

ADOPTION STATEMENT

THE DORSET HEATHLANDS PLANNING FRAMEWORK 2020-2025 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Notice is hereby given that, in accordance with Regulations 11 and 14 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012, Dorset Council formally adopted The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 20205-2025 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the 31 March 2020. The SPD will come into effect on the 1st April 2020 and from that date will replace the previous Dorset Heathland Planning Framework 2015-2020 SPD.

The SPD was subject to public consultation between 3rd January 2020 and 3rd February 2020. Pursuant to that consultation modifications have been made to the consultation draft SPD. Modifications made to the SPD are explained in the table below.

Any person with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt the SPD may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for a judicial review of the decision. Any such application must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which the SPD was adopted.

Hilary Jordan

Service Manager for Spatial Planning - Dorset Council

Table 1 Modifications to Dorset Heathlands Framework 2020-2025 Supplementary Planning Document post consultation.

Strikethrough text has been deleted

Underlined text has been added

Modification	Changes post consultation on draft SPD	Reason
M1	The objective of this SPD is to set out a strategy for the	In response
Executive	avoidance and mitigation mitigating the of impacts of new	to Dorset
Summary	housing residential development upon the Dorset	Wildlife
1st paragraph	Heathlands.	Trust
M2	The overall objective of the SPD is to establish a framework	For clarity
Executive	under which applications for development likely to have a	and in
Summary	significant effect on the Dorset Heathlands can be	response to
3 rd paragraph	permitted (or should be refused) so that any adverse	Local Nature
	effects on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands are	Partnership
	avoided. The strategy deals both with larger developments,	and Dorset
	which may affect the integrity of these sites alone, and	Wildlife
	smaller developments where cumulative effects may be the	Trust
	critical factor. The latter provision is necessary to meet the	
	'in combination' part of Regulation 63 of the Habitat	
	Regulations.	
M3	Therefore the Councils consider that in light of this	For clarity
Executive	evidence, a Any net increase in residential development	and in
Summary	within 5 kilometres will have an adverse impact on the	response to
4th paragraph	Dorset Heathlands. If adverse impacts are unavoidable then	Local Nature
	Therefore measures should <u>must</u> be put in place to avoid	Partnership
	and mitigate the all harm caused.	
M4	This SPD is a roll forward of the existing approach, a full	Clarity
Executive	review of the strategic approach to mitigation and	
Summary	avoidance will be carried out as part of the process of	
Addition to	preparing a BCP Local Plan and Dorset Council Local Plan	
5th paragraph	over the next few years.	a.
M5	# This SPD has been prepared jointly between BCP Council	Clarity
Executive	and Dorset Council with advice from Natural England. It	
Summary	covers a 5 year implementation period from 2020-2025.	
Split from 5 th		
paragraph		**
M6	SAMMs contributions secure the day to day costs of helping	Minor
Executive	local people to alter harmful behaviour through raising	grammatical
Summary	awareness of the issues and value of the protected sites,	change.
new 8 th	which includes (i) employing wardens to manage visitor	
paragraph	pressures on the heathland; and (ii) delivering education	
	programmes in local schools. SAMMs also pay for the	
	ongoing monitoring of a sample of heathlands and the	
	effects of new development and crucially whether this	
AA.7	strategy is effective.	For clarity
M7	HIPS are physical infrastructure works, such as the	For clarity
Executive	provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	and in
Summary	(SANGs) or enhancement of existing greenspaces to	response to
10th paragraph	increase the attractiveness for visitors that would	Dorset Dogs.
	otherwise visit the Dorset Heathlands. There are good	
	examples of SANGs across South East Dorset that includes	
	Upton <u>Country Park</u> Farm, <u>Canford Park</u> , Bytheway and	

		I
	Frenches Farm as well as a number of new sites coming	
	forward. HIPs costs vary from project to project and the	
	Councils use different mechanisms to fund mitigation	
	dependent upon local circumstances are funded from CIL.	
M8	An advisory group will oversee the advise on the delivery of	Clarity
	mitigation measures outside of those delivered through	
	planning applications. The advisory group is responsible for	
	confirming projects to the respective Councils as suitable	
	for approval and endorsing a preparation of a Monitoring,	
	Projects and Implementation Plan that will to set out the	
	progress in delivery of specific mitigation projects.	
	This draft SPD will be consulted upon and the feedback	
	used to inform the final draft, with the intention to adopt a	
	new SPD on 1 April 2020 to coincide with expiry of the	
	current SPD. Whereas this SPD is a roll forward of the	
	existing approach, a full review of the strategic approach	
	to mitigation and avoidance will be carried out as part of	
	the emerging Local Plan process with public engagement	
	taking place later in 2020.	
M9	The Councils consulted on this SPD from 3 January to the 3	Clarity
Introduction	February 2020. The feedback to the consultation is	
Insert new	summarised in a consultation statement and was used to	
paragraph at 1.2	prepare the SPD for adoption by the Council in March 2020.	
M10	1.2 <u>1.3</u>	Update
M11	The Councils intend to review of the strategy through the	Deletion of
1.3 <u>1.4</u>	preparation of new local plans over the next 2-3 years to	typographica
	ensure that growth can be effectively mitigated	l error and
	effectively.	clarity.
		WH White
		Ltd.
M12	1.4 <u>1.5</u>	11
		Update
	This SPD accords with the principles of the National	
1.5 <u>1.</u> 6	This SPD accords with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result	In response to Dorset
1.5 <u>1. 6</u>		In response
1.5 <u>1. 6</u>	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working	In response to Dorset
1.5 <u>1. 6</u>	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result	In response to Dorset Wildlife
1.5 1. 6 M13	<u>Planning Policy Framework</u> (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations.	In response to Dorset Wildlife
	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust.
M13	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust.
M13	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in
M13	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the:	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to
M13	 Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); 	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural
M13	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site;	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH
M13	 Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation 	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH
M13	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH
M13	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH
M13 2.1	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes.	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd
M13 2.1	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations')	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd
M13 2.1	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: • Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); • Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') require that any application for development	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd Typographic al error.
M13 2.1 M14 2.4	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: • Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); • Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') require that any application for development The NPPF recognises the value of our natural environment	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd
M13 2.1 M14 2.4 M15	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: • Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); • Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') require that any application for development The NPPF recognises the value of our natural environment stating that the 'planning system should contribute to and	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd Typographic al error. In response
M13 2.1 M14 2.4 M15	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') require that any application for development The NPPF recognises the value of our natural environment stating that the 'planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment', for example	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd Typographic al error. In response to Dorset
M13 2.1 M14 2.4 M15	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: • Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); • Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and • Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') require that any application for development The NPPF recognises the value of our natural environment stating that the 'planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment', for example by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes such as	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd Typographic al error. In response to Dorset Wildlife
M13 2.1 M14 2.4 M15	Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and it is a result of the co-operative approach to partnership working between the Councils, statutory bodies and other organisations. The lowland heaths in South East Dorset are covered by a number of international, European and national designations, in particular the: Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA); Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site; Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes. Regulations 63 of the The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') require that any application for development The NPPF recognises the value of our natural environment stating that the 'planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment', for example	In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust. For clarity and in response to Natural England, WH White Ltd Typographic al error. In response to Dorset Wildlife

