken forward, it should be subject to an updated ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
LA/CMUL/022	A153	Corfe Mullen	<p>It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed approach to secure mitigation for recreational pressures and urbanisation impacts on Dorset Heathlands and the need for a HIP. We also welcome the proposed approach to retain hedgerows and important ecological features but this should include all hedgerows within the site, not just those on the outer boundary. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.</p> <p>As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an updated ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats and species. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, the layout must include informal natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site. As proposed, creation of green space on this site would be expected to be substantial and to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings. Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites and other sensitive sites including DWT's Corfe Mullen Meadows Nature Reserve. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.</p>
LA/CMUL/026	A156	Corfe Mullen	<p>DWT consider that this site is not suitable for development due to the location of the site in the Ecological Network and the potential for harm to adjacent sites.</p>

It is noted that this site was assessed as part of Dorset Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2024 and identified to be unsuitable for development.

DWT welcome the recognition of the presence of the SNCI which is adjacent to the southern boundary of this site and in turn continues as part of the Dorset Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve at Happy Bottom. The site lies partly within the Existing and fully within the Higher Potential Ecological Network.

As for all sites, we agree it should be subject to an ecological survey, covering the whole site and including botanical assessment to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that any important features are identified that may need protection within policy.

Given the location of the site and the value of the adjacent habitats it is anticipated to have a relatively high ecological value for its size. There is a watercourse on the site and the adjacent SNCI is recognised for its Rush Pasture priority habitat. Modifications to drainage and water quality due to runoff, surface water discharge and pollution have the potential to negatively impact these habitats and this must be avoided to prevent off-site biodiversity losses.

The mitigation hierarchy must apply to **all** features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats and species. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.

Given the extent of existing ecological interest and habitat features of value anticipated on this site and identified as being protected in the proposed approach, as well as the likelihood of establishing access via Pine Road, DWT consider that it is the viability of development here is poor.

Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site for residential development, the layout must include significant natural green space which seeks to retain and enhance existing habitats and features of the site and will contribute to protecting and extending the existing adjacent habitats of value. As proposed, creation of green space on this site would be expected to be substantial and to expand and increase the connectivity of important habitats and ecological networks in this area.

We welcome the proposed approach to secure mitigation for recreational pressures and urbanisation impacts on Dorset Heathlands. It is also essential that existing trees, hedgerows, grassland and scrub habitats are buffered and retained and the ecological network is enhanced in this location. A buffer to the watercourse of at least 10m will also be required. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.

The cumulative impact of all the proposed sites at Corfe Mullen being taken forward is up to 710 new dwellings.

			Even if many of these are not taken forward, development on this scale will require adequate SANG provision to mitigate potential impacts on heathland sites and other sensitive sites including DWT's Corfe Mullen Meadows Nature Reserve. The proposed development sites are on the edge of or just outside the Heathland 400m zone and the establishment of suitable SANG provision at Corfe Mullen will be essential to taking any of these potential sites forward.
--	--	--	--

## Opportunity sites – Employment

DWT is commenting primarily on considerations regarding *Natural environment and ecology*

Our comments on specific sites follow:

Site Reference	Appendix and page no	Settlement	Comments
EL/BLFO/001	B8	Blandford Forum	The site lies within the Bryanston GHS bat SSSI zone and we recommend that appropriate bat activity surveys are undertaken in relation to this. Mitigation should include the retention and buffering of existing suitable habitat and suitable lighting strategy. However, it is essential that a comprehensive enhancement and mitigation strategy for the bats is also implemented which seeks to enhance habitats on the site in order to increase resources and improve connectivity for bats in the wider landscape.
EL/LALB/002	B10	Blandford Forum	The site lies within the Bryanston GHS bat SSSI zone and we recommend that appropriate bat activity surveys are undertaken in relation to this. Mitigation should include the retention and buffering of existing suitable habitat and suitable lighting strategy. However, it is essential that a comprehensive enhancement and mitigation strategy for the bats is also implemented which seeks to enhance habitats on the site in order to increase resources and improve connectivity for bats in the wider landscape.
EL/FERN/013	B16	Ferndown	<p>DWT object to the allocation of this site for employment use and consider it would be suitable for extension of the adjacent heathland support area.</p> <p>DWT is pleased to see that the location of the site adjacent to Ferndown Common SSSI, and the Dorset Heathlands SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites is recognised, however, it is not recognised that this site also lies immediately east of an existing heathland support area managed by the Erica Trust. We support the need for appropriate assessment and identification of potential impacts on the designated sites adjacent</p> <p>As identified, the site lies entirely within the existing ecological network and the priority habitat woodland is also recognised. The site forms an important part of the ecological corridor providing connectivity between Ferndown Common and other sites and habitat to the south and the extensive heathland sites of Slop Bog and Uddens Heath, with Ferndown Forest to the north. Due to its location it is also known from Nightjar tracking studies to be an important corridor on foraging routes</p>

