1.0 Review of Settlement Boundaries

1.1 This report sets out the results of a review of settlement boundaries. Settlement boundaries were established in the New Forest District Local Plan 1999 and there has been no wholesale review since this Plan.

1.2 Since the adoption of the Local Plan First Alteration (LPFA), a boundary for the New Forest National Park has been established. Although this new boundary is shown on the LPFA Proposals Maps, its implications for defined settlement and Green Belt boundaries could not be taken into account in that Plan because of the timing of its confirmation, at the very end stage of the plan process. Consequently, this settlement boundary review deals for the most part with anomalies arising between settlement boundaries and the National Park boundary, where it meets settlements and, in the south and west of the Plan Area, small areas of statutory Green Belt left over following the confirmation of the National Park boundary.

1.3 The report summarises the boundary changes and highlights the main changes recommended for each settlement. The most significant changes are numbered (in brackets) in the text. However, all changes are listed in Appendix 4.

2.0 Totton and Eling

2.1 There is one main change recommended at Totton. This is to extend the settlement boundary northwards on the eastern side of Salisbury Road (1). New development of a replacement football stadium for Totton FC in association with the development of their existing ground in the town, as well as existing development of a large distribution warehouse (former Hampshire Vintners) and a caravan site for gypsies at Little Testwood Farm has resulted in an increasingly built up character to this area which no longer justifies its 'countryside' status in policy terms. Additional land at Little Testwood Farm comprising scrubland and redundant farm buildings would come within the proposed new settlement boundary. It is proposed that this land be allocated for employment development to contribute to the Core Strategy targets for Totton.

2.2 Other changes recommended to the settlement boundary of Totton and Eling are all minor changes and relate to instances where the current boundary doesn’t follow map features. This is due to changes to the Ordnance Survey base map, or in some places where the boundary doesn’t reflect the extent of development which has taken place since the boundary was last defined. For example, housing development which has taken place at Testwood has resulted in the need to define a more detailed boundary in this area which follows the development line (4).

2.3 Further boundary changes at Totton will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed in the Sites and Development Management DPD.

3.0 Marchwood

3.1 Changes to the current settlement boundary will be limited to the incorporation of new allocations proposed in the Sites and Development Management DPD.
4.0 Hythe and Dibden

4.1 The National Park boundary follows but doesn’t adjoin the settlement boundary of Hythe and Dibden on the northern edge of the settlement (1 & 2). The boundaries don’t meet and narrow strips of land designated as “countryside” lie between the two, usually following a road where the National Park boundary follows one side of the road and the settlement boundary the other. These gaps serve no purpose and the settlement boundary should be amended to adjoin the National Park in these locations.

4.2 In the main, other proposed changes relate to instances where the settlement boundary doesn’t follow map features. This is largely due to changes in the Ordnance Survey map base. The required changes are very minor and there are no issues arising as a consequence of these changes.

4.3 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

5.0 Holbury

5.1 The National Park boundary follows but doesn’t always adjoin the settlement boundary of Holbury in the west and south-west of the settlement (3, 4, 5 & 6). Where the boundaries don’t meet, narrow strips of land designated as ‘countryside’ lie between the two. These gaps serve no purpose and the settlement boundary should be amended to adjoin the National Park.

5.2 In the main, these changes will result in the settlement boundary following the opposite side of a road to that at present, bringing the road into the settlement. However, in some locations this change would bring other areas of land into the settlement.

5.3 An area of public open space to the west of Lime Kiln Lane and part of Holbury Manor Park will be brought into the settlement (4). These areas will be protected from development by their existing Public Open Space designation.

5.4 Other proposed changes to the settlement boundary at Holbury relate to the boundary not following map features, either because the Ordnance Survey base map has changed, or the boundary has been drawn arbitrarily. There are no issues arising as a result of these changes, but the amended boundaries would provide clarity.