M16 New para 2.8 M17 M18 3.2	planned or detern A full review of he part of the prepart the Dorset Local replace the plans years and the our 2.8 2.9; 2.9 2.10 Some of these efforthe duration of the duration of the second plans and the second plans are second plans and the second plans are s	neathland mitigation waration of the BCP Cou Plan. These two new Is listed above. This protections can feed into a comes can feed into a fects are direct impactional used the development. I	vill be undertaken as uncil Local Plan and local plans will ocess will take a few a review of this SPD.	Clarity Update Clarity
-		ng, the effects arising ring ongoing mitigatio		
	3.2 3.3	ring ongoing milligatio	in incasules.	Update
M20	Drossuro	Description	Result of Pressure	To keep the
Figure 1	Pressure Disturbance Fire	Human related disturbance: Walking and other leisure activities Trampling Use of mountain bikes Use of drones Use of drones Use of drones Installation of services and infrastructure Dog related disturbance: Dogs off path Fires caused by human actions: Out of control camp fires and BBQs Arson	 Reduction in breeding success of birds, reptiles and other animals. Changes to vegetation. Creation of bare areas and subsequent soil erosion. Damage to bare ground reptile and invertebrate habitats and populations Increases in path and track networks. Damage to archaeological features. Long term vegetation changes. Increased mortality of heathland birds, 	document strategic and respond to Cranborne Chase AONB, Forestry Authority and Natural England.

	 Accidental fires caused by overhead cables, overhead cables, steam train, contractors, MOD. Climate change may increase risk. 	reptiles and other animals. • Fragmentation and reduction of heathland habitat
Enrichment	 Enrichment caused by human activity: Incidental enrichment from fly-tipping of organic materials Dog faeces left on site 	 Change in soil nutrient levels causing vegetation changes. Dog faeces causes vegetation change along sides of paths.
Criminal Activities/ Antisocial Behaviour	 Human activities: Attacks on cattle Den building Drug dealing Use of guns on site Wildlife crime such as poaching Vandalism to signs and infrastructure Dropping litter/fly-tipping 	 Damage and injury to animals, wildlife and property. Disturbance to birds, reptiles and other animals. Disruption and changes to the heathland habitat.
Predation	 Cat and rat predation on ground nesting birds and reptiles. 	 Reduction in breeding success of birds, reptiles and reptiles.
Hostility to conservation management	 Public opposition to management e.g. tree felling, 	 Increased costs of site management and visitors

		fencing and grazing.	
Rec	duction in	• Protections on heathlands mean that the causes have changed and are now linked to other pressures such as fire and enrichment.	• Reduction form 36,000 ha in the mid 18th Century to 7,373 ha in 1996
	agmentation heaths	 Other pressures contribute to fragmentation. 	• Fragmentation of heaths
	oporting bitats	 Building development in gardens may reduce supporting habitat area. 	• Less natural and semi-natural habitat adjoining heaths.
	cruption to drology	 Diversion of preexisting natural water sources Paved gardens reduce run off area? Drainage from roads. Trampling can increase surface run off. Causes can be Industrial and Residential 	• Increased or decreased water on heathland sites will affect habitat.
Pol	llution	 Streams polluted from industrial overflows, spills and accidents. Dumping of green waste and other fly-tipping can cause pollution. 	 Changes in pH of water supplies to heathland. Enrichment and pollutants from dumping, overflows, spills and accidents.
	cavation d extraction	• Sand and gravel extraction	 Mineral working destroying habitat and

Roads	Land-fill after extraction Litter discarded	disrupting hydrology. Possible pollution from landfill affecting habitat and species Increased fire
	 Cigarette ends discarded from cars Exhaust emissions from vehicles Wildlife road kills General road use 	 Pollution or enrichment causing vegetation changes. Increasing species mortality rates. Roads forming barriers to
		 species mobility. Noise and light pollution from traffic affecting species.
Management costs	 Dealing with increasing pressures contribute to extra costs 	• Greatly increased management costs on urban heathland sites.
Reduction	in • Mid 18C c36,0	100 ha to 2019 6,199 h

Reduction in area	• Mid 18C c36,000 ha to 2019 6,199 ha (DERC).
Fragmentation of heaths	• Fragmentation of heaths 768 fragments, 88% < 10ha (Webb & Haskins 1980). Many ecological impacts from smaller heath areas.
Supporting habitats	• Less semi-natural habitat adjoining heaths which provide functional support.
Predation	Fox, cat/rat predation on ground nesting birds and reptiles, direct predation and reduced recruitment.
Disruption to hydrology	Diversion of pre-existing natural water sources away from heathland catchments.

