

# Adoption of the New Forest District (outside the National Park) Core Strategy

## Sustainability Statement

Adoption of the Core Strategy	Page 1
Sustainability Considerations	Page 1
Options	Page 2
Consultation Responses	Page 2
Alternatives	Page 2
Monitoring sustainability effects	Page 3
Annex 1: Statement of Consultation, Representation and Community Involvement	Page 4

## **Adoption of the Core Strategy**

The New Forest District (outside the National Park) Core Strategy was adopted by New Forest District Council on 26 October 2009, following its examination by an independent inspector. The Core Strategy was found sound, subject to certain changes which have been incorporated.

The purpose of this statement is to explain how sustainability considerations were integrated into the Core Strategy document, and how the significant sustainability effects of implementation will be monitored.

## **Sustainability Considerations**

Sustainability has been a key consideration throughout the production of the Core Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisals which meet the requirements of both the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment were carried out throughout the process.

### Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

In May 2006 a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Background Paper 27) was prepared with the assistance of Land Use Consultants. A consultation took place which included the four statutory SEA consultees (at the time); English Nature, the Countryside Agency, English Heritage and the Environment Agency. A summary of consultation responses to the Scoping Report can be found in Annex 1 of the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report November 2008.

### Core Strategy Preferred Options

In October 2007 the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Preferred Options (Background Paper 32) appraised compatibility between the Sustainability Objectives and the Core Strategy Objectives before going on to appraise a number of options and policy outlines. Options examined were: strategic spatial options; town centre options; affordable housing options; options for tenure of housing on exception sites adjoining towns and villages and options for rural affordable housing. The appraisal also examined the cumulative effect of the policy outlines in combination with other plans and programs. The appraisal of cumulative effects was used to identify areas where mitigation measures would be required in order to make the plan sound.

### Core Strategy Submission

In November 2008 The Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Core Strategy (Background Paper 33) appraised the Core Strategy policies both individually and cumulatively in combination with other plans and programs. This included the appraisal of built in mitigation measures which exist to combat any negative effects of the plan.

## Options

The objectives of the Core Strategy, along with the issues identified during the scoping exercise and stakeholder consultations, set the context for the development of options.

The options were also informed by:

- the Issues and Options consultation ('Future Matters') that was undertaken November 2006 – January 2007 in respect of:
  - a Core Strategy for the District and the National Park,
  - revisions to the existing Community Strategy to produce the Sustainable Community Strategy, and
  - the Strategy for the New Forest (2002)
- Early work and consultations on an Employment Development Plan Document undertaken 2005-2006 (not progressed beyond Preferred Options stage)
- Consideration of requirements emerging through regional planning and national planning policies and guidance,
- the environmental, social and economic characteristics of the District,
- existing local policies

These led to the identification of

- four broad representative options for the distribution of new development (spatial options); and
- options for the following policies:
  - Town centre strategies
  - Affordable housing contributions
  - The tenure of housing on exception sites to meet local housing needs adjoining towns and villages
  - Rural affordable housing.

## Consultation Responses

A Statement of Consultation, Representation and Community Involvement was produced as part of the statement for submission under Regulation 30(1)(d) and was included in the examination library (Library Document F8). This document sets out who was consulted at the various stages of preparing the Core Strategy, what they said, and how this was taken into account in the final document. The Statement is included as an Annex to this document.

## Alternatives

The SEA Directive requires "*reasonable alternatives*" to be taken into account, and this requirement was followed. In some instances, other policy considerations (e.g. PPGs, PPSs and policies in the submitted South East Plan) predetermined which policy approach needed to be adopted, effectively ruling out some options. The number of options needed to be kept manageable and focused on those aspects where real choices had to be made.

## **Monitoring sustainability effects**

The Core Strategy contains a Schedule of Key Outcomes. This table includes the key mitigation measures which will need to be delivered in order to avoid any significant negative effects. The targets set out in the table will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). In preparing the AMR the New Forest District Council will ensure that the sustainability effects of implementing the Core Strategy are documented and that significant effects in particular are highlighted.

## **Annex 1**

# **New Forest District (outside the National Park) Core Strategy**

## **Statement of Consultation, Representation and Community Involvement**

Introduction – page 2

Part 1: Regulation 30(d) Statement – page 3 – 22

Part 2: Regulation 30(e) Statement – page 23– 30



# Introduction

This document describes the main consultations that have taken place during the preparation of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document for New Forest District (outside the National Park).

The Core Strategy was prepared under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, until June 2008, completing the Regulation 26 Pre-Submission public participation. From that date the procedure followed has been as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

The Council's Statement of Community Involvement, adopted in June 2006, set out the agreed process for community involvement. Policies SCI-1, SCI-2, SCI-4, SCI-5, SCI-7 and SCI-8 are particularly relevant to the preparation of the Core Strategy.

There has been public involvement in the preparation of the Core Strategy from the beginning of its preparation. The main ways the public have been involved in the process are set out below:

## Regulation 30 (d)

1. Citizens Panel Survey on Planning Issues;
2. Young People's Panel Survey on Planning Issues;
3. Employment DPD Preferred Options Consultation
4. Future Matters – Issues and Options Consultation – a joint consultation with the Local Strategic Partnership and National Park Authority
5. Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation.

## Regulation 30 (e)

6. Core Strategy Submission Document - Publication for Representations

The following sections set out, for each consultation undertaken:

- which bodies and persons were invited to make representations
- how those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations
- a summary of the main issues raised by those representations, and for the stages leading up to the Submission document publication, how those main issues have been addressed in the Core Strategy.

