



**Mitigation for Recreational Impacts on New Forest European Sites  
Supplementary Planning Document**

Consultation Draft, January 2021

Summary of the comments received and Council response

*April 2021*

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>New Forest National Park Authority</b>	10827_SPD21Mit_1	1 Executive Summary 1.1	It is helpful to have it clarified up front that the SPD relates to the Local Plan for New Forest District outside of the National Park. This should avoid any potential confusion with the Authority's separate Habitat Mitigation Scheme SPD (2020).	Noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>New Forest National Park Authority</b>	10827_SPD21Mit_2	1 Executive Summary 1.5 and 2.16	Support the requirement in Policy ENV5 of the adopted NFDC Local Plan (2020)	Noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Pennington and Lymington Lanes Society</b>	10864_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Support the removal of mitigation of the Solent European sites from the SPD.</p> <p>Measures provided to divert visitors away from the New Forest European sites proposed in this SPD will be ineffective and the proposed small areas of suburban greenspace termed ANRG will provide few if any of the features that attract visitors to the New Forest European sites.</p> <p>Agree that access management measures should be a key element in the mitigation strategy, but there is no mention of the need to improve the management of car parking within the New Forest European sites.</p> <p>Propose an alternative approach to the provision of alternative greenspace to provide much larger strategically placed areas of green space around the outside of the New Forest European sites.</p>	<p>Council continue to monitor the measures set out in the SPD for their effectiveness – the approach agreed by NE and through the Local Plan examination.</p> <p>The wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park. This SPD addresses the impacts of new Development within the plan area of NFDC (outside the National Park).</p> <p>Text added to the SPD to clarify this scope (Paras 2.10 and 4.21).</p> <p>The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>New Forest Association</b>	11034_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Support the removal of mitigation of the Solent European sites from the SPD.</p> <p>Measures provided to divert visitors away from the New Forest European sites proposed in this SPD will be ineffective and the proposed small areas of suburban greenspace termed ANRG will provide few if any of the features that attract visitors to the New Forest European sites.</p> <p>Agree that access management measures should be a key element in the mitigation strategy, but there is no mention of the need to improve the management of car parking within the New Forest European sites.</p> <p>Propose an alternative approach to the provision of alternative greenspace to provide much larger strategically placed areas of green space around the outside of the New Forest European sites.</p>	<p>Council continue to monitor the measures set out in the SPD for their effectiveness – the approach was agreed by NE and through the Local Plan examination.</p> <p>The wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park . This SPD addresses the impacts of new Development within the plan area of NFDC (outside the National Park).</p> <p>Text added to the SPD to clarify this scope (Paras 2.10 and 4.21).</p> <p>The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>New Forest National Park Authority</b></p>	<p>10827_SPD21Mit_3</p>	<p>2 Introduction and background to the Strategy</p>	<p>The approach to visitor accommodation is reasonable and it is appropriate for new visitor accommodation to make a proportionate contribution towards habitat mitigation measures.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to including an indication within the SPD of the likely measures to be used to mitigate the recreational impacts of new visitor accommodation (as distinct from new residential development).</p>	<p>The required mitigation for visitor accommodation is addressed as part of the overall package of measures the SPD sets out.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Beeton</b>	11006_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	Concerns that the recreation pressures on the New Forest will lead to greater restrictions which result in a lessening attraction to tourists.	Comments noted. This is an issue beyond the scope of the SPD.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Document Section</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<b>Marsh</b>	11018_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	Concerns raised with new development allocated for Bransgore and the impacts on traffic, public utilities and the lack of public green spaces	Concerns noted but are outside the scope of this SPD.  New development allocated for Bransgore will have to provide on-site ANRG, which will be publicly accessible to new residents as well as existing.
<b>Cox</b>	11020_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	Opportunity to utilise the open access land that will be created by the proposed designation of the section of the Solent Way.	Comments noted. Further work is ongoing by the Council on the identification of new off-site mitigation projects.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Sidwell</b>	11019_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Suggest changes to how car parks are managed and located across the New Forest.</p> <p>There should be a short summary of the main issues &amp; proposals published alongside this document.</p>	<p>The wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park . This SPD addresses the impacts of new Development within the plan area of NFDC (outside the National Park).</p> <p>Text added to the SPD to clarify this scope (Paras 2.10 and 4.21).</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Webster</b>	11021_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Note the increase in recreation use of the forest over the recent years and action is needed to be taken now to prevent further harm from housing allocated in the NFDC Local Plan over the next 20 years.</p> <p>Suggest greater restrictions on access to parts of the more sensitive areas of the New Forest as well as respecting the findings of the New Forest National Park Tranquil Area Mapping Report.</p> <p>Specific controls suggested for horse riders, dog walkers, cyclists, verge parking and littering and the operation of public houses.</p> <p>Contributions from Developers must be used to finance the review the Blashford Lakes Strategic Management Plan , 2006 ( BLSMP ) – suggest there is ample scope for the complex of Lakes in the Avon Valley to take the pressure off the New Forest which was one of the proposals of the Blashford Ibsley Local Plan , 1977</p>	<p>Access to parts of the New Forest, restrictions on specific user groups and the wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park . This SPD addresses the impacts of new Development within the plan area of NFDC (outside the National Park).</p> <p>Text added to the SPD to clarify this scope (Paras 2.10 and 4.21).</p> <p>Comments noted on the Blashford Lakes. This as an issue beyond the scope of the SPD.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Christchurch Bicycle Club</b>	11025_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	Introduction should state the rationale for not needing to mitigate any impact of cycling or horse riding.	The mitigation projects are focused on diverting the uses that cause the main impacts on the New Forest designated sites, which were further clarified by the 2020 report from Footprint Ecology.  Text added to the SPD to clarify this scope (Paras 2.10 and 4.21).