	Rapid run-off onto heaths from urban areas.
Pollution	 Changes in pH, nutrient status, turbidity of water supplies to heathland. Enrichment and pollutants from urban run-off. Pollutants from mis-connections storm overflows, spills, accidents
Sand and gravel working with land-fill after use	 Mineral working destroying habitat and disrupting hydrology. Polluted water can leak from landfill.
Enrichment	 Dog excrement causes vegetation change along sides of paths. Rubbish and garden waste dumping by roads and from gardens.
Roads	 Increased fire risk from car thrown cigarettes. Pollution/enrichment causing vegetation change from vehicles in transport corridor. Roads forming barriers to species mobility. Road kills increasing mortality rates. Noise and light pollution from traffic.
Service infrastructures both over and under heathland	 Disturbance during construction and maintenance. Leakage from underground pipes and sewers. Changes to heathland hydrology. Poles providing bird predator lookout posts.
<u>Disturbance</u>	 Changes in breeding bird and animal distributions within and across sites. Reduction in breeding success of birds/animals. Delayed breeding in SPA birds.
Trampling	 Changes to vegetation. Creation of bare areas and subsequent soil erosion. Damage to bare ground reptile and invertebrate habitats and populations. Increases in path and track networks. Damage to archaeological features.
<u>Fire</u>	Increased frequency of fires with majority in spring and summer.

		1
	 Long term vegetation changes. Increased mortality of heathland animals/birds. Fragmentation/reduction of habitat on heaths. Increased erosion into wetland habitats. Vandalism Vandalism Damage to signs and fences. Opposition to management e.g. tree felling, fencing and grazing. 	
	<u>conservation</u> <u>management</u> Management • Greatly increased management costs	
	costs on urban heaths.	
M21 3.3 3.4	residential development within 5 km of the Dorset Heathlands will inevitably result in greater urban pressures upon the heathlands. Therefore Natural England advises that the cumulative effect of a net increase of single dwellings up to 5 km from the Dorset Heathlands would have a likely significant effect on those designated sites.	For clarity and in response to Natural England
M22		Update
M23	Furthermore the Councils will work with neighbouring	For clarity
New para 3.6		and in response to Godshill Parish Council.
M24 4.1	This section sets out the approach to enabling development through the implementation of measures to avoid likely urban effects upon the Dorset Heathlands. The strategy is a long term approach with the SPD setting out a five year rolling programme of measures for the period 2020-2025.	For clarity and in response to Natural England and RSPB.
M25 4.3	which can be worse than each individual effect. Natural England advises that additional residential development within 400 metres of the Dorset Heathlands is likely to have a significant effect upon the designated site, either alone or in combination with other developments and that this cannot be mitigated. Further, in order to for an appropriate assessment in the 5km area to be able to conclude that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands it is necessary to control the type of development that is permitted within this 400 metre area as indicated below.	Typographic al error (WH White Ltd), for clarity and in response to Natural England.
M26 4.5	Although this SPD focusses on residential development there are other uses and forms of residential development that have differing impacts upon the Dorset Heathlands.	For clarity and in response to

	These uses are set out in Figure 3 and are intended to sign post applicants to the likely council position from the local plan policies. This figure is indicative rather than definitive and each proposal will need to be assessed on a case by case basis. Further detail on each use is set out in and are considered on a case by case basis as discussed in Appendix B.	Dorset Wildlife Trust and Natural England.
M27 Fig 3	Permitted within 400 metres: Extensions to residential dwellings in C3 Use Class where there is no net increase in dwellings, i.e. extension to a house Ancillary residential accommodation forming part of an existing building in C3 Use Class to provide independent living where there is no net increase in functional dwelling units, i.e. granny annexes Replacement dwellings in C3 Use Class where there is no net increase in dwellings Nursing homes within C2 Use Class where the residents are severely restricted with advanced dementia / physical nursing needs Managed student accommodation (Sui generis) i.e. accommodation that is managed by a university or run on their behalf by an accommodation provider Not permitted within 400 metres and requiring mitigation between 400 metres and 5km: A net gain in residential dwellings in C3 Use Class on the same site, including conversions Houses in Multiple Occupation (Sui generis) Residential Institutions within C2 Use Class where the residents are not severely restricted by illness or mobility Private sStudent accommodation, i.e. accommodation that is not managed by a university or run on their behalf by an accommodation provider Sites for gypsy, travellers and travelling showpeople Self-catering, caravan and touring holiday accommodation	Typographic al error and to ensure consistency between figure 3 and Appendix B and in response to Local Nature Partnership, Dorset Wildlife Trust, Fortitudo, West Parley Parish Council, WH White Ltd and Primetower Properties.
M28 4.8	The two Councils, as the competent authorities responsible, agree that this conclusion is sound and supported by the relevant evidence. It follows that these types of development proposals in the 400 metre to 5km area, unless covered by appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures, would not be compliant with local plan policy and the avoidance and mitigation strategy of this SPD and therefore the competent authority, in assessing such proposals, through a project level appropriate assessment, would not be able to conclude that there was no adverse effect on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands.	Clarity
M29 4.10	This part of the strategy focuses on wardening, raising awareness and monitoring the effectiveness of the strategy. SAMMs contributions secure the day to day costs of helping local people to behave in ways less harmful to the local heathlands they access. This is through raising	For clarity and in response to Dorset Dogs