# Part 1: Regulation 30(d) Statement

## (1) Citizens Panel Survey on Planning Issues

**Who was invited?** 1003 members of the Citizen's Panel

**How were they invited?** Through a postal questionnaire

**When were they invited?** October – November 2004

**What were the main issues raised and how have they been addressed?**

Issue	How Addressed	Relevant Sections
Too few/poor quality leisure and entertainment facilities	The district has well above the level of indoor sport/leisure provision recommended by Sport England so the strategy is focusing on better access to these facilities while allowing new leisure/recreational/entertainment facilities to be developed within town centres.	Objectives 5, 9 Policies CS7, CS8, CS20, CS24
Too few/poor quality local job opportunities	The strategy aims to help meet local employment needs, focusing on high value and knowledge based businesses. The strategy also aims to help improve the skills of the workforce.	Objective 4 Policies CS17, CS18, CS19
Too few/poor quality facilities for children and young people	The strategy aims to provide new spaces where children and young people can play. The provision of these spaces is a priority for the Council as a significant shortfall has been identified.	Policy CS7
Too few/poor quality public transport services	The strategy aims to work with partners towards some long term public transport projects.	Objective 5 Policy CS23
Strategy should be to allow only minimal development which meets local needs	The strategy will meet the requirements of the South East Plan. It also seeks to provide additional opportunities to address the significant local need for affordable housing.	Objective 3 Policies CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14, CS15
Employment sites are important and should be protected	The strategy aims to protect employment sites from alternative development pressures, with the exception of the very few small sites identified for release in the Employment Land Review.	Objective 4 Policy CS17

No housing should be developed on greenfield land, it is preferable to increase densities in existing settlements	The strategy is to protect the character of existing towns and villages and putting all new development within existing settlements by maximising development is not considered an acceptable strategy.	Objective 3 Policies CS1, CS10
The amount of affordable housing available should either continue at current levels, or be increased	The proportion of affordable housing provided as part of new development will increase. This is necessary to continue to reach the Council's affordable housing target.	Objective 3 CS15
There is support for small scale housing developments in smaller settlements, as long as it contributes significantly towards meeting the needs of local people.	Small scale housing developments will be allowed in the smaller settlements. Affordable housing will be required from all new housing developments.	Objective 3 Policies CS12, CS15(b)
Renewable energy should be encouraged, but the Council should identify areas where certain types of renewable energy development are unacceptable.	The strategy encourages the use of renewable energy and requires large developments to produce at least 10% of their energy requirements from renewable sources. Local renewable projects will be supported where there is no over-riding adverse local impact.	Objective 2 Policy CS4
Facilitation of a modal shift towards sustainable modes of transport should focus on improving facilities and the attractiveness of alternative methods rather than penalising the use of the private car.	The strategy seeks improvements to public transport and encourage walking and cycling through the provision of better facilities.	Objective 5 Policies CS23, CS24
A high quality built environment is important	The strategy contains a variety of ways in which the built environment will be preserved and enhanced.	Objective 6 Policies CS3, CS20
High priority should be given to conserving the districts historic built environment	The strategy provides a framework through which the historic built environment will be protected.	Objective 6 Policy CS3

## (2) Young People's Panel Survey on Planning Issues

**Who was invited?** 125 members of the Young People's Panel

**How were they invited?** Through a postal questionnaire

**When were they invited?** January 2007

**What were the main issues raised and how have they been addressed?**

Issue	How Addressed	Relevant Sections in Submission Document
The countryside in general, nature conservation sites and the New Forest National Park should be protected	The strategy provides protection to areas of high quality landscape and biodiversity. The strategy has taken into account its impact on the National Park throughout.	Objectives 7, 8, 9 Policy CS3, CS7
The existing character of towns and villages should be protected	The strategy contains a variety of ways in which the built environment will be preserved and enhanced.	Objective 6 Policies CS2, CS3, CS20
New open spaces and play areas are a good idea	The strategy will require development to incorporate or contribute towards the provision of new open spaces and play areas.	Objective 9 Policy CS7
New entertainment facilities are a good idea	The District has a good range of indoor sport/leisure provision including 5 of its own Health and Leisure centres. The strategy supports new leisure and entertainment facilities in town and district centres.	Objectives 5, 9 Policies CS7, CS8, CS20
Young people are worried about being able to find a job in the area	The strategy aims to help meet local employment needs, focusing on high value and knowledge based businesses. The strategy also aims to improve the skills of the workforce.	Objective 4 Policies CS8, CS17, CS18, CS19
Young people are worried about being able to afford to buy a house in the area	The proportion of affordable housing provided as part of new development will increase. This is necessary to continue to reach the Council's affordable housing target.	Objective 3 CS14, CS15
Places to 'hang out' with friends were rated as being poor. Young people would like to see	The strategy aims to provide new spaces where children and young people can play and	Objective 9 Policy CS7, CS8

more of these places	socialise. The provision of these spaces is a priority for the Council as a significant shortfall has been identified.	
Young people would like more shops for teenagers, located in town centres	The strategy proposes additional retail space within town centres.	Objective 6 Policy CS20

### (3) Employment DPD Preferred Options Consultation

**Who was invited?** Statutory consultees, persons and organisations who had registered an interest in the plan, the general public (see Appendix 1 for full list of consultees).

**How were they invited?** Through post and email consultation, through advertising on the website, through a notice in the local newspaper.

**When were they invited?** 27 October – 7 December 2006

**What were the main issues raised and how have they been addressed?**

*For clarity, only those issues raised which were of a strategic nature have been included*

Issue	How Addressed	Relevant Sections
Existing employment sites and allocations should be kept.	The strategy keeps all existing sites and allocations for employment use except a very few small sites identified for release in the Employment Land Review.	Objective 4 Policy CS17
Training and childcare uses should be allowed on employment sites.	The strategy allows these uses to take place on employment sites	Objective 4 Policy CS17
Do not allocate land at Lynes Farm for employment use	This land has not been allocated	Objective 4 Policy CS18
Allocated land at Crows Lane (existing reserve site) for employment use.	This land has been allocated	Objective 4 Policy CS18
Consider the potential of Dibden Bay to meet employment/commercial needs.	Dibden Bay was assessed in the sustainability appraisal. The results of the SA showed that development at DB would have significant negative impacts in relation to many of the appraisal objectives.	Annex 11 of Appendix 11 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options
Lift the petrochemicals restriction at Fawley Refinery.	Considered, but no policy change proposed.	Policy CS17
Support continuing the current policies of diversification of agricultural uses.	The strategy allows diversification projects where appropriate.	Objective 7 Policy CS21

Encourage home working and live/work units.	The strategy supports flexible working.	Objective 4 Policy CS17
---	---	----------------------------

#### (4) Future Matters issues and Options Consultation

**Who was invited?** Statutory consultees, persons and organisations who had registered an interest in the plan, the citizens' panel, the general public

**How were they invited?** Through post and email consultation, through advertising on the website, through a notice in the local newspaper, through an article in the Council's newssheet, 'New Forest Today'.

