



Forestry Commission
England

Latchmore Wetland Restoration Project

**Planning Statement, incorporating Design and
Access Statement**

July 2016

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	The Site	5
	Location	5
	Site Description	5
3	Background to the Application and the Proposed Scheme	7
	Background to the Application	7
	The Proposed Scheme	9
4	Stakeholder Engagement	11
	Pre-Application Consultation	11
5	Design and Access Statement	15
	Physical Context	15
	Use	15
	Amount	15
	Layout	16
	Scale	16
	Appearance	18
	Landscape	19
	Access	19
6	Planning Policy Appraisal	20
	Introduction	20
	Statutory Development Plan Policy	20
	Material Planning Considerations	21
	Compliance with Policy	22
7	Conclusion	30
	Appendix 1 – Biodiversity Checklist	31

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning Statement accompanies an application for planning permission for wetland restoration at Latchmore, in the New Forest. The application is part of a phased programme of works designed to restore and enhance the internationally-important habitats of the New Forest. Further details on the project can be found in: **Sections 3 and 5** of this Statement; the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volumes 1, 2 and 3) that also accompanies the application; and on the New Forest Higher Level Stewardship Scheme website^{1 2}. A number of similar projects have been implemented since 1997 through European Union Funding Programmes such as Life II (1997-2001), Life III (2002-2006), Pathfinder (2006-2008), Final 4000 (2008-2011) and the Higher Level Stewardship Scheme (2010-2020). Most recently, planning permission has been granted for wetland restoration works at North Sluffers Inclosure (14/00394), Harvestslade (14/00611), Amberslade Bottom and Broomy Inclosure (15/00045) and Pondhead (15/00294).
- 1.2 This Planning Statement incorporates a Design and Access Statement to meet the requirement of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (as amended).
- 1.3 Reference is made throughout the Statement to **Drawing 001: Location Plan** and the chapters, figures and appendices in **Volumes 1, 2 and 3** of the **ES**.
- 1.4 This Statement comprises the following sections:
- 1) Introduction
 - 2) The Site
 - 3) Background to Application and the Proposed Scheme
 - 4) Stakeholder Engagement
 - 5) Design and Access Statement
 - 6) Planning Policy Appraisal
 - 7) Conclusion
- 1.5 The Statement is supported by the following Appendix:
- Appendix 1: Biodiversity Checklist

¹ Available at: <http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/hls/>. Accessed 06/07/16.

² Available at: http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/hls/info/50/wetland_restoration. Accessed 06/07/16.

2 The Site

Location

- 2.1 Latchmore (central grid reference SU2121113830) is located within the New Forest National Park in Hampshire, adjacent to Frogham and Ogdens to the southwest and Fritham to the east, and approximately 6km east (to the centre of the site) of Fordingbridge. Abbots Well car park is located adjacent to the southwestern site boundary and Telegraph Hill car park is located just within the northern site boundary adjacent to the B3078 (see **Drawing 001 of this Statement** and **Figure 3.1** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**).

Site Description

- 2.2 The Latchmore Brook is a tributary of the River Avon. It arises in Picket Corner and Crow's Nest Bottom, draining west towards Ogdens (south of Frogham) where it becomes known as the Huckles Brook. The entire site lies within the New Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (a UK nature conservation designation), as well as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site (all European nature conservation designations).
- 2.3 The catchment area of Latchmore Brook (defined by the site boundary on **Drawing 001** and **Figure 3.1** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**) includes 27 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), one of which is also noted for its geological interest (Studley Wood SSSI Unit 58). Latchmore Brook extends through three forested Inclosures: Islands Thorns Inclosure (SSSI Unit 540), Amberwood Inclosure (which are 'thrown open' Inclosures³) and Alderhill Inclosure (SSSI Unit 66); before entering the Open Forest. Drains within Sloden Inclosure (SSSI Units 541 and 61) also flow into Latchmore Brook.
- 2.4 The catchment also includes the mire catchments of Claypits Bottom (SSSI Unit 30), Thompson's Castle (SSSI Unit 43), Latchmore Mire (SSSI Unit 44), Watergreen Bottom (SSSI Unit 49), and Ogdens Mire (SSSI Unit 50), whilst Latchmore Shade (SSSI Unit 48) (along the watercourse itself) includes wet heath and lawn habitats including SSSI Unit 28. The catchment also includes fifteen SSSI Units (Units 29, 31, 45, 46, 47, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60, 253, 255, 258, 259 and 542) within which restoration works are not proposed. Latchmore Brook also flows in a straightened, widened and deepened drain channel for much of its length across Latchmore Shade, before leaving the western edge of the Open Forest at Ogdens.
- 2.5 The stream's catchment includes open habitats (particularly in the lower sections of the catchment) such as dry heath, wet heath, mire as well as grassland. Woodland is dominant across the centre of the catchment particularly in the Inclosures and towards its head, and includes coups of semi-natural broadleaved woodland, as well as planted conifers and broadleaves. The catchment is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3.
- 2.6 Maps showing the entire catchment area of the Latchmore Brook and the SSSI units are provided in **Figures 3.1, 4.14** and **4.15** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**.

³ Thrown Open Inclosures are Inclosures from which grazing stock are not currently excluded, although the FC still reserve the right to exclude stock in order to meet management objectives when required.

- 2.7 Restricted Byway 790 runs through the Latchmore catchment area from Telegraph Hill towards Fritham. Bridleways 711 and 706, and footpaths 709 and 710 located south of Ogdens, terminate just within the Latchmore catchment area. The off road cycle route, Hampton Ridge, also runs between Frogham and Fritham (see **Drawing 001**, and **Figures 11.1 and 11.2** included in **ES Volume 2: Figures**). The catchment area also includes many access structures which allow vehicles/ walkers/ stock to cross existing watercourses.
- 2.8 The main land uses are forestry and grazing, particularly in the lower sections of the site (mainly by ponies and cattle). The site is also well used for informal recreation such as walking, cycling and horse riding.

3 Background to the Application and the Proposed Scheme

Background to the Application

- 3.1 Latchmore Brook was artificially straightened, deepened and widened in the mid-19th century and early 20th century. Artificial drainage networks were also created to improve the ground conditions for forestry. These changes have resulted in greater stream-bed incision, reduced connectivity with the floodplain and altered groundwater levels. The creation of drainage ditches in the forested area of the middle and upper catchment also created a more rapid and responsive flow regime where flood peaks have increased with water entering the main channel more quickly. These higher peak flows and velocities have created a higher energy system with higher rates of erosion and increased rates of sediment transport.
- 3.2 These effects have had, and are continuing to have an adverse effect on the ecology of the catchment. The channel incision has led to lower channel water levels and more limited seasonal inundation of the grassland and woodland habitats on the surrounding floodplain. The bed erosion on the main channel has also created knickpoints and erosion has progressed along some of the natural and artificial drainage channels and tributaries. This has caused increased erosion within the mire systems, the wet heath and the grassland habitats which can be found in Islands Thorns, Thompson's Castle and Claypits Bottom.
- 3.3 The wetland restoration works are seeking to restore the Brook to a more natural, meandering state (with a reduced gradient), reduce erosion of the stream banks and bed, reduce the rate of flows entering the main channels and prevent the drying out of the surrounding ground, specifically the mires.
- 3.4 The Forestry Commission (FC) has a legal responsibility under the EU Habitats Directive/Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to restore and maintain Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and SSSI where the habitat has been assessed by Natural England as being in an 'unfavourable condition'. The restoration works are therefore being proposed to restore the certain SSSI units within the Latchmore catchment back into 'favourable condition'.
- 3.5 The condition of the SSSI land in England is assessed by Natural England. There are six reportable condition categories: favourable; unfavourable recovering; unfavourable no change; unfavourable declining; part destroyed and destroyed.
- 3.6 The Latchmore Wetland Restoration is required as SSSI Units 30, 44, 48, 49, 50, 58, 61, 66, 540 and 541 which lie within the Latchmore Brook catchment are currently classed by Natural England as being in 'unfavourable recovering condition'. **Figure 3.1 in ES Volume 2: Figures** illustrates the location of the SSSI Units.
- 3.7 Units classed as 'recovering' are defined by Natural England as '*not yet being fully conserved but all the necessary management mechanisms are in place. At least one of the designated feature(s) mandatory attributes are not meeting their targets (as set out in the site specific Favourable Condition Table). Provided that the recovery work is sustained, the unit will reach*

*favourable condition in time*⁴. It is also worth noting that Unit 43 is listed as 'risk of damage' if no restoration works are undertaken.