			<p>for this species. It is essential that this site retains its functionality in the landscape. The site also supports some grassland which given the location and surrounding acid grassland and heathland habitats may also have significant ecological interest.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, the proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy is supported, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/FERN/014	B18	Ferndown	<p>This site lies immediately south of an SNCI, SZ09/050 Little Canford Ponds, which comprises old gravel pits supporting an interesting flora and community of aquatic invertebrates. The proposed site will have potential to extend and connect suitable habitats for wildlife if appropriate green spaces is created which provides ecological corridors connecting either the habitats of the River Stour.</p> <p>As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, the proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy is supported, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/PIWL/002	B30	Piddlehinton	<p>This site is well connected to the existing and higher potential ecological networks, and appears to comprise a mix of grassland and scrub. A site which is being used as a temporary gypsy and traveller site has been identified to support grassland of interest, being potentially of propriety habitat quality.</p> <p>As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just</p>

			<p>priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. If the Planning Authority is minded to progress this site, it is essential to retain and buffer areas important ecological features and created suitable green spaces which will extend and connect ecological networks.</p>
EL/PORT/010	B38	Portland	<p>The assessment of this site fails to recognise that it is also directly adjacent to the SNCI SY67/022 Inmosthay Quarry SE, recognised for the calcareous grassland interest supported on the old spoil heaps.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, DWT would expect to see provision for securing the long-term management and enhancement of the habitats of the SNCI. This site has suffered over the last 10 years through inclusion from the adjacent quarry site, with significant loss of habitat apparent from aerial imagery since 2015.</p> <p>As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>We support the proposal to provide a buffer to the adjacent SSSI, but this should also apply to the SNCI. If this site is taken forward, the proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy is supported, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/PORT/011	B40	Portland	<p>The assessment of this site fails to recognise that it is also directly adjacent to the SNCI SY67/027 East Weare Camp, recognised for the calcareous and coastal grassland interest. The site as proposed occupies a significant and important part of the local ecological network, forming a part of the continuous habitat which connects SSSI and SNCI habitats around the north-easter coast of Portland. DWT suggest that this area is not suitable for development and instead represents a vital missing link to the near continuous coastal corridor of the Isle of Portland SSSI.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, DWT would expect to see provision for securing the long-term management and enhancement of the habitats of the SNCI.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>We support the proposal to provide a buffer to the adjacent SSSI, but this should also apply to the SNCI, and any development of the site must also ensure that the coastal</p>

			<p>ecological connectivity of coastal grassland habitats is retained. If this site is taken forward, the proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy is supported, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/SLSI/003	B51	St Leonards & St Ives	<p>The eastern part of this site has previously been granted planning permission at appeal for change of use to SANG and a recreational facility. This is not mentioned as a consideration for the site. The site lies within the higher potential ecological network and existing ecological network which is recognised.</p> <p>The HRA flags potential impacts to nightjar foraging and flight lines and Assessment of potential impacts on heathland sites is essential and there is potential for the site to support grassland interest among other features of biodiversity value.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>A buffer to the adjacent SSSI will be essential if this site is taken forward. The proposed approach should also include application of the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/SLSI/004	B54	St Leonards & St Ives	<p>This site lies directly adjacent to the SNCI SU10/023 East Moors Wood, recognised for its wet woodland habitat. The site also includes part of the existing ecological network and lies within the higher potential ecological network and contains priority habitat deciduous woodland.</p> <p>DWT object to any development of the site which further reduces the quality and extent of the habitats on site. Having transitioned over the last 20 years, from grassland with hedgerows to a scrub mosaic in many of the impacted areas of the site, there is likely to be significant ecological interest here, with potential for grassland and heathland habitats, providing supporting habitat for the nearby heathland sites.</p> <p>The HRA flags potential impacts to nightjar foraging and flight lines and Assessment of potential impacts on heathland sites is essential</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p>