		T
	awareness of the issues and value of the protected sites and includes (i) employing wardens to manage visitor pressures on the heathland; -and (ii) delivering awareness and education programmes in local schools, on the heaths	
	and through local communities. SAMMs also pay for the ongoing monitoring of a sample of heathland birds, visitor access patterns and the effects of new development and crucially whether this strategy is effective.	
M30	If these levels of planned growth are exceeded, the	Clarity
4.15	Councils will have to ensure that suitable mitigation can be provided to avoid an adverse effect upon the Dorset Heathlands. The NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply unless the Councils	Clarity
	can demonstrate through appropriate assessment that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands. Mitigation will need to be provided where the adverse effect is likely to occur.	
M31	·	For clarity
4.17	Thusthe SAMMs charge for the two areas areis calculated by dividing the total cost of providing SAMMs by the number of planned homes within the 5km heathland area for each respective Council over the period 2020-2025, as shown in Figure 4. For Dorset Council, this contribution is only applicable in the 5km heathland area in the North Dorset	For clarity and in response to Dorset Local Partnership.
	Local Plan area. As set out in Section 5 Dorset Council will take the equivalent contribution per home from CIL for the remainder of Dorset. Section 5 details how this mitigation will be collected through planning applications.	
M32 4.18	HIPs are physical infrastructure projects that provide facilities to attract people away from the protected heathland sites. SANGs (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces) are the most significant element of provision, having a key role in providing an alternative destination to the Dorset Heathlands. Examples of HIPs are set out in Appendix A. HIPs should be fully operational before the occupation of the first dwelling. Figure 5 illustrates the coverage of SANGs since the mitigation strategy commenced in 2007.	Clarity
M33 4.19	Strategic SANGS are those where the SANG is sufficiently attractive as to draw visitors from a wider area. These SANGs will normally be related to a development or provided by the Councils and will attract visitors from a wider area (within the 5km area) than that required specifically for the project. These are likely to be set out in Local Plans. Smaller, nNon-strategic SANGs are linked to housing developments, but will be smaller and whereas they will attract local people who do not live in the new housing, they are not intended to draw visitors from a much wider area. Other HIPs projects are likely to be more bespoke to local areas and for example may consist of creating linkages between open green spaces, recreational facilities such as BMX tracks or fire access measures.	Clarity
M34 4.21	The two Councils invite local <u>landowners and</u> organisations to suggest new <u>projectsHIPs</u> . <u>HIPs including SANGs can be delivered and managed by both the public and private sector</u> . The Councils recommend that organisations have an	Clarity and in response to the Land Trust.

M35 4.23 M36 5.1	informal discussion with the appropriate Council and Natural England prior to submission of a proposal. Proposals for HIPs can be submitted using the separately published template. Projects will be considered for funding on a case by case basis. In some cases promoters of larger developments may wish to deliver bespoke measures which will be considered by the Councils with advice from Natural England. Further details are outlined in Appendix C-F To provide certainty to those considering or making applications for residential development and to ensure	Typographic al error.
M37	transparency and accountability this SPD sets a standard contribution for new dwellings that will be used to provide the necessary mitigation. The simplicity of this approach gives certainty thus avoiding unnecessary delay in the determination of planning applications. The standard contribution is calculated by spreading the cost of the necessary mitigation across the amount of planned development. 5.2 5.1	Lindata
		Update
M38 5.3 5.2	The Councils use different mechanisms to collect the funds needed to deliver the SAMMs-mitigation dependent upon local circumstances. Both Councils will fund HIPs through CIL monies, but will collect the SAMMs differently as set out below.	Clarity
M39	To provide certainty to those considering or making	Clarity
New para 5.3	applications for residential development and to ensure transparency and accountability this SPD sets a standard contribution for new dwellings to fund SAMMs. The simplicity of this approach gives certainty thus avoiding unnecessary delay in the determination of planning applications. The standard contribution is calculated by spreading the cost of the necessary mitigation across the amount of planned development.	Clarity
M40	Dorset Council will collect SAMMs contributions through CIL	Clarity
5.4	(except in the North Dorset area where there is no CIL charging schedule in place), whereas BCP Council will collect the SAMMs through planning obligations.	
M41 5.5	To enable the Councils to grant planning permission for proposals for a net increase in dwellings within the 400 metres to 5km heathland area, the applicant is required to pay SAMMs as follows: • Dorset Council will collect the necessary SAMMs costs through CIL. The contributions taken from CIL will be determined by the costs of funding SAMMs needed to mitigate the effects from the numbers of homes it expects to be delivered between 2020/21 and 2024/25. There is one exception, for the area covered by the North Dorset Local Plan where sites are within 5km of the Dorset Heathlands, where as set out in Section 4, a planning obligation of £406 per house and £277 per flat will be necessary.	For clarity and in response to Local Nature Partnership and Dorset Wildlife Trust.