- 3.8 It is important to note that Natural England has identified the SSSI Units in the Latchmore Brook catchment as being 'recovering' due to the Latchmore Wetland Restoration project which is proposed by the FC. If the restoration is not implemented the SSSI Units will revert to being classed as 'unfavourable no change'⁵ or 'unfavourable declining'.⁶
- 3.9 This scheme seeks to improve the condition of the SSSI units and the New Forest SAC and is in line with the New Forest Wetland Management Plan 2006-2016⁷ which seeks to "ensure the continued long term sustainability and integrated management of water-courses and wetland habitats" which "will prevent further decline of SAC habitats and bring them into favourable condition".

Figure 3.1: Erosion within the Latchmore catchment area



⁴ See definition at: <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/SSSIGlossary.aspx> (accessed 06.07.16).

⁵ **Unfavourable no change** - The unit/feature is not being conserved and will not reach favourable condition unless there are changes to the site management or external pressures and this is reflected in the results of monitoring over time, with at least one of the mandatory attributes not meeting its target (as set out in the site specific FCT) with the results not moving towards the desired state. The longer the SSSI unit remains in this poor condition, the more difficult it will be, in general, to achieve recovery. At least one of the designated feature(s) mandatory attributes and targets (as set out in the site specific FCT) are not being met.

⁶ **Unfavourable declining** - The unit/feature is not being conserved and will not reach favourable condition unless there are changes to site management or external pressures. The site condition is becoming progressively worse, and this is reflected in the results of monitoring over time, with at least one of the designated features mandatory attributes not meeting its target (as set out in the site specific FCT) with the results moving further away from the desired state. The longer the SSSI unit remains in this poor condition, the more difficult it will be, in general, to achieve recovery. See definition at: <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/SSSIGlossary.aspx> (accessed 7th March 2016).

⁷ New Forest Wetland Management Plan 2006 - 2016. Retrieved from http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/hls/downloads/download/8/new_forest_wetland_management_plan_2006-2016 on 7th March 2016

The Proposed Scheme

- 3.10 Planning permission is sought for approximately 5km of restored meander, approximately 8km of bed level raising and approximately 4.6km of channel infill, which is illustrated on detailed restoration proposal maps in the ES on **Figures 4.4**, and **4.6 – 4.13** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**.
- 3.11 The project will include work activity in twelve SSSI Units (28, 30, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 58, 61⁸, 66, 540 and 541). **Table 3.1** outlines the proposed works that will be undertaken and why the work is needed:

Table 3.1: Proposed restoration works

	Proposed works	What will it involve?	Why is it needed?
1.	Tree felling, scrub and vegetation clearance	Removal of required trees, scrub, and vegetation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide access to undertake the works. To enable ordnance clearance to be undertaken if required.
2.	Meander Restoration	Excavation and recreation of the old brook meanders and diversion of the Latchmore Brook from the existing drainage channels into the restored meanders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce flow rates and erosion in the Brook (by increasing the length of the channel and therefore reducing the gradient). To restore channel stability. To improve connectivity with the floodplain.
3.	Bed level raising of main channel, tributaries and side drains	Bed level raising of the main channel, tributaries and side drains by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excavation and setting aside of the gravel beds and vegetation from the existing channels, tributaries and side drains. Installation of clay plugs to ensure that the new stream bed is held in position and does not get eroded, and the partial infill between clay plugs using hoggin⁹ and heather bales to raise the bed levels. Replacement of the rescued gravel bed material and vegetation and any supplementary gravel that may be needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce flow rates and erosion. To improve connectivity with the floodplain.
4.	Drain infill	Complete infilling of certain sections of the existing main channel, tributaries or side drains using either clay plugs, hoggin (a mixture of sand, clay and gravel) or heather bales.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To divert the water into the restored meanders.

⁸ Restoration works are not proposed to be undertaken in Unit 61 but access through the SSSI unit will be required to undertake the works in SSSI Unit 49.

⁹ A mixture of sand and gravel.

	Proposed works	What will it involve?	Why is it needed?
5.	Repair of knickpoints (key erosion points) and drain infill	Installation of clay plugs and partial infilling of the gaps between the clay plugs with hoggin (a mixture of sand, clay and gravel) and heather bales.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To prevent further headward erosion of the Brook and supported habitats. To restore and stabilise water levels.
6.	Removal of spoil banks	Removal of spoil banks on the sides of the channels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enable the Brook to overtop its banks more frequently and restore connectivity with the floodplain. To reduce flow rates and erosion. To allow flood recession more naturally.
7.	Debris dams installation - placement of large wood (but only in SSSI Unit 66 Alderhill Inclosure)	Placement of large wood (such as old tree stumps and roots) across the channel.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce flow rates. To reduce erosion. To increase in-stream channel diversity.
8.	Replacement, maintenance or relocation of access structures (fords, culverts and bridges) -	Construction or replacement of a total of 15 crossings (either vehicle or pedestrian fords/stock crossings) on the line of the restored channel, pipes will also be installed at three culvert crossings to spread the flow.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To maintain or restore access. To reduce the focus of energy in the watercourse (via use of culverts).

3.12 Further detailed information outlining the activity and method statement for all of the works outlined in **Table 3.1** above are presented in **Chapter 4: Project Description and Design of ES Volume 1: Written Statement**.

4 Stakeholder Engagement

Pre-Application Consultation

- 4.1 The FC has undertaken extensive pre-application consultation to date with regard to the proposed scheme. It has in place a Protocol for Consultation and Approval of SSSI Restoration Works on the Open Forest during the New Forest HLS (Higher Level Stewardship) Scheme which applies to Latchmore, as the proposed scheme involves work within the Open Forest and 'thrown open' inclosures.
- 4.2 The protocol identified 14 stages which are:
- 1) *"Natural England identifies SSSI units that need restoring as part of HLS, identifying the key issues that need to be addressed in order for a unit to be reassessed as recovering.*
 - 2) *Forestry Commission works with HLS agreement holder and Natural England to prioritise SSSI restoration sites until February 2020.*
 - 3) *Forestry Commission undertakes fieldwork and research to prepare a restoration proposal for consultation.*
 - 4) *Restoration proposal circulated to consultees 2 weeks before a site visit.*
 - 5) *Consultation site visit with representatives of the Forestry Commission, Verderers, Commons Defence Association, Natural England, New Forest National Park Authority, Access Forum and New Forest Association.*
 - 6) *Forestry Commission writes up and circulates the record of discussions and decisions from the site visit to all invited consultees (regardless of whether they attended), with an accompanying revised restoration proposal for consideration and approval.*
 - 7) *Consultees to respond to Forestry Commission with any comments or conditions within 4 weeks.*
 - 8) *Review of feedback from consultees.*
 - 9) *Circulate final proposal to all consultees.*
 - 10) *Forestry Commission to prepare a full restoration plan, including site specific constraints and sensitivities (e.g. archaeology, rare species, community, access) and planned mitigation strategies.*
 - 11) *Forestry Commission to obtain licences and consents as required.*
 - 12) *Forestry Commission to review level of community engagement required and implement (e.g. signage, parish councils, local newsletters, information events).*
 - 13) *Forestry Commission to oversee delivery of restoration work on the ground.*
 - 14) *Forestry Commission to monitor works and undertake [repairs] (minor works) as required."*