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Syratt	10551_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>The document is too long and conveys too little. Monitoring Report is overly complex, with the only point that matters being how many local people actually use the areas and the success, or otherwise, of a particular ANRG rests solely on that point.</p> <p>Document does not to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ANRGs not a sufficient draw for the NF special landscape characteristics.</li> <li>• Dog walking and in particular off-lead</li> <li>• Complementary policies on access in the NF designated sites needed</li> <li>• Greater focus on improving biodiversity needed</li> <li>• Need to plan for longer than the plan period</li> <li>• Wildlife corridors needed to NF conservation areas</li> </ul>	<p>It is necessary to include the information due to the importance of ensure the Habitat Regulations are met and the associated legal requirements placed on the competent authority for decision making. However, some rationalisation section 2 has taken place to avoid duplication and make points more clearly.</p> <p>Further information added to Appendix 2 to better clarify the monitoring requirements.</p> <p>ANRGs designed as a locally convenient alternatives for recreation – particularly dog walking, to avoid people turning to their cars to travel to the New Forest.</p> <p>The Council is progressing work separately on Biodiversity Net Gain.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Hythe and Dibden Parish Council</b>	10178_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Welcome the design and strategy over open spaces in the New Forest and would encourage focus on accessible walking and cycling routes for all abilities, and safe parking areas.</p> <p>Highlight impact of on road parking and parking on verges will need to be a key focus, especially for managing the additional numbers of local residents visiting the recreational areas</p>	Comments noted. Work is ongoing by the Council on the identification of new off-site mitigation projects.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Fordingbridge Town Council</b>	10106_SPD21Mit_	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Fordingbridge Town Council is in agreement with all that the plan outlines as long as it is adhered to.</p> <p>Highlight issues in the Parish around lack of parking from those schemes already delivered and ensuring the surfaces used in new scheme are appropriate for the use.</p> <p>Local councils also need to be involved with these discussions at an early stage to ensure the local area gets what is wanted.</p>	<p>Detailed comments noted.</p> <p>Local Town and Parish Councils will be involved in the detail discussions of projects and their management going forward.</p> <p>Text amended in section 4 to enable Town and Parish Councils, local communities and local interest groups to be involved in the identification of future projects.</p>
<b>Hordle Parish Council</b>	10826_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	Proposals seem to be reasonable to implement the mitigation of new developments on the more sensitive areas for recreation	Comments noted

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Gill	11027_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Provide comments on how the use of the New Forest has changed with increasing visitor pressure.</p> <p>Rather than monitoring the effects, need at act now.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Text added to the SPD to clarify this scope (Paras 2.10 and 4.21).</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Bolton</b>	11028_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>The principle of providing more recreational spaces within easy distance of habitation is excellent both for the health and welfare of the residents.</p> <p>Essential, as highlighted in the Footprint Ecology Report 2008, that a larger scheme for the south of Hampshire needs to be included in which one or more new Country Parks</p>	<p>Comments on the provision of ANRG are noted.</p> <p>The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Pennyfarthing Homes</b>	10916_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>Whilst recognises and accepts the principle behind the need to mitigate, have the following issues with the document:</p> <p>SPD is not consistent with national or local policy</p> <p>The move away from the dual use of open space</p> <p>No consideration of overprovision of ANRG</p> <p>Lack of flexibility in ANRG design</p> <p>Lack of evidence to support charging rates</p> <p>SPD goes beyond the scope of recreational mitigation requirements</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>
<b>Pennyfarthing Homes</b>	10916_SPD21Mit_8	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy	<p>SPC currently goes far beyond the focused element of mitigation of recreation impacts on the European designated sites, incorporating a significant level of detail relating to the approach and design of landscape and open space.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Cranborne Chase AONB</b></p>	<p>10087_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>2 Introduction and background to the Strategy</p>	<p>No mention within the document of this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>Misunderstandings highlighted in connection with holiday accommodation and that such arrangements for visitors that are not appropriate in the National Park could be located within the AONB.</p> <p>NFDC has a duty to consider the effects of all decisions relating to land in this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with regard to the purposes of AONB designation.</p> <p>Lack of logic in requiring financial contributions to sites some significant distance away and not making a contribution to the management of the AONB. More appropriate for such contributions to be made to AONB Management Plan objectives and aims.</p>	<p>The SPD's scope is to address the specific issue of recreational mitigation and the Habitat Regulations.</p> <p>The AONB and its Management Plan actions will need to be considered through a separate process as set out by Local Plan Policy STR2.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Public Health, Adult Health and Care, Hampshire County Council</b></p>	<p>11035_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.10-2.17</p>	<p>Welcome the consideration to improve existing open spaces, and creating new alternative recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Fordingbridge Town Council</b>	10106_SPD21Mit_3	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.12, 2.13, 2.42	Provide observations and concerns on respect of car park and use and maintenance of existing mitigation projects in Fordingbridge.	Concerns are noted on the potential incompatibility between ANRG provision and protecting areas of high biodiversity. Supporting text to Local Plan Policy ENV1 notes this as an issue to address.
<b>New Milton Town Council</b>	10850_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.27	Support requirements extend to those developments that are permitted development and prior approval schemes	Noted
<b>New Milton Town Council</b>	10850_SPD21Mit_2	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.29	Residential extensions exceeding a certain level should be included in the obligation.	Views noted. No change.
<b>New Milton Town Council</b>	10850_SPD21Mit_3	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.38	Business visitor development should be identified through NNDR evidence or similar, as it could be used as a loophole to the mitigation.	Comments noted – appropriate justification would be required should a development propose these exceptional circumstances.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Whalley</b></p>	<p>11031_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.4</p>	<p>Before any approval ensure there will be properly detailed written evidence in consultation that development will satisfy the Habitats Directive by meeting the Precautionary Principle in all respects.</p>	<p>Comments noted - any on-site mitigation requirements will need to be agreed through a legally enforceable s106 agreement.</p>