			<p>DWT <b>object</b> to the allocation of any site which may result in the loss of priority habitats.</p> <p>A buffer to the adjacent SNCI will be essential if this site is taken forward. The proposed approach should also include application of the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/STAL/005	B57	Stalbridge	<p>This site lies on the River Cale, and the riparian area falls within the higher potential ecological network. A significant buffer must be provided to the river and this must seek to deliver an area of natural greenspace which supports the function of the river corridor as part of the ecological network.</p> <p>It is recommended that the site is subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. We support the proposal to retain existing ecological features and recommend that a lighting strategy is also implemented. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, the proposed approach must include application of the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/SNEW/008	B60	Sturminster Newton	<p>This site lies on the River Divelish, and the riparian area falls within the higher potential ecological network. A significant buffer must be provided to the river and this must seek to deliver an area of natural greenspace which supports the function of the river corridor as part of the ecological network. We recommend that a lighting strategy is also implemented.</p> <p>It is recommended that the site is subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. We support the proposal to retain existing ecological features. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, we support the proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/WARE/002	B63	Wareham	<p>This site occupies low-lying land immediately adjacent to the Wareham Meadows SSSI, which forms part of the Dorset Heathlands SAC and Ramsar site.</p>

			<p>Appropriate Assessment will be required to assess the impacts of proposed development of the site on the designated sites and the HRA flags the proximity of the Greater Horseshoe Bat Roost at Holton Heath which would require consideration of this species.</p> <p>The low lying grassland of the site, adjacent to the SSSI meadows is likely to support habitats of value and if this site is taken forward, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>DWT object to the allocation of any site which may result in the loss of priority habitats.</p> <p>A buffer to the adjacent SSSI will be essential if this site is taken forward. The proposed approach should also include application of the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/WASM/006	B67	Wareham St Martin	<p>The assessment of the site fails to identify that the site lies adjacent to the SNCI SY98/056 Sandford, which is recognised for its mosaic of acidic grassland, seasonally wet areas and heath. It is also very close the Holton and Sandford Heaths SSSI which form part of the Dorset Heathlands SAC, SPA and Ramsar. The development will need to demonstrate nutrient neutrality in relation to its location in the Poole Harbour catchment.</p> <p>Appropriate Assessment will be required to assess the impacts of proposed development of the site on the designated sites and the HRA flags the proximity of the Greater Horseshoe Bat Roost at Holton Heath which would require consideration of this species.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that its suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>A buffer to the adjacent SNCI will be essential if this site is taken forward. The proposed approach should also include application of the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>
EL/WMOO/004	B70	West Moors	<p>The assessment fails to recognise that the site lies opposite the SNCI SU00/101 The Nursery, recognised for its relict heathland habitat. Is also fails to identify that the site is within</p>

			<p>300m of Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI which comprises part of the Dorset Heathlands SAC, SPA and Ramsar. The site also includes part of the existing ecological network and lies within the higher potential ecological network and is bordered by a wooded treeline on the western boundary.</p> <p>The HRA flags potential impacts to nightjar foraging and flight lines and Assessment of potential impacts on heathland sites is essential and mitigation will be required if this site is taken forward. DWT also support the need for recreational mitigation for the New Forest to be considered.</p> <p>The site appears, from aerial imagery, to be permanent grassland which has not been intensively farmed. If this site is taken forward, as for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>DWT <b>object</b> to the allocation of any site which may result in the loss of priority habitats.</p> <p>The proposed approach should also include application of the mitigation hierarchy, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife</p>
EL/WINF/002	B74	Winfrith	<p>The assessment fails to recognise that this site includes the SNCI SY88/028 Winfrith, recognised for its acid grassland habitats, within the site boundary.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, DWT would expect to see provision for securing the long-term management and enhancement of the habitats of the SNCI. At the time of the last monitoring survey in 2013 the SNCI was identified to be exhibiting a slight decline in condition due to the spread of scrub and grassland arisings being left in situ after cutting. A buffer from any development activity and ensuring connectivity for the SNCI habitats and the isolated SSSI habitat enclosed within it must also be retained. A buffer to the surrounding SSSI must also be retained.</p> <p>The HRA flags potential impacts to nightjar foraging and flight lines and Assessment of potential impacts on heathland sites is essential and mitigation will be required if this site is taken forward.</p> <p>As for all sites, the proposed allocation site must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy. It is likely that other areas of the site may also support acid grassland priority habitats.</p>