- 4.3 Draft restoration proposals were circulated to Natural England, New Forest National Park Authority (NPA), Commoners Defence Association, New Forest Association, New Forest Access Forum, Verderers and Agisters following site visits in 2009-2015 by the aforementioned parties. The draft restoration proposal provided a description of why the site is in an unfavourable condition; what work is necessary to meet the Natural England criteria for a favourable condition; an annotated map of the site was provided listing the key points for discussion and a written summary of what was proposed.
- 4.4 Other key consultations included:
- November 2011 – Guided walk along the proposed restoration route with the New Forest NPA, Commoners Defence Association, Verderers and approximately 100 members of the public.
 - May 2012 – Meeting Hyde Parish Council, Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council and Hampshire County Council (Highways Department) to discuss proposed access routes.
 - June 2012 – Meeting with Natural England, Environment Agency, New Forest NPA, Friends of Latchmore and Prof. David Sear (University of Southampton) to discuss the proposed restoration.

New Forest NPA

- 4.5 A meeting was held with the NPA's Executive Director of Strategy Steve Avery at the outset of the EIA process on Monday 27th January 2014 to discuss the scope of the project and the proposed methodologies that would be used to undertake the EIA. Further meetings and discussions took place with the NFNPA as the project progressed. In summary, the following key points were discussed with the NPA in relation to the proposed scheme:
- Confirmed that further EIA screening was not required as the FC has volunteered to undertake an EIA.
 - Confirmed the key planning issues relevant to the application.
 - Confirmed what should be included within application's red line boundary.
 - Confirmed the documents required for submission.
 - Confirmed the scope of the Tree Survey is acceptable.
 - Confirmed that there is no issue with a five year construction period, with construction starting and stopping every year.
 - Requested inclusion of details of construction as part of the application.
 - Confirmed the nature of the public consultation events that would be undertaken as part of the EIA.
 - Confirmed the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 do not apply to the proposed scheme as it is necessary to the management of the New Forest SAC, in line with Regulation 21 of the Regulations, which states:

"Where it appears to the appropriate nature conservation body that an application for consent under regulation 20(2) (a) relates to an operation which is or forms part of a plan or project which –

...(b) is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of that site, they must make an appropriate assessment of the implications for that site in view of that site's conservation objectives".

EIA Consultations with Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees

- 4.6 Consultees and the approach to consultation were outlined in the Latchmore Restoration Planning Application: Consultation and Communication Strategy¹⁰ from the outset of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. The document outlined how LUC planned to engage with stakeholders during the preparation of the planning application and as part of the EIA process.
- 4.7 Meetings and other consultations were carried out with a number of statutory and non-statutory consultees during the EIA process, particularly with Natural England and the Environment Agency. The purpose of these consultations was threefold:
- to provide progress updates on the assessments being undertaken;
 - to enable any potential issues or concerns raised to be discussed at an early stage;
 - to ensure that the assessment process was transparent.
- 4.8 Details of these consultations are provided in the relevant topic chapters of the ES (see **Chapters 6 – 11 in ES Volume 1: Written Statement**).
- 4.9 Other key consultations included:
- February 2014 – Meeting with and presentation to the Friends of Latchmore outlining the proposed restoration works and scope of the EIA, and opportunity to discuss queries on work undertaken to date and proposed work.
 - February 2014 – Meeting with and presentation to Hyde Parish Council outlining the proposed restoration works and scope of the EIA, and an opportunity to answer questions.
 - December 2014 - Meeting with Friends of Latchmore, LUC and JBA and Cascade Consulting to discuss JBA report.

Public Engagement

- 4.10 The public engagement undertaken comprised two key stages as described below.
- 4.11 An initial public exhibition was held close to the location of the proposed restoration project:
- Tuesday 29th April 2014, 4pm – 8.30pm, Godshill Village Hall.
- 4.12 The exhibition provided an opportunity for local people to discuss the EIA and the key issues it would cover with members of the EIA team and FC. Exhibition attendees were encouraged to complete a feedback form, which was available at the exhibition and online. A summary of the feedback along with comments from the EIA team regarding how comments had been/would be addressed was circulated to all exhibition attendees and posted on the project website¹¹.
- 4.13 Following finalisation of the design/restoration measures and completion of the baseline surveys/assessment, a further exhibition was held close to the location of the proposed restoration works:
- Tuesday 6th October 2015, 4pm- 8.30pm, Hyde Church Community Centre.

¹⁰ Available at:
http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/downloads/download/31/latchmore_wetland_restoration_planning_application_consultation_strategy
Accessed 06.07.16

¹¹ Available at: <http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/info/100/latchmore> Accessed 06.07.16

- 4.14 The exhibition updated members of the public on the nature of the proposed works and provided a summary of the key findings of the EIA. Exhibition attendees were encouraged to ask questions about the scheme and to complete a feedback form, which was available at the exhibition and online. Again specialist FC staff members as well as representatives of the EIA project team were on hand to answer questions.
- 4.15 A summary of feedback along with comments from the EIA team regarding how comments had been addressed was circulated to all exhibition attendees and posted on the project website¹².
- 4.16 In addition to the above, the following public engagement was undertaken:
1. Wider advertisement for each public exhibition, including press releases, newspaper adverts, posters and emails.
 2. A website maintained for the project with regular updates provided and key documents uploaded: <http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/info/100/latchmore>.
 3. Dedicated email address for stakeholders to write to: enquiries.latchmore@forestry.gsi.gov.uk.
 4. Replies to direct queries from local residents and key stakeholders provided in letter and email format, or on the project website and by telephone as required.

¹² Available at: <http://www.hlsnewforest.org.uk/info/100/latchmore> Accessed 06.07.16

5 Design and Access Statement

Physical Context

- 5.1 A description of the site is set out in **Section 2** of this Statement. Detail of the habitats within the site can be found in **Chapter 7: Ecology** in **ES Volume 1: Written Statement**.

Use

- 5.2 The site will continue to function as Forested Inclosure (including 'thrown open' Inclosures) and Open Forest, accessible to the public for recreation and commoners' stock.

Amount

- 5.3 The project will consist of approximately 5km of restored meander, 8km of bed level raising and 4.6km of channel infill, which is illustrated on detailed restoration proposal maps in the ES on **Figures 4.6 – 4.13** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**.
- 5.4 The project will also involve the construction and/or the replacement of access structures in SSSI Units 58, 66, 540 and 541 (illustrated on **Figures 4.6 – 4.13** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**). This will involve the replacement of:
- Two vehicle fords (SU 21444 13963, SU 21726 14376).
 - Nine culverts (two collapsed) (SU 1984712942, SU 2141414601, SU 21260 14617, SU 21641 14466, SU 21708 14660, SU 20928 12870, SU 20855 12920, SU 20699 13006, SU 20716 12892).
 - One collapsed vehicle bridge (SU 21398 14866).
 - One collapsed pedestrian bridge (SU 22602 15796).
 - One footbridge (SU 22460 15732).
 - One vehicle bridge (SU 22111 15494).
- 5.5 These structures will be replaced with:
- 12 pedestrian fords/ stock crossings.
 - Three vehicle fords.
- 5.6 Pipes will also be installed at three culvert crossings to spread the flow (SU 20716 12758, SU 20650 13136, SU 21016 13239).