		<p>background to the Strategy 2.44 - 2.48</p>	<p>research reports recommending a strategic, proportionate and co-ordinated approach to avoiding and mitigating impacts is developed, the SPD could include greater reference to the mitigation measures recommended it responds.</p> <p>The NFNPA highlight the need for complementary measures within the designated sites as part of an overall package to mitigate the increased levels of development in the Local Plan.</p> <p>A balanced package of measures would include a greater proportion dedicated to ranger provision within the designated sites.</p>	<p>established approach and been through two Local Plan public inquiries. Footprint has confirmed evidence base on which the SPD was established. The Strategy has also been reviewed for the higher level of development set out in the Local Plan Part 1.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p><b>Pennington and Lymington Lanes Society</b></p>	<p>10864_SPD21Mit_5</p>	<p>2 Introduction and background to the Strategy 2.49 - 2.50</p>	<p>Consider that to provide a real alternative to the New Forest European sites, much larger areas or networks of recreational green spaces are also required that may be termed Country Parks, Nature Parks or some similar designation. Dibden Inclosure is an example of the scale a strategically located areas of alternative natural recreation space would need to be to offer a real alternative to both existing users of the New Forest and new residents of housing development.</p>	<p>The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p>
		<p>background to the Strategy 2.5</p>	<p>document covers solely recreational impacts arising from new development in NFDC (outside the National Park)</p>	

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Lord	11026_SPD21Mit_1	2 Introduction and background to the Strategy Para 2.29	Some home extensions need to make contributions.	Comments noted. No change to the SPD as subsequent change of uses would trigger the need to provide contributions.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Pennyfarthing Homes	10916_SPD21Mit_3	3 Local Plan Policies and other relevant documents 3.3	<p>There is no justifiable reason as to why there should not be dual use of the ANRG / informal public open space (POS).</p> <p>SPD sets out that POS can be delivered in many forms and again there is no evidence that ANRG become less effective because it also functions as POS.</p> <p>Policy ENV1 does not explicitly take the approach setting out informal open space required to be provided under saved Policy CS7 is wholly additional to mitigation land required under Policy ENV1.</p>	<p>The approach to requiring ANRG in addition to informal public open space (POS) as two requirements was confirmed by the Local Plan due to the higher levels needed – covered at the LP examination and the replacement of Policy DM3 by ENV1.</p> <p>The text of section 3 of the SPD clarified to reflect this.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Lisher	11017_SPD21Mit_1	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development	Too much consideration seems to be given to dogs and their owners.	Focus on dog walking reflects the evidence that this is the biggest user group on the Forest.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
O'Callaghan	11022_SPD21Mit_1	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.18 – 4.20	There appears to be a complete disregard for cyclists in the proposals. Urge the Council to further investigate a properly linked cycling area for both locals and visitors which would benefit all parties.	Focus of this strategy is on the main impacts identified through evidence, and cycling use is comparatively small compared to walking and dog walking.  Text of the introduction (Section 2) of the SPD updated to clarify this issue.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Hart	11023_SPD21Mit_1	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development	Strong objection to the proposals and mitigation will not work – needs more joined up thinking with how the park is promoted for use.	Comments noted. The focus on this SPD is to mitigate impacts from new development in the New Forest District (Outside the National Park).

