1. This note is prepared by NFDC in response to the questions raised by the Inspector in Inspector’s Further Comments and Questions – Note 2, August 2012. The Inspector’s questions are shown in bold text.

NFDC Response to Inspector’s Note Section 1. Green Belt boundary

1.1 Several of the housing allocations include removal of land from the Green Belt. In the Council’s view, do Core Strategy policies CS10(o) and CS12 provide the necessary justification for the principle of releasing land from the Green Belt at various settlements to meet housing needs (i.e. the exceptional circumstances necessary for altering established boundaries set out in NPPF paragraph 83)? Does the principle of releasing land from the Green Belt to accommodate housing in each settlement in accordance with policy CS12 require any further local (i.e. settlement specific) justification? If so, where is this found?

Response to paragraph 1.1

2. The answer to the first part of the question (i.e. was the principle established through policies the Core Strategy?) is “yes”. The answer to the second part of the question (i.e. is further settlement-specific justification needed for the principle?) is, in the Council’s view, “no”, except for New Milton where justification is needed for the proposed release of some Green Belt land in preference to the allocation of two small areas that are already excluded from the Green Belt. Further elaboration is provided below.

3. This matter was considered at the Core Strategy Examination and is covered in paragraph 3.28 of the Core Strategy Examination Inspector’s Report (Document O66, page 13):

“I am satisfied that the setting of limits on the numbers of houses to be provided by policy CS12 has been sufficiently justified, particularly in regard to potential environmental constraints, notably the presence of international nature conservation sites. The suggested breakdown of additional housing by settlement is broadly consistent with the Plan’s settlement hierarchy, while the level of detail will provide certainty when guiding subsequent DPD
preparation. The detailed allocation of sites in line with this policy is likely to result in the removal of some land from the Green Belt. Potentially affected settlements are Lymington and Pennington, Milford-on-Sea, Hordle and Everton, New Milton and Bransgore: in all cases, the Green Belt extends close to (and/or adjoins) the settlement boundary. Paragraph 2.7 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts (PPG 2) states that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless, among other matters, exceptional circumstances exist which necessitate such revision. In my view, the requirement for affordable and local needs housing referred to above, a demand that is so great that it will not be fully met, is sufficient in principle to amount to an exceptional circumstance in the context of such site allocations. Nevertheless, the detailed identification of sites will be a matter for the subsequent Sites and Development Management DPD.”

4. In view of the Core Strategy Inspector’s conclusions as quoted above, and the subsequent inclusion of Policy CS12 in the adopted Core Strategy, the Council does not consider that further justification is needed for the principle of releasing some Green Belt sites to meet the requirements of CS12 (and employment land needs at New Milton set out in CS18(a) (ii)). The settlements listed in the 4th sentence of the above quote are exactly the same as the settlements where the Local Plan Part 2 proposes some small releases of sites from the Green Belt to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS12.

5. Additional settlement-specific justification is needed, however, to show that the specific sites proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt through the Local Plan Part 2 are not unacceptable with regard to other policies and are the most suitable sites having regard to relevant criteria. The Council considers that the sites proposed to be released from the Green Belt meet these requirements. The full assessment is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal (Document S11 – see especially Section 6: Appraisal of site-specific policies and alternatives, together with Appendix 5 (which sets out the individual site assessments of the sites proposed for allocation) and Annex 2 (which sets out detailed appraisals of all sites assessed as “reasonable alternatives”).

6. All land adjoining the defined boundaries of Lymington and Pennington, Milford-on-Sea, Hordle and Everton, and Bransgore is Green Belt. It would not be possible to implement Core Strategy CS12 without some scale releases from the Green Belt adjoining these settlements.

7. While there are small amounts of “white land” adjoining New Milton, the Council considers that the Green Belt releases proposed at New Milton are the most appropriate way of providing for the needs of CS12 (and CS18 employment sites). The two areas excluded from the Green Belt adjoining New Milton in the adopted Local Plan (carried forward from previous Local Plans) are:
   i. An area north east of New Milton off Park Road and Park Close, Ashley (about 1.3 hectares).
   ii. Hoburne Naish Holiday Park (area about 3.1 hectares).

8. More than half (about 1.8 hectares) of the land at the Hoburne Naish Holiday Park is within the Coastal Change Management Area within which, according to Policy DM5, new residential development is not appropriate. Other factors add to the unsuitability of this site for a Policy CS12 allocation – including the separation of New Milton and Highcliffe, and that fact that this site is already in use as a Holiday Park.
9. The land at Ashley was considered as a potential CS12 allocation in drawing up the Local Plan Part 2 and was included in the January Consultation Document (Document S1, Section 4, page 179). However, it was considered that there are more suitable sites, as proposed in the submitted Local Plan Part 2, to meet CS12 requirements, including Sites NMT 1 (Land south of Gore Road, east of the Old Barn) and NMT4 (Land east of Caird Avenue, south of Carrick Way woodland), both of which currently lie within the Green Belt. The reasons for preferring the allocated sites to the “white land” at Ashley are summarised in paragraph 3.80 of the Sustainability Appraisal (Document S11, page 76), which refers to the environmental improvements that can be achieved through the development of these sites. (Note: The sites reference numbers have been updated in the submission documents from those used in the consultation document). The SA Report concludes that: “Such environmental enhancements would not be achieved by the allocation of NMT1 [in the Public Consultation Document]: Land off Park Road and of Park Close site, which had originally been identified as a preferred allocation on the basis of it being outside the Green Belt.” Document S11, page 77, Paragraph 3.80). Moreover, the size of the “white land” off Park Road and Park Close is far below that needed to make any significant inroads into the CS12/CS18 requirements for New Milton. Even if this land were to be allocated in this plan, it would not preclude the need for other releases from the Green Belt to be considered adjoining New Milton.

10. The releases of Green Belt land proposed in the submission document, in total, affect about 0.002% of the Green Belt within New Forest District.

1.2 No changes to the Green Belt appear to be made for any long term housing requirements that might need to be accommodated in the Green Belt beyond the plan period. In reviewing the Green Belt, how has the Council addressed the intention in policy CS10(o) to look ahead to 2031 and the requirement in NPPF, paragraph 85? Council to explain its approach fully.

Response to paragraph 1.2

11. The Core Strategy and submitted Local Plan Part 2 look ahead to 2026. The last sentence of Policy CS10(o) refers to a longer time horizon in considering limited small scale changes to the Green Belt, having regard to the South East Plan which referred to the need to look ahead to 2031.

12. All of the factors set out below are relevant to the approach taken towards this issue in the submission documents.

13. Only parts of the Plan Area (the Avon Valley south of Ringwood to the west of the New Forest National Park, and the coastal strip south of the National Park) are within the Green Belt. There will continue to be large parts of the plan area outside the Green Belt (including at Ringwood, Fordingbridge and all of the Totton and the Waterside area) which will provide opportunities to be considered for meeting longer term development requirements if necessary without a further review of the Green Belt.

14. Within the parts of the plan area that lie within the Green Belt (the Avon Valley south of Ringwood and the coastal strip south of the National Park), the Local Plan Part 2 carries forward some small areas of “white land” (between the built-up area boundaries and the Green Belt) which are not allocated for development in this plan, although the significance of this should not be over-stated:
   - Land off Park Road and Park Close, New Milton (1.3 hectares).
• Hoburne Naish Holiday Park, west of Barton-on-Sea (3.1 hectares but not considered as a suitable housing development site for the reasons referred to above).

15. In a future review of the Council’s development plan looking beyond 2026, the areas referred to in the above paragraphs will continue to provide areas outside the Green Belt that can be considered for longer term development requirements if necessary.

16. There are currently no strategic development requirements for the plan area for the period after 2026. The plan area is not one in which it would be appropriate to continue a past “trend” rate of development. Over recent decades, New Forest District has had successively lower development requirements, as is shown in the diagram below.

Note: These are the figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual requirement</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1981-1990 South Hampshire Structure Plan
1991-1995 Hampshire County Structure Plan
1996-2005 Hampshire County Structure Plan Review
2006-2026 South East Plan (NFD outside the National Park)

17. As the graph above shows, there has been a steadily declining housing requirement for New Forest District. The requirement set out in the South East Plan, which is met by the Core Strategy without the CS12 sites (which are additional to the South East Plan requirement) did not need any sites to be released from the Green Belt. In the Council’s view, it should not be assumed that there will be a future housing requirement for the period beyond 2026 that would need further releases of Green Belt land.
18. The reducing housing requirement recognises that it would be inappropriate to aim to accommodate all housing needs/demands within the Plan Area. New Forest District is subject to a very high level of constraints on development. These are set out in section 3.2 of the Core Strategy. In particular, there are many areas subject to national and international nature conservation designations in and close to the plan area (covering most of the New Forest National Park, the Test and Avon river valleys and much of the coast; in addition substantial parts of the plan area are covered by AONB and Green Belt designations). The extent of national and international designations limits the scope to meet development requirements within the plan area. In preparing the Core Strategy, it was clear that there was some tension between the amount of development proposed for the period up to 2026 and the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive to avoid adverse impacts on the integrity of European designations. The mitigation measures included in the Council’s development plan (including increased open space standards and the Green Infrastructure strategy) are important in this respect. Subject to the inclusion of certain recommended changes regarding mitigation measures, the Core Strategy Examination Inspector was satisfied that the Council’s strategy was sound (see Document O66, page 20, paragraphs 3.46 and 3.47). As is set out in the Council’s statement regarding the “Duty to co-operate” (Document S7,) the Council has worked with other local authorities in putting together a sub-regional strategy that meets housing and employment needs in the wider area. Clearly the Council will need to continue to work with other local authorities in the area to satisfy the “duty to co-operate” requirements and to show how development needs in the wider area are being met over the longer term. While no one currently has any reliable information on possible development requirements for the plan area after 2026, the Council’s view is that it should not be assumed that there will be a continuing need for sites to be released from the Green Belt in the plan area for development at that time.

19. Hence, given that significant parts of the plan area remain outside the Green Belt and will be able to be considered for development opportunities after 2026, and that continued restraint in the plan area is the most likely long-term strategy, the Council considers that it would not be appropriate to take further areas out of the Green Belt in this plan beyond the small areas that are needed for CS12/CS18 requirements.

20. With regard to the specific points in paragraph 85 of the NPPF, the Council’s response is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPPF para. 85 requirements</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When defining (Green Belt) boundaries, local planning authorities should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;</td>
<td>The Council’s approach complies with the Core Strategy, which in turn aims to provide for sustainable development requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not include land which is unnecessary to keep permanently open;</td>
<td>This has been a consideration in selection of areas that can be released from the Green Belt to meet CS12/CS18 requirements and in producing the schedule of minor revisions (Document S1, Appendix 1 Part C and Sustainability Appraisal (Document S11), pages 185-186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’</td>
<td>The response to this matter is set out in the paragraphs above this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPPF para. 85 requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Council’s response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;</td>
<td>The submission documents comply with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and</td>
<td>Clearly there cannot be any absolute guarantee regarding this issue, given that no development requirements exist for the period after 2026. The Council is satisfied that it has adopted the appropriate approach to this matter for the reasons set out in the paragraphs above this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.</td>
<td>This principle has been followed in defining the revisions to the Green Belt boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 A large number of very minor changes are made to the Green Belt not directly related to accommodating future development needs. Do such changes need to be justified by exceptional circumstances? Are these changes related in any way (i.e. triggered by) the proposals and policies in this DPD (other than being included in the plans in Appendix 1). What criteria/process have the Council used to decide on these minor changes to the boundary? Have any such criteria/process formed part of any previously published evidence?

Response to paragraph 1.3

21. The proposed minor changes to the Green Belt boundary are set out in the Submission Document (Document S1, Appendix 1, Part C, pages 52 to 59). There is a section in the Sustainability Appraisal dealing with them (Document S11, pages 185-186 and Appendix 8 pages 480 to 495).

22. Most of these changes concern the relationship between the Green Belt and the boundary of the New Forest National Park. Prior to National Park designation, most of the area now covered by the National Park was designated as Green Belt, but Green Belt was removed from the National Park once designation was confirmed. The definition of the National Park boundary resulted in several very small isolated pockets of Green Belt left over between the National Park boundary and some of the defined built up areas outside the National Park (i.e. in the Plan Area of the submission documents). Hence as a consequence of National Park designation, residual pockets of Green Belt are proposed to be deleted around Lymington (see Document S1, Appendix 1, Part C: PM-LYM-C1, C3, C5, C6 and C7); New Milton (PM-NMT-C1); and Bransgore (PM-BRAN-C1, C3 and C4).

23. Some of the minor revisions cover areas of railway and highway (where the National Park boundary follows one side and the settlement boundary follows the other). A few areas cover public open space. Two areas contain dwellings and their curtilages.

24. The definition of the National Park boundary therefore provides an exceptional circumstance, as required by the NPPF, needed to revise the Green Belt boundary for these small areas. In the Council’s view, the realignment of settlement boundaries with the National Park boundary provides for a permanent and sustainable Green Belt boundary.

25. In undertaking this review of the Green Belt boundaries, the Council has also taken the opportunity to correct some anomalies which have arisen over time. This includes instances where development has overtaken existing boundaries (Document S1, PM-HOR-C1 and C2) and the old boundary no longer makes sense as the land in question is not open in character. The remaining proposed changes are intended to realign the Green Belt boundary with map features and are very minor in nature (Document S1, PM-LYM-C2, C4, PM-MoS-C1, PM-RING-C6 and C7). In these cases the current Green Belt boundary does not follow recognised features and would lead to uncertainty in interpreting the line of the Green Belt / settlement boundaries. It is considered that these factors also constitute exceptional circumstances needed to justify a review.