6.0 Blackfield

6.1 The National Park boundary follows the settlement to the east, south and west. In the area of the Heather Road estate the Park boundary comes into the settlement and so the settlement boundary will need amendment to address this (1). This is also the case with small areas at Lepe Road (4) and Kings Ride (5). In other areas there is a mis-match between the National Park and settlement boundaries, for example at Saxon Road (2), Green Lane (3) and West Common (4). The settlement boundary should follow the National Park in these locations.

6.2 Other proposed changes around Blackfield relate to inconsistencies with the map base and are very minor.
6.3 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

7.0 Fawley

7.1 The National Park lies immediately to the east and south of Fawley. At Copthorne Lane and Ashlett Road there is a mismatch between the National Park and the settlement boundaries (1). In this case, it is recommended that the settlement boundary should cross the road to adjoin the Park boundary.

7.2 To the south of the settlement, the Park boundary follows along the south side of Fawley Road (2). It is recommended that the settlement boundary should cross the road to join up with the Park boundary. This would bring two areas of land within the settlement. These areas are associated with the road junctions at Calshot Road and School Road where they meet with Fawley Road. Both areas have good tree cover and a small area is currently subject to an area Tree Preservation Order.

7.3 Other proposed changes around Fawley relate to inconsistencies with the map base and are very minor.

8.0 Lymington

8.1 Many of the proposed changes in Lymington concern the boundary of the National Park and its relationship with the settlement and Green Belt boundaries.

8.2 Green Belt surrounds Lymington and in many instances the Park boundary was not drawn tightly up against the settlement, thus leaving several small areas, or slivers of Green Belt between the settlement and the Park boundaries. These should be incorporated into the settlement. In most cases, changes would involve the settlement boundary following the opposite side of the road to that which it currently follows. This is the case to the east of Marsh Lane (railway line) (1); south of Kings Saltern Road, All Saints Road and east of Viney Road (3); at Wainsford Road and Ramley Road (5); and at the Passford Bridge roundabout (8).

8.3 There is a small area of Green Belt to the north-west of Pennington Oval and south of Wainsford Road (5). This appears to include a dwelling and a derelict nursery. The site measures about three-quarters of a hectare and has substantial tree cover around its boundaries.

8.4 All other proposed changes are minor and relate to instances where the settlement boundary doesn’t follow map features, or settlement and Green Belt boundaries not coinciding.

8.5 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

9.0 Milford-on-Sea

9.1 No significant boundary changes are proposed for Milford on Sea. There is one minor amendment to the far eastern boundary where the boundary cuts through residential gardens and instead should follow map features.
9.2 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

10.0 **Hordle and Everton**

10.1 Three main changes are proposed to the boundaries at Hordle. None is proposed for Everton.

10.2 The first change relates to Woodlands Caravan Park east of Stopples Lane, Hordle (1). The settlement and Green Belt boundaries cut through the caravan park and also through individual caravans. This does not represent a permanent and defensible boundary. Therefore it is recommended that the boundaries be drawn to follow the limits of development in this location.

10.3 The other changes are proposed to incorporate recent development on the edge of the settlement at Sidney Street, Hordle (1) and Everton Road (2). These developments were permitted in the Green Belt as an affordable housing scheme and a facility for deaf people. These areas appear as extensions to the settlement and no longer meet Green Belt purposes.

10.4 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

11.0 **New Milton**

11.1 Only two changes are proposed at New Milton. The first relates to the drawing of the National Park boundary on the northern edge of New Milton which follows the northern side of Sway Road (1). The settlement boundary follows the southern side of the road leaving a sliver of Green Belt between the two. It is recommended that the settlement boundary follow the National Park boundary in order to resolve this problem.

11.2 The second change concerns the need to incorporate new development which has taken place at Earlswood Park, Ashley (2). The settlement now adjoins the National Park in this location and the two boundaries should coincide. Open spaces and woodland which would be brought into the settlement could be protected by means of a suitable green infrastructure designation.

11.3 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

12.0 **Bransgore**

12.1 In Bransgore there are several isolated areas of Green Belt left over after the confirmation of the National Park boundary. The status of these sites should be reviewed as they are no longer tenable areas within the Green Belt.