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Thomas</b></p>	<p>11024_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development</p>	<p>Note the increase in usage of the National Park over the last few years (excluding the present pandemic in which the level of use is approaching its ability to cope).</p> <p>The provision of alternative green spaces would help to reduce these pressures, especially if they could be made attractive to the dog owners and walkers who now frequent the areas mentioned above, as well as other areas elsewhere in the National Park.</p> <p>To allow these alternative green areas to be used as intended maintenance of the vegetation must occur regularly and the areas kept clean without litter.</p>	<p>Local knowledge comments noted.</p> <p>Ongoing maintenance and management of the alternative natural green spaces is addressed by this SPD.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Bolton</b>	11028_SPD21Mit_2	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.10 – 4.13	There are large tracts of poor quality agricultural land which, without future EU subsidies, could be returned to nature and recreation.	Comments noted. The SPD's agreed mitigation approach is for ANRGs to be integrated or adjacent to new development.
<b>Sport England</b>	10840_SPD21Mit_1	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development	<p>Wish to ensure that any existing playing field sites or sports facilities eg golf courses are protected against designation as suitable alternative natural green space.</p> <p>Based on experience elsewhere that that providing mitigation uses on a given site has then precluded use of the site for formal sport in order to ensure that the site can be used for wider recreational use eg dog-walking.</p>	The use of existing facilities to provide recreational mitigation projects is not proposed by the SPD. Saved Local Plan Policy CS7 provides protection for such facilities.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>New Forest Association</b></p>	<p>11034_SPD21Mit_2</p>	<p>4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.1</p>	<p>The ability of the ANRG to divert visits away from the New Forest European sites is identified in the SPD as one of the key performance criteria for monitoring the effectiveness of the mitigation (Table 1, page 20). Given that the ANRG will not provide any of the features that attract visits to the New Forest and the use of the 8 ha of alternative greenspace per 1000 head of population, believe the method of mitigation will be ineffective and will not prevent further damaging recreational use of the New Forest European sites.</p>	<p>This SPD's approach and the ANRG space standards were confirmed through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p> <p>A commitment is also made in the SPD to ongoing monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the strategy as set out in Appendix 2.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Pennington and Lymington Lanes Society</b>	10864_SPD21Mit_2	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.10 - 4.13	The ability of the ANRG to divert visits away from the New Forest European sites is identified in the SPD as one of the key performance criteria for monitoring the effectiveness of the mitigation (Table 1, page 20). Given that the ANRG will not provide any of the features that attract visits to the New Forest and the use of the 8 ha of alternative greenspace per 1000 head of population, believe the method of mitigation will be ineffective and will not prevent further damaging recreational use of the New Forest European sites.	<p>This SPD's approach and the ANRG space standards were confirmed through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p> <p>A commitment is also made in the SPD to ongoing monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the strategy.</p> <p>Section 5 of the SPD has been rationalised to avoid confusion around ANRG sizes, which will be confirmed through the development. management process.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Public Health, Adults Health and Care, Hampshire County Council</b></p>	<p>11035_SPD21Mit_2</p>	<p>4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.10-4.13</p>	<p>Welcome the recognition of the key features of well-designed ANRGs.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Pennyfarthing Homes	10916_SPD21Mit_5	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.12	<p>NFDC needs to provide clarity and consistency with regards to the approach in circumstances where smaller individual parcels of a strategic allocation can be being brought forward through planning applications:</p> <p>the draft SPD does not appear to recognise the potential mitigation ‘credit’ scenario which would in effect exist if an individual application development site is able to overprovide ANRG and a different landowner able to benefit from provision off-site in order to deliver housing.</p> <p>that the SPD’s current wording lacks sufficient flexibility to really facilitate the approach in site-specific situations, to fully respond to matters such as safety and long-term maintenance.</p> <p>there is an assumption that ANRG must be provided adjacent or close to a development. However, there is no basis for this requirement.</p> <p>The overall concept on which mitigation is based is that ANRG should ensure that there is no increase in visits to European sites as result of new development. ANRG located further from the development in question may be acceptable if its visitor catchment includes enough existing visitors (dwellings) to achieve this overall</p>	<p>The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy ENV1 ii(a) is an at least 8 hectares requirement, so cannot be considered overprovision.</p>

			cumulative outcome.	

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Cranborne Chase AONB</b></p>	<p>10087_SPD21Mit_2</p>	<p>4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.14 - 4.16</p>	<p>Lack of logic in requiring financial contributions to sites some significant distance away and not making a contribution to the management of the AONB. More appropriate for such contributions to be made to AONB Management Plan objectives and aims</p>	<p>The scope of this SPD addresses the specific issue of recreational mitigation and the Habitat Regulations.</p> <p>The AONB and its Management Plan actions will need to be considered through a separate process as set out by Local Plan Policy STR2.</p>

<b>Public Health, Adults Health and Care, Hampshire County Council</b>	11035_SPD21Mit_3	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.18 - 4.20	Encourage the measures proposed to enhance existing recreational walking routes.	Support noted.
		development 4.18 - 4.20	Rights of Way in the area due to increased use.  would welcome the chance to discuss the issues around Fordingbridge's footpath network with NFDC and HCC also to suggest other improvements to walking routes in order to comply with the aims of your Supplementary Planning Documents.	Future project proposals will look to draw on the knowledge of local groups.  Text amended in section 4 to enable Town and Parish Councils, local communities, and local interest groups to be involved in the identification of future projects.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>New Forest Association</b>	11034_SPD21Mit_3	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.21	SPD fails to address the main issue of access management, that is the provision of car parking within the New Forest European sites. As most visitors arrive in the New Forest by car, car parks need to be the focus of improved access management.	The wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Gill</b>	11027_SPD21Mit_2	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.21 - 4.22 - 4.23	Suggest further wardens / rangers / volunteers out everyday making sure that people understand how to live with the national park.	Comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Pennington and Lymington Lanes Society</b>	10864_SPD21Mit_4	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.21 - 4.23	As most visitors arrive in the New Forest by car, car parks need to be the focus of improved access management. Until this element of access management is successfully addressed, the mitigation measures proposed will not prevent adverse impacts.	The wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>New Forest National Park Authority</b></p>	<p>10827_SPD21Mit_6</p>	<p>4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.21 - 4.23</p>	<p>Provision of on-site rangers is a key aspect of mitigation and we welcome the reference to the People &amp; Wildlife Ranger within the draft SPD.</p> <p>This measure currently makes up a small element of the Council's mitigation package and we suggest a larger proportion of the contributions received could be directed towards ranger provision.</p>	<p>This Council has an established approach and been through two Local Plan public inquiries. Footprint Ecology study has confirmed the evidence base on which the SPD was established.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Document Section</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<b>Gill</b>	11027_SPD21Mit_3	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.24	Rather than monitoring, looking to address the visitor pressures now.	Comments noted.
<b>New Forest Association</b>	11034_SPD21Mit_4	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.3	To provide a real alternative to the New Forest European sites, much larger areas or networks of recreational green spaces are required. These may be termed Country Parks, Nature Parks or some similar designation.	The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.