**When were they invited?** From 28 November 2006 to 31 January 2007

**What were the main issues raised and how have they been addressed?**

##### 1. Natural Environment and Landscape

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
1.1	Managing and minimising the impact of development pressures in and around the National Park	96%	96%
1.2	Taking a holistic approach to conserving habitats and species	91%	92%
1.3	Managing the cumulative effects of small scale impacts	94%	92%
1.4	Maintaining the tranquillity of the natural environment	93%	92%
1.5	Sustaining commoning and land management which contributes to the special qualities of the area	87%	86%
1.6	Enhancing landscapes and habitats where the New Forest character has been lost or	78%	86%

	degraded		
--	----------	--	--

**How have these issues been addressed?**

Mitigation measures are proposed in Policy CS7 to minimise the impact of development in the plan area on the New Forest National Park and other nature conservation sites. Issues surrounding protecting and enhancing the special environment of the New Forest National Park including supporting the conservation of biodiversity are included in Policy CS1 and in more depth in Policy CS3.

**2. Cultural Heritage**

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
2.1	Conserving the distinctiveness of the cultural heritage of the area	92%	89%

**How have these issues been addressed?**

Measures to support the conservation of the historic environment and cultural heritage are included in Policy CS2 and CS3.

**3. Environmental Protection and the Wise Use of Natural Resources**

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
3.1	Managing the impact of climate change on the New Forest area over the next 20 - 30 years	86%	81%
3.2	Coastal management and protection	87%	90%
3.3	Minimising the impact of flooding	86%	81%
3.4	Making wise use of natural resources (water, energy and the use of non renewable materials)	98%	96%
3.5	Reducing and managing waste	98%	98%
3.6	Reducing pollution:		
	- Air	95%	94%
	- Light	92%	83%
	- Noise	95%	93%
	- Contaminated land	94%	93%
	- Fly tipping	95%	97%
	- Litter	96%	98%

**How have these issues been addressed?**

Flood risk, climate change, pollution and coastal management have been addressed through policies CS5 on Safe and healthy communities, CS6 on Flood risk and CS4 on Energy and resource use. Policy CS1 on sustainable development provides a holistic approach to dealing with the issues outlined above.

#### 4. Housing

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
4.1	Helping more local people have access to affordable housing that meets their needs	89%	85%
4.2	Providing affordable housing in rural communities	83%	74%
4.3	Providing the right type of new housing to meet the needs of local communities	91%	84%
4.4	Making the best use of the existing housing stock	92%	89%
4.5	Providing housing for special needs	87%	75%
4.6	Addressing the housing needs of gypsies and travellers	39%	31%

#### How have these issues been addressed?

Housing provision, including the provision of affordable housing, is addressed through policies CS11-15. Affordable rural housing will be provided through policy CS22. Gypsy and traveller needs will be met through policy CS16.

#### 5. Economy

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
5.1	Increasing Investment	74%	74%
5.2	Improving and making best use of skills	80%	81%
5.3	Increasing levels of enterprise	82%	74%
5.4	Making local businesses more competitive	67%	75%

#### How have these issues been addressed?

Policies CS17 and CS18 on Employment and economic development address these issues.

#### 6. Transport

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations	% of Individuals
----------	-------	--------------------	------------------

		<b>who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'</b>	
6.1	Meeting the challenge of future growth	96%	91%
6.2	Promoting sustainable methods of transport - alternatives to the private car	95%	81%
6.3	Reducing road traffic accidents involving animals	80%	83%
6.4	Improving access to services and town centres	67%	67%

#### **How have these issues been addressed?**

Policies CS23 on Strategic transport proposals and CS24 on Local transport considerations address transport infrastructure within the plan area.

### **7. Tourism**

<b>Issue No</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'</b>	<b>% of Individuals who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'</b>
7.1	Visitor engagement	65%	69%
7.2	The tourism industry becoming more competitive in a dynamic global market place	63%	52%
7.3	Tangible community benefits from tourism	51%	52%
7.4	Improving management of access and travel arrangements	80%	73%

#### **How have these issues been addressed?**

Policy CS19 on Tourism supports measures which will reduce pressure on vulnerable habitats, while supporting tourism which will bring community benefits.

### **8. Leisure and Recreation**

<b>Issue No</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'</b>	<b>% of Individuals who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'</b>
8.1	Healthy communities: participation and rehabilitation	65%	76%
8.2	Investing in leisure facilities	69%	74%
8.3	Improving accessibility to leisure opportunities	76%	62%
8.4	Managing the impacts of recreational pressures on the environment of the National Park	89%	84%
8.5	Better understanding and enjoyment of the	80%	80%

	special qualities of the National Park by local people and visitors		
--	---	--	--

**How have these issues been addressed?**

Policy CS7 Open space sport and recreation and CS8 Community services and infrastructure address both outdoor and indoor recreational facilities.

**9. Health**

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
9.1	Tackling Health Inequalities	63%	65%
9.2	Reducing the number of people who smoke	73%	77%
9.3	Tackling obesity	71%	75%
9.4	Increasing uptake of physical activity	79%	78%
9.5	Improving sexual health	72%	68%
9.6	Reducing harm from alcohol and encouraging sensible drinking	82%	83%

**How have these issues been addressed?**

The strategy aims to provide sustainable development, which in general encourages healthier lifestyles for example, increasing the walking and cycling options available.