	BCP Council will, as set out in Section 4, charge a SAMMs rate of £394 per house and £269 per flat paid by planning obligation through a payment: o prior to the grant of planning permission as an upfront payment (Section 111 of the 1972 Local Government Act); or o prior to commencement (Section 106 Agreement or unilateral undertaking).	
M42 5.8	The charge will be index linked and adjusted annually on 1 April to reflect inflation and ensure that the appropriate level of SAMM can be delivered over the plan period.	For clarity (WH White Ltd)
M43 5.11	Where a settlement extension is allocated through a local plan or neighbourhood plan, the provision of a SANG will form part of the overall infrastructure provision of that site, particularly where settlement extensions or development on green field sites are proposed. Where a planning application which needs a HIP comes forward on an unallocated site, the applicant will need to ensure mitigation is secured, and may not necessarily rely on the Councils to secure mitigation through a financial contribution. Further tThe threshold for the number of homes that trigger the requirement to provide a SANG is around 50 unless stated differently in an existing adopted local plan for an area. alongside a planning application varies by Local Plan area. Guidance for the provision of SANGs is set out in Appendices D and E.	For clarity and in response to Bournemout h Developmen t Company, Catesby Estates, Dorset Wildlife Trust, Pennyfarthin g Homes, and Talbot Village Trust.
M44 5.12	Within the In built up areas of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole and towns in Dorset, opportunities to provide HIPs alongside large developments is more constrained than in rural areas. Because of this, approaches vary by local plan area; i.e. in one local plan area a financial contribution towards a specific strategic HIP may be adequate, but in another local plan area a bespoke HIP may be necessary for the Council to be certain that the urban effects can be mitigated and thereby planning permission granted. Each application will be considered on a case by case basis as the nature of some sites will enable the provision of a HIP within the scheme and again will depend upon the specific requirements of that Local Plan area. Early engagement with the Councils and Natural England at pre-application stage is recommended.	Clarity
M45 Additional section	Appropriate assessment of planning applications 5.14 As stated in paras 4.7-4.8, any additional residential development within 400 metre to 5km heathland area is likely to have a significant effect on the Dorset Heathlands either alone or in combination with other proposals. Therefore in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, the Councils will undertake a project level appropriate assessment when considering all planning applications where there is a net gain in homes within the 400 metre to 5km heathland area. 5.15 This SPD provides a strategic mitigation framework to enable applicants to secure the appropriate avoidance or	For clarity and in response to Catesby Estates, Fortitudo, Primetower Properties, WH White Ltd

	mitigation measures to comply with local plan policy and thereby enable the Council to conclude through appropriate assessment that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands. For the majority of development mitigation can be secured in accordance with this strategic mitigation framework. 5.16 However there will be instances when the applicant will be required to provide further information and agree to further avoidance and mitigation measures to enable the Council to conclude there is no adverse effect. For example, possible adverse effects can be avoided by alterations to the design or through the use of conditions on planning permission and these will be set out in the appropriate assessment. 5.17 The Council after completing the appropriate assessment template will publish it alongside the determination of the planning application. The Councils application of the Habitats Regulations is in accordance with recent case law, e.g. Sweetman 2 (People over wind), Holohan and Dutch nitrogen, which all reinforce the need for a rigorous approach.	
M46 Paragraph	5.14 5.18 <u>;5.15</u> 5.19 <u>; 5.16 5.20<u>;5.17 5.21</u></u>	Updates
numbering		
M47 6.1	The two Councils will use the contributions to deliver mitigation in a timely manner and ensure that mitigation is provided before first occupation of the property. Local organisations will be encouraged to complete the published template to submit projects and bid for funding.	In response to Local Nature Partnership, West Parley Parish Council and Dorset Wildlife Trust.
M48 6.2	Progress with mitigation measures and new projects will be set out in a Monitoring, Projects and Implementation Plan. The preparation of this plan will be overseen by an Advisory Group and This plan will form part of the Council's requirements to publish an Infrastructure Funding Statement. The formation of the two new Councils provides the opportunity to review the delivery of mitigation. Currently mitigation is provided by a combination of the Urban Heaths Partnership, hosted by Dorset Council, and by each Council. The review is expected to be complete within 2 years.	Clarity
M49 6.3	Delete paragraph	
M50 6.4 6.3	Both Councils have declared a Climate Change Emergency and are preparing Action Plans to ensure the Councils are carbon neutral by 2030. Any mitigation projects will have to accord with these Action Plans and help the Councils achieve carbon neutrality or offsetting measures where appropriate. Furthermore all projects will need to align with the Council's other The Councils will, where feasible,	In response to Local Nature Partnership, Woodland Trust, Suzy Monsell,

	 ensure that projects accord with corporate objectives, and the relevant objectives of partner organisations, for example: as part of the Dorset Integrated Care System to ensure health and wellbeing through greater accessibility to open space; and as part of the Dorset Local Nature Partnership to enhance ecological networks / Nature Recovery Networks supporting healthy lives, adapting to climate change and by achieving a net gain in biodiversity. 				Wessex Water and Dorset Wildlife Trust.		
M51 Appendix A	Part 2: Disturbance by humans and/or dogs			in g al s /	Provision of strategic SANGs, e.g. Upton Country Park, Hicks Farm, Woolslope Farm, Morden Park, Two Rivers Meet Developer led SANGs alongside settlement extensions, e.g. Canford Park		In response to WH White Ltd and Forestry Authority.
M52 Appendix B	There are forms of development which are not specifically mentioned in this SPD that may cause additional harm and these will be considered on a case by case basis. Therefore, before submitting a planning application, applicants are encouraged to seek early engagement with the respective Council or Natural England.						For clarity
M53 Appendix B table	University managed student accommodati n	Ye s	N o	Ye s	Contribution as per C3 housing unless managed. Exemptions for large scale managed student accommodatio n.	Each self- containe d cluster flat or studio4 room = 1 flat	For clarity and in response to the Bournemout h Developmen t Company and WH White Ltd.
M54 Appendix B Use Class C2 sheltered housing/nursing homes	Use Class C2 - Specialist housing, i.e. sheltered housing / nursing homes Certain types of specialist purpose built nursing homes where residents are no longer active will not have a significant effect and do not need to provide mitigation, e.g. where nursing care is necessary such as for advanced dementia or physical nursing needs: • Purpose built schemes for the frail elderly where there is an element of close care provided on site 24 hours a day. This level of care is above that of provision of an onsite wardening service provided for sheltered accommodation. It would be expected that there would normally be an age restriction of 60+years for the occupants of the units and that the planning permission would be conditioned in such a way that the units could not become open market housing. Experience from schemes of this nature indicates that in order to provide 24 hour care the minimum number of units is generally around 40 and						In response to Dorset Wildlife Trust.

