

## Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications arising from the consultation on the Proposed Submission draft Aggregate Minerals Site Allocations Local Plan Consultation

### General changes/comments on approach/comments on introduction

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)/agreed	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
<b>General comment/modifications</b>				
PM1	Update copyright dates for all maps in the plan.	Yes	Figure 1.1, Area and Inset Maps.	Maps and Figures Copyright details for all maps and figures to be updated to read “© <b><i>Crown copyright and database rights 2012 Ordnance Survey 100049050</i></b> ”
PM2	Amend figure 1.1 to un-embolden the boundary of Southampton.	Yes	Figure 1.1	Figure 1.1 To be amended to remove bold outline of Southampton area in the interests of consistency.
PM3	In accordance with the National Planning Policy requirements for Development Frameworks to be called Development Plans and Development Plan Documents to be re-termed Local Plans - update all references.	Yes	All relevant references	<u>All relevant references</u> Replace all references to Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) with ' <b><i>Development Plans</i></b> ' and all references to Development Plan Documents/DPD to ' <b><i>Local Plan(s)</i></b> '.
PM4	Replace all references to the draft National Planning Policy Framework with National Planning Policy Framework	Yes	All relevant references	<u>All relevant references</u> Replace all references to the draft National Planning Policy Framework with ' <b><i>National Planning Policy Framework</i></b> '
PM5	In accordance with the National Planning Policy delete references to MPS's and PPS's/PPG's and/or replace with NPPF where relevant.	Yes	All relevant references	<u>All relevant references</u> Delete references to MPS's and PPS's/PPG's and/or replace with ' <b><i>NPPF</i></b> ' where relevant.
<b>Comments in order of Local Plan site profile</b>				

	<b>Human Health and Amenity</b>			
PM6	All sites should be assessed against the MPS2 minimum standard of noise control.	Yes	The Noise section within the Human Health and Amenity criteria within each of the site profile tables.	Officers are currently in discussions with Public Protection Services regarding the position to take in light of the recently introduced National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM7	The traffic and transportation section needs to be looked at in a co-ordinated way with other plans and strategies to limit the impacts of HGV movements on the A419 through Latton and Cricklade.	Yes	The Upper Thames Valley – context section.	<u>Context Section</u> Reflect the fact that issues of a strategic and local nature will need to be addressed through the development of minerals proposals in the Upper Thames Valley. Additional text as a new paragraph to be added beneath paragraph 2.4, to read: <b><u>'The planned release of minerals sites in the Upper Thames Valley will need to ensure that all relevant strategic and local considerations (including HGV movements along the A419 and the requirements of other plans and strategies in the area) have been factored into the development of minerals proposals.'</u></b>
	<b>The Water Environment</b>			
PM8	Reference should be made in all cases to the relevant Catchment Flood Management Plan and to Wiltshire Council's Flood Risk Assessment.	Yes in part	Water environment section of all site profile tables.	<u>Site Profiles</u> Reference should be made to the Wiltshire SFRA and to floodplain protection. However it was felt unnecessary to make reference to relevant catchment flood management plans. Suggested change in all water environment sections to read <b><u>'With reference to the Wiltshire SFRA, the site is...A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with any subsequent planning application with proposals to protect the floodplain where necessary.'</u></b>
PM9	Add text to detail the relevant vulnerability of aquifers for each site.	Yes	Water environment section of all site profile tables.	Through discussion with the Environment Agency and following the Agency's advice. Add text into the water environment section of all site profile tables detailing the vulnerability of aquifers in relation to each site.

## Comments by site: Cox's Farm

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested/agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Preferred restoration objective</b>			
PM10	The restoration sub-section fails to give adequate prominence to the public rights of way network and its importance to landscape setting locally. The restoration section should be amended to ensure any subsequent restoration scheme preserves, enhances, maintains and improves these features.	Yes	Table 2.2 – Preferred restoration objective	<u>Site Profiles</u> It is agreed that reference should be made to the need to retain and enhance the existing PRow network on the site. Text should be altered to read ' <i><u>In addition, there should be no net loss or degradation of the important local footpath PRow network in the area, these features should, where possible, be maintained during working and enhanced during restoration.</u></i> '
	<b>Human Health and Amenity</b>			
PM11	A 'Zone of Sensitivity' should be developed whereby mineral extraction should carry strong conditions to offer suitable noise, dust, landscape and historical setting protection to the residents, and setting, of Marston Meysey Conservation area. Proposed standoff area to be the line of the first field boundaries to the west and displayed on the site map.	Yes – in part	Table 2.2 – Human Health and Amenity	<u>Site Profiles</u> It is agreed that reference could be made in the site profile table to a 'zone of sensitivity'. It is not appropriate to incorporate a standoff zone onto the site map as this would be a matter for the planning application process to determine in precise detail. The following text should be added to the bottom of the human health and amenity section: ' <i><u>To protect the historic character and residential amenity of Marston Meysey, a 'Zone of Sensitivity' incorporating a proposed minimum 100m 'stand off distances' will need to be negotiated at the planning application stage.</u></i> '
	<b>Landscape and visual</b>			
PM12	A 'Zone of Sensitivity' should be developed whereby mineral extraction should carry strong conditions to offer	Yes – in part	Table 2.2 – Landscape and Visual	<u>Site Profiles</u> It is agreed that reference could be made in the site profile table to a 'zone of sensitivity'. It is not