26. In proposing these changes the Council has been mindful of national policy concerning the definition of Green Belt boundaries and considers that the requirements of paragraph 85 of the NPPF have been followed. In particular, the proposed boundary changes follow mapped features which are recognisable and likely to be permanent.

27. Paragraph 2.48 of the Submission Document (Document S1) sets out the local context for the proposed changes affecting the Green Belt. The Council can confirm that none of
the minor changes illustrated in Part C of Appendix 1 have been triggered by other proposals and policies in the DPD. In some cases the small areas proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt are already protected by other Plan policies (PM-LYM-C4 and C5 (part), PM-BRAN-C1 and C4 (playing fields) – areas of existing open space).

28. Prior to the preparation of the Submission Documents, the proposed map changes were published in Appendix 4 of the Public Consultation Document (Document S2) in January 2011 and an outline of the process and detailed results of the review of settlement and Green Belt boundaries was published as a Background Paper to the Consultation Draft (BP45). This Background Paper was not re-published at the proposed submission stage given that it is mainly covered by the Sustainability Appraisal (Document S11, Appendix 8) but it is available as post-submission document NFDC9: Settlement Boundary Review.
NFDC Response to Inspector’s Note Section 2. Housing allocations

2.1 Has there been any updated evidence of local housing needs since the Core Strategy was adopted? Are there still needs in each of the settlements listed in CS12 which will not be met by existing turnover of affordable housing or other expected provision?

Response to paragraph 2.1

29. The Council has not undertaken a new housing market assessment since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2009 (Document S14). The Core Strategy examined the issue of local housing need and set the appropriate strategic policies for addressing the local need.

30. Evidence submitted at the Core Strategy Examination showed the extent of the local need for affordable housing – see Background Paper 24: Central Hampshire and New Forest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Document BP24). The level of housing need is set out in paragraphs 8.41 to 8.48 of the document. Figure 8.14 gives the minimum estimate of Housing Need in New Forest District (for Social Rented Homes) of 660 dwellings per annum (the households included in this estimate were either currently in housing need or likely to require it in the future on the basis of their income) and Figure 8.16 provides an upper estimate of 1060 per annum (which includes all households who have applied for housing in the authority area, not just those applicants with identified need.)

31. The Core Strategy (Document S14) does not set out to address the total need for affordable housing. Policy CS14 sets a target of providing ‘at least 100 additional affordable dwellings per annum’. The significant environmental constraints that apply within and adjoining the plan area, which include extensive areas protected under the Habitat Directives (Special Protection Area, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar sites), as well as land designated as Green Belt, part of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the New Forest National Park, have led to an adopted strategy of development restraint within the Plan Area. Although the Core Strategy was prepared before the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, the restrictions that apply within this plan area accord with policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. (See paragraph 14 of NPPF (Document N70)). Under the Habitats Regulations, Policies CS9, CS10 and CS11 of the Core Strategy were subject to Appropriate Assessment in respect of the recreational effects likely to arise for the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. Residential development at levels in excess of that made provision for in the Core Strategy has not been tested.

32. It is within this context of a need to restrict development that the Core Strategy addressed the local need to provide additional affordable housing to address the housing needs of local people. The delivery of a substantial proportion of ‘CS12’ sites, where suitable and appropriate sites can be found, is essential if significant inroads are to be made towards meeting the Core Strategy target level of provision.

33. The Council’s Annual Monitoring Reports (Documents S15, O61, O62, O63 and O64) provide information about the provision that has been made for affordable housing. Information for the period 2007 – 2011 is summarised below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of additional affordable homes built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. For the Inspector's information, attached in Appendix 1 of this document, is information giving a current ‘snap-shot’ of households on the Homesearch Register currently seeking affordable housing within the District. This shows that there is a continuing need to provide additional affordable housing in all settlements throughout the Plan Area. A chart giving a ‘snapshot’ figure of numbers on the Homesearch Register in March for each year between March 2001 and March 2012 is also included.

2.2 On what evidence does the Council rely to show that the sites allocated under CS12 (to provide 70% affordable housing) are viable and will come forward for development?

Response to paragraph 2.2

35. The Inspector's attention is drawn to para.3.26 of the Core Strategy Inspector's Report (Document O66) regarding policy CS12, and in particular the statement that he had seen “no substantive evidence that the dwelling mix envisaged by the Council would deter developers….”.

36. Further, as part of the preparation of the Sites and Development Management document, in August 2010, the Council wrote to all landowners/agents of sites being considered for possible allocation and asked them to respond to a questionnaire regarding their site (attached as Appendix 2). Question 2 of this questionnaire specifically asked them to confirm that development of their site (if allocated) would comply with Core Strategy policy CS15(b) (Document S14, page 57). Where a negative response was received to question 2 the site was eliminated from further consideration as it would not comply with the Core Strategy. Appendix 3 summarises the responses in relation to sites which are allocated in the submitted plan.

37. The site selection process excluded sites where a landowner had informed the Council that the site was not available for development. (See The Sustainability Appraisal Report S11, Assessment tables in Annex 2, first question under Objective 3.)

2.3 Some of the allocated sites (including LYM2, RING3, TOT1) are identified in the site-specific assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as being used, previously used, or with potential as, back-up grazing and as having commoners rights attached. Such features result in a negative red score in the SA. Council to produce a list of all the allocated sites which are so identified in the SA.

- Do such allocations conflict with policy CS21(f) and, if so, how has the Council weighed this harm both for each site and the cumulative effect of the loss of such sites?
• Is the cumulative loss of such parcels of land significant in terms of the overall availability/distribution of such back-up grazing, the needs of commoners and the management of land within the New Forest National Park?

Response to paragraph 2.3

38. There are only a small number of proposed housing allocations, as shown in Appendix 4, where the land has been used for back-up grazing or has potential to be used for back-up grazing.

39. Information to inform the Sustainability Appraisal regarding back-up grazing land was obtained from the New Forest National Park Authority (NPFNPA). The National Park Authority obtained the information from the Verderers of the New Forest. The role of the Verderers of the New Forest is to:

• protect and administer the New Forest’s unique agricultural commoning practices and conserve its traditional landscape;
• conserve its traditional landscape, wildlife and aesthetic character, including its flora and fauna, peacefulness, natural beauty and cultural heritage;
• safeguard a viable future for commoning upon which the foregoing depends.

40. Policy CS21 in the Council’s Core Strategy (Document S14, page 69) states that ‘the strategy for the rural economy is to:

“......
(f) work with the New Forest National park Authority and other neighbouring authorities to protect essential back-up grazing land to support commoning;
..... “

41. The Council considers that those housing allocations which are on land which has currently/recently been used for back-up grazing and has commoning rights attached or on land which has potential for back-up grazing do not result in an overall significant conflict with Policy CS21(f). The Council does not consider that any of the housing allocations that it has identified are on ‘essential’ back-up grazing land. In their representations on the proposed submission document (Document S1) the New Forest National Park Authority (NPFNPA) state they consider the plan to be sound. The only comment that the NPFNPA make with regard to back-up grazing is in relation to LYM2 (Document S1, Section 4, page 115) . In their comments (Representation Reference: 222g) the NPFNPA state that the LYM2 site has commoning rights attached and has recently been used as back-up grazing land. In addition the NPFNPA’s statement states that ‘the Authority does not support the allocation of Green Belt land, which has commoning rights attached and has recently been used for back-up grazing land, for residential development to meet the additional dwelling target set out in the Core Strategy’. However, despite this, the NPFNPA’s representation goes on to state that the Authority does not consider that its concerns relate to the fundamental soundness of the document. The Verderers of the New Forest did not make any representation on the Council’s proposed submission document.

42. Given the response of the NPFNPA and the lack of comment from the Verderers of the New Forest, the Council considers that the cumulative loss of land which has currently/recently been used for back-up grazing or land which has potential for back-up grazing, is not significant in terms of the overall availability/distribution of such back-up grazing land, the needs of commoners and the management of land within the New Forest National Park. In addition, based upon its experience and knowledge surrounding issues associated with back-up grazing land, the Council considers that the total area of land taken from the pool of actual and potential grazing land as a result of the Local Plan
Part 2’s (Document S1) proposed housing allocations, is very small when considered against the total amount of back-up grazing land which is available surrounding the open forest. The Council has asked the Verderers of the New Forest for a map showing the extent of the existing back-up grazing land. However, the Verderers of the New Forest are not prepared to make such a map available to the Council. The Council considers that there are far greater and more significant pressures on the availability of back-up grazing land than the small losses that will result from the implementation of the proposed housing allocations in the Local Plan Part 2. In particular, this includes pressure for mineral extraction and from recreational horse-keeping. The pressure from recreational horse-keeping on back-up grazing land is highlighted in paragraph 2.93 on page 36 of Section 2 of the Local Plan Part 2 (Sites and Development Management) (Document S1).

43. Further to the above the Council considers that a distinction needs to be made between back-up grazing land which is directly adjacent or in close proximity to the open forest and back-up grazing land that is located at some distance from the open forest. The housing allocations identified in Appendix 2 as having currently/recently been used for back-up grazing or which have potential for use as back-up grazing land, are on land which is not directly adjacent to the open forest. A number of the sites are some distance from the open forest and thus are not ideal sites for back-up grazing given the logistics involved in moving animals to these locations and the requirement for commoners to check on their animals daily. The assessment of the impact of the loss of back-up grazing land took into account that it is more important that back-up grazing land adjacent to or in close proximity to the boundary of the open forest is protected.

2.4 Southern Water (rep 354) has identified that for many of the allocated sites there is insufficient capacity for sewerage at the site and accordingly an off-site connection will be required. (Sites include: TOT1, TOT3, TOT6, TOT11, HYD1, LYM1, LYM2, MoS1, NMT2 and NMT3 – Council to highlight any others.)

Response to paragraph 2.4

44. The Council is not aware of any further sites other than those identified by Southern Water where an issue of insufficient capacity for sewerage has been raised.

2.5 In principle, where this situation is confirmed, should the policy for such sites refer to the need for an off-site sewerage connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity? Is there any more recent evidence for these or other sites? (Any party disputing Southern Water’s assessment should discuss the matter with Southern Water/Council leading to a Statement of Common Ground in due course).

Response to paragraph 2.5

45. It is the Council’s view that it is not necessary for the policies in the Local Plan to go into detail about the method of connection to the sewerage system. The Council believes the details are an issue for the detailed planning application stage and/or a site brief. The Local Plan must establish that a connection is feasible (if necessary, off-site) and the Council has not been made aware of any proposed allocations where there is an overriding problem in this respect.
46. Under Section 98 of the Water Industry Act 1991 it is the statutory duty of Southern Water to provide a public sewer for domestic purposes. This requirement for the statutory sewerage undertaker to allow new development to connect to public sewerage system has also been confirmed by the Supreme Court in a case between Barratt Homes Limited v Welsh Water (2009) UKSC 13.

47. The Council is aware that Southern Water aspires to ensure that all new connections should take place at the nearest point of adequate capacity. This approach ensures that the cost of the investment is passed to those who directly benefit from it (i.e. those who occupy the new development) and protects existing customers who would otherwise have to pay through increased general charges. Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connections, even when capacity is insufficient (as confirmed by the Supreme Court judgement). Once detailed planning applications are submitted, the planning authority will work closely with utility providers to impose any necessary planning conditions on the permission relating to connections to the systems.

48. The Council does not have any further evidence for the sites in relation to off-site sewerage connections.

2.6 On some sites, Southern Water has identified existing sewers, mains or other infrastructure crossing the site which will require an easement (precluding building) or diversion. (Sites include: TOT3, HYD1, HYD2, LYM6, NMT1 and NMT2 - Council to highlight any others. As above for any technical disputes.) Should the policy for such sites refer to such constraints?

Response to paragraph 2.6

49. In response to the Inspector’s comments at 2.6 the Council believe that it is unnecessary for policies in a development plan document to specifically refer to the protection of necessary easements for the protection of service infrastructure crossing a site. Where there is an issue, these are detailed matters which will be addressed at detailed planning stage through a planning application or site development brief. The necessary easement/title information arrangements will be part of the detailed land development work.

50. However, if the Inspector’s view is that site-specific policies in a development plan document should specifically refer to easements for mains water and sewers on a site, then the Council would not object to making appropriate changes to the Plan.

2.7 Local residents and other interested parties raise concerns about highway safety/local capacity in relation to a number of the allocations (both residential and employment sites).

- Has each allocation for development been assessed for acceptability in relation to highway matters by the Highway Authority?
- Is there any analysis already undertaken on which the Council rely other than in the SA?

Response to paragraph 2.7

51. New Forest District Council (NFDC) Transportation Section undertook a preliminary appraisal of the sites being considered for inclusion in the Local Plan Part 2 (Document S1). This initial appraisal was forwarded to Hampshire County Council (as Highway Authority) to provide comment and any further information. The initial assessments/appraisals of the potential sites were then used to inform the transportation
considerations of the Sustainability Appraisal (Document S11). Where landowners’ consultants provided detailed technical input this was taken on board in the considerations and was not duplicated by NFDC, particularly if the Highways Authority had raised no highways concerns regarding the evidence provided (as was the case with the proposed allocation at Durley Farm, Totton, (Policy TOT1, Document S1)).

52. The initial appraisal work undertaken by NFDC considered transport issues associated with the site, principally relating to access for vehicles, pedestrians, cycles and availability of public transport.