**10. Community Safety**

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
10.1	Reducing offending rates of young people	88%	95%
10.2	Reducing the numbers of people killed or seriously injured on our roads	92%	97%
10.3	Reducing anti-social behaviour and crime and disorder linked to the excessive consumption of alcohol	83%	91%
10.4	Reducing the incidence of deliberate fires	87%	88%
10.5	Solving community based issues in your neighbourhood	70%	78%

**How have these issues been addressed?**

The strategy aims to provide facilities for young people as part of Policy CS7 Open Space. Policy CS5 Safe and healthy communities provides design guidelines to reduce crime in public places. The strategy aims to provide safer roads through Policy CS24 Local transport considerations.

**11. Children and Young People**

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
11.1	Children and young people being healthy	90%	90%
11.2	Children and young people staying safe	88%	93%
11.3	Children and young people achieving in and enjoying life	90%	90%
11.4	Children and young people making a positive contribution	89%	87%
11.5	Children and young people becoming economically active and independent	69%	83%

#### **How have these issues been addressed?**

The strategy aims to address a shortfall in the provision of safe and healthy play spaces through Policy CS7 Open space, sport and recreation. Policy CS5 deals with safe and healthy communities whilst Policy CS17 deals with 'employment and economic development including improving workforce skills. Policy CS8 focuses on new community services including possible new provision whilst Policy CS20 on town, village and local centres also considers the provision of new entertainment and leisure facilities.

#### **12. Older People**

Issue No	Issue	% of Organisations who said issue was 'very important' or 'important'	% of Individuals
12.1	Older people having better access to services and information	85%	88%
12.2	Older people having continued independence	88%	94%
12.3	Older people being enabled to influence the development of services that affect them	80%	88%
12.4	Older people remaining healthy	85%	96%

#### **How have these issues been addressed?**

The strategy aims to improve accessibility to services and improved health for everyone through sustainable development. Policy CS21 Rural Community aims to support local services in rural areas. Policy CS2 requires new homes to be capable of adaptation (lifetime homes).

#### **13. Towns, Villages and Countryside – Spatial Planning Issues**

**Q202 - When considering how we should make best use of land for new development within our existing towns and villages what should we do?**

There was general agreement on how to make best use of land. Organisations (59%) and individuals (66%) said that they would like a balance between promoting higher density and protecting the existing character.

**Q203 - Should new development be allowed on green-field sites?**

The opinions of the organisations consulted were split - 39% of organisations said that it was acceptable for new development to be allowed on greenfield sites, but only if there is no alternative way of accommodating development. This view was also held with 37% of individuals, 33% of organisations and 19% of individuals thought that in some circumstances it might be the best option for accommodating more development.

## (5) Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation

**Who was invited?** 1,080 Statutory consultees, persons and organisations who had registered an interest in the plan, the general public (see Appendix 1 for the list of consultees).

**How were they invited?** Through post and email consultation, through advertising on the website, through a notice in the local newspaper, through the issue of press release to local media, through an article in the Council's newssheet, 'Ne Forest Today'.

**When were they invited?** From 29 October to 10 December 2007

The Council consulted on the Core Strategy Preferred Options document from 29 October – 10 December 2007. A total of 145 responses were received. The response forms asked respondents to indicate whether or not they agreed or disagreed with each section/ policy outline and invited additional comments.

### Summary of Core Strategy Representations

<b>SUMMARY OF CORE STRATEGY RESPONSES</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No View</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Key Issues</b>	55	13	4	72
<b>Core Strategy Vision Statement</b>	49	13	8	70
<b>Core Strategy Objectives</b>	43	19	6	68
<b>CS1- Sustainable Development Locations</b>	65	10	2	77
<b>CS2- Settlement Hierarchy</b>	55	28	2	85
<b>CS3 - Preferred Spatial Option for housing and employment</b>	52	34	4	90
<b>CS4 - Housing provision and distribution</b>	41	41	4	86
<b>CS5 - Employment sites</b>	42	34	5	81
<b>CS6 - Hierarchy of shopping centres</b>	48	3	9	60
<b>CS7 - New retail, commercial and leisure development</b>	36	8	18	62
<b>CS8 - Green Belt</b>	51	17	5	73
<b>CS9 - Gaps</b>	49	8	10	67
<b>CS10 - Transport</b>	36	17	12	65
<b>CS11 - Energy and Resource Use</b>	50	7	12	69
<b>CS12 - Infrastructure and Utilities</b>	48	0	14	62
<b>CS13 - Flood Risk</b>	49	5	10	64
<b>CS14 - Housing types, sizes and tenure</b>	50	15	9	74
<b>CS15 - Affordable housing contributions</b>	36	33	10	79
<b>CS16 - Exception sites to meet local housing needs – adjoining defined towns and villages</b>	33	21	11	65
<b>CS17 - Affordable housing for rural communities</b>	44	4	11	59

<b>SUMMARY OF CORE STRATEGY RESPONSES</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>No View</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CS18 - Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople</b>	32	3	22	57
<b>CS19 - Types of employment</b>	48	9	11	68
<b>CS20 - Workforce skills</b>	50	0	13	63
<b>CS21 - Flexible working</b>	43	3	15	61
<b>CS22 - Rural economy</b>	47	3	11	61
<b>CS23 - Tourism</b>	40	3	15	58
<b>CS24 - Wildlife and nature conservation</b>	48	4	10	62
<b>CS25 - Historic heritage, landscape, townscape and design</b>	47	4	11	62
<b>CS26 - Open space, sport and recreation</b>	42	18	10	70
<b>CS27 - Community facilities and social deprivation</b>	45	6	10	61
<b>CS28 - Pollution and major hazards</b>	45	1	11	57
<b>CS29 - Developers' contributions</b>	54	10	6	70
<b>Site Specific</b>				
<b>Appendix</b>				
<b>Other</b>				