<b>Ringwood Town Council</b>	10825_SPD21Mit_1	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.36	No specific mention of Town and Parish Councils in respect of partnership working.	<p>Comments noted. Local Town and Parish Councils will be involved in the detail discussions of projects and their management going forward.</p> <p>Text amended in section 4 to enable Town and Parish Councils, local communities and local interest groups to be involved in the identification of future projects.</p>
		requirements for new development 4.36	Councils should be included in this strategy	<p>and Parish Councils will be involved in the detail discussions of projects and their management going forward.</p> <p>Text amended in section 4 to enable Town and Parish Councils, local communities and local interest groups to be involved in the identification of future projects.</p>
<b>New Forest National Park Authority</b>	10827_SPD21Mit_7	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development 4.44	This approach of allowing scope for 'alternative' mitigation projects to be considered' is pragmatic and it is appropriate for the Council to provide a degree of flexibility	Comments noted.

		<p>requirements for new development 4.5</p>	<p>basis for their SPD calculations, as the use of the '72 visits per annum' average figure from across the 0 - 25km distance band may under-estimate the scale of impact on the New Forest's designated sites.</p>	<p>72 visits per annum provides a good representation of the predicted visits and a precautionary estimate of people living in the plan area.</p> <p>The mitigation required for the strategic sites will be scalable to address the number of units provided on a given site, to in turn address the commensurate number of visits.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Lord	11026_SPD21Mit_2	4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development Para 4.3/4.17	Improvement and enhancement of existing green spaces as recreational mitigation could include reducing verge cutting, areas of open space to allow more wild flower growth, etc.	Comments noted.  Biodiversity is a key consideration with mitigation projects coming forward in this SPD.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>New Forest Association</b></p>	<p>11034_SPD21Mit_5</p>	<p>4 Recreation Mitigation requirements for new development Table 1 Performance of mitigation proposals 4.24-4.26</p>	<p>The most important of these should be the monitoring of recreation activity and in particular visitor behaviour within the New Forest.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>West P</b>	10743_SPD21Mit_1	5 The delivery of alternative natural recreational green spaces through strategic site allocations in the Local Plan	In creating these spaces, more people from the local area will be encouraged to use them and mitigate use of the national park? When calculating, I think a % of the property immediately neighbouring the new development should also be added to the Ha. It will need to be larger than just for the new development.	Comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land</b></p>	<p>11030_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>5 The delivery of alternative natural recreational green spaces through strategic site allocations in the Local Plan Table 2 Assumed occupancy rate for dwelling size 5.1 - 5.3</p>	<p>It is necessary to use up-to-date information that is robust for the time period the SPD is expected to used for. As such, the assumed occupancy rates need to be amended as suggested in paragraph 2.10 above</p>	<p>It is necessary to consider the occupation levels of a new development rather than existing dwellings within a given area, for which this SPD uses. If new data on this is released, then it will be considered in future reviews of the SPD.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Document Section</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<b>Lisher</b>	11017_SPD21Mit_2	6 Implementation and Funding	Existing network of footpaths and walkways is very poorly maintained and in some areas the uneven surface is dangerous. More money should be planned for enforcement.	Comments noted. Maintenance and monitoring and key aspects that will be funded for through the provisions in this SPD.
<b>Persimmon Homes South Coast</b>	10990_SPD21Mit_2	6 Implementation and Funding 6.17	Monitoring costs (see below for comments on appropriateness of monitoring costs) should be subsumed within the administration fee that is charged with CIL	Monitoring for the recreational mitigation is a separate requirement to the needs to monitor CIL payments and spending.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Pennyfarthing Homes</b>	10916_SPD21Mit_7	6 Implementation and Funding 6.25	<p>concerned by the lack of transparency and evidence presented in the SPD in support of the proposed charging schedule, particularly in respect of the off-site contributions for sites of less than 50 dwellings and the new introduction of fees associated with site of more than 50 dwellings.</p> <p>With no details of the proposed mitigation projects it is impossible to understand how the charging schedule has been reached and if the levels of financial contributions being sought are appropriate.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council have re-appraised the schedule due to concerns the figures may not be adequate to deliver the full range of projects required. This is to ensure the charges are appropriate for the delivery of the offsite mitigation requirements.</p> <p>The project list will also be published as a standalone document alongside the SPD.</p>
<b>New Milton Town Council</b>	10850_SPD21Mit_4	6 Implementation and Funding 6.4	Comments on the detail to be included with any land transfer.	Comments noted. These details would be secured through a s106 legal agreement at the point that planning permission is granted.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Document Section</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<b>New Forest National Park Authority</b>	10827_SPD21Mit_8	6 Implementation and Funding Table 10 Contribution rate per dwelling for access management 6.19 - 6.20	The level of increased funding from new development in the District for access management measures indicates the Council could potentially support a proportionate increase in the ranger resource their mitigation fund delivers above the single ranger post currently funded.	The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.
<b>Persimmon Homes South Coast</b>	10990_SPD21Mit_4	6 Implementation and Funding Table 11 Contribution rate for development less than 50	Example calculations of how costs would be worked out for smaller (<50 dwellings) and larger (>50 dwellings) would be beneficial.	Comments noted. Examples are provided and will be updated regularly on the Council website on how this is calculated.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Cranborne Chase AONB</b>	10087_SPD21Mit_3	6 Implementation and Funding Table 11 Contribution rate for development less than 50 6.25	it seems more appropriate for such contributions to be made to AONB Management Plan objectives and aims rather than for possible impacts on sites in other parts of the District.	SPD has been prepared to address the specific issue of recreational mitigation and the Habitat Regulations.
<b>New Forest National Park Authority</b>	10827_SPD21Mit_10	Appendix 2 - Monitoring Requirements	<p>The monitoring of bird numbers within the New Forest's protected sites requires a partnership approach and is not something the National Park Authority can undertake alone.</p> <p>The costs of monitoring bird numbers will need to be borne by a range of organisations and it is suggested that development within New Forest District could make a proportionate financial contribution to this monitoring.</p>	It is anticipated that the money collected for monitoring would proportionately pay for these surveys.
