NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL - LOCAL PLAN (PART 2) EXAMINATION

**Inspector’s request for Statements of Common Ground**

There are 3 matters on which it would be helpful if interested parties could produce a statement of common ground (SCG).

**Issue 1: Regulatory matters - Duty to Co-operate**

Questions:
Has the duty to co-operate been met with regard to any cross boundary implications of the proposed urban extension to Christchurch (proposed in the emerging Christchurch Borough Core Strategy), particularly in relation to a possible renewable energy centre and/or SANGS. *(NB If the statutory duty to is not met the plan would have to be withdrawn.)*

If the statutory duty is met, does the requirement of the NPPF for strategic planning across local boundaries mean that the Local Plan should address (by any specific policies, proposals or explanatory text) any cross boundary implications of the proposed urban extension to Christchurch?

*I would welcome a SCG from as many of the relevant parties as possible eg: District Council, Christchurch Borough Council, Hampshire County Council as minerals planning authority and Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (rep 370b).*

**Issues 3 and 4 - New Milton Allocations NMT 2, 3 and 4**

Question:
Does: the current use of part of this area for minerals processing or possible future use in connection with extraction elsewhere (see rep 224); its safeguarding in the emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan; possible contamination; need for reclamation; and viability considerations undermine the justification for this allocation or make delivery uncertain?

*I would welcome a SCG addressing this question prepared, as far as possible, by the Council, the landowners, the proposed developer, the mineral operator and Hampshire County Council as minerals authority.*

**Issue 3 - Hythe HYD1**

Question:
Is there a justified need to safeguard that part of this allocation to the south east of the adjoining Seadown Veterinary Hospital for the possible expansion of that practice (see rep 175) and, if so, should any land adjoining the allocation be allocated for housing in substitution for the safeguarded land?

*I do not suggest at this stage that any a change is necessary for soundness, but the interested landowners and the Council may wish to discuss the matter to see if any parties agree that a change may be justified and to prepare a SCG accordingly.*

The above questions will be repeated in the list of questions issued at the beginning of October, so any other party with a relevant representation and not a party to a statement of common ground can comment on the matter.

**Simon Emerson**
INSPECTOR  21 August 2012