**What were the main issues raised and how have they been addressed?**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>How Addressed</b>	<b>Relevant Sections</b>
Is the placing of individual settlements within the settlement hierarchy, and the amount of new development that will take place in each settlement right for those settlements?	Since the Preferred Options document the placing of all settlements within the hierarchy has been reviewed. It has been decided to move Marchwood up to Level 3.	Policy CS9
Is the proposed mix of brownfield and greenfield development appropriate?	The strategy has recognized the need to meet development needs in the most sustainable way, utilizing development opportunities within existing built up areas while maintaining local distinctiveness and character. Some greenfield development will be necessary to address local housing and employment needs.	Objectives 3, 4 Policies CS1, CS10

<b>Issue</b>	<b>How Addressed</b>	<b>Relevant Sections</b>
Is the proposed level of housing appropriate?	The proposed level of housing meets the requirements of the draft South East Plan and provides additional housing to meet the needs of local people.	Policy CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS15
Has a SHLAA been carried out? What allowance is being included for windfalls and how is it justified?	A SHLAA has been prepared and was published at the same time as the Core Strategy publication. There is no reliance on windfalls for the delivery of the South East Plan housing requirement.	Policies CS10, CS11
Is the proposed level of affordable housing appropriate?	The proportion of affordable housing provided as part of new development will increase. This is necessary to continue to reach the Council's affordable housing target.	Objective 3 CS15
Are the affordable housing site size threshold and the % requirements viable, taking into account the value of previously developed residential land?	Some extra viability work has been done and the affordable housing policies revised to ensure economic viability.	Policy CS15
Should the affordable housing threshold have further variations within the district?	Some extra viability work has been done and the affordable housing threshold revised for certain types of development.	Policy CS15
Can the market adjust to the affordable housing threshold as quickly as is proposed?	In order to allow the market more time to adjust, the requirements will not become fully operational until 1 <sup>st</sup> Jan 2011.	Policy CS15
What (if any) proportion of market housing should be allowed on exception sites?	In order to keep a mix of tenures and ensure viability of schemes up to 30% of dwellings on sites for affordable housing released under policy CS12 can be low cost market housing. For exception sites, Policy CS22, 100% of the housing must be affordable, but this includes intermediate housing.	Policies CS12, CS15 (b), CS22
Should the policy on gypsies and travellers provide more	The location of any extra gypsy sites will be assessed	Policy CS16

<b>Issue</b>	<b>How Addressed</b>	<b>Relevant Sections</b>
information on potential sites?	at the site allocations level having regard to the emerging revised requirements in the RSS. A criteria based policy is included in the Core Strategy.	
Is the proposed level of employment land to be provided appropriate?	The proposed level of employment land will meet the District's PUSH requirement and provide opportunities for the growth of local businesses and provision of local jobs.	Policy CS17
Is the type of employment land proposed appropriate?	The strategy aims to HELP meet local employment needs, focusing on high value and knowledge based businesses. It is felt that the provision of these types of employment, coupled with a strategy to improve the skills of the workforce will provide local people with high quality jobs.	Objective 4 Policies CS17, CS18, CS19
Could the strategy do more to assist the locally specific marine/boating related industries?	The strategy aims to protect opportunities suitable for marine related industries	Policy CS17
Should retail development amounts be split between individual towns?	The strategy now contains a split between the individual towns	Policy CS20
Has the strategy considered fully its impact on the New Forest National Park?	The strategy has taken into account its impact on the National Park throughout.	SA/SEA (Background Paper 33) HRA (Background Paper 30) Supporting Paper 1
Has a full habitat regulations assessment been carried out?	Yes, and it has been updated and published at each stage of the process.	HRA (Background Paper 30)
Should the strategy do more to protect biodiversity? Or can development take place alongside biodiversity?	The strategy aims to protect and enhance biodiversity. Nationally, internationally and locally designated sites will continue to be protected as at present.	Policy CS3
Should the strategy do more to protect the coast?	The strategy will take a sustainable and practical approach to coastal	Policies CS5, CS6

Issue	How Addressed	Relevant Sections
Is the treatment of green belt land appropriate?	protection. The strategy follows the principle of the South East Plan which allows for small scale green belt reviews. The detailed small scale revisions will be identified in a future DPD dealing with site allocations.	Policy CS12
Are the local gaps that are proposed needed? Should further local gaps be identified?	There is general support for the use of local gaps. Some were previously designated as 'strategic gaps'. Some of the additional local gaps suggested by other parties are already designated as green belt and consequently already have a high level of protection.	Policy CS10
Does the strategy consider fully the need to improve rail services and cycling facilities in order to encourage sustainable transport modes?	The strategy aims to work with partners towards long term public transport projects.	Objective 5 Policy CS23
What prioritization should be given to the transport improvement schemes proposed in the district?	Policies CS23 and CS24 together with table 3 of the Core Strategy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan indicate priorities for transport improvement schemes.	Policy CS23
Has the strategy sufficiently addressed traffic pollution?	The matter is dealt with, requiring measures to address air quality problems.	Policy CS5
Is policy CS11 Energy and Resource Use viable?	The Council has done further investigation into the viability of this policy and has decided to revise the policy.	Policy CS4
Could the flood risk strategy be more locationally specific? Can it include surface water run-off?	Areas at risk from flooding are identified by the Environment Agency and this data is being constantly updated. It is best to refer back to this data rather than have data included in the strategy which might become out of date. The strategy will discourage the use of materials which	Policy CS6