- 5.7 The project will also involve the removal or felling of trees, scrub and vegetation to facilitate access to the work areas. It is estimated that 106 trees will be required to be felled within the Islands Thorns Inclosure (for which there is an existing felling licence under the Forest Design Plan¹³) and 54 trees (in 37 locations) on the Open Forest (outwith the existing licence area). These are a mixture of holly, birch, scots pine, oak, willow, beech and thorn. Scrub clearance will also be required along the proposed access routes to allow access for works vehicles and to enable these routes to be checked and cleared for unexploded ordnance prior to works commencing. Further information on the proposed access routes is provided in **Chapter 4: Project Description and Design** of **ES Volume 1: Written Statement**.

Layout

- 5.8 The layout of the project is illustrated on **Figures 4.4**, and **4.6 – 4.13** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**. Natural meanders will be restored bringing water flow back to its original course. Where the original meander route is not evident, the existing channel will have its dimensions reduced (by bed level raising and narrowing) to correspond and link into the original meander stretches.
- 5.9 Further detail of the restoration works can be found in **Chapter 4: Project Description and Design** of **ES Volume 1: Written Statement**.

Scale

- 5.10 Within the Latchmore catchment, 5km of old Brook meanders will be restored, 8km of main channel, tributaries and side drains will have their bed level raised, and 4.6km of main channel, tributaries and side drains will be infilled. The width of the restored channels will range from 50-500cm. The depth of the restored channels will range from between 10-70cm. The bed level raising and partial infilling will in some locations include channel narrowing of between 50-300cm. **Figures 4.1 – 4.3** in **ES Volume 2: Figures** illustrate typical cross-sections of the proposed restoration works.
- 5.11 The pedestrian fords/stock crossings that will be put in place will be approximately 2-3m in width, while vehicle fords will be approximately 4-5m in width.

Figure 5.1: Example of a Restored Channel



¹³ New Forest Inclosures, New Forest District, Inclosure Forest Design Plans, Phase C.

Figure 5.2: Example of an existing culvert



5.12

Figure 5.3: Collapsed pedestrian bridge (SU 22602 15796)



Figure 5.4: Existing vehicle ford (SU 22602 15796)



Appearance

- 5.13 As with previous restoration schemes, hoggin, gravel and clay will be imported for the purposes of raising the bed level of the watercourse, diverting the watercourse into remnant meanders and infilling the redundant channels. Heather bales will also be required. Filled redundant channels will be top-dressed with the vegetation removed to make way for the restored meanders.

Figures 5.5 & 5.6: Typical Heather Bales and Hoggin



Figure 5.7: Typical Gravel



Landscape

- 5.14 The proposed scheme will involve clearing out remnant meanders and creating new meanders, which will require the removal and temporary storage of vegetation. The stored vegetation will be used to top-dress the redundant drains once filled in. Spoil banks along the channels will be removed and where possible, material from the banks will be used to infill the redundant channels and side drains. No other soft landscaping or planting is proposed as part of the scheme.

Access

- 5.15 Access to the site will be via four routes and their respective access points as shown on **Figure 4.16** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**. The four routes and respective access points will be used by material delivery vehicles (HGVs and Tractor/Trailer), low loaders and smaller vehicles used by restoration works contractors. Information relating to access and traffic and transportation is presented in **Chapter 4: Project Description and Design** and **Chapter 9: Traffic and Transportation** of **ES Volume 1: Written Statement**, and **Appendix 4.2** in **ES Volume 3: Appendices**.

6 Planning Policy Appraisal

Introduction

- 6.1 This section sets out the national and local planning policy context and other material considerations that are relevant to the proposed scheme. It then explains how the restoration proposals are consistent with policy requirements.

Statutory Development Plan Policy

- 6.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that:
- 6.3 *"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise".*
- 6.4 The statutory development plan that covers the New Forest comprises the New Forest National Park Authority's Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) (2010).

New Forest National Park Authority's Core Strategy and Development Management DPD

- 6.5 The New Forest NPA's Core Strategy and Development Management DPD (the 'Core Strategy and DM DPD') was adopted in December 2010 and sets out the vision and planning framework (which includes strategic and detailed development management policies) for the National Park for the period up to 2026.
- 6.6 Core Strategy and DM DPD policies of relevance to the proposed scheme are:
- **Policy CP1: Nature Conservation Sites of International Importance** states developments which may affect the integrity of internationally importance sites for nature conservation (either individually or cumulatively) will not be permitted unless:
 - there is no alternative solution; and
 - there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest for the development.
 - **Policy CP2: The Natural Environment** seeks to protect, maintain and enhance nationally, regionally and locally important sites and features of the natural environment, including habitats and species of biodiversity importance, geological features and the water environment.

Development that will harm the notified feature of a SSSI will normally be refused.

In addition, opportunities to enhance ecological or geological assets should be maximised, particularly in line with the Biodiversity Action Plan priorities.
 - **Policy CP4: Climate Change** requires the consequences of climate change upon flooding to be considered, to improve resilience to flooding events and incorporate sustainable design in the management of water.

- **Policy CP6: Pollution** states opportunities should be taken to control and reduce the impacts of noise, visual intrusion, nuisance and other unacceptable environmental impacts on the National Park and its special qualities.
- **Policy CP7: The Built Environment** seeks to protect, maintain and enhance nationally, regionally, and locally important sites and features of the built environment, including local vernacular buildings, archaeological sites and designated landscapes.
- **Policy DP1: General Development Principles** states that development proposals and uses of land must uphold and promote the principles of sustainable development. Development proposals must demonstrate high quality design and construction which enhances local character and distinctiveness. *"This includes, but is not restricted to, ensuring:*
 - *...development respects the natural and built environment, landscape character and biodiversity, and where appropriate makes provision for new tree planting...;*
 - *amenity is not adversely affected in terms of additional impacts, visual intrusion, overlooking and shading; and*
 - *no adverse impacts associated with traffic or pollution (including noise and light pollution)".*
- **Policy DP2: Safeguarding and Improving Water Resources** states that development will not be permitted if it would risk harm to the quality and yield of water resources including abstraction sites, groundwater, rivers, streams and still waters.
- **Policy DP4: Flooding and the Coast** requires Environment Agency flood zones to be taken into account along with the suitability of development types in relation to potential flood risk, and states that development proposals will not be permitted if they:
 - would increase the risk of fluvial flooding;
 - do not comply with the sequential test or are inappropriate in high flood risk areas.

6.7 Policy DP4 also states that appropriate developments will require a flood risk assessment.

Material Planning Considerations

- 6.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹⁴ was published in March 2012 and constitutes guidance for local planning authorities as a material consideration in determining planning applications. It sets out a series of principles and reinforces the Government's commitment to a plan-led system where local planning authorities should approve development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.
- 6.9 The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making, stating that proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development that should run through both plan-making and decision-taking. In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 6.10 In terms of delivering sustainable development, the NPPF sets out a number of overarching policies which, taken as a whole, contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The overarching policy of relevance to the proposed Latchmore Wetland Restoration project relates to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.

¹⁴ Available at: <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>. Accessed 06.07.16

- 6.11 Paragraph 118 states "when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:
- if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
 - proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
 - development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;
 - opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;
 - planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland, and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss; and
 - the following wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites;
 - potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;
 - listed or proposed Ramsar sites;
 - sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites."

Compliance with Policy

- 6.12 This section explains how the proposed project conforms to the planning policy and other material planning considerations set out above. It should be read in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement (**Section 5**) and the ES (Volumes 1, 2 and 3) that accompanies the application.