the scheme will also have communal facilities. Authorities should consider requiring a covenant precluding pet ownership where it is in their view an effective measure in reducing the risk of adverse effects of predation and disturbance. • Purpose built schemes for the accommodation of disabled people, for example a care home for people with dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay-SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilit			
ownership where it is in their view an effective measure in reducing the risk of adverse effects of predation and disturbance. • Purpose built schemes for the accommodation of disabled people, for example a care home for people with dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAAWs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy lsuch as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and alack of the facilities compared to a campus lead to the following the compared to a campus lead to the facilities compared to a campus lead to the facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately manag		the scheme will also have communal facilities. Authorities	
reducing the risk of adverse effects of predation and disturbance. Purpose built schemes for the accommodation of disabled people, for example a care home for people with dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay 5AWMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore pro		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
disturbance. Purpose built schemes for the accommodation of disabled people, for example a care home for people with dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAWMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus-cation. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to pravitely managed facilities where centrol of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) quality S		ownership where it is in their view an effective measure in	
disabled people, for example a care home for people with dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. of C campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls, may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Un		reducing the risk of adverse effects of predation and	
disabled people, for example a care home for people with dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAWMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to acampus forcation, may be an increased risk which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities valiable on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to pravitely managed facilities where centrol of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupa		disturbance.	
dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where centrol of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M58 Appendix D title Appendix D title M59 Introduction M50 Appendi		 Purpose built schemes for the accommodation of 	
dementia, where by the nature of the residents' disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where centrol of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M58 Appendix D title Appendix D title M59 Introduction M50 Appendi		disabled people, for example a care home for people with	
disabilities, they are unlikely to have any impact on the adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Between 400 metres and Skm mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residence accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus can the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-containty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M57 Appendix D title M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction Introduction Introduction situation so a publications likely			
adjacent protected heaths. Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from Appendix B are managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M50 Append			
Any planning application would need to be supported by an impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title Appendix D title Appendix D title			
impact assessment with details of how the potential impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may on the required to provide heathland mitigation pay-SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. Appendix D title M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		·	
impacts resulting from staff and visitors will be mitigated. It may be necessary to use pet covenants or other suitable legally binding agreements in these specific situations M55 Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay-SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M50 Introduction M50 Introduction M50 Introduction M50 Introduction M50 Introduction M50 Introduction Introduction Introduction Introduction Introd			
M55 M55 Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy path pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M68 M59 Introduction Suitable Alternative-Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) all error			
legally binding agreements in these specific situations Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAWMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M50 Introduction M50 Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) all error			
Appendix B Purpose built student accommodation Between 400 metres and 5km mitigation the effects from large managed blocks of student halls of residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non-students) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e., Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to contact years are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Introduction M57 Introduction M50 Introduction Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) gality all error all error			
Appendix B Purpose built student be different from those of C3 residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAWMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to nonstudents and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D introduction M57 Introduction M57 Introduction Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely	MSS	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	For clarity
residenceaccommodation on University campus are likely to be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay-SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D introduction M57 Appendix D introduction M57 Introduction M57 Introduction Typographic all error			
be different from those of C3 residential development. The self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely	• •	1 	
self-contained facilities available on campus, restrictions on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAWMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D is Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Introduction Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely	-		•
on dog ownership and the closeday to day management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D is Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is all error 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is all error 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		•	
Developmen to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely	accommodation		_
to the extent that there may not be significant effects on protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled, with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
protected heathlands. These types of development may not be required to provide heathland mitigation pay-SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. Appendix D title M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) all error is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			•
be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		,	
provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
as managed student accommodation. Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location, may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D is Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		be required to provide heathland mitigation pay SAMMs	White Ltd.
Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D is Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		provided the Councils can be assured that units will remain	
smaller developments may not be able to the provide the Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		as managed student accommodation.	
Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D Introduction Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) undity and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		Other student housing, i.e. off campus student blocks or	
Councils with the same level of assurance and heathland mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an expectation that occupancy (such as switching to nonstudents) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D title M57 Appendix D Introduction Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) undity and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		smaller developments may not be able to the provide the	
expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non- students) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
expectation that occupancy (such as switching to non- students) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		mitigation will be therefore be applicable. There is an	
students) and dog ownership will be less controlled. with switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Introduction 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
switching to non-students and a lack of the facilities compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative-Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative-Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
compared to a campus location. may be an increased risk which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D ittle M57 Appendix D introduction M57 Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Typographic al error Typographic al error Typographic al error			
which is associated with private sector managed units which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths Introduction Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
which do not fall within a defined use class i.e. Sui Generis, arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
arising due to changes in the type of occupants within these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
these developments compared to facilities on a campus. The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		,	
The self-contained facilities available on campus and the close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
close management of student halls may therefore provide a degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Introduction Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
degree of certainty that the risk of adverse effects is low compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
compared to privately managed facilities where control of occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAWMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
occupancy, pets, etc. and switching to non-student residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		,	
residents can occur. Unless there are clear management regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) Introduction Introduction Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG)			
regimes to control occupancy and pets then SAMMs are applicable. M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			
M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Appendix D title Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		_	
M56 Appendix D: Guidelines for the establishment of Suitable Appendix D title AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable AlternativeAccessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		, , , ,	
Appendix D title Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Quality Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Appendix D Introduction Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely	M56		Typographic
Standards for the Dorset Heaths M57 Introduction Appendix D Introduction Introduction Introduction Is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			,
M57 Appendix D Introduction Int	Appendix v title		al ellol
Appendix D Introduction 'Suitable Alternative Accessible Natural Greenspace' (SANG) al error is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely	MEZ		T
Introduction is the name given to green space that is of a quality and type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely			,
type suitable to be used as mitigation for applications likely		. , ,	al error
	introduction		
to affect the Dorset Heathlands European and		, ,	
to accept the 23,000 material and pour and		to affect the porset Heathlands European and	