Issue	How Addressed	Relevant Sections
	contribute to surface water run-off.	
Is the proposed open space standard viable and justified? Could the open space policy say more about implementation?	Further work has been carried out by the Council. The open space standard has been revised. The policy now provides the basis for future DPD Policies and an open space SPD which will say more about implementation.	Policy CS7
Should the open space standard provide a standard for indoor sports facilities?	The Council has assessed the provision of indoor sport within the district and has found it to be higher than the level recommended by Sport England. Consequently an indoor space standard would be counter-productive.	Policy CS7
Could the strategy do more to address the needs of young people?	The strategy has been amended to place greater emphasis the provision of new open spaces designated for children and young people. The provision of these spaces is a priority for the Council as a significant shortfall has been identified.	Policy CS7
Could the strategy do more to address the needs of elderly people?	The strategy aims to ensure that new housing is designed for easy adaptation to enable people to remain in their homes in old age.	Policies CS2, CS13
Could the strategy do more to ensure that the needs of communities are met?	The strategy has been developed to reflect the needs of the community as emerging through the Sustainable Community Strategy and an extensive programme of 'grass roots' community planning. Details of particular projects are outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Policy CS5
Should the collection of contributions be on a tariff or site by site basis?	This is something which will be determined once further government guidance has been issued.	N/A

## **Appendix 1 – List of Consultees**

### **Government Bodies**

English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Highways Agency  
Natural England  
Defence Estates  
Government Office for the South East  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Health & Safety Executive  
Ministry of Defence  
Secretary of State for Transport<sup>1</sup>

### **National Bodies**

Royal Society for Protection of Birds  
Salisbury Health Care NHS  
The Theatres Trust  
Sport England  
National Farmers Union  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
Coal Authority<sup>1</sup>

### **Local Strategic Partnership**

Community First New Forest  
New Forest Primary Care Trust  
New Forest Business Partnership  
New Forest National Park Authority  
Brockenhurst College  
Forestry Commission New Forest  
New Forest Tourism Association  
Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service  
Hampshire County Council  
Department of Health/SE Public Health Group  
Hampshire Constabulary  
New Forest District Association of Local Councils  
Registered Social Landlords (LSP)

---

<sup>1</sup> Consulted following publication of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008

Citizens' Advice Bureau  
New Forest Young Persons' Forum  
Head of County Services (Library and Information Services)  
Hants Parish & Town Councils  
Citizens Advice Bureau

### **Service/Utility Provider**

National Grid  
Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service  
Southern Water  
Network Rail  
Southern Electric  
Wessex Water  
British Gas  
British Telecommunications plc  
Bournemouth & West Hants Water Co.  
Hampshire Constabulary  
RWEpower

### **Regional Bodies**

SEEDA  
South West England Regional Assembly  
South East England Regional Assembly

### **Local Groups**

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
Hightown Hill Residents Association  
New Milton, Barton-on-Sea and District Residents Association  
Pennington Residents' Association  
Ellingham and Ringwood R.F.C  
Fawley Church  
New Forest Association  
CPRE  
Shipyard Residents Hythe  
Hampshire Cycling/CTC  
Lymington Society  
Hampshire Economic Task Group  
Calmore Infant School  
Rushington Manor Residents' Association  
Solent Protection Society  
New Forest Commoners Defence Assn  
Sway Women's Institute  
Knightcrest Park Residents Association

New Forest Association of Local Councils  
Stonham  
Connexions  
North West Forest Children & Families Forum  
South West Forest Children & Families Forum  
The Environment Centre  
Planning Aid South  
Tourism South East  
Southampton & Fareham Chamber of Commerce  
Cranborne Chase & West Wilts Downs AONB  
Bransgore Residents Association  
Solent Centre for Architecture & Design  
Hampshire Association of Parish & Town Councils  
Verderers of the New Forest  
Ramblers Association  
Bransgore & District Residents Assocn.  
New Forest Tourism Association  
The Portsmouth Society  
New Forest Association Planning Sub-Committee  
New Forest Business Partnership  
Federation of Small Businesses (New Forest Branch)  
Ringwood Chamber of Trade & Commerce  
South Hampshire Enterprise Agency  
New Milton Town Partnership  
Lymington & District Chamber of Commerce & Industry  
Shipyard Residents  
Fryern Court Road Residents' Association  
Six Acre Residents Association  
Ringwood & Fordingbridge Footpath Society  
Fordingbridge and District Community Association  
Bransgore Community Steering Group  
New Forest Dog Owners' Group  
Sway Women's Institute  
Swaythling Housing Society  
Pennington Community Action Group  
Tourism South East  
Totton and Eling Community Association  
Hants and IOW Active Sports Partnership  
The Children's Society Young Carers Initiative  
CTC  
British Horse Society  
Wellow History Society  
Avon Valley Archaeological Society  
Great Wells House self catering accommodation  
Hampshire Gardens Trust  
Winchester Reference Library  
County Youth Service

### **Neighbouring Councils**

Eastleigh Borough Council  
Wiltshire County Council  
Test Valley Borough Council  
Salisbury District Council  
Southampton City Council  
Hampshire County Council  
Christchurch Borough Council  
East Dorset District Council  
Dorset County Council  
Melchet Park & Plaitford Parish Council  
Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council  
Romsey Extra Parish Council  
Wellow Parish Council  
Hurn Parish Council  
Burton Parish Council  
Alderholt Parish Council  
Cranborne & Edmondsham Parish Council  
Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council  
St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council  
Verwood Parish Council  
Bishopstone Parish Council  
Bower Chalke Parish Council  
Coombe Bisset Parish Council  
Downton Parish Council  
Landford Parish Council  
Odstock Parish Council  
Redlynch Parish Council  
Stratford Tony Parish Council

**Parish and Town Councils**

Aldershot Parish Council  
Ashurst & Colbury Parish Council  
Beaulieu Parish Council  
Boldre Parish Council  
Bramshaw Parish Council  
Bransgore Parish Council  
Breamore Parish Council  
Brockenhurst Parish Council  
Burley Parish Council  
Copythorne Parish Council  
Damerham Parish Council  
Denny Lodge Parish Council  
East Boldre Parish Council  
Ellingham Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council  
Exbury & Lepe Parish Council  
Fawley Parish Council  
Fordingbridge Town Council

Hale Parish Council  
Hordle Parish Council  
Hyde Parish Council  
Hythe & Dibden Parish Council  
Lymington & Pennington Town  
Lyndhurst Parish Council  
Marchwood Parish Council  
Martin Parish Council  
Milford-on-Sea Parish Council  
Minstead Parish Council  
Netley Marsh Parish Council  
New Milton Town Council  
Ringwood Town Council  
Rockbourne Parish Council  
Sandleheath Parish Council  
Sopley Parish Council  
Sway Parish Council  
Totton & Eling Town Council  
Whitsbury Parish Council  
Woodgreen Parish Council

**Local Businesses and Residents**

Local businesses, agents and residents who have asked to be kept informed/ consulted.  
(Database of over 750 addressees).