53. Access to the site was appraised by reviewing data detailing vehicle speeds and flows (where information was available) to identify likely sight line requirements for each site (as recommended by Manual for Streets (http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/manual-for-streets/) or (where relevant) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (http://www.dft.gov.uk/ha/standards/dmrb/) to see if these could be achieved. The speed and flow data is held by NFDC and was collected by Speed Detector Radar (SDR) and Speed Indicator Devices (SID). Additionally road widths at possible access points, stagger distances of junctions, types and adequacy of junctions in the vicinity of the sites were appraised.

54. The initial site assessments identified any transport improvements required and/or proposed in the vicinity of the site. Likewise the speed limits and width or weight restrictions on the roads adjacent to the site and also if there are any on-street parking issues/waiting restrictions in place and/or likely to be required if the site is to be developed.

55. With regard to pedestrian and cycling accessibility the assessments appraised the following:
- Continuous pedestrian route/designated cycle route from site to local centre and schools
- Availability of verges to create widen footways
- Suitability of highway for on road cycling (traffic speed/volume)
- Controlled crossing facilities on route to town/schools
- Uncontrolled crossing facilities on route to town/schools:
- Barriers to cycling e.g. large or busy roundabouts / junctions / roads

56. With regard to public transport provision and opportunities the assessments appraised the following:
- Provision of bus stops within 400m of the site
- Frequency of services
- Suitable pedestrian route between bus stop and site
- Distance to rail station

57. The assessments also noted the following:
- Personal Injury Accident records
- Street light provision
- Known highway constraints (such as possible junction capacity issues, need for pedestrian/cycle crossing improvements etc.)
- Previous highway authority comments/advice (if any)
- Potential Benefits (i.e. what transport benefits could be provided as part of development of a site. E.g. improved cycle and pedestrian links).

58. The Council’s evidence is published in document NFDC10: Transport Site Assessments, which gives details of the Transport Assessment work undertaken on site allocations.
2.8 What is the status/significance of references to the number of dwellings for each allocation (capacity) expressed either in the policy or only in the text? Are such references intended by the Council to restrain the number of dwellings in an otherwise acceptable development on the site? On what evidence are these capacity figures based?

Response to paragraph 2.8

59. Paragraph 2.104 of the Local Plan Part 2 (Document S1) sets out the status/significance of the number of dwellings referred to in the Plan. The figures given for the indicative number of dwellings associated with each allocation are included in the text rather than in the actual policy. This is deliberate. The dwellings numbers for these sites are not meant to be either targets or limits. They are meant to be indicative numbers and are included for 2 reasons:
1. To give the public and interested parties an indication of the likely scale of development proposed at the allocation;
2. In order to be able to relate the site-specific proposals in the Sites and Development Management DPD to the housing figures set out in the Core Strategy. [Note: The site-specific dwelling figures thus provided the basis for the Table submitted (Document NFDC1) in response to the Inspector’s request in paragraph 4.3 of the Inspector’s Note 1 (Document ID1)].

60. Some technical work was undertaken to assess the land requirements for development in order to determine appropriate site sizes and parts of larger sites for consideration, as well as the potential dwelling capacity of sites going forward as possible allocations. The Council’s Urban Designer was involved in advising on options for layouts on some sites. Following this work, a broad density estimate of 25 dwellings per hectare was applied to the site areas on CS11 and CS12 green field sites to give the indicative dwelling figures. Densities may be higher for sites within the built up areas. Account was also taken of the Core Strategy open space requirements and other requirements for allotments and landscaping where appropriate.

61. In deciding appropriate levels of development on the allocations – in the preparation of site briefs and in reacting to planning applications – regard will be had in particular to the factors set out in Core Strategy policy CS2 Design Quality, to any site-specific criteria and to relevant Supplementary Planning Documents (including the Housing Design and Density SPD (Document O55) and to any adopted relevant Local Distinctiveness SPD (see Documents O58 and O59).
NFDC Response to Inspector’s Note Section 3. Transport – Waterside railway

3.1 The reinstatement of the railway and 3 locations for stations are set out in Core Strategy policy CS23(f). Has there been any material change of circumstances since the adoption of the Core Strategy concerning the delivery/timing of such reinstatement? On what evidence does the Council rely as to the realistic prospects for reintroducing passenger services on the Waterside line?

Response to paragraph 3.1

62. The London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy (See section 11: Solent and South Hampshire) when viewed at: http://www.networkrail.co.uk/browse%20documents/rus%20documents/route%20utilisation%20strategies/rus%20generation%202/london%20and%20south%20east/london%20and%20south%20east%20route%20utilisation%20strategy.pdf refers to the Waterside Line. Network Rail formally agreed to work with the local authorities as Hampshire County Council (HCC) take the project through the GRIP (Governance for Rail Investment Project) process. HCC is undertaking studies with the aim of developing a robust business case. Network Rail and the South West Trains (SWT) (the franchise holder) have been closely involved in the study work so far. Both have agreed to be part of the Steering Group for the Governance for Rail Investment Project (GRIP) 3 study which is currently underway. The project also has the support of New Forest National Park Authority, NFDC and Hythe & Dibden Parish Council (who have all contributed financially to initial studies.)

63. HCC believes the prospects for delivery are realistic. Initial work indicates a Benefit : Cost ratio of over 2:1 which in Department of Transport (DfT) appraisal terms offers ‘high’ value for money.

64. The Council suggest that the following text be considered as a revision to paragraph 3.5 of the Local Plan part 2 (Document S1):

“Re-opening the Waterside railway to passengers

3.5 Policy CS23(f) of the Core Strategy seeks reinstatement of passenger services on the Waterside branch railway, including safeguarding land for the provision of new passenger stations and associated works and facilities. The previous proposal for a station in West Totton, at Bartley Park has been abandoned. Further detailed work on the re-opening of the Waterside railway to passengers will be progressed during the early years of the plan period. The proposals of this Plan, which include identifying the locations for new local community stations and the associated proposed pedestrian and cycle links, (as set out in the sections for Totton, Marchwood and Hythe) are based on the best information available at the time of preparing the Local Plan Part 2. However, the precise location of the stations may be subject to review during the plan period.”

3.2 What is the primary purpose in identifying the station locations? Is it to allocate them for development during the plan period or to safeguard the land from other development which would prejudice the provision of a station in the future?

Response to paragraph 3.2

65. The primary purpose is to safeguard the land for the local community (railway) stations.
66. Please note, although precise locations for the local community (railway) stations is still under consideration, the Council (in consultation with HCC) have concluded that there is no need to include the residential property, south of the railway line, adjoining Jacob’s Gutter Lane, within the TOT22.3 safeguarding for a station at Hounsdown. (Information on map change will follow.)

3.3 On what evidence/analysis does the Council rely to demonstrate that the areas allocated for each station (TOT22.3, MAR8.2, HYD8.1) encompass sufficient land to provide operational stations, including related facilities, such as parking for the disabled, drop-off and pick-up area, any other parking, taxi waiting, cycle parking, in so far as these may be necessary and appropriate? (Only HYD8.1 mentions the provision of parking). Would passenger services operate on the existing single track line?

Response to paragraph 3.3

67. The current areas allocated are based on information previously provided by HCC. The GRIP3 Study referred to above should be completed during 2013 and it is expected to reach conclusions on the land required for stations taking into account factors including those referred to above. This will allow the Council to review and revise the existing land safeguarding for the three stations. The proposed stations will be local community stations with links and facilities for walking and cycling. At Marchwood a small car park could be provided for circa 12 cars on Network Rail land and HCC indicate priority is likely to be given to those with disabilities.

68. Initial studies indicate that for an hourly service in each direction (this gives the Benefit:Cost ratio of over 2:1 referred to above) passenger services can operate on the existing single track line which has an existing passing loop at Marchwood station that allows for passing manoeuvres.

3.5 In relation to TOT15.6, the Council propose an addition after paragraph 3.44 (NFDC2, Ch 3.4) to refer to development not prejudicing long term opportunities to enhance the railway. How/on what evidence would the Council assess such an impact?

Response to paragraph 3.5 (no 3.4)

69. There are currently no known proposals to develop the railway in any other way than to operate passenger services on the Waterside Line. No other pieces of infrastructure e.g. sidings are required to operate passenger services on the Waterside Line. Any longer term development of the railway would be dealt with as proposals come forward and these would need to take account of the existing situation at that time and, if not already implemented, proposed passenger services on the Waterside Line.

NFDC Response to Inspector’s Note Section 4. Landscape features/ Open space

4.1 Several representations question the appropriateness of including all or part of particular sites as landscape features identified in Part E, Appendix 1 of the plan. These are sites designated as protected by DM8. Appendix 1, Part A, PM-ALL-A5 states all landscape features previously designated in the Local Plan have been reviewed. On
what criteria/by what process have the existing sites been reviewed and the new sites designated? Have these criteria/process formed part of any published evidence?

Response to paragraph 4.1

70. Five representations relate to particular defined landscape features. These include two representations from landowners who have objected to the inclusion of some of their land within a landscape feature designation. In both instances the representations (Nos. 251i (Turley Associates) and 373b (Esso Petroleum) raise objections to Landscape Features carried forward from the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21.)

71. Most of the Landscape Features identified on the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration Proposals Maps (Document S21) have been carried forward into the Local Plan Part 2. The ‘review’ that took place was principally to correct the boundaries, addressing mapping problems associated with transferring the information on to a GIS system. There were so many minor detailed discrepancies found between the Local Plan base maps and the GIS maps that the decision was taken that it would be best to publish the revised boundaries of each Landscape Feature in their entirety, rather than highlight the corrections as changes. This was not a review in the sense that a detailed reassessment of each and every established landscape feature was not undertaken, nor was the merit of each feature reassessed against defined criteria. The ‘new’ Landscape Features are mostly the same as the ‘old’ Landscape Features, with their boundaries plotted more accurately.

4.2 If not addressed in response to the above, Council to explain:
- The basis on which land/features have been designated which are outside settlement boundaries (given that most of the designated sites are within settlements).
- The approach to areas which include dwellings/residential curtilages.
- The approach as to the significance of public visibility of the land/feature.

Response to paragraph 4.2

72. Although, as explained above, not a matter directly re-examined in detail for the purposes of the preparation of this Plan, the Council sets out below the basic approach which has informed the designation of landscape features.

73. Land/features have been designated outside settlement boundaries where they are important to the character and landscape setting of the town.

74. Dwellings/residential curtilages are included as landscape features where in combination their garden land contributes to significant ‘pools’ of private green space within the urban area, often with mature trees and shrubs that have a wider impact on the character of a neighbourhood.

75. Public visibility adds to the value of landscape features, but is not the only consideration. Landscape features can have values and benefits connected with bio-diversity, health and welling, climate change etc., without being publicly visible.
4.3 I understand that the evidence as to the additional requirements for open space by settlement is set out in BP38b Open space Profiles. This document does not appear to refer to allotments. On what evidence have the need for additional allotments in various settlements been identified? The plan makes provision for a number of new substantial areas of public open space and allotments (unrelated to any other development proposals). On what basis have these sites been selected and what alternative sites were considered and rejected?

Response to paragraph 4.3

76. Document BP38b is about public open space, not allotments. The PPG17, Sport, Recreation and Open Space Study, (Document BP13) considered the provision of allotments at a strategic level (See Section 9, pages 93 -95) and at the strategic level concluded that compared to other areas of the country there was a low level of provision of allotments in the district compared with what was considered 'in many other studies' to be a reasonable provision. The Council did not adopt the approach recommended by the PPG17 study to include a standard of allotment provision of 0.3 hectares per 1000 population, as a policy in the Core Strategy.

77. The Council decided on a different approach to allotment provision related more to the identified local need and opportunities. (See Policy CS7, document S14) In preparing the Sites and Development Management document, Town and Parish Council’s were consulted on their need/ requirement for allotment provision in their parish. This consultation provided the evidence of need for allotments. The results are summarised in the table attached in Appendix 5 to this response.)

78. Regarding the basis for selection of public open space/ allotment allocations (unrelated to any other development proposals) in preparing this Plan, the Council has not removed unimplemented proposals for public open space or allotments which were proposals of the previous local plan where it is still the intention to implement them. (Where public open space proposals of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alternation have been implemented the notation on the Proposals Map has been changed (as set out in S1, Appendix 1: Part D)). The intention remains for the unimplemented allocations made in the New Forest District Local Plan First Alternation (Document S21) to be implemented within this plan period and accordingly the proposals are carried forward into the new Local Plan.

79. All allotment allocations made in this plan (apart from those associated with development proposals), i.e. policies, TOT21 and NMT12 are proposals carried forward from the New Forest District Local Plan First Alternation (Document S21, see Policies TE-25 (now policy TOT21), and NM-18 and NM-19 (Both allocations now in policy NMT12).) No alternative sites were considered because the Council still consider these appropriate locations to address a continuing need.