Flood Risk

- 6.13 The Environment Agency floodplain map shows that most of the area close to the watercourse lies in Flood Zones 2 and 3. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared in support of this application to demonstrate how flooding within and outwith the site will be affected by the proposed scheme – see **Appendix 6.6 in ES Volume 3: Appendices**. The proposed scheme will increase the total flood inundation area by 7.1, 7.5, 6.9 and 9.2ha compared to the baseline situation for the 1 in 2, 1 in 5, 1 in 10 and 1 in 25 year flood events. This is equivalent to an increase of 20.5% and 14.1% to the flood inundation area due to the restoration works for the 1 in 2 and 1 in 25 year flood event. This is in line with the overall objective of the proposed scheme which seeks to reconnect the watercourse with the adjacent floodplain and thus, restore the mire habitat through seasonal flooding.

- 6.14 The proposed works (channel infill and meandering) will reduce the likelihood of the rapid flow of water downstream through the site and divert flood flows more frequently to the floodplain, as set out above. This means that flood risk at properties and infrastructure located downstream of Ogdens footbridge will not increase as a result of the proposed works. Furthermore, there are no properties located on the Latchmore floodplain which could be affected by the proposed increased flood inundation area on the floodplain. As such, there is no need for any flood storage compensation measures.
- 6.15 Local changes to groundwater levels, including ponding, due to raised surface water levels and greater presence of flood water on the floodplain may arise as a consequence of the proposed restoration measures. Removing spoil banks along the existing channel will also facilitate the movement of previously-trapped water on the floodplain into the channel, enhancing the channel-floodplain connectivity and facilitating a more naturalised regime.
- 6.16 These changes are desired from the restoration point of view as they will ensure more water is held within the catchment rather than passing rapid flows through the deep and straight channel.
- 6.17 The FRA also confirms that the Exception Test is not required as the proposed restoration works are considered to be 'water compatible' development.
- 6.18 An agreed monitoring and action plan will be implemented to monitor the recovery rate and implications of the proposed works. This is included in **Appendix 4.3** of the ES. As such, if inspection or public information suggests that the proposed works are having an adverse effect on flood risk, an action plan will be implemented to respond to the concern swiftly.
- 6.19 As such, the proposed scheme complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policy DP4.

Biodiversity

- 6.20 The site is located within the New Forest SAC, SPA, Ramsar and within 27 units of the New Forest SSSI (listed within paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 of this Statement and illustrated in **Figures 3.1, 4.14** and **4.15** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**). Some of the SSSI units are currently recorded as being in an 'unfavourable recovering condition'¹⁵, a classification which assumes the proposed restoration works will be implemented. Pre-application consultation was undertaken prior to the submission of this application as part of the EIA which included consultation with Natural England, Hampshire Wildlife Trust, British Dragonfly Society, New Forest Association and New Forest NPA Environment and Rural Economy Team.
- 6.21 A number of ecological surveys have been undertaken to support this application, including:
- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey.
 - National Vegetation Classification Survey.
 - River Habitat Survey.
 - Breeding Bird Survey.
 - Kingfisher Survey.
 - Otter Survey.
 - Southern Damselfly Survey.
 - Smooth Snake Habitat Appraisal.
 - Fish surveys (including smolt trapping, electrofishing and redd count surveys).

¹⁵ JBA consulting (April 2013) New Forest SSSI Geomorphological Survey Overview.

- Bat Surveys.
- 6.22 The findings of the surveys can be found in **Chapter 7 of ES Volume 1: Written Statement**. In summary, following the application of mitigation, there is only one significant residual effect that may occur when the restoration is being undertaken. This is in relation to the direct habitat loss for fish as they will need to be temporarily removed from the watercourse. Post restoration the impact of the restoration for fish will be beneficial.
- 6.23 Given the nature of the project, post-restoration effects are identified as being positive for all ecological features. Consequently, effects on ecological features as a consequence of the delivery and operation of the project are significantly positive (in EIA Regulation terms) at the Site or Local level.
- 6.24 A Monitoring Plan will be implemented pre and post-restoration to ensure that no unexpected negative effects arise. Where such effects are recorded, an action plan will be implemented to remedy the issue. With regard to the designated sites, the condition of the SSSI will be monitored by Natural England on a 6 yearly cycle. The results of the monitoring will be shared with the FC to ensure that the project has achieved its objectives. The Monitoring Plan is set out in **Appendix 4.3** of the ES.
- 6.25 In summary, it is considered that the significant long term ecological benefits of the works, specifically on the condition of the SSSIs, clearly outweigh the short term effects on fish when the restoration work is being undertaken. As such, the proposed scheme complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policies CP1, CP2, DP1 and DP2 and paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

Geodiversity

- 6.26 As stated above the Latchmore Brook is located within the New Forest SSSI which is also notified to protect geodiversity.
- 6.27 The citation for the New Forest SSSI¹⁶ includes the following paragraph pertaining to the geodiversity of the section of Latchmore Brook that flows through Studley Wood:
- "Studley Wood stream section is a prolific Tertiary locality exposing the only complete exposure of the silty Huntingbridge Formation of the Bracklesham Group. This is also the stratotype for the Studley Wood Member of the Formation. This series of units forming the top of the Bracklesham beds is remarkable for its molluscan faunas and the number of species limited to the Formation. Numerous corals, scaphopoda, bivalves and gastropods occur here. This is an outstanding Eocene locality of great interest in studies of Tertiary stratigraphy and palaeontology within the Hampshire Basin and across north western Europe."*
- 6.28 The proposed works within Studley Wood comprise:
- complete infill of the existing incised stream gully and rejuvenation of the historic meander channels; and
 - raising of bed levels within the existing stream channel to correspond with the elevation of the rejuvenation meanders.
- 6.29 Whilst there will be a moderate impact on the Studley Wood GCR, the geological resource will not be damaged, rather it will be infilled (see **Chapter 6 of ES Volume 1: Written Statement**). A comprehensive and detailed programme of mitigation works in the form of a Geo-Conservation

¹⁶ Retrieved on 10th June 2016 from:

<https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/SiteDetail.aspx?SiteCode=S1003036&SiteName=new%20forest&countyCode=&responsiblePerson=>

Strategy will be prepared in consultation with Natural England, the Tertiary Research Group and the British Geological Survey. This will include:

- A synopsis of the current scientific knowledge of the site, building on both the baseline Geckoella work, plus other work undertaken by Natural England and the Tertiary Research Group.
- A method statement/ specification for each element of the strategy, such that all contractors can be suitably informed of the issues and their importance.
- A Monitoring and Recording Plan, providing the framework for geo-conservation workers to adhere to in rescue sampling, recording and preservation, including named stakeholders involved in the geo-conservation works.

6.30 The FC is happy for this mitigation strategy to be secured by way of condition.

6.31 As set out above and in **Chapter 7 of ES Volume 1: Written Statement** there will be significant positive effects on statutory designated sites and habitats, including the New Forest SSSI. The proposed works will have an adverse effect on the geological element of the New Forest SSSI. However, the benefits of the scheme, specifically the positive effects on the New Forest SSSI with regard to habitat, are considered to clearly outweigh this adverse effect. Natural England has agreed that the works are required at Studley Wood in order to adopt a coherent catchment wide approach to the restoration works. The proposed scheme therefore complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policies CP1, CP2 and DP1 and paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

Historic Environment

6.32 **Chapter 8: Historic Environment** in **ES Volume 1: Written Statement** examines the potential effects of the project on the historic environment. This includes cultural heritage and archaeology within the project area and, as appropriate, its immediate environs. It includes an assessment of potential effects upon a range of receptors, comprising:

- Designated and undesignated archaeological sites including Scheduled Monuments.
- Known and potential archaeological sites.
- Areas of archaeological sensitivity.