12.2 The existing and proposed areas of open space south and north of Burley Road (4) and to the north of Rosehill Drive (1) should be brought into the settlement. These will be protected by Public Open Space safeguarding policies.
12.3 An area of Green Belt covering the public house and associated land adjoining the junction of Ringwood Road and Burley Road (4) should be brought within the settlement.

12.4 Another small area of residual Green Belt is located at Poplar Lane on the south eastern edge of Bransgore (3). This covers two properties ‘Clayhill Cottage’ and the garden of ‘Forest Edge’. The Green Belt should be deleted and the area brought within the settlement boundary.

12.5 Other proposed changes in Bransgore relate to overlapping boundaries or the settlement boundary not following map features.

12.6 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

13.0 Ringwood

13.1 Most changes in Ringwood relate to gaps between the settlement boundary and the National Park or between the settlement boundary and the Green Belt. Minor amendments to the boundaries will resolve these anomalies.

13.2 The main change in this area involves the treatment in policy terms of Blashford (12). Currently, Blashford is not a defined settlement and countryside policies apply in the area. However, Blashford is only just over one kilometre north of Ringwood Town Centre and contains the largest employment site in the area, at Headlands Business Park. Allocations previously made to extend the business park have recently been taken up and developed with a variety of industrial and office units. This and other planning decisions in the area have reinforced the ‘sub-urban’ characteristics of Blashford.

13.3 It is proposed therefore to define a settlement boundary around Blashford. Policies applicable within settlements will apply within Blashford. As previously explained, this will only serve to bridge the gap between previous planning policy which defined the area as countryside and planning practice which has tended to treat the area as a defined settlement. The proposal will serve to acknowledge the prevailing character of the area and reconcile policy with practice.

13.4 The boundary is proposed to include the whole of Headlands Business Park and the linear residential development to the south along Salisbury Road. The proposed boundary for Blashford and the existing boundary of Ringwood should not join together. There is a narrow but important green gap between the settlements associated with the Lin Brook, which should be maintained. There is substantial tree cover along the Brook and in the garden of the property called ‘Lynbrook’ which serves to reinforce the separateness of the two settlements. The latter is protected with area and individual Tree Preservation Orders. Also excluded from the proposed settlement boundary are the lakes to the east of Blashford and the Headlands Adventure Centre. To the north of Headlands Business Park there is an abrupt change to the character. Development is more dispersed which provides a transition between the open countryside to the north and the more urban character of Headlands to the south. It is considered important to maintain this transition which can be served by excluding the area from the defined settlement boundary. Countryside policies will continue to apply north of Headlands.
Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

**Fordingbridge**

14.1 Changes in this area mainly relate to the current settlement boundary not following map features. This is due to changes in the map base supplied by Ordnance Survey.

14.2 To the south east of the High Street the current settlement boundary cuts through properties and gardens (2). It is proposed to amend the boundary to follow map features in order to provide a more logical boundary.

14.3 To the west of the town there is an area of land between West Mills and Mulberry Gardens (3). This ‘finger’ of countryside runs alongside Ashford Water. The current boundary cuts across a residential garden and, in doing so, it doesn’t follow any map features. It is proposed to follow the curtilage of the property in this location.

14.4 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

**Ashford**

15.1 Minor changes are proposed at Ashford to amend the settlement boundary to follow map features.

15.2 One change at Fordingbridge Business Park in Ashford will ensure that the settlement boundary incorporates development which has taken place there (1).

15.3 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.

**Sandleheath**

16.1 The main change at Sandleheath involves the incorporation within the settlement of land at Sandleheath Industrial Estate (1). An extension to the industrial estate was permitted in 1999 and development beyond the existing settlement boundary has taken place. The boundary should be amended to take account of the extent of the new development area.

16.2 Further boundary changes will be limited to the incorporation of any new land allocations proposed as part of work on the Sites and Development Management DPD.