80. New public open spaces unrelated to other development proposals are listed below. Again, most of these site allocations are carried forward from the New Forest District Local Plan First Alternation, or were open areas already subject to protective designations. The table indicates the relevant policy in the New Forest District Local Plan First Alternation (Document S21). Alternative sites have not been considered and rejected as part of the process of carrying forward these allocations. In relation to the two new public open space allocations (NMT10 and NMT11), there are no appropriate alternative sites that could reasonably be considered.
### Additional Public Open Space allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy No.</th>
<th>Proposal in Local Plan Part 2 (DocS1)</th>
<th>Policy in New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Doc. S21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT19</td>
<td>New public open space north east of Bartley Park</td>
<td>Proposed POS – Policy TE-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT20</td>
<td>Extension to public open space south of Bartley Park</td>
<td>(Previously land reserved for rail station (TE23), no longer required and in NFDC ownership (Check)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD6</td>
<td>New public open space south of Hardley Lane, west of Fawley Road</td>
<td>Proposed POS – Policy HD-16 Allocation extended to include land previously used as a private sports ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD7</td>
<td>New public open space west of Lower Mullins Lane</td>
<td>Proposed POS – Policy HD-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT9</td>
<td>New public open space west of Fernhill Lane</td>
<td>Proposed POS – Policy NM-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT10</td>
<td>New public open space off Culver Road</td>
<td>Green Belt (in School playing field use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT11</td>
<td>New public open space south of Lymington Road, north of Chestnut Avenue</td>
<td>Landscape feature – protected by DW-E12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RING5</td>
<td>Public Open Space Proposal, land west of Green Lane</td>
<td>Proposed POS – Policy RW13 (northern part of allocation implemented – see PM-RING-D15 in S1 Appendix 1: Part D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sustainability Appraisal of these proposals is set out in Appendix 5 of Document S11.

4.4 In relation to HYD6, paragraph 3.125 says that, in part, the proposal involves the public use of an existing private sports facility. There appears no longer to be any private sports facility on this site (all the land appears to be paddocks). Was the assumed existing facility on this site a factor in selecting this land for allocation? Does the absence of any such facility on the land alter the justification for selecting this land?

Response to paragraph 4.4.

81. Policy HYD6 (New Public Open Space south of Hardley Lane, west of Fawley Road) is carried forward from Policy HD-16 in the adopted New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21) with the addition of land to the east of the original allocation, which in the past accommodated a private sports ground.

82. Whether or not previous sports facilities are still in use did not affect the Council’s decision to carry forward this proposal (as amended) from the previous Local Plan, and to confirm the allocation of the site as public open space. However, its previous use does give an indication of the suitability of this land as an open space allocation. The allocation will help address the deficiency of formal open space.
Please indicate which sites proposed for public open space are in public ownership (County/District/Parish/Town Council). Where part of an allocated site is in public ownership please provide a plan to indicate which part. (BP38b refers to part of the Local Plan allocation off Mullins Lane, Hythe as having been acquired - p20- and to half of NM-13 at New Milton being in Council ownership – p54). Some private landowners appear opposed to the proposed use (eg HYD6, HYD7, NMT12a). On what basis does the Council consider that there are reasonable prospects of implementing such proposals? Is the cost of land acquisition included in the costs in NFDC4 (the update of the IDP)?

Response to paragraph 4.5

The submitted Local Plan Part 2 (Document S1), includes 8 new proposed public open space allocations unrelated to other developments. Of these 2 are in full public ownership and 3 are in part public ownership with the remaining 3 being in private ownership. The table below indicates the details of the ownership and, as per the Inspector’s request, where there is a part public ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ownership details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT19</td>
<td>New public open space north east of Bartley Park</td>
<td>Part owned by New Forest District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT20</td>
<td>Extension to public open space south of Bartley Park</td>
<td>Owned by New Forest District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD6</td>
<td>New public open space south of Hardley Lane, west of Fawley Road</td>
<td>In private ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD7</td>
<td>New public open space west of Lower Mullins Lane</td>
<td>Part owned by Hythe and Dibden Parish Council and part privately owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT9</td>
<td>New public open space west of Fernhill Lane</td>
<td>Part owned by New Forest District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT10</td>
<td>New public open space off Culver Road</td>
<td>Owned by New Milton Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT11</td>
<td>New public open space south of Lymington Road, north of Chestnut Avenue</td>
<td>In private ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RING5</td>
<td>Public Open Space Proposal, land west of Green Lane</td>
<td>In private ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following three plans show the new open space proposals which are in part ownership. The blue areas of land are those areas which are in private ownership, with the green hatched area delineating being publicly owned. The total area of the allocation is the area covered by these two notations combined.
TOT19 New public open space north east of Bartley Park

HYD7 New public open space west of Lower Mullins Lane.
In response to the Inspector's question regarding the cost estimates of land acquisition given in NFDC - Deliverability of Infrastructure Projects (Document NFDC4), the Council responds that the costs indicated are full project estimates to implement the proposals listed and include any land acquisition if appropriate. As these are only estimates the costs could increase/ decrease when the project is to be implemented.

The Council already has significant funds held specifically for the provision of public open space. Total funds are in excess of £3 million and the Council is actively involved in discussions with Town and Parish Councils to bring projects forward.

Pages 16 and 17 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule Context and Rationale Document (Document EVI1) set out the monies the Council has received in recent years compared to those expected to be received once the CIL charging schedule is adopted.

The Council has a process for allocating received developer contribution/ Community Infrastructure Levy money to identified projects such as the allocations in the Plan. As part of this, the Council will work closely with all stakeholders to ascertain the availability and deliverability of projects as it has during the preparation of the plan.

As stated in paragraph 5.8 of Document EVI1,

“…the IDP identifies those projects currently considered a priority to support the objectives of the Local Development Framework which total approximately £32m, these projects are set out in Appendix A of the IDP (Document EVI2). Current identified funding reduces the funding gap of priority projects to around £25m. The
Council has also identified a list of other possible projects costing over £250m for which no timeframe or budget has been identified which is set out in Appendix B of the Document EVI1. Whilst the projects in Appendix B will contribute towards the mitigation of new development and delivery of the Local Development Framework the achievement of the Local Development Framework is not dependent on it.”

90. With an expected CIL income of approximately £900k per annum, the Council believes that there are reasonable prospects of implementing the proposals.

4.6 Requirements for new open space/allotments are included in proposals for new housing allocations. Whilst for some allocations (usually the smaller sites) this requirement is directly related to that required as a result of policy CS7 (open space standards), on the larger sites it appears that additional open space provision is being required to meet existing deficiencies (e.g. TOT1, MOS1 - in the submitted plan, RING1, FORD1 and others in relation to allotments). Is the Council expecting the developer of the residential element of the proposals to provide open space/allotments beyond that required by the CS7? If so, on what basis is this justified? If not, how will the additional open space/allotments be delivered?

Response to paragraph 4.6

91. Regarding allotments, the Core Strategy (Document S14, policy CS7) made provision for the allocation of new allotment gardens, to address local needs. The Council’s view is that the delivery of allotment garden provision would be best achieved if associated with a residential development proposal as they are more likely to be implemented. As referred to in Section 2 of this response above, when considering sites for allocation, the Council sought the views of site owners/agents on their willingness to provide allotment gardens (amongst other possible development requirements) as part of development proposals for their site. The response is set out in Appendix 6. The requirement for allotments is set by the site specific policies allocating a site for development – there is no standard set in policy CS7.

92. This approach is in accordance with the vision set by the Core Strategy, that is, one of seeking to address local needs generally within the context of environmental constraints. Para. 5.2 of the Core Strategy (S14) states:

“The tensions and pressures on the Plan Area will be managed in such a way that maintain and protect the area’s special qualities, but maximise the opportunities for the needs of the local population to be met.”

93. The policy CS12 allocations are made specifically to address local needs, and where there is the opportunity to do so, the Council consider it appropriate for these allocations to address other local needs as well as the housing needs, as part of the allocation.

94. In relation to public open space, Policy CS7 sets a minimum standard for public open space provision. Under policy CS7 (b) new residential development is required to provide public open space ‘based on a minimum level of provision of 3.5ha per 1000 population’. The Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Core Strategy (Document BP30) identified the need for Appropriate Assessment of Policies CS9, CS10 and CS11 in respect of the recreational effects likely to arise from housing provision on the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. The HRA concluded that full appropriate assessment under the Habitat Regulations would not be required provided the plan
included strategic avoidance and mitigation such as the delivery of Green Infrastructure
as part of the assessment in order to avoid in-combination effects. (Document.BP30,
paragraph 1.4). The partial Appropriate Assessment of CS9, CS10 and CS11 are set out
in Section 4 of BP30. The Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Local Plan Part 2
(Document S12) sets out in Table 2.11 (page 14) the mitigation measures that were
identified in the Core Strategy and which are taken forward into relevant parts of the
Local Plan Part 2.

95. The delivery of recreational open space to mitigate the recreational impact of residential
development is a requirement necessary within this Plan Area. Where there are
opportunities and capacity to do so, the proposals of the Plan make provision for
additional allocations of open space, in excess of the minimum standard set in Policy
CS7 (Document S14), in association with the CS11/CS12 housing allocations, to
contribute towards the mitigation of recreational impacts of residential development on
the European designations.

96. Details of the delivery of allotment land and public open space are matters for site-
specific negotiations in the context of a planning application or preparation of a site
development brief. There may be cases where additional sources of funding will be
needed to ensure delivery and such funds may be available from existing S.106 open
space contributions or through the Community Infrastructure Levy. However, the starting
point for any negotiation is that open space/ allotment provision will be expected to be
made as part of the development proposals for the site, in accordance with the relevant
site-specific policy. At this stage in the process there is no evidence to suggest that the
delivery of these additional benefits is unachievable.
NFDC Response to Inspector’s Note Section 5. Other matters to clarify

5.1 TOT12 The Council proposes a change (NFDC2, Ch 3.10) to remove the employment allocation from covering the access road/visitor parking and associated land serving the football club. Many representations refer to an extant requirement in a unilateral undertaking (2008?) concerning the provision of open space/car parking on part of the allocated employment area in the submitted plan. Does this unilateral undertaking relate to the land now proposed to be removed from this allocation or does it extend over land still proposed to be allocated?

Response to paragraph 5.1

97. The unilateral undertaking relates to both the land that is now proposed to be removed from the allocation and the land that is still proposed to be allocated.

5.2 RING4.1 and TOT15.2 are town centre car parks identified as town centre opportunity sites for retail development. On what evidence is the Council satisfied that there would remain sufficient car parking to serve the needs of the respective town centres if these sites were developed?

Response to paragraph 5.2

98. The District Council has undertaken car park surveys in Ringwood and Totton. The most recent data is for December 2010.

99. In Totton the survey data of public car parks indicated the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTTON</th>
<th>Total spaces available - 513</th>
<th>Empty</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>% Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pm</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100. In addition, there are other car parks in the town centre (not operated by the District Council), including the Asda car park in the town centre which has 499 spaces. Survey information provided by Asda in association with a planning application in 2010, indicated that their car park was (as a maximum) 90% full on Fridays and 89% full on Saturdays.

101. The Town Centre Opportunity site, TOT15.2, is currently a private car park associated with Totton Shopping Centre. The TOT15.2 site is part of a car parking area, currently providing 57 car parking spaces (not all of which would necessarily be lost.)

102. Based on this evidence the Council is satisfied that there would remain sufficient car parking.

103. In Ringwood the survey data of public car parks indicated the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RINGWOOD</th>
<th>Total spaces available</th>
<th>Empty</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>% Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>am</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>657</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* More recent count 817 spaces)

104. In addition there are 212 car parking spaces in the Waitrose car park in the town centre. Survey information is not available for the use of this.

105. The Town Centre Opportunity Site RING4.1 would utilise land currently used for car parking. However, it would not be the Council’s intention to permit a development which resulted in a net loss of car parking in Ringwood Town Centre. The Council would expect replacement car parking spaces to be provided as part of a development, and increased provision made if feasible and environmentally acceptable. In this way the Council will ensure that sufficient car parking to serve the needs of the town centre continues to be provided.

5.3 TOT15.2 (Library Road car park) would appear to come within the area defined as subject to TOT16 (Civic building complex) (p173 of Appendix 1). The latter policy limits the uses in this area and does not include retail. How are the 2 policies intended to operate? Are the 2 policies compatible?

Response to paragraph 5.3

106. There is no overlap between these two policies. Town centre opportunity area TOT15.2, relates to the area of car parking lying directly to the west and behind the shops in Totton Precinct, as shown by the small purple dot on Map TOT-TC1 (page 59, Document S1). TOT16 applies to the area shown in Appendix 1: Part F of the submitted Plan (Document S1), on page 173 – Proposals Map change number PM-TOT-F2. There are no incompatibility issues between the two policies.

5.4 What is the main aim of policy TOT16 - the protection of visual civic character or buildings for public services? What happens if, in the future, there are not sufficient operational public services to make effective use of this town centre land/buildings? Is the policy sufficiently flexible to accommodate change?

Response to paragraph 5.4

107. Policy TOT16 is carried forward without change from the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21, policy TE6, page 327). The aim of TOT16 is to continue to retain this well established hub of civic and community uses that is in an accessible location within the town centre. (Within the District, this feature is unique to Totton.) The Council regards this hub of civic and community uses to be a positive benefit to the community which should continue to be safeguarded in the future. The policy gives flexibility for change within the mix of civic and community use, so that if any of the current uses cease, this site will provide an opportunity for new civic or community
uses to be provided in an accessible town centre location in Totton. The policy is compatible with Policy CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy (Document S14). The term ‘community uses’ is a wider definition than the ‘public services’ referred to in the Inspector’s question. The policy does not seek to restrict future uses within this area to those provided by the public sector.

5.5 **TOT20**: The Hants and IOW Wildlife Trust refer to this site as a SINC. It is not shown as such on the Proposals Map. Has it been identified as a SINC since that map was produced? If it is a SINC, will public open space use be compatible with retention of the qualities which led to its recognition as a SINC?

**Response to paragraph 5.5**

108. The SINC relating to the proposed Public Open Space south of Bartley Park, is not shown on the Proposals Map as the Council is proposing not to show any SINCS on the Proposals Map in future. SINCs are local nature conservation designations made at County level and are subject to regular review and change. The SINC in this location is not a new designation. It was in place when the site was previously identified for a railway station in the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21, policy TE-23 page 334). The new allocation as informal open space can be compatible with the SINC designation through effective management measures.