6.33 The assessment identified that the works associated with the following restoration phases may affect the features listed below (as identified on **Figures 8.2 – 8.15** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**):

- Islands Thorns and Studley Wood:
 - OA 29 Islands Thorns Inclosure Bank.
 - OA 31 Studley Castle Royal Hunting Lodge. Scheduled Monument.
 - OA 37 Possible Ancient Bank.
 - OA 83 Burnt Flint Spread.
 - OA 84 Burnt Flint Spread.
 - OA 86 Burnt Flint Spread.
 - OA 463 Burnt Flint Spread.
- Amberwood Inclosure:
 - OA 104 Amberwood Inclosure Roman Kilns. Scheduled.
 - OA 109 Features associated with former Holloways.
 - OA 110 Clay Extraction Site.
 - OA 224 Semi-Circular Earthwork.
 - OA 238 Amberwood Inclosure Roman Kilns. Scheduled.

- OA 357 Holloway.
- OA 358 Holloway.
- OA 464 Burnt Flint Spread
- Alderhill Inclosure:
 - OA 238 Amberwood Inclosure Roman Kilns. Scheduled.
 - OA 364 Two Undated Trackways.
 - OA 365 Medieval Bank and Ditch.
 - OA 367 Holloway.
 - OA 370 Roman pottery findspot.
- Sloden:
 - OA 254 Post-medieval Hollow Way.
 - OA 255 Undated Sandstone Quarry.
 - OA 256 Area of undated extraction and Roman pottery finds.
 - OA 263 Area of Roman Pottery Kilns. Scheduled.
 - OA 313 Area of possible Roman Kilns.
 - OA 314 Area of possible Roman Kilns.
 - OA 315 Area of possible Roman Kilns.
- Latchmore Shade, Watergreen Bottom, Thompson's Castle and Latchmore Mire
 - OA 382 Wide Ditch.
 - OA 383 Undated Bank and Ditch.
 - OA 405 Area of undated Drainage ditches.
 - OA 408 Bronze Age Burial Mound. Scheduled Monument.
 - OA 415 Possible Prehistoric Burnt Mound.
 - OA 416 Possible Prehistoric Burnt Mound.
 - OA 466 Possible Prehistoric Burnt Mound.

6.34 **Chapter 8: Historic Environment** in **ES Volume 1: Written Statement** sets out the proposed mitigation to protect the historic environment features listed above. Measures to be implemented include:

- Archaeological monitoring of meander restoration (e.g. in Islands Thorns and Amberwood Inclosure) due to OA 29, OA 224, OA 382.
- The demarcation of known archaeological features (OA 37, OA 238, OA 263, OA 358, OA 367) to avoid impacts from works traffic.
- Archaeological excavation of features (OA 83, OA 84, OA 86, OA 415, OA 416, OA 463, OA 466) prior to the works commencing.
- The implementation of an archaeological watching brief of any groundworks in close proximity to OA 109, OA 110, OA 254, OA 255, OA 256, OA 313, OA 314, OA 315, OA 357, OA 370, OA 383, OA 405, OA 464.
- Blanketing of track as it crosses OA 364 to ensure that buried features are not damaged.
- The implementation of an archaeological watching brief of any groundworking in relation to Alderhill Inclosure stockpile due to OA 365.
- A 'Tool Box Talk' to discuss the nature, visibility and presence of potentially undetected archaeological sites to ensure that the contractors are aware of the resources that may be encountered.

6.35 Taking into account the above mitigation strategy, it is considered that the proposed works will not have an adverse impact on the historic environment. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policy CP7.

Traffic and Transport

- 6.36 The restoration works are proposed to commence in 2017 for four years, with work taking place between July and September each year undertaken in short stages of up to 12 weeks. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (**Appendix 4.2 in ES Volume 3: Appendices**) has been submitted as part of the planning application which sets out the routes construction vehicles will use to travel to and from the site. As a worst case scenario, the proposed scheme will result in an additional 70 vehicle movements (58 of these will be HGVs¹⁷) per day from Ogdens, Alderhill, Fritham and Telegraph Hill.
- 6.37 These movements are calculated on a five day working week with deliveries only taking place between the hours of 07.00-19.00 Mon-Fri. There is suitable reserve capacity within the highway network, therefore the additional movements forecast during the construction periods can be accommodated.
- 6.38 As such, construction traffic will not have an adverse impact on the safety or operation of the highway network and its users.
- 6.39 No impacts are envisaged post restoration as no traffic movements will be created, or the need for additional parking.
- 6.40 It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policy DP1.

Landscape and Trees

- 6.41 The proposed scheme will comprise a number of works including the excavation and restoration of remnant meanders. **Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity in ES Volume 1: Written Statement** considers that damage and disturbance from construction activity, vehicular movements and stockpiling of materials will be minor for all landscape and visual receptors, other than the Latchmore Shade area and recreational users of it. In this area a moderate effect is predicted for the period of up to two years it will take for vegetation to re-establish. Elsewhere the scale and duration of works are not considered sufficient to have significant effects on landscape character or views. Post restoration, minor adverse effects are expected in the short term, through to minor beneficial in the longer term. The changes are not considered likely to fundamentally affect the character of the landscape or of views in any of the affected areas.
- 6.42 Removal or felling of trees, scrub and vegetation will be undertaken to facilitate access to the work areas. It is estimated that approximately 106 trees will be required to be felled within the Islands Thorns Inclosure (for which there is an existing felling licence under the Forest Design Plan¹⁸) and 54 trees on the Open Forest (outwith the existing licence area). These are a mixture of holly, birch, scots pine, oak, willow, beech and thorn. The loss of the 54 trees on the Open Forest is not considered to be unacceptable as it will have a negligible effect on the site, and the New Forest as a whole. Furthermore, the felling of these trees on the open forest was agreed with members from: the Verderers, the Commoners Defence Association, NFNPA, Natural England, New Forest Association, New Forest Access Forum and the FC, onsite at the Studley Wood SSSI Habitat Restoration Consultation Meeting on 14th November 2014. A separate felling licence for these works will be applied for by the FC.
- 6.43 It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policy DP1.

¹⁷ This includes HGVs and tractor/ trailers.

¹⁸ New Forest Inclosures, New Forest District, Inclosure Forest Design Plans, Phase C.

Recreation, Land Use and Access

- 6.44 The ES assesses the potential effects of the project on land use and recreation in **Chapter 11: Land Use and Recreation** in **ES Volume 1: Written Statement**.
- 6.45 Effects during the restoration works on land use, including access for grazing animals, are expected to be negligible during the period when the restoration works are taking place, as temporary restrictions will only take place during the summer each year over a four year period (2017 – 2020), and will only relate to the immediate areas where work activity is taking place. Sufficient water will, however, be available for grazing stock.
- 6.46 The materials required for the project will be delivered and stockpiled along four delivery routes and the forest roads within the site (see **Figures 4.4 and 4.16 1** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**). There will be some short term, temporary disruption due to: the movement of material delivery vehicles and restoration works vehicles; the temporary closure of Ogdens Car park in the summers of 2017, 2018 and 2020; and restricted access to areas where the restoration works are taking place, including minor diversions to the Hampton Ridge off road cycle route. However, effects will be mitigated by the use of appropriate signs and diversions, including signs at all of the entry points to the catchment to make members of the public aware of the works and all machine operators will stop work when members of the public approach.
- 6.47 Restricted Byway 790 runs south from the northern area of the site, from Telegraph Hill towards Fritham. A small area of the Restricted Byway intersects an existing access track and crosses a proposed access route which will be used by restoration vehicles, as shown on **Figure 11.1** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**. However, the effects on recreational users of Restricted Byway 790 during the restoration works are expected to be negligible, as the Hampshire County Council Public Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that the Restricted Byway is not recognisable on the ground and the Byway does not need to be closed. However, appropriate signage will be placed at the intersections of where Restricted Byway 790 crosses the existing access track and proposed access route, detailing that works operations are underway in the area. Vehicle movements will also be halted by an on-site banksman if members of the public are present during operation.
- 6.48 Once the works are complete, a minor positive effect is expected on recreation and access as a result of the replacement of dilapidated structures (including two vehicle fords, two vehicle bridges, two pedestrian bridges and nine culverts) with the construction of 15 new fords (comprising 12 pedestrian and three vehicle crossings).
- 6.49 As such, the proposed scheme complies with paragraph 75 of the NPPF, which seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way and access.