## Part 2: Regulation 30(e) Statement

### (6) Core Strategy Submission Document

**Who was invited?** Statutory consultees, over 1000 persons and organisations who had registered an interest in the plan, the general public (same as preferred options – see Regulation 30(d) statement Appendix 1).

**How were they invited?** Through post and email consultation, through advertising on the website (<http://www.newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=8192>), through a notice in the local newspaper and a press release to local media.

**When were they invited?** From 7<sup>th</sup> November to 19<sup>th</sup> December 2008

During the period for representations on the Core Strategy submission document representations were made by 92 representors. Most made more than one representation. In total 515 separate representations were made. The table below summarises to which parts of the Core Strategy document the representations related, and whether the representations were objecting or supporting those parts of the Core Strategy.

### Core Strategy Submission Representations

Policy	Number of Reps			TOTAL
	Object	Support	Comment	
Not policy specific	74	23	23	120
CS10	44	9	4	57
CS12	26	11	3	40
CS15	25	4	4	33
CS18	21	4	2	27
CS17	17	4	4	25
CS11	20	0	2	22
CS7	12	5	4	21
CS1	10	4	2	16
CS9	6	8	2	16
CS25	12	4	0	16
CS14	9	4	0	13
CS3	8	2	1	11
CS4	4	4	3	11
CS19	4	5	2	11
CS2	5	2	3	10
CS8	9	1	0	10
CS6	3	3	3	9
CS13	7	1	0	8
CS23	2	3	3	8
CS20	3	3	1	7
CS21	3	2	1	6
CS24	4	1	1	6

<b>CS5</b>	2	1	2	5
<b>CS16</b>	3	0	2	5
<b>CS22</b>	0	2	0	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>515</b>

## Summary of Main Issues Raised by Core Strategy Representations

The Council has identified the main issues which have been raised by the representations. These are set out in the following schedule.

Related policy	Issue
	Are the objectives appropriately expressed? Are the Objectives SMART?
	How has the impact of major development in adjoining areas (South East Dorset, South Hampshire) been taken into account in the strategy, and how are the effects mitigated?
CS1	Does the strategy give appropriate emphasis to the use of previously developed land? Is the strategy appropriate in not including a presumption in favour of meeting housing and employment needs on previously developed sites in the countryside?
CS1/CS3	Does the strategy deal appropriately with 'cultural heritage' and the 'historic environment'?
CS3	Is there evidence to support the need to mitigate the impact of development on nature conservation interests?
	Does the Core Strategy provide the appropriate level of detail about mitigation measures?
CS4	Are the requirements to introduce the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards appropriate?
	Does the Core Strategy need to supplement SE Plan policies NRM15 and NRM16 or should this be dealt with in a subsequent DPD?
	Is national and regional policy/ guidance on renewable energy complied with?

Related policy	Issue
	Should specific mention be made of bio-mass?
CS5/CS6	Is Flood Risk dealt with appropriately? Does it comply with National Policy? Has appropriate account been taken of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment?
	Does the Core Strategy deal appropriately with previously developed land within settlement boundaries that is at risk from flooding?
CS7	Is the proposed standard for public open space appropriate? Should the standard be 'relaxed' in areas where existing provision is good?
	Does CS7 provide adequate and appropriate provision within the Plan Area for the mitigation of recreational impacts on the New Forest SPA and other sensitive European sites?
	Should a new country park be provided within the Plan Area to mitigate recreational impacts on the New Forest National Park?
	Should the strategy include a local standard for indoor sports provision?
	Should the value of 'natural play' be reflected in the policy?
CS8	Do policies in the Strategy provide an appropriate basis for supporting the development of new infrastructure that is needed to support communities in the plan area?
CS9	Is the settlement hierarchy appropriate?
	Should more housing development be directed towards Fordingbridge?
	Should more development be directed towards Totton?
	Should Bransgore be a level 2 settlement?
CS10	Should the South East Plan housing figures be regarded as a target, a maximum or a minimum for provision?
	Does the housing provision made meet the requirements of the South East Plan?

Related policy	Issue
	Does the strategy provide a balanced approach to housing and employment development which will not increase cross-boundary movements into Dorset?
	Is it inappropriate for the strategy to seek development locations which are accessible by both car-based and other transport modes?
	Has appropriate weight been given to the protection of the New Forest National Park?
	Does the Core Strategy adequately deal with mitigation measures to address recreational and other impacts on SPAs/ European nature conservation designations?
	Does the Core Strategy appropriately deal with Highway Agency concerns about the capacity of the A31/A338 Ringwood junction?
	Should the phrase 'by both car based and other transport modes' used in the document be amended as suggested by the Highways Agency to "by both car and other sustainable transport modes"? Does the reference to ensuring development is assessable by both car based and other transport modes make the strategy unsound?
	Is it appropriate for the Strategy to include provision for small amendments to the green belt boundary – to be determined through a subsequent DPD?
	Is the designation of 'local gaps' appropriate? Should a local gap be defined between Totton and Nursling?
	Does the strategy deal appropriately with the issue of an ageing population in the plan area?
	Does the housing provision made meet the requirements of the South East Plan?
	Are the assumptions made about the supply of housing sites in the SHLAA sound?
	Has NFDC overestimated/ underestimated the future supply of housing sites from development within existing built-up areas, including small unidentified sites?
	Does the strategy optimise the use of brownfield sites?
	Are additional greenfield allocations required? Should additional land be allocated for development around Lymington?
	Are the assumptions made about the impact of the emphasis, on local distinctiveness and good design, on future housing land supply from sites within the existing settlements appropriate and does this comply with national policy?