5.6 **LYM2**: Is the site/would the development be visible from the National Park boundary to the north and if so what is the significance of this visibility (SA Appendix 2 indicates No. Rep 389 Wates Developments, Site Appraisal by WYG indicates Yes –see their appraisal plan.) What assessment did the Council make of the affect of the development on the setting of the Buckland Conservation Area?

**Response to paragraph 5.6**

109. The SA assessment of land north of Alexandra Road is set out on pages 274-277 in Annex 2 of document S11. The Inspector’s questions relate in particular to SA Objective 10: Maintain, enhance and create high quality landscape, townscape and seascape. The Council’s appraisal scores the site as having ‘negligible effect likely’ relating to the criterion ‘Will it protect the landscape character of the New Forest National Park and the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB?’ and scores it as having ‘minor negative effect likely’ relating to protection of the character of the countryside and coast/towns and villages’.

110. Visibility of a site from the New Forest National Park is not in itself an assessment criterion, although it is a factor which has a bearing on the criterion ‘Will the development have an impact on locally important views and setting?’ which for the Alexandra Road site was scored as having ‘minor negative effect likely’ (Document S11, Annex 2, page 277). While there would appear to be differences in opinion on whether or not the LYM2 site is visible from the National Park between Representation 389 and the SA Report, this is not a matter which has had a significant influence on decisions about site allocations. Significant areas of development in the towns and villages within the Plan Area are very visible from the National Park. In several locations, including around Lymington, the National Park Boundary abuts the settlement boundary. While the Council accepts it may be just about possible to get a distant glimpse of this site at certain points along Sway Road (although the National Park boundary actually lies to the
north side of Sway Road), the Council does not consider this to be a matter of significance.

111. The impact of the development of the LYM2 site on the Buckland Conservation Area is assessed under the criterion ‘Will it protect, maintain and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites and historic landscapes?’ It was scored as having ‘negligible effect likely’. It should be noted that residential development already adjoins the Buckland Conservation Area boundary, immediately to the south of the Conservation Area, and closer to the conservation area than the LYM2 site.

5.7 NMT1: Representation 327 highlights repeated flooding in the vicinity of this site and flood water storage and/or escape over the proposed site. The SFRA identifies a Localised Flooding Area which appears to encroach on part of the site (NFO18 surface run off and gulley overflow in SFRA, Tile G, Background Paper 28), but flood risk is not acknowledged in the SA. What conclusion does the Council draw from the SFRA (and any other local knowledge) as to flood risk on and around this site? Has flood risk been adequately taken into account in selecting this site? Should the policy requirements for this development address any flood risk?

Response to paragraph 5.7

112. The Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) indicates that the proposed allocation site lies within Flood Zone 1 where, with regard to flood risk, development should be acceptable. The Environment Agency has made no specific comment regarding flood risk on this site.

113. On the basis of historic records provided by the Council’s Land Drainage Service, the SFRA indicates that there have been a number of localised flood events in the vicinity. The map appears to indicate that these events have mainly occurred to the east of the proposed allocation site, although one event covers the site itself. There is also a ‘Localised Flooding Area’ covering an area south of Gore Road and Milton Mead to the east of the site. It appears that these localised events have resulted from blocked culverts, and surface water run-off from surrounding areas overburdening drains.

114. Advice from the Council’s Land Drainage Service regarding the proposed allocation is as follows:-

“All surface water from the site must be dealt with on the site. The drainage of surface water on this site must be considered at a very early stage in the development process and details based on an actual on-site investigation should be submitted with or prior to the planning application. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required with the Planning Application. Planning approval should not be considered before the submitted surface water drainage proposals have been approved based on on-site soakage tests.

The current design specification for drainage will be a 1 in 100 year storm + climate change”

115. The requirement for proposals to provide a Flood Risk Assessment on sites where flood risk might be an issue is contained in Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. However, given the historical context of localised flooding in proximity to this site, and advice from the Council’s Land Drainage Service, it is considered that the NMT1 policy could usefully include a clause to highlight the need for a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment. The Council is happy to be guided by the Inspector on this matter.
5.8 SOP1 To understand the Council’s position prior to posing questions for discussion, Council to explain:

- What is the problem or harm that the Council is seeking to address by having a policy for this particular site?

Response to paragraph 5.8

116. Sopley Camp/Merryfield Park is a site of some 11 hectares lying in the Green Belt and adjoining the New Forest National Park, to the west of Bransgore. The ‘camp’ was established during the Second World War, although the buildings on site date from the early 1950’s. Permanent occupation by the RAF ceased in 1974. The site has been subject to Green Belt policies since 1958. 91 of the utilitarian former military structures (mostly single storey buildings), together with interconnecting paths and roads remain on the site. There are also significant areas of undeveloped land - open grass and trees - within the site.

117. The main harm that is being addressed is the continuing issues relating to the non-authorised use of the buildings on the site, which in themselves have a harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

118. The policy SOP1 in the submitted Local Plan Part 2 (Document S1) is seeking to provide an appropriate planning policy framework which will enable the long term future of the Sopley Camp site to be resolved in a way appropriate to its Green Belt location. Its purpose is to prevent inappropriate development which would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt whilst resolving the long term issues the Council has faced when dealing with this site. In preparing the new Local Plan the Council has recognised the need to review its previous policy for the Sopley Camp site. Previous planning policies in successive adopted Local Plans (set out in Appendix 7) have successfully prevented inappropriate development within the Green Belt, but have not been successful in achieving the full and proper restoration of the site. Return of the site to agricultural and/or forestry uses had been an aim of previous Local Plan policies.

119. The Local Plan policy for the site, in the adopted New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21), Policy SC-1 states:

“Policy SC-1 Sopley Camp
Development involving the re-use of land and existing buildings at Sopley Camp will not be permitted.”

120. This policy was carried forward, without review, from the New Forest District Local Plan adopted in 1999. The New Forest District Local Plan policy was based on the policy in the previous Local Plan for the area, the Avon Valley Local Plan, which was adopted in June 1988. The Avon Valley Local Plan policy CP11 stated:

“Policy CP.11 Development at the former RAF Sopley Camp will not be permitted. The Local Planning Authority will encourage the full and proper restoration of the site to forestry or agriculture.”

121. The policy in the Avon Valley Local Plan was one that reflected a planning appeal decision by the Secretary of State into proposals for a residential development on the Sopley Camp site at the time of the Avon Valley Local Plan Public Inquiry. (The Public Inquiry on the planning application appeal was held concurrently with the Public Inquiry...
for the Avon Valley Local Plan in 1986.) Comments made in the Secretary of State’s decision on the planning appeal had a significant influence on subsequent planning policies for the Sopley Camp site. In particular the following comments are made in para. 5 of the Secretary of State’s decision letter (Attached as Appendix 8):

“5...a benefit of the proposed development would be to ensure the clearance of the existing buildings and to avoid the possibility of them becoming derelict. However, bearing in mind the existing natural cover and the possibility of additional growth, he agrees with the Inspector that even if the site was to become derelict, it would not substantially detract from the appearance of the area”

122. The site was sold by the Ministry of Defence in 1989. Since the early 1990s there has been extensive investigation and enforcement action, including various appeals and court action, taken over considerable periods of time regarding unauthorised activities taking place on the site. It is in an attempt to secure a stable and appropriate future for the Sopley Camp site that the Council has revised the previous Local Plan policy, to replace it with one that seeks a comprehensive site restoration, to be enabled by a limited amount of development.

- **What is the primary objective of the Council in encouraging redevelopment?**

123. Policy SOP1 does not refer to encouraging ‘redevelopment’. The Council is only encouraging ‘redevelopment’ of the site in the context of a framework of a comprehensive site restoration plan. Policy SOP1 states that ‘the aim is to return most of the Sopley Camp site to agriculture and forestry, and significantly improve the environmental appearance of the site’. The policy accepts that to achieve restoration of the site some form of enabling development will be required. It is considered that the previous Local Plan policies have not been successful in achieving the restoration of the site to countryside uses as they provided no opportunity for any enabling development.

- **Why is agriculture and forestry the required primary future land use?**

124. Agriculture and forestry are the required primary future land uses for the site because this is a site in the countryside, in the Green Belt and adjoining a National Park. A significant part of the site is undeveloped.

- **Why do all existing buildings need to be removed as part of any future development?**

125. The basis of the policy is to achieve a comprehensive restoration of the site. In doing so the Council wishes to see the future of the whole site appropriately resolved. The exclusion of parts of the site from the restoration plan, with the retention of existing buildings, may lead to continuing planning enforcement issues on the site. The Council may look favourably on the retention of a few of the existing buildings on the site, perhaps as a reminder of its history, but this would need to be a matter considered at a detailed planning stage in a site Development Brief or in the context of negotiations on a planning application.

- **Why is the nature and scale of redevelopment to be capped at that necessary to achieve financial viability (i.e. assessed as enabling development) rather than being assessed solely in relation to physical planning considerations (openness of the Green Belt; visual and traffic impact etc)?**
126. The ‘cap’ on development is as set out in the first paragraph of policy SOP1 (Document S1), in that the resulting development should have a reduced impact on the openness of the Green Belt compared with the former military camp buildings and structures. If the impact of any resulting development is greater than the impact of the existing development, then there are no environmental gains to justify development in this Green Belt location. To be clear, this is not a location where allocations for either housing or employment development would be consistent with the spatial strategy in the adopted Core Strategy. (Document S14). (There was discussion on this matter at the Core Strategy Examination hearing sessions, but the Inspector made no reference to it in his report, and made no changes to the Core Strategy in response to the evidence given by representees on this matter in the hearing session).

127. The financial viability factor comes into play to ensure that the level of development on this site is kept to the minimum level necessary to achieve the site restoration. The Council will not accept viability reasons as a justification for a scheme that will have greater impact than the existing buildings and structures on the openness of the Green Belt. Given the history of the site and with regard to previous Local Plan policies and the Secretary of State’s comments on the site in 1987, the Council considers it appropriate to seek to minimise the impact on the Green Belt of any future development on this site and secure the long awaited environmental gains.

- How is the policy consistent with NPPF in relation to Green Belts, particularly paragraph 89?

128. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework gives six categories of development which is acceptable within the Green Belt as exceptions. Each area considered in turn in relation to SOP1:

- buildings for agriculture and forestry;

129. Policy SOP1 allows for agricultural and forestry uses.

- provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

130. The Council would regard such uses as consistent with policy SOP1

- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

131. This policy is more permissive than the Green Belt policy previously set out in PPG2. Local Plan Policy (SC-1, Document S21, page 224) did not allow extension or alteration of the existing buildings. The Council’s view that the application of this new Green Belt policy on the Sopley Camp site, given the high number of individual buildings scattered across the site, could have a material impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this area.

- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

132. The authorised use of the site is: “Training or rest camp on an occasional basis including day and residential training, education and activity courses and ancillary uses”. In addition, a handful of the buildings have Certificates of Lawfulness for various uses, but mainly storage. Replacement buildings for these purposes would not be incompatible with policy SOP1 (NFDC1).
133. The site is not within a village in the Green Belt. Given that a suitable site has not been identified in Bransgore to make provision under Policy CS12 (g) (NFDC1, page 53) for up to around 10 dwellings to address identified local needs for affordable housing, the Council would consider such a use acceptable in principle on this site, and therefore the policy is compatible with the NPPF, paragraph 89 in this respect.

134. The Council consider policy SOP1 accords with the intentions of this part of NPPF paragraph 89. It is accepted that the Council’s policy wording uses the phase that the resulting development ‘should have a reduced impact on the openness of the Green Belt’, whereas the NPPF refers to not having a ‘greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt’. Clearly in practice the difference between these two judgements is marginal. However, again in view of this particular site’s history and the view expressed about the site by the Secretary of State in the 1987 appeal decision, the Council believe it appropriate to seek if possible to reduce the impact of this site on the openness of the Green Belt if there is an opportunity to do so. In any event, policy SOP1 is consistent with this criterion of paragraph 89, in that it would prevent development which would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Council to provide a copy of the decision on which paragraph E11.20 of the adopted Local Plan (S21) is based (The Secretary of State has supported the view…) and any assessment of the appropriate policy for this site made by the Inspector conducting the last Local Plan Inquiry.

135. The appeal decision referred to is attached as Appendix 8). The last Local Plan Inspector to consider the policy for Sopley Camp was the Inspector for the Public Inquiry into the New Forest District Local Plan in 1996/7. The relevant extract from his report is attached as Appendix 9). (The matter was not considered at the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration Local Plan Inquiry as policy SC-1 was not a reviewed policy.)

5.9 FORD1: The SA of this site does not refer to proximity (5km) to the Dorset Heaths SPA (Annex 2 p 94), but other (rejected) sites (e.g. FORD 02/FORD 19) on either side are said to be within 5km. Has the SA correctly addressed this point? If not, the impact will need to be assessed.

Response to paragraph 5.9

136. In response to the Inspector’s question regarding the proximity of the Fordingbridge sites to the Dorset Heaths SPA, the Council confirms that FORD1 and FORD 19 are at a distance greater than 5km from the Dorset Heath SPA. Distance from the Dorset Heaths SPA is only mentioned in the SA when it is less than 5km and therefore an issue.