M58 Appendix D Accessibility M59 Appendix D Accessibility	internationally protected sites. The provision of SANGs is one of a range of mitigation measures, which the Councils and Natural England consider offer an effective means of avoiding or mitigating harm from a number of urban effects. SANGs co-located with developments are the preferred option so people can walk or cycle to them. The requirement for car parking with SANGs will be considered. 1. Sites must have adequate free parking for visitors, unless the site is intended for local pedestrian use only, i.e. within easy walking distance (400m) of the developments linked to it. The amount of car parking space should be determined by the anticipated numbers using the site and arriving by car	For clarity and in response to Clare Lees For clarity and in response to the Bournemout h Developmen
M60 Appendix D Paths, Tracks and other SANG Infrastructure Insert new paragraph; split criteria into 2, renumber following criteria and add an additional criteria.	A substantial number of visitors like to have surfaced but not tarmac paths, particularly where these blend in well with the landscape. This is not necessary for all paths but there should be some visitor-friendly, all weather routes built into the structure of a SANGs, particularly those routes which are 1-3 km long. Boardwalks may help with access across wet areas but excessive use of boardwalks, as may be necessary on sites which are mostly wet or waterlogged such as flood plain and grazing marsh, is likely to detract from the site's natural feel. Ideally SANGs should be available for year round use, to establish people's behaviours to utilise this mitigation rather than visit heathland. However flooding events generally do not coincide with the bird nesting season (March-July) when the adverse effect of people upon protected birds is most sensitive. The short periods of flooding must be weighed against the quality and natural attributes of riverside access. Land in the Stour floodplain, for example, provides for multiple green infrastructure benefits and is located within easy reach of nearby urban areas. Other infrastructure specifically designed to make the SANG attractive to dog walkers may also be desirable but must not detract from a site's relatively wild and natural feel. Measures could include accessible water bodies for dogs to swim/drink; dog bins, fencing near roads/car-parks etc. to ensure dog safety, clear messages regarding the need to 'pick-up', large areas for dogs to be off lead safely, dog training areas may be appropriate in larger SANGs: 5. Paths must be easily used and well maintained but most should remain unsurfaced to avoid the site becoming too urban in feel.	For clarity and in response to the Bournemout h Developmen t Company, Dorset Wildlife Trust and Lulworth Estate, Redwood Property & Mr Andrew Jackson, Save Land North of Merley, West Parley Parish Council Andrew Coleman, Stephen Lloyd-Jones, Marion Pope, Hazel Price and WH White Ltd.
	6. A majority of paths should be suitable for use in all weathers and all year around. Boardwalks may be required in wet sections.	

	67. All SANGs with car parks must have a circular walk which starts and finishes at the car park.			
	78. It should be possible to complete a circular walk of 2.3-2.5km around the SANGs, and for larger SANGs a variety of circular walks			
	89. SANGs must be designed so that visitors are not deterred by safety concerns.			
	10. SANGs should have good green infrastructure links with nearby developments to encourage use of the SANG			
M61 Appendix D Advertising	The need for some advertising is self-evident. Any advertising should make clear that the site is designed to cater specifically for dog walkers: Renumber criteria from 9 and 10 to 11 and 12.	SANGs open to all		
M62 Appendix D Landscape and vegetation	The open or semi wooded and undulating nature of most of the Dorset Heathland sites gives them an air of relative wildness, even when there are significant numbers of visitors on site. SANGs must aim to reproduce this quality using native species to provide a net gain in biodiversity, but do not have to contain heathland or heathy vegetation. Surveys in the Thames Basin heath area show that woodland or a semi-wooded landscape is a key feature that people who use the SPA there appreciate. Deciduous woodland is preferred to coniferous woodland.	Clarity		
M63 Appendix D Landscape and vegetation Numbered criteria	Split original paragraph 11 into 2 and renumber to give paragraphs 13 - 16.	Update		
M64		For clarity		
Appendix D	Criteria Current Future	and in		
Updated Site Quality Checklist	Parking on all sites unless the site is intended for use within 400m only	response to the Bournemout		
	Car parks easily and safely accessible by car, open in nature and sign posted	h Developmen t Company, Catesby Estates and		
	Easy access between development or car park and SANG; able to safely let dog out of car into SANG	Lulworth Estate, Redwood Property & Mr Andrew		
	Access points with signage outlining the 4 layout of the SANGS and routes available to visitors	Jackson.		

	5 (1 11 11 11 11	
5	Paths easily used and well maintained but	
	mostly unsurfaced	
6	Circular walk start and end at car park	
7	Circular walk of between 2.3 - 2.5 km	
8	SANG design so that they feel safe for visitors	
ð	Clearly sign posted or advertised in some way	
10	Leaflets or website advertising their location to potential users	
11	Perceived as semi natural space, without too much urban intrusion	
12	Contains a variety of different habitats	
13	Access unrestricted - plenty of space for dogs to exercise freely and safely off the lead	
14	Site is free from unpleasant intrusions	
15	Links to existing or proposed SANG	
16	Links to public Rights of Way network	

	<u>Features</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Future</u>
	<u>Access</u>		
1	Sites must have adequate parking for visitors, unless the site is intended for local pedestrian use only, i.e. within easy walking distance (400m as a straight line) of the developments linked to it.		
<u>2</u>	Car parks must be easily and safely accessible by car, be of an open nature and be clearly sign posted.		
<u>3</u>	There should be easy access between the car park or housing and the SANG with the facility to take dogs safely from the car park to the SANG off the lead.		
4	Access points should have signage showing the SANGs layout and the routes available.		