Amenity

- 6.50 There are a number of residential properties adjacent to the site/catchment area boundary (e.g. to the west in Ogdens) (see **Figure 4.4** in **ES Volume 2: Figures**). However, the proposed works and access routes are away from the catchment area boundary. Only the existing FC access tracks are adjacent to/pass through the site/catchment area boundary. The residential receptors adjacent to the site/catchment area boundary are within 200m of proposed stockpile locations in certain locations (e.g. Ogdens).
- 6.1 Noise, dust and vibration have been assessed as part of the EIA, see **Chapter 9: Traffic and Transportation** in **ES Volume 1: Written Statement**, and **Appendix 9.1** in **ES Volume 3: Appendices**. Temporary, localised effects are anticipated for noise and dust.
- 6.2 The vibration assessment (see **Appendix 9.1**) which was undertaken established that the levels of vibration from restoration works traffic (tipper lorries, and tractors and trailers) whilst

perceptible, will not cause any structural damage, even for buildings of cob construction. Good practice mitigation measures based on this assessment will however be adopted to reduce perceived levels of vibration. Furthermore, the effects from the restoration works will be minimised through the implementation of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which the contractor will adhere to. It is therefore considered that the project will not result in any unacceptable adverse effects with regard to the amenity of nearby properties and the amenity of users of the site.

- 6.3 Once the works are complete, no adverse impacts on amenity are anticipated.
- 6.4 It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme complies with Core Strategy and DM DPD policies CP6 and DP1.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 A number of the New Forest SSSI units located within Latchmore Brook catchment are classed by Natural England as being in 'unfavourable recovering condition'¹⁹. The proposed wetland restoration works will assist in restoring New Forest SSSI Units 28, 30, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 58, 61, 66, 540, and 541, significantly contributing to the conservation of the New Forest SAC. A Monitoring Plan will be implemented post-restoration to ensure that no unexpected negative effects arise. Where any negative effects are identified, an action plan will be implemented to remedy the issue. The condition of the New Forest SSSI will also be monitored post-restoration by Natural England on a 6 yearly cycle. Natural England will share the result of the monitoring with the FC to ensure that the project has achieved its objectives and the effects on the SSSI are positive.
- 7.2 The proposed scheme will increase the total flood inundation area in line with its overall objective which seeks to reconnect the watercourse with the adjacent floodplain and thus, restore the mire habitat through seasonal flooding. The proposed works will therefore reduce the likelihood of the rapid flow of water downstream through the site as high flows will more frequently use the floodplain. As such, flood risk at properties and infrastructure located downstream of Ogdens footbridge will not increase (but is likely to decrease) as a result of the proposed works. Furthermore, there are no properties located on the Latchmore floodplain which could be affected by the proposed increased flood inundation area on the floodplain. As with biodiversity, a monitoring and action plan will be implemented to monitor the recovery rate and implications of the proposed works with regard to flooding. As such, if inspection or public information suggests that the proposed works are having an adverse effect on flood risk, an action plan will be implemented to respond to the concern swiftly.
- 7.3 Measures have been identified, and will be put in place, to minimise and manage the temporary and localised disruption during the works, which will take place for 12 weeks throughout July and September every year between 2017-2020. These measures are set out in the CEMP (**Appendix 9.1 in ES Volume 3: Appendices**). The contractor will be required to adhere to these measures which will be secured by way of planning condition.
- 7.4 The proposed scheme complies with the NPPF and New Forest NPA's Core Strategy and DM DPD policies, as the restoration works will conserve and enhance the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar and New Forest SSSI for future generations.

¹⁹ It is important to note that Natural England has identified the SSSI Units in the Latchmore Brook catchment as being 'recovering' due to the Latchmore Wetland Restoration project which is proposed by the FC. If the restoration is not implemented the SSSI Units will revert to being classed as 'unfavourable no change' or 'unfavourable declining'. See footnotes 6 and 7 for definitions of these classes.

Appendix 1 – Biodiversity Checklist

Site address: Latchmore Brook

There are numerous legally protected sites of nature conservation interest across Hampshire. Hampshire also supports a wide range of legally protected species and non-statutory important sites. Developments can adversely affect these and in many cases Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are **legally required** to address potential impacts to these. LPAs are required by the Government to consider the conservation of biodiversity when determining a planning application. Government planning policies for biodiversity are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), while the Local Authority's local plan / core strategy will set out how they address these requirements in local policy terms. In order to meet these requirements, LPAs need to be able to understand what the potential impacts of the development might be and if there are impacts on biodiversity, how these will be avoided or mitigated.

This Checklist has been designed to help you work out if your proposal is likely to affect biodiversity, and if so, help you understand what additional information you will need to provide to support your application and how to get that information.

Guidance for applicants

If your answers to the questions in **Sections 1, 2** and / or **3** identify that your project may potentially have an adverse impact on designated sites, priority or other notable habitats or legally protected or notable species you will need to submit a Biodiversity Statement or other suitable report which demonstrates the following:

- Information about the sites, species, habitats or features that could be affected (such as location, size, abundance, importance)
- Likely impacts of your development on habitats, sites or species identified in this Checklist
- How alternative designs and locations have been considered
- How adverse impacts will be avoided
- How any unavoidable impacts will be mitigated or reduced (*see note 4*)
- How impacts that cannot be avoided or mitigated will be compensated (*see note 4*)
- Any proposals for enhancements of biodiversity

Where more targeted and specific reports are necessary (for example bat surveys), these must:

- Be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced person
- Be of appropriate scope and detail (i.e. be carried out to established standards)
- Be conducted at an appropriate time of year, in suitable weather conditions and using recognised methodologies.

Reports may not be required where applicants are able to provide pre-application correspondence from Natural England, the Local Authority or their ecological adviser that confirms that they are satisfied that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on any features identified in Sections 1, 2 or 3.

The application may not be validated if any of the information submitted proves to be inadequate. If validated and the information is subsequently found not to fully address any potential impacts then further information may be required during the course of any planning application, for instance if any of the information you have provided needs clarification, or if other potential impacts are identified. If sufficient information on ecological issues is not provided by the time the application needs to be determined, the application may be refused.

It is strongly advised that you consider biodiversity at the **earliest** possible stage in your project as there are seasonal constraints to much of the survey work that may be needed to support your application.

For further advice on competent ecologists that can undertake specialist survey work, please see the Chartered Institute of Ecological and Environmental Management <http://www.cieem.net> in the first instance.