137. The FORD 1 site is more than 5km from the Dorset Heaths SPA, and therefore the distance of the site from the SPA is not stated in the summary in the Sustainability Appraisal (Document S11).
138. In the SA report (Document S11, Annex 2, page 118), the Council has incorrectly stated that site FORD 19 was within 5km of the Dorset Heaths SPA when in fact it is further than 5km from the Dorset Heath SPA. FORD2 is within 5km of the Dorset Heath SPA, as stated in the SA.

139. Subject to the correction relating to FORD19 (a non-allocated site) this matter is addressed correctly in the SA Report. (Document S11).

5.10 ASH1 Does development of this site require access over land in the ownership of 6/9 Jubilee Crescent (see rep 348)? Council to provide a copy of the appeal decision referred to in rep 348 regarding land to the rear of 4 Jubilee Crescent.

Response to paragraph 5.10

140. With regard to access to this proposed allocation site, the Inspector’s attention is drawn to a plan submitted by the site owners (in response to the Council’s questions regarding deliverability) which shows that the owners retain right of access to the site (see Appendix 10). This appears to demonstrate that access to the site can be achieved from Jubilee Crescent.

141. The relevant appeal decision referred to by Rep. 348 is provided at Appendix 11 for the Inspector’s attention. The decision concerns land to the rear of 7-11 Jubilee Road, to the west of Jubilee Crescent and to be accessed from the turning head in Jubilee Crescent.

142. In the Council’s view, this decision has no bearing on the principle of development on the proposed allocation site.
Appendix 1: No. of households on NFDC Homeseach Register

Figure 1: August 2012 by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Relevant CS12 allocation proposed</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaulieu</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boldre / Pilley / Norley Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook / Bramshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockenhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copythorne / Bartley</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Lodge</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Boldre/East End</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exbury / Lepe</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netley Marsh / Woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sway</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashurst / Colbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breamore</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransgore</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damerham</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellingham/Harbridge/Ibsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godshill</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopley</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodgreen</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandleheath</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford-on-Sea</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchwood</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordingbridge</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibden / Dibden Purlieu</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmore</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eling</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calshot</td>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfield and Langley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbury and Hardley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymington</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Milton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkford</td>
<td></td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: People can choose multiple parishes so there is considerable overlap.
Figure 2: Number on Homesearch Register – Annual snapshots at end of March

**Number in Housing Need on Homesearch Register**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority cases</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>4,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Blue: Number in Housing Need on Homesearch Register - Priority cases
- Red: Number in Housing Need on Homesearch Register - No Priority
Appendix 2: Form sent for completion to site owners/ agents

Form to be completed and returned to Policy and Plans Team by 06.09.10

e-mail to: policyandplans@nfdc.gov.uk

| Site: |  |
| Site Ref.No: |  |
| Core Strategy policy the development to be considered under: |  |
| Site Area: |  |
| Information provided by: |  |
| Contact details for requests for further information: |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Response (Attach supporting documents as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Access | Can safe access to the site be achieved?  
Do you control all land required to provide the access?  
Provide details of proposed access arrangements. |
| 2. Affordable Housing | Confirm the development will comply with Core Strategy Policy CS15(b) and provide a minimum 70% affordable housing, including a minimum 40% social rented and 30% intermediate affordable housing. If not, say what affordable housing you would provide.  
Provide details of your proposal to show how it would comply with CS15(b). |
| 3. Public Open Space | Confirm that the development would include provision for public open space (including play space for children/young people) in accordance with Policy CS7.  
Give details of the public open space which would be provided on-site. (Area, type) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Allotments</strong></th>
<th>There is a need for allotments in the area. Give details of any provision you would make for allotments as part of a development in this area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Other community benefits</strong></td>
<td>Please give details of any other community benefit which you would provide as part of development proposals for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Other supporting information</strong></td>
<td>Please give details of any additional supporting information you wish to be taken into account.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Response to letter August 2010 regarding provision of affordable housing in accordance with policy CS15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>CS allocation policy</th>
<th>Guidance figure for no. of dwellings</th>
<th>Potential no. of affordable dwellings</th>
<th>Owner / Agent confirmed compliance with policy CS15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT1</td>
<td>Land at Durley Farm, Hounsdown</td>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT2</td>
<td>Land at Loperwood Farm</td>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR1</td>
<td>Land between Cracknore Hard Lane and Normandy Way Land at Park’s Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR2</td>
<td>Land between Cracknore Hard Lane and Normandy Way Land at Park’s Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR3</td>
<td>Land south of Hythe Road</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR1</td>
<td>Land between Cracknore Hard Lane and Normandy Way Land at Park’s Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR2</td>
<td>Land between Cracknore Hard Lane and Normandy Way Land at Park’s Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR3</td>
<td>Land south of Hythe Road</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD1</td>
<td>Land at Forest Lodge Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLA1</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYM1</td>
<td>Pinetops Nurseries</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYM2</td>
<td>Land north of Alexandra Road Land north of School Lane</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoS1</td>
<td>Land north of Alexandra Road Land north of School Lane</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR1</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 155-169 Everton Road, Hordle</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR2</td>
<td>Land at Hordle Lane Nursery</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT1</td>
<td>Land south of Gore Road, east of the Old Barn</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT4</td>
<td>Land east of Caird Avenue, south of Carrick Way woodland (Residential, business and employment development)</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RING3</td>
<td>Land south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane and adjacent to Crow Arch Lane</td>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORD1</td>
<td>Land east of Whitsbury Road, Fordingbridge</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH1</td>
<td>Land adjoining Jubilee Crescent, Ashford</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAND1</td>
<td>Land to west of Scout Centre, south of Station Road</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | | 857 | 550 |

? Indicates positive response subject to caveat.
## Appendix 4: Housing allocations and back-up grazing land status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Status of land regarding back-up grazing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT1</td>
<td>Land at Durley Farm, Hounsdown</td>
<td>Currently/recently used as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT2</td>
<td>Land at Loperwood Farm</td>
<td>Potential for use as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT3</td>
<td>Land at Hanger Farm, Totton</td>
<td>Potential for back-up grazing but has no commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR2</td>
<td>Land at Park's Farm</td>
<td>Historically used as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR3</td>
<td>Land south of Hythe Road</td>
<td>Potential for use as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD1</td>
<td>Land at Forest Lodge Farm</td>
<td>Potential for use as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYM2</td>
<td>Land north of Alexandra Road</td>
<td>Currently/recently used as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR1</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 155-169 Everton Road, Hordle</td>
<td>Potential for use as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT1</td>
<td>Land south of Gore Road, east of the Old Barn</td>
<td>Potential for use as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT4</td>
<td>Land east of Caird Avenue, south of Carrick Way woodland (Residential, business and employment development)</td>
<td>Potential for back-up grazing following restoration of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RING3</td>
<td>Land south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane and adjacent to Crow Arch Lane</td>
<td>Currently/recently used as back-up grazing land and has commoning rights attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 5: Parish Council Allotment Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Allotments Required?</th>
<th>Level of existing provision</th>
<th>Numbers on waiting list</th>
<th>Approximate waiting times</th>
<th>Parish assessment of level of provision needed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milford on Sea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>10-15 plots</td>
<td>Have land available but unable to provide infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28 plots</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5+ years</td>
<td>20 plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Milton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100 plots</td>
<td>65 (waiting list closed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchwood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>There is no need for additional provision now but looking to the future it is possible that additional land could be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe &amp; Dibden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>158 plots</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>24-30 months</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 plots</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>44 half and quarter plots</td>
<td>Are interested in creating allotments at Deneside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>322 plots</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2 years+</td>
<td>50 plots</td>
<td>Possible location could be on the open space adjacent to Hawkers Close off Salisbury Road or HCC land adjacent to Salmon Leap allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransgore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandleheath</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good provision on private site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum size of allotment site – 10 plots of 10 rods + paths (total 0.28ha)

(At 2011)
## Appendix 6: Landowners/agents response to letter in August 2010 regarding provision of allotments as part of a development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>CS allocation policy</th>
<th>Guidance figure for no. of dwellings</th>
<th>Allotment provision required in allocation policy</th>
<th>Owner / Agent comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOT1</td>
<td>Land at Durley Farm, Hounsdown</td>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rep 250 (Site layout provides 10 allotments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT2</td>
<td>Land at Loperwood Farm</td>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR1</td>
<td>Land between Cracknore Hard Lane and Normandy Way</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR2</td>
<td>Land at Park’s Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provision to be made – may be off-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR3</td>
<td>Land south of Hythe Road</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYD1</td>
<td>Land at Forest Lodge Farm</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not willing to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLA1</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Blackfield Primary School</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Will only provide if viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYM1</td>
<td>Pinetops Nurseries</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYM2</td>
<td>Land north of Alexandria Road</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Can accommodate if there is a demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoS1</td>
<td>Land north of School Lane</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To be agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR1</td>
<td>Land to the rear of 155-169 Everton Road, Hordle</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR2</td>
<td>Land at Hordle Lane Nursery</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Off-site provision will be made if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT1</td>
<td>Land south of Gore Road, east of the Old Barn</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMT4</td>
<td>Land east of Caird Avenue, south of Carrick Way woodland (Residential, business and employment development)</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The site has capacity to accommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RING3</td>
<td>Land south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane and adjacent to Crow Arch Lane</td>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Will provide to a standard of 0.3ha per 1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORD1</td>
<td>Land east of Whitsbury Road, Fordingbridge</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Will make provision related to the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH1</td>
<td>Land adjoining Jubilee</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAND1</td>
<td>Crescent, Ashford Land to west of Scout Centre, south of Station Road</td>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Policies for Sopley Camp

Extracts from the New Forest District Local Plan Adopted in November 1999 and
the Avon Valley Local Plan Adopted in June 1988
E11.20 In view of the transportation and environmental constraints in a sensitive area containing a number of industries, this site should not be regarded as a potential strategic resource in the same way as, for example the former Marchwood Power Station site.

E11.21 The local planning authority accepts that the site may continue in some form of power generation use. Policies for this site are therefore directed to reducing the substantial environmental and visual impact of this installation.

E11.22 A general policy on power generation is at Policy DW-P1, Section C11.

Gordleton Pit, Lymington

Policy GP-1
Gordleton Pit

3.00 hectares of land adjoining the Gordleton Pit Industrial Estate, Sway Road, Lymington, is allocated for industrial and business development. Development of the site for storage or distribution uses will not be permitted. Access shall be gained from an extension of the existing industrial service road.

E11.23 This site adjoins the existing industrial area and the allocation is carried over from the previous local plan. In view of the visually exposed nature of the site, particularly from the south, a generous landscape buffer is required to reduce the visual impact of the development on the surrounding countryside. The local road network is considered inadequate to accommodate traffic associated with Class B8 storage and warehousing uses.

Sopley Camp

Policy SC-1
Sopley Camp

Development involving the re-use of land and existing buildings at Sopley Camp will not be permitted.

E11.24 Sopley Camp lies east of Sopley village, adjoining Bransgore. It is an ex-RAF domestic site originating from the time of the Second World War. The camp area, which lies on the north side of Derritt Lane, comprises some 15 hectares of land on which there are some 100 existing buildings and many substantial trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The site was formerly part of the Manners Estate and has been subject to Green Belt policies since 1958.
AVON VALLEY LOCAL PLAN

Adopted

JUNE 1988
Other Hamlets

4.32 There are a number of other scattered groups of houses in the Plan area, such as at Upper and Lower Burgate, Tinkers Cross, Hangersley Hill, Hightown, Crow and Ripley.

POLICIES FOR THE VILLAGES

Policy CP.9
THE VILLAGES
DEVELOPMENT WITHIN BICKTON, IBSLEY, HARBIDGE AND SOPLEY VILLAGES, AND OTHER HAMLETS WILL BE LIMITED TO THAT WHICH IS NORMALLY PERMITTED IN THE COUNTRYSIDE (INCLUDING THE NEW FOREST HERITAGE AREA WHERE APPROPRIATE) (SEE POLICIES CP.3, AND CP.4).

CP.9.1 The few small villages in the area are either of a very dispersed character in countryside of high landscape or ecological value; have no further opportunities for infilling; or it is considered that any additional development would be detrimental to their character.

Policy CP.10
LOCAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES IN VILLAGES
IN THE VILLAGES OF BICKTON, HARBIDGE, IBSLEY, SANDLEHEATH AND SOPLEY, PROPOSALS INTENDED DIRECTLY TO MAINTAIN THE VIABILITY OF EXISTING ESSENTIAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES, OR TO PROVIDE NEW ONES (SUCH AS VILLAGE HALLS, LOCAL SHOPS, POST OFFICES, CEMETERIES AND MEDICAL FACILITIES) WILL BE CONSIDERED SYMPATHECTICALLY BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY, PROVIDING THE GENERAL PLANNING CRITERIA ARE MET. (POLICY GC.1, CHAPTER 2)

SOPLEY CAMP

4.33 East of Sopley Village, closer to Brangore is Sopley Camp, an ex-RAF Domestic site originating from the time of the second World War. The camp area on the north side of Derritt Lane comprises 15 ha. (37.5 acres) on which there are some 100 existing buildings with many substantial trees. About 2.8 ha. (7 acres) of the site is playing fields. The site was formerly part of the Manners Estate.

4.34 The Local Planning Authority looked closely at Sopley Camp when considering the possible options for locating new housing development, to meet the requirements of the South West Hampshire Structure Plan's policies for its Western Sub-Area. Notwithstanding the considerable difficulties of locating new
housing in the Local Plan without prejudicing the primary conservation objective of the Structure Plan, or having an adverse environmental effect on neighbouring towns in the Plan area, the Local Planning Authority rejected Sopley Camp as a site suitable for residential development.