Related policy	Issue
CS11	Are the sites allocated at Durley Farm and Crow Lane appropriate allocations and deliverable?
	Are the affordable housing requirements appropriate?
	Are the public open space requirements appropriate?
	Is it appropriate to safeguard future options for a link road in the Crow Lane allocation?
	Do the allocations adequately implement SE Plan policies NRM11 and NRM12 regarding the implementation of renewable energy/ energy efficiency measures and combined heat and power schemes on allocated sites?
CS12	Is it appropriate for the Strategy to include provision for additional housing allocations, above that in the South East Plan, in order to address the local need for affordable housing?
	Should additional housing provision, over the SE Plan requirements, be expressed as a 'maximum'?
	Is the proposed distribution and level of new housing proposed for each settlement in CS12 appropriate?
	Does the term 'affordable housing' used in CS12 need clarifying?
	Is it appropriate for sites identified under CS12 to be released for development prior to sites allocated under CS11?
	Does the approach to identifying housing land supply accord with PPS3?
	Should affordable housing provided under policy CS12 be subject to a local connection requirement?
	Should the Strategy include the allocation of the further land for housing as set out in CS12, if affordable housing provision could not be achieved in accordance with Policy CS15(b)?
CS13	Is there a need to clarify phrases in (a) and (d)? (Maximising affordable housing/ family housing)
	Should the strategy identify as a housing priority a specific need for extra care housing and/or sheltered housing to meet the needs of the ageing population?

Related policy	Issue
CS14	Does the target for affordable housing and how the need is to be addressed by other policies in the Core Strategy need further clarification?
CS15	Are the affordable housing targets set in CS15 appropriate and justified? Can they be delivered?
	Should the % of affordable housing be expressed as a target not a minimum target?
	Does the policy provide the appropriate balance between actual 'on-site' provision and off-site contributions?
	Will it be economically viable to provide affordable housing in accordance with policy CS15?
	Is the proposed split between 'social rented' and 'intermediate' affordable housing appropriate?
	Is clarification needed on what parts of policy CS15 the last paragraph of the policy refers to? Is the period of 'discount' necessary?
	Can the overall housing numbers be achieved with the proposed affordable housing policies?
	Should affordable housing requirements apply to extra care housing and care home developments? What form should these contributions take?
CS16	Should 'impact on historic environment' be added to the criteria?
	Has Circular 4/2007 been considered?
CS17	Is the level of employment growth appropriate? Will it increase housing demand and stimulate in-migration rather than meeting local employment needs? Will it reduce traffic flows related to travel to work? Will it have unacceptable traffic impact on the National Park?
	Is the definition of 'employment sites' too narrow? Does the strategy take appropriate account of employment provision generated by non-B Class uses? Tourism, Service and Care sectors?
	Should (d) be amended to allow release of employment sites to alternative uses where there would be a 'greater benefit to the wider community'?
	Should health, care and education provision which generates employment be accepted on employment sites?

Related policy	Issue
	Should reference to SE Plan policy encouraging the development of communications technology infrastructure be added?
	Should the strategy make provision for extension of existing and enlargement of employment sites?
	Has appropriate account been taken of the Solent Waterfront Strategy?
	Should the Strategy make provision for large regional retail distribution facilities?
CS18	Does the strategy provide an appropriate distribution of new employment land? Are sites in the localities identified 'deliverable'?
	Will the redevelopment and intensification of existing employment sites in Totton and Marchwood deliver the PUSH requirement for additional warehousing floorspace? Is the redevelopment of existing sites (including Eling Wharf) deliverable?
	For employment development near sensitive European designated sites is appropriate provision made for mitigate measures?
	Do the policy criteria need further clarification?
	Should additional provision (of up to 13.8 hectares) be made for the employment development , including a Regional Distribution Centre, at Wade Park Ower?
CS19	Should the strategy be clearer about parts of the coast where access should be limited?
CS20	Should the retail floorspace figures be expressed in a way to give some flexibility?
	Does a comment need adding about the need to review the retail floorspace requirements over the plan period?
CS21	No issues raised
CS22	No issues raised

Related policy	Issue
CS23	Is their adequate emphasis on mitigation and public transport improvements?
	Does the strategy provide an appropriate basis for securing mitigation measures to address for transport impacts from development?
CS24	Should provision be made in the Core Strategy for access improvements to Eling Wharf?
	Should the strategy provide for contributions towards transport impact mitigation measures within the New Forest National Park?
CS25	Does the policy comply with Circular 5/2005? Does it provide an appropriate basis for detailed policies in other LDF documents?
	Does the strategy meet the infrastructure delivery planning requirements set out in PPS12?
	Does the Core Strategy make appropriate provision to ensure that development policies be implemented without damage or disturbance to protected sites?
	Should the amendment to para.3, put forward by HCC, be incorporated?
	Should provision be made for contributions towards the AONB Management Plan?
Other issues not policy specific	Does the Core Strategy have appropriate policies for the coast?
	Does the Core Strategy have appropriate regard to the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB?
	Does the Core Strategy conform to national and regional policy in relation to Dibden Bay?
	Should the employment land at Christchurch Road Ringwood be released for mixed development?

Related policy	Issue
	Are the Key Diagrams clear?
	Can the Objectives be monitored satisfactorily?
	Does the community involvement in the preparation of the Core Strategy Core Strategy comply with the SCI?
	Has the Sustainability Appraisal been properly undertaken?
	Are the conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment based on a robust evidence base?

## Summary

The Core Strategy has been prepared working closely with partner organisations, including the New Forest National Park Authority, local communities and agencies. There have been two major public consultations – the ‘Future Matters – Issues and Options’ consultation in 2006, and the ‘Preferred Options’ consultation in 2007. All of the consultation that has taken place helped in producing the Core Strategy Submission Document – Publication for Representations.