	suitable noise, dust, landscape and historical setting protection to the residents, and setting, of Marston Meysey Conservation area. Proposed standoff area to be the line of the first field boundaries to the west and displayed on the site map.			appropriate to incorporate a standoff zone onto the site map as this is a matter for the planning application process to determine. The following text should be added to the landscape and visual section: <u><i>...to protect the historic landscape setting of Marston Meysey village. A 'Zone of Sensitivity' will need to be negotiated at the planning application stage.'</i></u>
	<b>Archaeology</b>			
PM13	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.	Yes	Table 2.2 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u>  Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:</p> <p><b><u><i>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</i></u></b></p>
	<b>Historic built environment</b>			
PM14	A 'Zone of Sensitivity' should be developed whereby mineral extraction should carry strong conditions to offer suitable noise, dust, landscape and historical setting protection to the residents, and setting, of Marston Meysey Conservation area. Proposed standoff area to be the line of the first field boundaries to the west and displayed on the site map.	Yes - in part	Table 2.2 –Historic built environment	<p><u>Site Profiles</u>  It is agreed that reference could be made in the site profile table to a 'zone of sensitivity'. It is not appropriate to incorporate a standoff zone onto the site map as this is a matter for the planning application process to determine. The following text should be added to the Historic built environment section:</p> <p><b><u><i>'Mitigation will need to offer robust buffer and landscape screening to the west of the site (through the incorporation of a 'Zone of Sensitivity', negotiated at the planning application stage) in</i></u></b></p>

				<i>order to protect the setting of the Marston Meysey Conservation Area.'</i>
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM15	Make reference to the fact that – ‘Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements’.	Yes – In part	Table 2.2 – Traffic and transportation	<p><u>Site Profiles</u></p> <p>The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any subsequent planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <i><u>‘A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.’</u></i></p>

## Comments by site: Blackburr Farm

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Site Description</b>			
PM16	Include reference to the PRow running centrally through the small parcel of land to the west and for the need to retain access for infrastructure providers.	Yes – in part	Table 2.3 - Site description	<p><u>Site Profiles</u>            Agreed. Incorporate reference to the PRow on the site. The retention of infrastructure provider access will need to be addressed as part of a planning application process. Insert text to read '<i>...where vegetation does not offer natural screening. A PRow runs through the southern section of the site.</i>'</p>
	<b>Preferred restoration objective</b>			
PM17	Amend wording to highlight the importance of the canal project in the area. Wording to state that 'restoration of the canal at this location must be considered within the wider context of the restoration of the Cotswold Canals project as a whole.'	Yes – in part	Table 2.3 – Preferred restoration objective	<p><u>Site Profiles</u>            Agreed in part. Whilst the preferred restoration objective section of the table could more strongly refer to the need for the restoration of the canal network at this location, to suggest that it 'must' would be to pre-determine any restoration scheme proposed through a planning application. Therefore suggested amended wording to read '<i>Restoration of the canal which bisects the site could also be considered as part of a wider restoration project should be considered within the wider context of the Cotswold Canals restoration project as a whole.</i> However,...</p>
	<b>Archaeology</b>			
PM18	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide,	Yes	Table 2.3 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u>            Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the</p>

	Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.			County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:  <b><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></b>
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM19	Strengthen the text in this section to refer to the requirement for improvements to the C124.	Yes	Table 2.3 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> This change can be accommodated by utilising the same detail as that used for the Cox's Farm traffic and transportation section as both sites could access the C124. Suggested wording to incorporate <b><u>'The site should be treated as an extension to nearby sites, utilising existing access arrangements wherever possible. Access from the site could make use of the C124 although appropriately planned improvements will need to be made to this route to ensure that it is of an appropriate standard for accommodating minerals HGVs.'</u></b>
PM20	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements'.	Yes – In part	Table 2.3 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <b><u>'A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental</u></b>

				<i>impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.'</i>
--	--	--	--	--

### Comments by site: North Farm

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested/agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Archaeology</b>			
PM21	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.	Yes	Table 2.4 – Archaeology	<p><u>Site Profiles</u> Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:</p> <p><b><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></b></p>
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM22	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements'.	Yes – In part	Table 2.4 – Traffic and transportation	<p><u>Site Profiles</u> The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <b><u>'A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a</u></b></p>