4.35 The site has been subject to Green Belt policies since 1958, its institutional use in this case being considered to be compatible with its Green Belt status. Use of the developed part of the site for institutional purposes could lawfully be continued and the existing buildings retained.

4.36 The Secretary of State for the Environment, in dismissing a planning appeal against the refusal of planning permission for residential development on the site, heard concurrently with the Public Local Inquiry into objections to the Local Plan, supported the view that proposals for restoring the site to agriculture and forestry are economic and viable. He further agreed that with the existing natural cover, even if the site was to become derelict, it would not substantially detract from the appearance of the area.

Policy CP.II
SOPLEY CAMP

DEVELOPMENT AT THE FORMER RAF SOPLEY CAMP WILL NOT BE PERMITTED. THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY WILL ENCOURAGE THE FULL AND PROPER RESTORATION OF THE SITE TO FORESTRY OR AGRICULTURE.

CP.II.1 If required to meet local needs the Local Planning Authority would give favourable consideration to the retention of the existing playing fields within an overall scheme for restoration.
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E.S. Johnson BA FRICS FRTPA, Chief Planning Officer
New Forest District Council, Lyndhurst, Hampshire.

Reference numbers relate to policies in the Written Statement

CP6-10, AU1-14, E10-12, T1, S10, CONS4-6, R13-15, R17-21, CS2-3, CS8-7
Appendix 8: Appeal Decision Reference: APP/B1740/A/86/46488 relating former RAF Camp Sopley
Secretary of State Decision letter dated 5 March 1987
SIR

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971 - SECTION 36
APPEAL BY MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
APPLICATION NO. 030714

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to say that consideration has been given to the report of the Inspector, Mr W A Wood, FICE, who held a local inquiry into your clients' appeal under Section 36 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971 against the decision of the New Forest District Council to refuse outline planning permission for residential development including amenity open space on the former RAF Camp Sopley, Berritt Lane, Bramsgore, Hants. A copy of the report is enclosed.

2. The Inspector's conclusions for this appeal and those relating more generally to housing strategy and to the identification of housing sites in the Avon Valley Local Plan (AVLP) are reproduced in the annexes to this letter. He recommended that the appeal be dismissed.

3. The Secretary of State has given careful consideration to the Inspector's conclusions and to all the arguments for and against the proposed development. He notes that the whole of the appeal site lies within the Green Belt as defined in the approved Structure Plan for S.W Hampshire (SWHSP) where there is a presumption against development except for the essential requirements of agriculture and forestry. He further notes that the whole of the site is included in the Green Belt as proposed in the AVLP. He is aware that the Local Plan is currently on deposit and has not yet been adopted but he thinks that weight needs to be given to the fact that the site has been subject to green belt policies since 1958. Furthermore, he notes that the site currently has an institutional use appropriate to a rural area. In all the circumstances, the Secretary of State sees no reason to think that the site should not continue to be subject to the green belt policies set out in the Structure Plan, pending the determination of detailed boundaries in the Local Plan.

4. There is no disagreement among the parties that a 5 year supply of housing land has been identified in the AVLP, so there is no presumption in favour of the proposed development as described in Circular 15/84. Whilst the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that the housing allocation in the AVLP is likely to result in a shortfall in the order of 20 to 40 dwellings on the SWHSP requirement, he also agrees with the Inspector that such a shortfall is too small to justify the release of the appeal site for housing.
5. The Secretary of State shares the Inspector's view that Lord Nannett's proposals for returning the site to agriculture and forestry are economically viable and, whilst he accepts there can be no assumption that Lord Nannett will in fact acquire the site, he agrees with the Inspector that some agricultural or woodland use can be made of it. He accepts that a benefit of the proposed development would be to ensure the clearance of the existing buildings and so to avoid the possibility of them becoming derelict. However, bearing in mind the existing natural cover and the possibility of additional growth, he agrees with the Inspector that even if the site was to become derelict, it would not substantially detract from the appearance of the area.

6. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that any agricultural advantage to be gained by developing the appeal site instead of other sites allocated for residential development elsewhere in the plan area would be very small. He also agrees with the Inspector that there would be no benefit to the village of Bransgore from the proposed development. He notes that in the adopted Forest and Downlands Villages Local Plan the green belt boundary is tightly drawn around the existing built-up area of Bransgore but he agrees with the Inspector that, if residential development of the appeal site were allowed, it would be difficult to argue that the strip of open land between the appeal site and the village fulfilled a green belt function and that the pressure to develop the gap would be very difficult to resist. He also agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that further expansion of the village of Bransgore would be detrimental to its character. He considers it important in this context to uphold the vital role of the Green Belt, as set out in Circular 14/84, in checking the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas and safeguarding the surrounding countryside from further encroachment.

7. The Secretary of State has given due weight to the Government's policy, reiterated most recently in Circular 14/85, that there is a presumption in favour of allowing applications for development unless there are overriding objections and there is a need to encourage employment and to provide the right conditions for economic growth. However, Circular 14/85 also confirms that the Government remains firmly committed to the protection of the Green Belts. Accordingly, having regard to the fact that the appeal site has been subject to green belt policies for a number of years and that it is proposed in the Local Plan to include it in the permanent Green Belt, the Secretary of State concludes that this objection constitutes a clear planning objection which outweighs the points in favour of the proposal, even when they are taken together. For these reasons he accepts the Inspector's recommendation and hereby dismisses your client's appeal.

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant

R W HIRST
Authorised by the Secretary of State
to sign in that behalf
CONCLUSIONS

Bearing in mind the above facts:-

The approved SHWSP defines this area as green belt and the only exclusions from the green belt are the existing built up areas and extensions to them. Bransgore is the only existing built up area near Sopley Camp and in the adopted FDVLP the green belt boundary is tightly drawn around the existing built up area and no expansion of the village is proposed. The appeal site is outside the village and separated from it by a strip of open country and though it is in the AVLP area and not within the FDVLP it is clearly within the green belt as defined in the Structure Plan policy C.1.1. The original use as an RAF domestic site and its later use for refugees was as a self contained community and though it was primarily residential in character it was an institutional use of the whole site and not an ordinary residential area with individual dwellings. As such it appears not to conflict with Structure Plan policy C.1.2 which allows institutional uses in the green belt. The proposal is to confine new development to the area which is already developed and not to increase the ground area covered by buildings but this would be an ordinary housing estate which would not be contiguous with the rest of the village of Bransgore. This would conflict with national and local policies for the protection of the green belt and the main issue in this case is whether the circumstances are such as to override these policies.

The MOD have no further use for the camp and propose to sell it to the highest bidder whether planning permission is granted or not. Though policy CPI1 of the AVLP would allow alternative uses of the existing buildings no use has been identified which would ensure their continued maintenance. The only realistic alternative uses for the site appear to be to return it to agriculture and woodland, which the council prefer, or to redevelop it. There were 4 main reasons argued as to why redevelopment should be allowed to outweigh the green belt objection:

1. Use for agriculture and woodland would not be economic and the buildings would not be likely to be cleared and the whole site would become derelict.

2. The use of this land for development would avoid using better land elsewhere.

3. There would be benefits to Bransgore.

4. The AVLP has not allocated enough land to meet the requirements of SHWSP policy H.1.1.

There is no dispute that it would not be economic to clear the whole of the camp including the roads and hard standings for an agricultural or woodland use. I am not however convinced that such extensive clearance would be necessary. The
playing fields, which are 2.8 ha in extent, could be returned to agriculture with little or no work. The remaining area where the buildings are located about 12.3 ha of which about a fifth is built development. Lord Manners suggested that at the eastern end of the site it might be economic to remove the hut bases and to leave the roads as access. There was no information on the construction details of these buildings and I cannot be certain that such extensive clearance would be economic and at the present time it would be reasonable to assume that demolition and clearance would be limited to the walls and roofs of the buildings and that all roads, hardstandings and building floors would remain. Lord Manners stated that he would be prepared to purchase the land and that he would return the western end to woodland. If this site were to be re-integrated into his estate I have no doubt that there would be no significant increase in overhead costs and though the woodland may not be particularly productive due to the hard areas which would remain I have no doubt that it would be a substantial amenity and would be worth doing.

However, it cannot be assumed that Lord Manners would acquire the site and no clearance of the site may be undertaken. In this case the use of the site for agriculture, with the exception of the playing field area, is likely to be limited to rough grazing. The buildings would continue to deteriorate and vandalism could accelerate the process and they may rapidly become derelict. The buildings are fairly well screened at present and are mainly only single storey. Though the appearance of the buildings would deteriorate the overall effect on the site as a whole when viewed from the public roads and paths would not in my opinion be significantly changed. Any additional growth of scrub, creepers or natural regeneration of trees would tend to provide additional screening of the buildings. I am satisfied that some agricultural or woodland use is likely to be made of the site if it is not developed and I do not consider that even if the buildings become derelict that the site would become so unattractive as to constitute an unacceptable eyesore.

If this site were to be used for housing there would be less need to allocate other land elsewhere in the district. The SWHSP identifies the Ringwood and Fordingbridge areas as the locations for new housing developments and the AVLP has excluded land from the green belt to allow for further development in the Ringwood area. With an average density of 25 dwellings per hectare it should only require about 5 ha of land to accommodate 20 dwellings in the Ringwood or Fordingbridge area. The appeal site has 2.8 ha of playing fields which could be used for agriculture and though the existing development on the remaining 12.3 ha would significantly reduce its agricultural use it seems to me that any agricultural advantage to be gained by developing Sopley Camp instead of other sites would be likely to be small.

Transpore has grown rapidly in recent years and the Parish Council and residents complain that the growth in housing has not been matched by other facilities. While the existing facilities could no doubt cater for the additional population from Sopley Camp if they had to there is no evidence to suggest that this would bring any benefit to the village as the appellants claim. Sopley Camp is separated from the village by a relatively narrow strip of open farmland. If residential development on the camp were permitted it would be difficult to argue that this strip of open land fulfilled a green belt function and pressure to develop the gap would be very difficult to resist. The FDVLP makes no provision for employment land uses in the village or any expansion of shopping or other facilities and the effect of developing this site could be the further expansion of this dormitory village without adequate improvement to the facilities available for the residents.

In Annex A I conclude that the housing allocation in the AVLP is likely to result in a shortfall of 20 to 40 dwellings on the 2000 allocation in the Policy H.1.1. The SWHSP identifies the Ringwood and Fordingbridge areas for new housing development and the AVLP has excluded land from the green belt to allow for further development in the future.
I am not satisfied that the circumstances in this case are such as to justify allowing this development in the green belt. There is no need to release this land for housing when the shortfall in the land allocated for residential use is so small and land has been excluded elsewhere in the AVLP area to cater for future housing need. I have been unable to identify any benefit to the village of Drongsre from this development and if it were to lead to further expansion of the village it could be detrimental to its character. The use of this land for housing instead of other land elsewhere in the AVLP area would not produce major benefits to agriculture which would outweigh the green belt objection to this site. The clear benefit of this proposal is that it would ensure the clearance of the existing buildings and avoid the possibility of their becoming derelict. This is clearly desirable but as I do not consider that if the site were to become derelict it would substantially detract from the appearance of the area I do not find this a sufficiently compelling reason to override the objections to development of this scale in the green belt.
Conclusions

The main aims of conservation and restraint were supported by the Secretary of State in approving the SWHSP. In modifying the plan to increase the housing provision from 1,700 to 2,000 in the Western Sub area it was envisaged that this would require the release of more land but the principal reason for the increase was to provide a more gradual reduction in the building rate. The conservation constraints of the New Forest, the green belt, high quality agricultural land and the physical constraints of the Avon flood plain and the extensive gravel workings would all restrict development in this plan area in the long term and the fact that additional housing sites have become available in the built-up area does not seem to me to be a sufficient argument to justify the AVLP allocating more land for housing than is required by the Structure Plan. The requirement in Policy H.1.1. for 2,000 dwellings meets the building rate which was deemed desirable when the SWHSP was approved and if development is to be permitted which would substantially exceed this total it seems to me that it should only be allowed if the particular circumstances were to outweigh the SWHSP policy considerations.

The purpose of Policy H.1.1. is to control the number of dwellings that are built and it seems to me essential that when monitoring and reviewing the Structure Plan, preparing and monitoring local plans and assessing whether there is a 5-year land supply that the most up to date completion total should be used together with the outstanding commitments at that date. It is agreed that using this method there is a need to provide land for an additional 503 dwellings in the Western Sub area in 1988-96. The figure arrived at by the council using an updating of commitments from 1980 to 1986 gives a requirement of only 490 dwellings. The commitment figures come from the District Council's records but the completions are the County Council's figure and the council expressed some reservations about this figure. No evidence was however produced to show that the County's figures were inaccurate nor did the council produce any evidence of the number of completions based on its own records. The council's method is not compatible with the 5-year supply calculations which are required by Circular 15/84. It is also more difficult for developers to check the council's figures and as the plan period progresses will probably be more time consuming and difficult to produce. In the absence of evidence showing the County Council's completion figures are incorrect I consider that the calculations should be based on these and the outstanding commitments at 1 April 1986 and this requires the provision of a further 503 dwellings in the period 1986-96.