<b>Cox</b>	11020_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 2 - Monitoring Requirements	Table 4.1 refers in the future tense to surveys carried out some years ago	Comments noted. Table updated to reflect this.
<b>Syratt W</b>	10551_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 2 - Monitoring Requirements	Table 4.1 refers in the future tense to surveys carried out some years ago	Comments noted. Table updated to reflect this.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Bolton</b>	11028_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 2 - Monitoring Requirements	hoped that monitoring of any schemes takes place and is learned from. There is also a lot of knowledge already in existence gathered from years of experience	Comments noted.
<b>Persimmon Homes South Coast</b>	10990_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 2 - Monitoring Requirements	<p>Parts 1 and 3 of the monitoring framework, it is accepted that these met the CIL tests. However, for the remaining elements, these relate to monitoring of the Council's Mitigation Strategy more generally, which not directly related to the development. As such, it would not be appropriate for the Council to seek planning obligations in respect of part 2, 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p>To seek to charge applicants for monitoring part 4 would constitute double counting with NE work.</p>	<p>The monitoring of the strategy overall is key to understanding its success in provision mitigation to the designated New Forest sites. Without the mitigation, it would directly affect the delivery of new development.</p> <p>The monitoring of bird numbers within the New Forest's protected sites requires a further partnership approach that includes Natural England.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Document Section</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<b>Cox</b>	11020_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 3: Design considerations for recreation walking route enhancements	Signage for restricted byways needs to adequately show the restrictions of use.  Fails to take into account that there is no longer a requirement for dedicated dog waste bins.	Comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Pennyfarthing Homes	10916_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	<p>No evidence that the 'ready-made template', with set dimensional / concentric requirements, will be more effective than other design approaches.</p> <p>The document should be simplified and focused and be sufficiently flexible to encourage variety and a design-led approach to each individual site, and the circumstances, context and physical characteristics of each site, whereby the ANRG design should respond positively to, for example, the dimensions and shape of the site, wider connections and its principal function which is to accommodate housing to meet local need, making effective use of the land resource.</p> <p>The SPD does not form part of the development plan and will only be of significant weight in decision taking where it is consistent with and accords with the local plan and national policy.</p>	<p>The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Pennyfarthing Homes</b></p>	<p>10916_SPD21Mit_4</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)</p>	<p>There is no justifiable reason or evidence as to why there should not be dual use of the ANRG / informal public open space (POS).</p> <p>The is no reference in policy ENV1 that dual use is no longer acceptable between ANRG and CS7 compliant POS.</p>	<p>The approach to requiring ANRG in addition to informal public open space (POS) as two requirements was confirmed by the Local Plan due to the higher levels needed – covered at the LP examination and the replacement of Policy DM3 by ENV1.</p> <p>The text of the section 3 of the SPD clarified to reflect this.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Pennyfarthing Homes</b></p>	<p>10916_SPD21Mit_6</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)</p>	<p>A limited design approach of this nature leads to the overprovision of ANRG, to detriment of other aspects of the scheme, such as landscape, amenity, urban design and architectural considerations.</p> <p>Seek further confirmation, and absolute certainty, on the inclusion of woodland areas within ANRG.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p> <p>Clarification on the use of woodland as ANRGs is noted.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Pennington and Lymington Lanes Society</b></p>	<p>10864_SPD21Mit_3</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)</p>	<p>The ability of the ANRG to divert visits away from the New Forest European sites is identified in the SPD as one of the key performance criteria for monitoring the effectiveness of the mitigation (Table 1, page 20). Given that the ANRG will not provide any of the features that attract visits to the New Forest and the use of the 8 ha of alternative greenspace per 1000 head of population, believe the method of mitigation will be ineffective and will not prevent further damaging recreational use of the New Forest European sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p> <p>Section 5 of the SPD has been rationalised to avoid confusion around ANRG sizes, which will be confirmed through the development. management process.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Cicero Estates</b>	10852_SPD21Mit_1	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	Needs to be clear what the Local Plan, as the adopted development plan document, states, and where the SPD as proposed either sits in accordance with this or goes beyond what is reasonable for the level of policy direction that an SPD.	Comments noted.  The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.
<b>Cox</b>	11020_SPD21Mit_4	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	Take into account that there is no longer a requirement for dedicated dog bins	Comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Syratt W</b>	10551_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	<p>The SPD does not plan far ahead. HMG now considers retention and enhancement of biodiversity a high national priority.</p> <p>In the context of the Conservation Areas of the National Park, wildlife corridors will become essential.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out the need for optimising opportunities for biodiversity, and suitable habitat management on mitigation projects.</p> <p>The requirements of Local Plan Policy DM2 and additionally for achieving biodiversity net gain will be in addition to the measures set out in this strategy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Syratt W</b>	10551_SPD21Mit_4	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	Several areas, e.g., around Fordingbridge, that are not designated in any way, have a high degree of biodiversity value. These, naturally, have most of the characteristics listed as being desirable Quality Criteria for an ANRG. Such areas need to be identified well in advance of any development and registered as unsuitable for development and reserved as ANRGs for wildlife, thus saving development costs.	Comments noted.