				<i>planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.'</i>
--	--	--	--	--

### Comments by site: Land east of Calcutt

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Site Description</b>			
PM23	Amend the section to mention that public Water Mains and Sewers may lie across the site.	Yes	Table 2.5 - Site description	<u>Site Profiles</u> Agreed, this information should be incorporated into the site description. Suggested addition to text ' <i>The site is crossed by an oil pipeline, and low level power lines and possible water mains and sewer. Early consultation with the relevant infrastructure providers to establish the location of installations, and to arrange for them to be diverted and/or safeguarded where necessary should be made.</i>
PM24	Early consultation to establish the position of such mains, and to arrange for them to be diverted where necessary should be made to the relevant water/sewerage company.	Yes	Table 2.5 – Any other issues row	<u>Site Profiles</u> To introduce the requirement for consideration regarding the infrastructure running across the site, add an additional row titled 'Any other issues' above the 'Cumulative effects' row with the following text: ' <i>Early consultation with the relevant infrastructure providers to establish the location of installations on site, and to arrange for them to be diverted and/or safeguarded where necessary, should be made as part of any planning application process.</i>
	<b>Archaeology</b>			
PM25	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology	Yes	Table 2.5 – Archaeology	<u>Site Profiles</u>

	section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.			Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:  <b><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></b>
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM26	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements'.	Yes – In part	Table 2.5 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> The councils are of the view that this change can be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <b><u>'A Transport Assessment should be submitted with a planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.'</u></b>

## Comments by site: Land at Cotswold Community

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Site Description</b>			
PM27	Make specific reference to the sewage works located on the site.	Yes	Table 2.6 - Site description	Site Profiles Agreed, this information should be incorporated into the site description. Suggested addition to text ' <i>The spine road cycle track also runs along the southern perimeter of the site. <b>A sewage works facility is located within the southern section of the site.</b></i> '
PM28	Wording will need to be introduced to highlight the need for early consultation with the relevant infrastructure company to arrange for the sewage works facility and any associated infrastructure to be safeguarded and/or diverted where necessary.	Yes	Table 2.6 – Any other issues row	Site Profiles To introduce the requirement for consideration regarding the infrastructure running across the site, add an additional row titled 'Any other issues' above the 'Cumulative effects' row with the following text: ' <b><u>Early consultation with the relevant infrastructure providers to arrange for the sewage works facility and any associated infrastructure (once location is established) to be safeguarded and/or diverted where necessary should be made as part of any planning application process.</u></b> '
	<b>Archaeology</b>			
PM29	Strengthen wording of the Archaeology section to make reference to the need for appropriate investigation and response in line with PPS5 and its practice guide, Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008) and; Minerals Extraction and	Yes	Table 2.6 – Archaeology	Site Profiles Agreed, however in light of the introduction of the NPPF and subsequent replacement of PPS5 updated wording was sought from English Heritage and the County Archaeologist. The following text should be added to bottom of the Archaeology section:

	Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) as the site is likely to include a number of archaeological features.			<b><u>'Appropriate investigation, mitigation and response in line with the NPPF; PPS5 Practice Guide (or its replacement); Minerals Extraction and the Historic Environment (English Heritage March 2008), and; Minerals Extraction and Archaeology: A Practical Guide (English Heritage June 2008) will be required.'</u></b>
PM30	Add 'English Heritage' as a contact that any prospective applicant will need to work closely with when bringing forward proposals.	Yes	Table 2.6 – Archaeology	<u>Site Profiles</u> Agreed, due to the potential for archaeology findings on and around the site associated with the historically important features in the area this change should be accommodated into the archaeology section of the site profile. Text addition to read <u>'...any applicant will need to work closely with the County Archaeologist and English Heritage to develop and implement sufficient and suitable mitigation plans.'</u>
	<b>Historic built environment</b>			
PM31	Due to the presence of listed buildings within the site boundary. Insert text to the effect of: 'A cultural heritage assessment and conservation plan to inform which buildings might be removed and the measures required to secure the enhancement of the historic farmstead should form part of any mitigation/restoration plan.'	Yes	Table 2.6 – Historic built environment	<u>Site Profiles</u> Agreed, due to the listed status of some of the buildings located towards the centre of the site, information should be included within the plan requesting measures be put in place during operations to limit the impact on these buildings and to incorporate the buildings into any restoration proposals. Additional text should be inserted after the current text in this section and to read <b><u>'A cultural heritage assessment and conservation plan to inform which buildings might be removed and the measures required to secure the enhancement of the historic farmstead should form part of any mitigation/restoration plan.'</u></b> (proposed to cross reference this point in the restoration section of the site profile)
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM32	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to	Yes – In part	Table 2.6 – Traffic and transportation	<u>Site Profiles</u> The councils are of the view that this change can be