SECTION 1 – Legally protected sites for nature conservation

<p>PROPOSAL DETAILS</p> <p>Please answer ALL questions Yes or No by marking the appropriate box against each question</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>If you have answered 'YES' to any of these, is it likely that the development would have an impact on the identified site? (<i>see note 2</i>)</p> <p>Please explain why / why not, or state if further information is provided</p>
<p>1.1 Is the application for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >0.5ha in area • >10 units/dwellings • power station • sewage treatment works • fish farm • industrial/agricultural development next to or discharging pollutants into a water course • a new road scheme <p>AND within 2km of a SAC, SPA or Ramsar site? (<i>see note 1</i>)</p>	<p>✓</p>		
<p>1.2 Is the application for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • power station • sewage treatment works • fish farm • industrial/agricultural development next to or discharging pollutants into a water course • a new road or rail scheme • any new housing units • any new industrial units • other infrastructure and services • industrial estate • service station • golf course • leisure centre/stadium • car park • industrial or agricultural unit with large powder or liquid discharges <p>AND within 500m of a SSSI? (<i>see note 1</i>)</p>		<p>✓</p>	

Continued →

SECTION 2 – Habitats

<p>PROPOSAL DETAILS</p> <p>Please answer ALL questions Yes or No by marking the appropriate box against each question</p> <p>NB: <i>If Yes, there may be a SINC* , Priority Habitat** or other important feature within or adjacent to the application site – please see <u>note 3</u> for further information on identifying these.</i></p>	YES	NO	<p>Is it likely that the development would have an impact (see <i>note 2</i>) on this?</p> <p>Please explain why / why not, or state if further information is provided</p>
<p>2.1 Are any of the following present on or within 100m of the application site?</p>			
<p>a) <i>Broad-leaved woodland</i></p>	✓		
<p>b) <i>Veteran (particularly old / large) trees</i></p>	✓		
<p>c) <i>Water courses (rivers or streams)</i></p>	✓		
<p>d) <i>Lakes or ponds</i></p>	✓		
<p>e) <i>Wetlands or marshes</i></p>	✓		
<p>f) <i>Flower-rich meadow / grassland</i></p>		✓	
<p>g) <i>Water meadow</i></p>		✓	
<p>h) <i>Heathland</i></p>	✓		
<p>i) <i>Mature hedgerow</i></p>		✓	

* SINC – Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. These are not legally protected, but are identified in planning policy as being of importance for biodiversity and are considered during the planning process – see <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/biodiversity/hampshire/sincs.htm>

** Priority Habitat – natural or semi-natural habitats that have been identified as being at risk (in that they are rare or in decline) or that are important for certain key species of plant or animal - <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/prioritylist.aspx>

Continued →

Section 3 – Legally protected species

PROPOSAL DETAILS Please answer ALL questions Yes or No by marking the appropriate box against each question	YES	NO	If you have ticked 'YES' to any of these, you will need to consider potential impacts to the following:	Survey attached?
3.1 Will the proposal affect any of the following features / structures? (see note 2)				
a) buildings with hanging tiles (see note 5), timber cladding or weatherboarding where the building is within 200m of woodland or water		✓	} <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bats and bat roosts 	
b) pre-1960 buildings or structures within 200m of woodland and/or water		✓		
c) pre-1914 buildings or structures within 400m of woodland and/or water		✓		
d) pre-1914 buildings with gable ends, peg tile / traditional clay tile roofs or slate roofs, hanging tiles or weatherboarding regardless of location		✓		
e) underground structures (e.g cellars, caves or mines)		✓		
f) bridges or similar structures		✓		
g) structures where there is known current or historic bat use		✓		
3.2 agricultural buildings particularly of traditional brick, timber or stone construction and/or with exposed timber beams greater than 20cm thick		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bats and bat roosts ▪ Barn owl ▪ Nesting birds 	
3.3 other large agricultural buildings		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Barn owls 	
3.4 Will the proposal affect trees with any of the following features? (see note 2)				
a) old and veteran trees	✓		} <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bats and bat roosts ▪ Nesting birds 	
b) trees with obvious holes, cracks, cavities or heavy vegetation	✓			
c) trees with a circumference greater than 1m at chest height	✓			

Continued →

Section 3 continued

PROPOSAL DETAILS Please answer ALL questions Yes or No by marking the appropriate box against each question	YES	NO	If you have ticked ' YES ' to any of these, you will need to consider potential impacts to the following:	Survey attached?	
3.5 Are there streams, rivers or lakes on or within 25m of the application site that would be affected (including their banks and adjacent habitat) by the development?	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bat foraging habitat ▪ Otters ▪ Water vole ▪ White-clawed crayfish 	Detailed in EIA	
3.6 Will the proposals affect (see <i>note 2</i>) any of the following features?				Detailed in EIA	
a) <i>deciduous (i.e. not mainly conifer) woodland?</i>	✓		} <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bat foraging habitat (see note 1a) ▪ Dormice ▪ Breeding birds ▪ Badger 		
b) <i>field hedgerows over 1m tall and over 0.5m thick?</i>		✓			
c) <i>areas of scrub well-connected to woodland or hedgerows?</i>		✓			
3.7 Is the proposal either: - a major application (>0.5ha, >10 dwellings or >1000m ² floor space for non-residential) within 500m of a pond, - or any other application within 200m of a pond where water in the pond(s) at its highest level (excluding flood events), is 225m ² (c.15m x 15m)?		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amphibians (particularly with respect to great crested newts) 		
3.8 Will the proposal affect mature/overgrown gardens over 0.25ha, or any rough grassland, derelict/brownfield land, railway land or allotments? (<i>see note 2</i>).		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reptiles ▪ Breeding birds 		
3.9 Will the proposal affect flower-rich meadows or grassland on or directly adjacent to the site? (<i>see note 2</i>).		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Breeding birds 		

Notes

▪ **Note 1**

You can find out if your application site is on or near any of these sites from www.natureonthemap.org.uk, www.magic.gov.uk or the LPA's Local Plan Proposals Map.

SSSI = Site of Special Scientific Interest (designated and protected under UK law); SAC = Special Area of Conservation; SPA = Special Protection Area (these are designated and protected under EU law and are also SSSIs); Ramsar site = internationally important wetland, designated under the Ramsar Convention – these will also be SPAs / SACs and SSSIs. See <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designatedareas/default.aspx> for more information.

▪ **Note 2**

Effects could be DIRECT, such as destruction, removal or modification, or INDIRECT through disturbance such as run-off, noise, dust, lighting or increased recreational use.

▪ **Note 3**

Areas of designated Ancient Woodland and some Priority Habitats can be found on www.magic.gov.uk. The LPA's Local Plan Proposals Map may identify the location of any SINCs. Ordnance survey maps may also help.

▪ **Note 4**

Avoidance = measures taken to avoid impacts – should be the first considerations; Mitigation = measures which make unavoidable impacts less severe; Compensation = measures which counterbalance remaining impacts, resulting in an overall no net loss of biodiversity. (NB 'Mitigation' as a general term, or a 'mitigation strategy' is often used to cover all these processes).

▪ **Note 5 – a note on hanging tiles.**

This checklist, where relating to potential impacts on **bats**, is adapted from the Bat Conservation Trust's guidelines (see <http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/guidanceforprofessionals.html>) on where bats might reasonably be likely to be found. However bats can be found in other locations, types or areas of buildings. It is particularly important to note that where a building has **hanging tiles** but is not within 200m of woodland or water, there is still potentially a reasonable likelihood of bats being present and a survey may be required in situations other than those specifically identified in this checklist.

Important: this checklist can not include all protected species and all circumstances where they may be affected. Legislation relating to protected species applies in all circumstances and it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that protected species and habitats are not impacted as a result of development. If protected species are found during the course of development, work should be halted and advice sought from Natural England or a qualified ecologist.

For office use:

1	Have ALL questions on ALL sections been completed?	Y / N	If YES, go to 2	If NO, application should not be validated
2	Have any questions been answered 'Yes'?	Y / N	If YES, go to 3	If NO, application can be validated
3	Does the applicant identify likely impacts and address potential issues in any comments made on the checklist?	Y / N	If YES, application can be validated	If NO, go to 4
4	Has a separate statement, report or other supporting information been submitted to address potential impacts?	Y / N	If YES, application can be validated	If NO, application should not be validated

If you are unsure about any of these, please call the Hampshire County Council Development and Biodiversity team (part of the Strategic Environmental Delivery Group) on 01962 832313