<b>New Milton Town Council</b>	10850_SPD21Mit_5	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	General assumption in the document that recreation only extends to pedestrians with or without dogs, yet leisure cycling is also known to be impactful to sites.	The mitigation projects are focused on diverting the uses that cause the main impacts on the New Forest designated sites, which were further clarified by the 2020 report from Footprint Ecology.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Currie B	10875_SPD21Mit_1	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	<p>Any SPD should be in accordance with the Local Plan approach and appropriately evidenced and justified to provide an appropriate basis upon which to inform development proposals.</p> <p>No concerns or objections to the principal objectives of the SPD. It is however the detail of the document and those sections which diminish flexibility and seek to impose an undue and unrealistic level of prescription where we consider that appropriate changes should be made in order to render the document sound and a reasonable basis upon which to direct development within the District, and in particular the delivery of the Council's strategic site allocations in a sustainable and realistic manner.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Currie B	10875_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	Needs to be clear what the Local Plan, as the adopted development plan document, states, and where the SPD as proposed either sits in accordance with this or goes beyond what is reasonable for the level of policy direction that an SPD.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>New Forest National Park Authority</b>	10827_SPD21Mit_11	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	The mitigation strategy should not preclude the provision of new strategic greenspace (such as a country park). This mitigation measure is included in Table 4 of Footprint Ecology's report on Recreation use of the New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar: Impacts of recreation and potential mitigation approaches' as a longer term potential strategic mitigation measure.	The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cicero Estates	10852_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	<p>Any SPD should be in accordance with the Local Plan approach and appropriately evidenced and justified to provide an appropriate basis upon which to inform development proposals.</p> <p>No concerns or objections to the principal objectives of the SPD. It is however the detail of the document and those sections which diminish flexibility and seek to impose an undue and unrealistic level of prescription where we consider that appropriate changes should be made in order to render the document sound and a reasonable basis upon which to direct development within the District, and in particular the delivery of the Council's strategic site allocations in a sustainable and realistic manner.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Reeves Family and Merlion Capital</b>	11032_SPD21Mit_1	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	Needs to be clear what the Local Plan, as the adopted development plan document, states, and where the SPD as proposed either sits in accordance with this or goes beyond what is reasonable for the level of policy direction that an SPD.	Comments noted.  The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.
<b>BREO Ringwood Limited</b>	11033_SPD21Mit_1	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)	Needs to be clear what the Local Plan, as the adopted development plan document, states, and where the SPD as proposed either sits in accordance with this or goes beyond what is reasonable for the level of policy direction that an SPD.	Comments noted.  The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Reeves Family and Merlion Capital</b></p>	<p>11032_SPD21Mit_2</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)</p>	<p>Any SPD should be in accordance with the Local Plan approach and appropriately evidenced and justified to provide an appropriate basis upon which to inform development proposals.</p> <p>No concerns or objections to the principal objectives of the SPD. It is however the detail of the document and those sections which diminish flexibility and seek to impose an undue and unrealistic level of prescription where we consider that appropriate changes should be made in order to render the document sound and a reasonable basis upon which to direct development within the District, and in particular the delivery of the Council's strategic site allocations in a sustainable and realistic manner.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>BREO Ringwood Limited</b></p>	<p>11033_SPD21Mit_2</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG)</p>	<p>Any SPD should be in accordance with the Local Plan approach and appropriately evidenced and justified to provide an appropriate basis upon which to inform development proposals.</p> <p>No concerns or objections to the principal objectives of the SPD. It is however the detail of the document and those sections which diminish flexibility and seek to impose an undue and unrealistic level of prescription where we consider that appropriate changes should be made in order to render the document sound and a reasonable basis upon which to direct development within the District, and in particular the delivery of the Council's strategic site allocations in a sustainable and realistic manner.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD's overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD's status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Hordle Parish Council</b>	10826_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.1.10 - A4.1.14	There are sufficient proposals to cover the implementation and funding of the green space as well as its continued management and maintenance which would be monitored by the Council.  Support for adoption of the Strategy.	Support of the strategy noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Fordingbridge Town Council</b>	10106_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.2.7	Fordingbridge Town Council agrees with all the things that should be considered on a landscape framework document.	Comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>Persimmon Homes South Coast</b></p>	<p>10990_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.3.1</p>	<p>The SPD should not prohibit off-site ANRG solutions provided that this mitigation meets the locational requirements set out paragraph A4.3.1 of the SPD.</p>	<p>The approach to mitigation used by this SPD was confirmed most recently through the recent Local Plan Part 1 examination.</p> <p>The SPD's overall status is that of guidance and reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Fordingbridge Town Council</b>	10106_SPD21Mit_5	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.3.2	In respect of biodiversity, ANRG sites should not be considered in isolation. The SPD mentions linkage by footpaths. It is hard to see how these sites and maintain a high level of biodiversity if wildlife cannot migrate between these sites and to the open countryside beyond. They need to be connected by a green corridor with trees and planting.	Comments noted – biodiversity and in particular Biodiversity Net Gain is a separate consideration for which the strategic sites will also need to address.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Currie B</b>	10875_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.4	Propose the Council delete the restrictive and prescriptive requirements set out within Section A4.4 of Appendix 4 as a whole, and instead focus on the design quality and appearance of the ANRG spaces and the infrastructure which should be delivered in order to make these attractive and functional public spaces.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>BREO Ringwood Limited</b></p>	<p>11033_SPD21Mit_3</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.4</p>	<p>Propose the Council delete the restrictive and prescriptive requirements set out within Section A4.4 of Appendix 4 as a whole, and instead focus on the design quality and appearance of the ANRG spaces and the infrastructure which should be delivered in order to make these attractive and functional public spaces.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>Cicero Estates</b>	10852_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.4	Propose the Council delete the restrictive and prescriptive requirements set out within Section A4.4 of Appendix 4 as a whole, and instead focus on the design quality and appearance of the ANRG spaces and the infrastructure which should be delivered in order to make these attractive and functional public spaces.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