	<p>mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements’.</p>			<p>accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <u>‘These highlighted concerns will need to be addressed through a Transport Assessment submitted with a planning application and to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.’</u></p>
--	--	--	--	---

## Comments by site: Land near Compton Bassett

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested/agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Site Description</b>			
PM33	Planning consent for the 350 homes detailed has now been granted. Re-word the text to reflect this development and remove 'on appeal' text.	Yes	Table 3.2 – Site description	<p><u>Site Profiles</u> This change should be accommodated as an update to the current picture in the area. Altered text to read: <b><u>'Outline Planning consent for 350 homes at Sandpit Lane...has been granted on appeal.'</u></b></p>
	<b>Traffic and transportation</b>			
PM34	Make reference to the fact that – 'Any permissions will need to be conditioned to mitigate impacts on individual properties adjoining access routes and along HGV movement routes, and control the hours of vehicle movements'.	Yes – In part	Table 3.2 – Traffic and transportation	<p><u>Site Profiles</u> Whilst this was not a change requested specifically for this site, in light of other comments and concerns about HGV movements in the area and impacts on Calne and surrounding villages along access routes, the councils are of the view that this change could be accommodated in part. It is not for this plan to include controls on the hours of vehicle movements as this will be an issue for any planning application to determine. However, reference can be made to the need to mitigate impacts on individual properties on adjoining access routes. Text should be included to the effect of: <b><u>'A Transport Assessment should be submitted with any planning application to identify the measures that will be taken to adequately mitigate or compensate for the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts of the proposal including impacts on individual properties adjoining HGV access and movement routes.'</u></b></p>

## Comments by site: Extensions to Brickworth Quarry

Comment reference	Summary of Submitted Representation	Modification suggested/agreed (Yes/No)	Pre-submission draft document reference	Officer response/Suggested modification if made and location within document
	<b>General comment/modifications</b>			
	<b>Preferred restoration objective</b>			
PM35	Strengthen the wording in this section to state the need for management of the site post restoration principally for biodiversity.	Yes	Table 4.2 – Preferred restoration objective	Site Profiles This change should be accommodated, additional text to read: <i>'Restoration must aim to deliver targets within the Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan (WBAP) to support BAP habitats and species <b>and the site will need to be managed for biodiversity enhancement post restoration.</b>'</i>
PM36	Further wording in this section could state the need for reviewing opportunities across the remainder of the wider minerals site which already has planning permission, and exploring options to link woodland habitats in the area.	Yes	Table 4.2 – Preferred restoration objective	Site Profiles This change should be accommodated, additional text to read: <i>'A key focus of the restored site must be the <u>connectivity of habitats both within and around the site, seeking opportunities to link restored areas of the neighbouring mineral working consents. Options should be explored to link woodland habitats in the surrounding vicinity and also out into the wider countryside area.</u>'</i>
	<b>Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>			
PM37	Review the detailed ecological site assessment outcomes to determine whether impacts to the New Forest SSSI (hydrologically) have been assessed and make reference to outcomes (i.e whether the site will impact on this feature).	Yes	Table 4.2 – Biodiversity and geodiversity	Site Profiles This issue is referenced in the water environment section of the site profile. Through discussion with the County Ecologist, it has been confirmed that the detailed ecological site assessment does assess potential hydrological impacts to the New Forest SSSI. An addition to the text in this section of the plan can be made to make reference to the need for any planning

				applicant to provide evidence that the minerals workings will not impact on the water levels in adjacent areas such as the New Forest SSSI. Suggested text to read: <u><b>'As the County Wildlife Sites and New Forest SSSI are dependent on both surface water and ground water levels to maintain their special interest...'</b></u>
	<b>Landscape and visual</b>			
PM38	As an outcome of the recent Waste Site Allocations DPD examination, it was suggested by the appointed Inspector that any proposals on site, be it waste management operations or mineral working, will need to demonstrate that the interests of the New Forest National Park and its setting are not eroded. The suggested change to the landscape, townscape and visual section of the Waste Site Allocations DPD should therefore be replicated in this section of the Minerals Site Allocations DPD.	Yes	Table 4.2 – Landscape and visual	For consistency and conformity with the approach taken for the site as detailed through the Waste Site Allocations DPD, a requirement to strengthen the wording of the site profile by addressing the issue of proximity to the New Forest National Park is proposed. The following text should be incorporated at the start of the landscape and visual section of the site profile: <u><b>'The proximity of the New Forest National Park will need to be fully considered through any subsequent planning application process. Proposals for further mineral working will need to demonstrate that the interests of the New Forest National Park and its setting are not eroded.'</b></u>