			<p>DWT <b>object</b> to the allocation of any site which will result in the loss of priority habitats.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, the mitigation hierarchy must be applied, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p> <p>DWT support the proposal for longer term restoration and management planning covering a larger area of the Dorset Innovation Park site.</p>
EL/WINF/004	B76	Winfrith	<p>This site lies within the existing ecological network and has been identified to support acid grassland habitats.</p> <p>The HRA flags potential impacts to nightjar foraging and flight lines and</p> <p>Assessment of potential impacts on heathland sites is essential and mitigation will be required if this site is taken forward.</p> <p>As for all sites, the proposed allocation site must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.</p> <p>DWT <b>object</b> to the allocation of any site which will result in the loss of priority habitats.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward, the mitigation hierarchy must be applied, but this must apply to <b>all</b> features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.</p>

# Part B – Gypsy & Traveller Sites

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/BEAM/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

## Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

This site lies within 100m of two SNCIs which are recognised for their woodland and neutral grassland habitats, and within habitat mapped as Priority Habitat Lowland Deciduous Woodland. The site is well connected via public rights of way to one of the SNCI sites. We agree that existing woodland must not be impacted by the use of the site and all trees and understorey structure retained. DWT is pleased to see these factors recognised, however, the presence of watercourses on site is not identified as a natural environment and ecology consideration. It is essential that waste and drainage requirements are considered and should the Planning Authority be minded to pursue the site, impacts to the ecology of the aquatic environment must be avoided or fully mitigated.

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site. We support the need to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area.

The proposed approach also includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/BEAM/002

### What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

The assessment of this site does not recognise the presence of the SNCI green lane habitat along Common Water Lane, less than 100m south of the site. Like many historic green lanes it is vulnerable to changes in level of use and impacts should be considered as part of this proposal.

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site.

The proposed approach also includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

**Which site are you commenting on?**

GT/CHIC/003

**What are the main considerations for this site?**

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

**Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed**

We welcome the proposed approach to provide mitigation for recreational pressures on Chesil and the Fleet, retain important ecological features. This should be reflected fully in any policy developed for the site.

As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.

The proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy is supported, but this must apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.

---

## Opportunity sites

**Which site are you commenting on?**

GT/WEYM/003

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

See DWT response to LA/CHIC/011

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/CHOK/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

This site lies within the Bryanston SSSI consultation area and within the existing and higher potential ecological network. DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to expand an existing use.

As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.

The proposed approach to apply the mitigation hierarchy is supported, but this must apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/CMUL/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

See DWT response to GT/CMUL/001

---

## Opportunity sites

**Which site are you commenting on?**

GT/FNEV/001

**What are the main considerations for this site?**

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

**Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed**

Plumber Coppice, less than 200m to the west is an Ancient Woodland SNCI. It is essential that potential for impacts to this habitat or species using this habitat are considered.

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site. There appears to have been a significant expansion of the site in the last 10 years which has resulted in loss of habitat in the southern part of the site. DWT recommend that if this site is taken forward, this should be restricted to the northern part of the site and that there should be no further intensification of use.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

**Which site are you commenting on?**

GT/FRAM/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

## Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site. The grassland on the site doesn't appear to have been subject to intensive agricultural use and may support existing biodiversity interest.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

### Which site are you commenting on?

GT/HAZE/002

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐

- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

**Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed**

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to intensify an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site. The grassland on the site doesn't appear to have been subject to intensive agricultural use and may support existing biodiversity interest.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

It is essential that the use of the site does not result in impacts to Alners Gorse Butterfly Reserve or Blackmore Vale Commons And Moors SSSI.

---

## Opportunity sites

**Which site are you commenting on?**

GT/HORT/001

**What are the main considerations for this site?**

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

## Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

This site lies adjacent to an Ancient Woodland SNCI which lies south of Horton Drive. DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site. If impacts to the SNCI and ancient woodland are identified, mitigation measures must be secured.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/HORT/002

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

This site lies adjacent to three SNCIs, including two ancient woodland sites and a site recognised for its neutral grassland interest. DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use and welcomes the recognition that the site may support significant grassland interest. As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.