	Paths, Tracks and Infrastru	<u>icture</u>	
	Paths must be easily used and		
	well maintained but most should		
<u>5</u>	remain unsurfaced to avoid the		
	site becoming too urban in feel.		
	Most paths should be suitable for		
6	use in all weathers and all year		
<u>6</u>	around. Boardwalks may be		
	required in wet sections.		
	SANGs with car parks must have a		
<u>7</u>	circular walk which starts and		
	finishes at the car park.		
	A circular walk of 2.3-2.5km		
8	around the SANGs is available -		
<u> </u>	for larger SANGs a variety of		
	<u>circular walks created</u>		
	It must be designed so that		
9	visitors are not deterred by safety		
	<u>concerns</u>		
	Good green infrastructure links		
<u>10</u>	with nearby development to		
	encourage use of SANG		
	Advertising and marketing of t	the SANG	
11	It should be clearly sign-posted		
	<u>and advertised</u>		
	Leaflets and/or websites		
	advertising their location to		
	potential visitors should be		
<u>12</u>	produced and provided at the		
	sales office of the new		
	development and to the new homeowners		
	Landscape and vegetati	<u>OII</u>	
	They must be perceived as		
1.1	natural chacos without interesing		
	natural spaces without intrusive		
<u>13</u>	artificial structures, except in the		
<u>13</u>	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks.		
13	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers		
13	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable		
13	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a		
	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to		
<u>13</u>	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of:		
	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to		
	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of: woodland, scrub, grassland,		
	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of: woodland, scrub, grassland, heathland, wetland, open water)		
	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of: woodland, scrub, grassland, heathland, wetland, open water) Access within the SANGs must be		
	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of: woodland, scrub, grassland, heathland, wetland, open water) Access within the SANGs must be largely unrestricted with plenty		
14	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of: woodland, scrub, grassland, heathland, wetland, open water) Access within the SANGs must be largely unrestricted with plenty of space provided where it is possible for dogs to exercise freely and safely off lead but		
14	artificial structures, except in the immediate vicinity of car parks. Visually-sensitive way-markers and some benches are acceptable They must aim to provide a variety of habitats for visitors to experience (e.g. some of: woodland, scrub, grassland, heathland, wetland, open water) Access within the SANGs must be largely unrestricted with plenty of space provided where it is possible for dogs to exercise		

	They must avoid where unpleasant visual and a intrusions (e.g. derelict be intrusive adjoining buil dumped materials, left intermittent or continuous from traffic, industry, treatment works, waste facilities).	uditory puildings, dings, oud us noise sewage				
M65 Appendix E SANGs planning application principles	SANG Visitor Monitoring Large developments may come forward in phases, monitoring should commence prior to the occupation of the first occupation dwelling where there is existing SANG public use. It need not be when the land has no existing public access. Monitoring should be phased at two/three years after each substantive phase and also at five years after the development is completed. It may be the case that monitoring will need to include nearby heathland sites. The primary aims of visitor monitoring are to inform the SANG delivery and allow for adjustments as well as demonstrating the SANGs functionality and use by existing local residents. Effective monitoring will provide a robust baseline which can be observed in future strategic monitoring events. After From five years after from the final phase of a development future ongoing SANG monitoring will be incorporated into the ongoing SANG monitoring will be					
M66	recording approaches. Add summary table:				Clarity	
Appendix E	Information required	<u>Outline</u>	<u>Full</u> <u>F</u>	Provided Provided		
Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM)	SANG maintenance and function should be secured and demonstrated to be in place for perpetuity.	<u>√</u>	<u>✓</u>			
	Change of Use application for the SANG		<u>√</u>			
	Natural England confirms it meets the SANG criteria	<u>√</u>	<u>√</u>			
	SANG is deliverable (ownership/control and management secure)	✓_	<u>✓</u>			
	Can be maintained in perpetuity	<u>√</u>	<u>~</u>			
	Will be monitored for 5 years from completion		<u>√</u>			
	Draft S106 provided	<u>√</u>				

	Full S106 provided		<u>√</u>			
	Assessment of Biodiversity	./				
	features of SANG	<u>√</u>	_			
	SANG layout/masterplan	<u>√</u>	<u>√</u>			
	SANG management					
	plan/costed		<u> </u>			
	If site has existing public					
	access, visitor survey	<u>√</u>	<u>√</u>			
	<u>provided</u>					
	SANG monitoring strategy,					
	agreed with LPA/Natural		<u>√</u>			
	<u>England</u>					
	SANG Monitoring post each					
	development phase (large		<u>√</u>			
	<u>developments)</u>					
	SAMM contribution can be	\checkmark	<u>√</u>			
	met					
	Natural England confirms					
	measures required are	✓	√			
	secured pre-submission					
	<u>(desirable)</u>					
	This checklist is to assist applic	ants prep	aring t	the necessal	rv	
	information and there are likely				<u> </u>	
	depending on the size and com					
	Early engagement, where possi	ble, can r	educe	delays.		
M67	3 rd paragraph: For clarity					
Appendix F:	As set out in this SPD, <u>additional residential development is</u> and in					
Permitted	likely to have a significant effect on the Dorset Heathlands response to					
Development/Pri	either alone or in combination with other proposals. Therefore in accordance with the regulations above the Estates					
or Approvals	Council is obliged to undertake	Estates, d Fortitudo				
	secure suitable mitigation in ac					
	uncontrolled' approval of residence				Primetower	
	allowed by the amended order,				Properties.	
	assessment or any required mit	igation or	devel	lopment is		
	likely to have significant effect on the Dorset Heathlands					

Table 2 Post Cabinet Changes

Modification	Change	Why			
M68	people's behaviours too	Typographical error			
Appendix D, page 28, para 4	utilise this				
M69	large areas for dogs to be off	Typographical error			
Appendix D page 28, para 5	lead safely, , dog				
M70	There are SANG omissions on th	nis map which we cannot			
Figure 5 SANG distribution	e 5 SANG distribution currently update due to technical issues caused by remote				
map.	working made necessary by Covid19 restrictions. This map will				
Update	be updated when normal working practices resume and the				
	SPD re-published.				