		<p>guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.4</p>	<p>restrictive and prescriptive requirements set out within Section A4.4 of Appendix 4 as a whole, and instead focus on the design quality and appearance of the ANRG spaces and the infrastructure which should be delivered in order to make these attractive and functional public spaces.</p>	<p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Currie B	10875_SPD21Mit_4	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.5	ANRG diagrams 1-3 which follow on from Section A4.5 should be deleted from the SPD. The Landscape Framework diagram at Figure 4 is more than sufficient to indicate the type and quality of space which is expected and alongside the detailed design considerations at A4.6 provides an appropriate framework for considering ANRG and POS provision on sites.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

		<p>guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.5</p>	<p>from Section A4.5 should be deleted from the SPD. The Landscape Framework diagram at Figure 4 is more than sufficient to indicate the type and quality of space which is expected and alongside the detailed design considerations at A4.6 provides an appropriate framework for considering ANRG and POS provision on sites.</p>	<p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>BREO Ringwood Limited</b></p>	<p>11033_SPD21Mit_4</p>	<p>Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.5</p>	<p>ANRG diagrams 1-3 which follow on from Section A4.5 should be deleted from the SPD. The Landscape Framework diagram at Figure 4 is more than sufficient to indicate the type and quality of space which is expected and alongside the detailed design considerations at A4.6 provides an appropriate framework for considering ANRG and POS provision on sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cicero Estates	10852_SPD21Mit_4	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.5	ANRG diagrams 1-3 which follow on from Section A4.5 should be deleted from the SPD. The Landscape Framework diagram at Figure 4 is more than sufficient to indicate the type and quality of space which is expected and alongside the detailed design considerations at A4.6 provides an appropriate framework for considering ANRG and POS provision on sites.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD’s overall status is that of guidance. It reflects an agreed approach with NE that would meet the Habitat Regulations. The SPD continues to set out that alternative approaches are acceptable where fully justified by evidence.</p> <p>Revisions to text in Section 4 and Appendix 4 made to clarify the SPD’s status as guidance rather than policy.</p>

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<b>West P</b>	10743_SPD21Mit_2	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) A4.5.3 & A4.5.5	Detailed comments on the design and implementation of planting and maintenance of such ANRG sites.  Should' include needs to be more prescriptive. Must would be better.	Comments noted.
<b>Lord</b>	11026_SPD21Mit_3	Appendix 4 - Design guidance for the provision of integrated greenspace on large scale sites, including Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace (ANRG) Para A4.5.4 / A4.5.13	Detailed comments on the species of planting and design of SUDS on such ANRG sites.	Comments noted.

Respondent	Comment ID	Document Section	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p><b>New Forest Dog Owners Group</b></p>	<p>11029_SPD21Mit_1</p>	<p>Appendix 5 - Managing dogs on recreational sites</p>	<p>Detailed comments in respect of walkers with dogs, including:</p> <p>NFDOG welcomes this draft report covering NFDC (non-NPA areas), which is sensible and necessary.</p> <p>Concern raised with having 'designated areas for dogs to walk off lead'. This possibly implies the introduction of other areas where dogs should be walked on lead (at all times, and not seasonally which is understandable).</p> <p>The need for communication is highlighted, and a key part of recreation in the New Forest is explaining that the environment is different, special, and those who enjoy it have a duty to respond appropriately and responsibly to the environment and the situation of their activity.</p> <p>Car parking should at least be maintained at the current level and if, for example, it is necessary to close a car park such as Hatchett Pond, in the longer term NFDC, ( and the NPA and FE) should consider offset, and opening equivalent new car parks and areas</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The need to communicate the importance of the New Forest environment is part of the work of the Ranger element of this mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The wider management of all visitors (including car parking arrangements) within the New Forest European sites, is an issue addressed through the work of the NFNPA, (such as the Partnership Plan and Recreational Management Strategy) and others involved with management of land in the National Park. This SPD addresses the impacts of new Development within the plan area of NFDC (outside the National Park).</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Document Section</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
<b>Historic England</b>	10145_SPD21Mit_1		No comments	
<b>Marine Management Organisation</b>	10327_SPD21Mit_1		As this is a supplementary planning document it does not need an additional bespoke response from MMO.	Noted.
<b>Highways England</b>	10820_SPD21Mit_1		No comments	