If impacts to the SNCIs and ancient woodland are identified, mitigation measures must be secured. It is essential that a buffer is maintained to the ancient woodland sites adjacent to the site. If existing impacts such as fly-tipping or direct damage to the adjacent woodland is identified then measure must be implemented to ensure this is rectified and can be avoided in future.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/LMUP/001

What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

See DWT response to LA/LMUP/016,017

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/MARN/003

### What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

See DWT Response to LA/MARN/007

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/PIWL/001

### What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐

**g. Transport (access and movement)** ☐

**h. Green Belt (if applicable)** ☐

**i. Other issues** ☐

**Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed**

The assessment of the site does not identify that the site lies entirely within the existing and higher potential ecological network.

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to intensify an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

**Which site are you commenting on?**

GT/SAOR/001

**What are the main considerations for this site?**

**a. Specific design requirements** ☐

**b. Natural environment and ecology** ☒

**c. Landscape and visual** ☐

**d. Heritage** ☐

**e. Flood risk** ☐

**f. Amenity, health, education** ☐

**g. Transport (access and movement)** ☐

**h. Green Belt (if applicable)** ☐

**i. Other issues** ☐

**Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed**

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to intensify an existing use. As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.

The grassland on the site doesn't appear to have been subject to intensive agricultural use and may support existing biodiversity interest.

The proposed approach includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to **all** features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/SHAF/003

### What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

The site supports permanent grassland which forms part of St James's Common, which has not been subject to intensive agricultural use. The Common here forms part of an ecological network which provides connectivity with further designated and locally important sites including Breach fields SSSI and Breach Fields South and Long Cross SNCIs. DWT recognise that this proposal is for the authorisation of existing use, but consider this site to be unsuitable for allocation due to its location and opportunities to enhance this ecological corridor should be sought.

As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that it's suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.

The proposed approach includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/SHAF/004

What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

This proposed site lies within 100m of an ancient woodland SNCI to the north and there is an extensive network of locally important woodland and grassland habitat in the local area.

The site appears to support permanent grassland and may have existing biodiversity interest, it is noted this potential is identified.

As for all sites, it must be subject to an ecological survey to identify any key features and priority habitats and species. This should be undertaken as identified in the introduction to appendix A ahead of the next phase of Local Plan production and prior to allocation so that its suitability for development can be understood. Any important features that are identified may need protection within policy.

The proposed approach includes application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

Tree planting to provide landscape and visual mitigation must not be undertaken on grassland of high ecological value.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/STSG/001

What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to intensify an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/STWA/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to intensify an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/SPRO/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to intensify an existing use and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/WSTA/002

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

DWT is pleased to see that the presence of a small area, which forms part of the more extensive West Staffor Bypass SNCI is recognised. This lies immediately to the west of the proposed site.

We support the proposal that a suitable buffer should be retained to the SNCI grassland habitats here and recommends that ecological assessment must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site.

The proposed approach should include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife. We support the need to retain and buffer areas around important ecological features and also recommend that measures to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area should be secured.

---

## Opportunity sites

Which site are you commenting on?

GT/WSTO/001

## What are the main considerations for this site?

- a. Specific design requirements ☐
- b. Natural environment and ecology ☒
- c. Landscape and visual ☐
- d. Heritage ☐
- e. Flood risk ☐
- f. Amenity, health, education ☐
- g. Transport (access and movement) ☐
- h. Green Belt (if applicable) ☐
- i. Other issues ☐

Please provide further details on these considerations, and how they might be addressed

The entirety of the site forms part of the existing ecological network and is located within a block of woodland which straddles the River Cale. The site therefore may have significant existing ecological value. We agree that existing woodland and the riparian habitats must not be impacted by the use of the site and all trees, wooded areas and riverside habitat retained, a significant buffer must be retained adjacent to the watercourse.

DWT recognises that this proposal seeks to authorise an existing use. An ecological assessment is essential and must be undertaken to identify existing and potential impacts on habitats and species on and adjacent to the site. We support the need to control external lighting to avoid impacts on biodiversity in this rural area.

The proposed approach also must include application of the mitigation hierarchy, however, this approach should apply to all features of the site which support biodiversity, not just priority habitats. This includes non-priority habitats of local value and any features of the site which support protected and priority species or contribute to landscape scale connectivity for wildlife