Much of the argument on the likely yield of small sites comes from the increase from the 300 to 400 in the draft to 640 in the deposited plan. The draft appears to have taken the SWHSP estimate for small sites whereas the deposit plan
has not only taken account of actual permissions but has not been confined to small sites of up to 10 dwellings. The figure of 640 includes larger windfall sites and even one site which was an allocation in Policy H1.1. in the draft plan. Response 4(XI) shows that the present commitments include 101 dwellings on large sites and 106 on large windfall sites. If these 207 are deducted from the 640 the yield of small sites is 433 which is not significantly higher than the SWHSP or the draft plan's assumptions. These 207 dwellings are the equivalents of 13 dwellings per over a 14-year period and I consider the redevelopment totals in Table 2 in the AVLP should be reduced by this amount to arrive at a reasonable estimate for the yield of small sites for 1986-96. Larger windfall sites have recently made a significant contribution to the housing provision but while it is reasonable to expect small sites to continue to come forward there is no guarantee that other large windfall sites will come forward and it is important that the provision from small and windfall sites should not be over-estimated and I see no justification at the present to make an allowance for more than the small sites.

I do not doubt the council's evidence that only about 5% of planning permissions lapse completely and for the permissions which are outstanding at 1 April 1986 this could be a reasonable take-up rate for the plan period. For the 1981-86 period the actual take-up rates found in the County Council research have been used and was not seriously challenged. But for the 1986-96 period I consider it is more realistic to assume a lower figure than 95% could apply and 85%, which is said to apply in the South East where demand is also high, seems to be a more realistic figure. Using the reduced yield of small sites and these take-up rates the estimated provision from small sites in the period 1986-96 is 252 dwellings as shown in Table A.

The estimated capacity of the sites allocated in the AVLP is in the order of 301 to 321 and this would leave a probable shortfall of between 20 and 40 dwellings on the requirement for 2,000 in the Structure Plan. The capacities of the allocated sites are only estimates and with the high proportion of small sites which are unpredictable with any accuracy it seems to me that the AVLP allocations provide a sufficient lend to meet the Structure Plan requirement at the present time.

The SWHSP identifies Ringwood and Fordingbridge as the rain areas for the provision of the additional housing needed to meet Policy H.1.1. I cannot therefore accept as a matter of principle the argument advanced by some objectors that there should be no further development in Ringwood.
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permission, when satisfactory mechanisms referenced in the appeal Decision of the 24 January 1997, are resolved. In determining this appeal, the Inspector concluded that there were very special circumstances that justified inappropriate development in the Green Belt (outside the GP-1 allocation) and also noted that there was no practical alternative to the appeal site available.

6.11.31 In support of the objection 226b, reference is made to the planning application submitted by Lymington Precision Engineers for the development of 2.47ha land adjoining the southern boundary of the Gordleton Industrial Estate for industrial purposes, providing for a relocation into new premises of an existing company located in Lymington. This site together with the Setmasters extension land and the Parker Bath extension beyond GP-1 land would occupy almost entirely the additional land sought in Objection 226b.

6.11.32 My considerations in respect of the objection are made in the context of the Local Plan. I conclude that all the industrial development at the Gordleton Industrial Estate has been allowed exceptionally. Such development is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Development has also been allowed to take place in the face of the inadequacy of the local road network, relating to safety factors associated with the narrowness of the rural roads serving the development. In addition, possible improvements to the C430 to the west and east of the Estate would harm the character of the New Forest (now having National Park status for planning purposes). In addition, possible road improvements to the C430 close to Bucklands Rings fort, and within the Buckland Conservation Area would be very difficult to justify and likely to be very costly. Routing industrial traffic South along Ramley Road into Lymington is also unsatisfactory having regard to the width of the rural sections and also the penetration of heavy vehicles into the urban area in order to join the A337.

6.11.33 There is a limited need for land to meet the relocation and/or expansion needs of local firms, and the Setmasters' decision and also the strongly favourable indications in the Parker Bath appeal indicate that this is being partly met through the development control process. The Local Plan is primarily concerned with the use of land and not the occupier. It will be for the Local Planning Authority or the Planning Inspectorate on Appeal to evaluate specific proposals and determine whether planning permission should be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt and in a location served by inadequate local roads. Within the New Milton and Lymington area, the Green Belt and environmental constraints (n.b. the New Forest) and the problems of generally inadequate links to the Strategic Road network, indicate that employment development should be broadly regulated to accord with the current level of provision i.e. that new development should provide mainly for the needs of local companies. It would be desirable if allocations LP-14 and NM-16 could be taken up by local firms, but this cannot be predicted. I do not favour further industrial land allocation in the Green Belt at the Gordleton Industrial Estate. The allocation under Policy GP-1 could be deleted from the Local Plan; the area does appear to be a development commitment under the September 1989 planning permission, with development now carried out on the land. However, I make no recommendation on this last point. Likewise, I consider that the Proposals Map should not show the existing development (Phase 1) of 5ha as allocated industrial land, but should remain as 'washed over' land in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

6.11.34 THAT NO MODIFICATION BE MADE TO THE LOCAL PLAN.

POLICY SC-1 (Sopley Camp)

OBJECTIONS: 124a (Peter Hilton (Wickham) Ltd), 259b (Mrs Sally Owen), 321b (Planwork Ltd)
ISSUES

6.11.35 Delete Policy SC-1 as a discrete policy for Sopley Camp and allow for the re-use of existing buildings under Policy CO-RB1. Development should not take place at Sopley Camp.

CONCLUSIONS

6.11.36 The objection site is a disused military (RAF) camp extending to some 15ha in total area of which some 4.9ha are open land. The residual 10.1ha is intensely developed with 91 low rise buildings predominantly of uniform construction of rendered block/brick construction with corrugated asbestos/cement roofs. The camp was constructed during the Second World War and occupation by the RAF ceased in 1974. The site lies in the Green Belt. Its eastern boundary adjoins the New Forest near New Merryfield Farm. The site is also close to the defined boundary (Inset Map 11) of the village of Brangore, but is separated from it by open farmland.

6.11.37 The objection site is subject to Policy CP.11 of the Avon Valley Local Plan adopted by the District Council in June 1988. This policy reads: ‘Development at the former RAF Sopley Camp will not be permitted. The Local Planning Authority will encourage the full and proper restoration of the site to forestry or agriculture’. In the Proposed Change set out in para 2.1 of NFDC/32.3 the District Council propose to revert to this wording. Following the sale of the site to private owners in 1989, there have been a number of applications for the re-use of the site and buildings primarily for business, holiday/leisure and residential uses, but none of these was allowed. The lawful use of the site is established as ‘a training site and rest camp on an occasional basis’.

6.11.38 I consider that it is appropriate to have a discrete policy for Sopley Camp in view of the pressure for the re-use of the site and vacant buildings, and also taking account of the extent of the site and the number of buildings. In defining Policy SC-1, the District Council have had regard to the context provided by Policy CO-RB1, but as the existing lawful use only enables a very limited development opportunity the reality of Sopley Camp is tantamount to an abandonment of use. It is correct to conclude in relation to para 3.8(a) of PPG2 that any re-use is likely to have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it. Furthermore the existing buildings on the site were erected to meet a military emergency need and are of a form bulk and general design not in keeping with their surroundings and which result in harm to the visual amenity of the Green Belt in this location.

6.11.39 The existing use of the land and buildings is clearly a transient use which has now effectively ceased, and I concur with Policy SC-1 that no re-use of the premises should be allowed. Any re-use would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Improvements to the external appearance of the buildings - which are of poor design quality and generally inferior construction - would only follow permission for re-use and would not be sufficient reason for allowing a re-use of the buildings; any re-use would only sustain and probably increase the adverse impact of the site on the Green Belt. Even if the buildings became derelict this would be of lesser impact than the re-use of the site, and the perpetuation of a transient site use. Dereliction can be addressed by building clearance and the re-use of the site for agriculture or forestry. Policy SC-1 sets a presumption against new development at Sopley Camp, and this negative approach is consistent with PPG2 and the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I do not favour the second sentence of the proposed revised wording of Policy SC-1 in para 2.1 of NFDC/32.3 that refers to 'encouragement'; this is better included as an aspiration of the District Council in the supporting text.
The prospect of the former buildings being used for agricultural purposes should also not be encouraged. I put forward a revised policy wording.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT POLICY SC-1 BE MODIFIED TO READ:
6.11.40  ‘Policy SC-1
Sopley Camp
Development involving the re-use of land and existing buildings at Sopley Camp will not be permitted’.
Appendix 10: Evidence relating to access for proposed allocation ASH1: Land adjoining Jubilee Crescent, Ashford.
Your Ref: 352.3

Mr James Ives
Senior Policy Planner - Policy and Plans Team
New Forest District Council
Appletree Court
Beaulieu Road
LYNDHURST
Hampshire
SO43 7PA

Dear Mr Ives

NEW FOREST DISTRICT (OUTSIDE THE NATIONAL PARK)
SITES AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Thank you for your letter dated 4 August last, setting out the context under which the Council is considering the potential of sites for development.

We note that our land is being considered as a possible site for allocation under Policy CS12, and return herewith your schedule with the required answers appended. Trusting that our answers will be of assistance to yourselves.

Yours sincerely

Mrs R E Palmer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Access</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access can be achieved to the site from Jubilee Crescent.</td>
<td>My sister, Mrs Diane Slade, and I own the necessary land to access the land in question, as shown on the attached plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I confirm that the development will comply with the provisions set out in the Core Strategy Policy CS15(b), and that the proportions of affordable housing will accord with the requirements of the Policy.</td>
<td>The land would be offered to a Housing Association (RSL) to develop in accordance with the provisions of Policy CS15(b), and to meet the number of units identified in Policy CS12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I confirm that the development would provide for public open space in accordance with the provisions of Policy CS7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my earlier correspondence I offered the majority of the remainder of the land in our possession as open space for the benefit of the local community. This area of land is in excess of the 3.5 ha of public open space per 1000 population.</td>
<td>The exact type and location of any open space within the affordable housing development will be dependent on the final layout of the scheme and the mix of housing proposed. This layout will be determined by the applicant, taking account of Policy CS7, and other good practice in terms of site layout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As is mentioned above, in my response dated 26 April 2010 to your earlier correspondence, I offered the majority of the remainder of the land in our ownership for open space. Some of this land could be used for allotments if it were considered to be of an adequate standard for this use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other than a significant area of open space, I do not propose any other community benefits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My family are not developers and we do not propose to develop the site ourselves. If the land in question is allocated as a site to meet a local housing need in accordance with Policy CS12 and Policy CS15(b), then the site would be offered to a local RSL to carry out the development in full accord with these policies, and any others in the Core Strategy regarding the development of housing sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Appeal Decision Reference: APP/B1740/A/08/2060710, Land to the rear of 7-11 Jubilee Road, Ashford, Fordingbridge.
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19th March 2008

by Roy Foster  MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 April 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/A/08/2060710
Land to the rear of 7-11 Jubilee Road, Fordingbridge SP6 1DP

The appeal is made by Raymond Brown Building Ltd under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is against the refusal of planning permission by New Forest District Council for the erection of 2 chalet-style dwellings and 1 bungalow, all with integrated garages.

The application [Ref 07/90858] was dated 24 August 2007 and refused by notice dated 23 October 2007.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. From the representations, complemented by my visit, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are the effects of the development on (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) the living conditions of neighbours. The Council’s reason for refusal concerning the lack of an open space contribution has been overcome by the completion of an appropriate unilateral undertaking.

Inspector’s consideration of the issues

3. Dealing with the first issue, Local Plan policy BU-H1 is consistent with the aims of PPS3 and welcomes residential infilling in principle. However, policy DW-E1 requires (1) that new development shall be “appropriate and sympathetic” in matters such as appearance, form, siting and layout, and (2) that it shall have regard to the scale and siting of adjoining development and the character of the area.

4. Jubilee Crescent consists of eight modern dwellings fronting both sides of a short cul-de-sac off Jubilee Road. The proposed new development would comprise three dwellings accessed by an extension of the turning head in Jubilee Crescent. These would be built within the much-reduced back gardens of 7-11 Jubilee Road. I have considered the Information produced with regard to local plot ratios and footprints but in my view this form of development, with the houses sited close behind Nos 7-11 and on higher land close to the rear of No 4 Jubilee Crescent, would have an unattractively contrived and cramped relationship with existing buildings and be jarringly at odds with the prevailing form and layout of the area which is generally a conventional suburban one of houses fronting both sides of more generously proportioned streets and cul-de-sac. Extending the turning head into an access road would also materially exacerbrate the already rather harsh appearance of that feature.
5. Overall, I consider that this scheme would fail to comply with the objectives of policy DW-E1. Having said this, I do not accept the Council’s point concerning the need to retain a transition zone into countryside as the land immediately to the south appears to be a large garden with good visual separation from the more open countryside beyond it.

6. A blue atlas cedar tree, subject to a Tree Preservation Order, imposed as recently as November 2007, occupies a central position on plot C. The Council’s arboricultural officer does not clearly explain why the loss of this protected tree is assented to. However, I note that local residents expressed concerns about the loss of this tree in representations about the application. I share these concerns and find the requirement to fell an attractive maturing tree, categorised as A1 by the appellant’s consultant (and which could be expected to be an important influence in the design of the scheme) a further factor adding weight to my conclusion that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

7. Turning to the second issue, policy DW-E1 also requires new development to avoid visual intrusion, noise and other adverse effects on local amenities. In this case I consider that residents of No 4 Jubilee Crescent would suffer a material reduction in the quality of their living conditions as a result of increased disturbance by people and vehicles passing very close to the flank wall of that bungalow and a sense of enclosure caused by the erection of the new dwelling (albeit a bungalow) on the higher land at plot A to the south west of No 4. These effects would undermine the aims of policy DW-E1 and reinforce my conclusion that the Council’s decision should be upheld.

Roy Foster
Inspector