

New Forest National Park Authority

**Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England)
Regulations 2004**



**NEW FOREST
NATIONAL PARK**

**Consultation Statement
(Regulation 30(1)(d) Statement)**

February 2010

New Forest National Park Authority Consultation Statement

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Regulation 25 Consultation – ‘ <i>Future Matters</i> ’	4
3. Additional Stakeholder Involvement – ‘ <i>New Forest New Chapter</i> ’	8
4. Regulation 26 Consultation – ‘ <i>Draft National Park Plan</i> ’	13
5. Additional Stakeholder Involvement	28
6. Publication of the Submission draft Core Strategy DPD	31
Annex A: Reg. 25 Consultees – ‘ <i>Future Matters</i> ’	32
Annex B: ‘ <i>New Forest, New Chapter</i> ’ participants	37
Annex C: Reg. 26 Consultees – ‘ <i>Draft National Park Plan</i> ’	38

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The National Park Authority has prepared a *Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD* ('the Core Strategy') that sets out both strategic planning policies and development management policies for the Park. It also expresses the spatial elements of the National Park Management Plan and the respective Community Strategies for the area.
- 1.2 The process of compiling the evidence base and preparing the Core Strategy began in 2006 when the National Park Authority became an operative planning authority. The Authority resolved in September 2005 to prepare a joint Core Strategy with New Forest District Council (Authority Report NFNPA 30/05). A number of documents for the evidence base were jointly commissioned with New Forest District Council. Under the requirements of the 2004 Planning Regulations (see below), there was consultation held between November 2006 and January 2007 on the Core Strategy '*Issues and Options*' document which was undertaken jointly with consultation on the review of the New Forest District Community Strategy and the National Park Management Plan, and was entitled '*Future Matters*'. This is set out in more detail in Section 2 of this Statement.
- 1.3 In mid-2007 the Authority took the decision to produce a separate Core Strategy for the National Park, as the Authority could not adhere to the timetable for the joint Core Strategy, and did not want to impede the District Council's progress in preparing a Core Strategy for their area. The Authority undertook a number of formal and informal consultation events / partnership working, that would inform both the New Forest Management Plan and the Core Strategy. This is set out in more detail in Section 3 of this Statement.
- 1.4 Initial work on the Core Strategy was undertaken in accordance with the *Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004*. Consequently the Authority consulted on an 'Issues and Options' paper in 2006/7. With the changes to the regulations introduced by the *Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations June 2008*, the Authority undertook further extensive 'public participation in the preparation of the Plan' (Regulation 25). As well as a series of workshops, this included the publication of the consultation draft *National Park Plan* for comment between August – November 2008 (which integrated the Management Plan and Core Strategy in a single document), and the series of follow up engagements. Following this consultation it was decided to separate the National Park Management Plan and the Core Strategy. Further consultation took place on a revised Management Plan, which was finalised in December 2009 and published in February 2010. The Core Strategy was also revised and published as a submission document in February 2010 (Regulation 27).

- 1.5 This Consultation Statement sets out the main formal and informal consultation events undertaken by the National Park Authority in preparing the Core Strategy from 2006 onwards. In accordance with Regulation 30 (1) (d) of the 2008 Planning Regulations, this sets out:
- (a) which bodies were invited to comment at each consultation stage;
 - (b) how they were invited to comment;
 - (c) a summary of the main issues raised;
 - (d) the total number of representations made at each stage; and
 - (e) how the comments have been taken into account.
- 1.6 The Authority has also had regard to its adopted *Statement of Community Involvement* (March 2007) in preparing the Core Strategy. The Statement of Community Involvement aims to fully involve the community and other interests in the preparation of the Local Development Framework and this Consultation Statement highlights the range of methods adopted by the Authority in preparing the Core Strategy over the last three years. The consultation undertaken by the Authority significantly exceeds the requirements of the Planning Regulations and the Authority's own commitments in the Statement of Community Involvement.

2. Core Strategy Regulation 25 Consultation ‘Issues and Options’ ‘Future Matters’ Consultation Summary

<i>Who was invited to comment?</i>	Statutory consultees, persons and organisations who had registered an interest in the plan, the Citizens’ Panel, the Young People’s Panel Survey and the general public – see Annex A
<i>How were they invited?</i>	Through post and email consultation, through advertising on the website, through a notice in the local newspaper, through an article in the New Forest District Council’s news sheet, ‘New Forest Today’.
<i>When?</i>	From 28 November 2006 to 31 January 2007 (9 weeks)
<i>How many commented?</i>	A total of 146 organisations and 429 individuals gave their views.

- 2.1 The initial consultation on the joint Core Strategy (known as the Regulation 25 ‘Issues and Options’ stage under the 2004 Regulations) was integrated with consultation on the review of the Community Strategy for New Forest District, and the preparation of the National Park Management Plan. This resulted in the publication of the document ‘*Future Matters*’, with consultation running between 28 November 2006 and 31 January 2007. The consultation document set out in detail the key issues for the New Forest and asked for views on both the issues and series of possible options for addressing them.
- 2.2 The issues and options were structured according to 13 topics, ranging from the natural environment and cultural heritage, to the economy, recreation, and transport. The consultation was sent to a wide list of consultees amounting to around 1,700 individuals and organisations, including the specific, general and other consultation bodies, where appropriate (as listed in Annex E of Planning Policy Statement 12: *Local Development Frameworks*). All statutory agencies, parish and town councils and members of the New Forest Consultative Panel received a copy of the document, as did the local steering committees for parish and town plans. This was supplemented by consultation with relevant local groups and organisations, as well as the Citizen’s Panel and Young People’s Panel. See Annex A for a list of those consulted.
- 2.3 125 members of the Young People’s Panel Survey were consulted in January 2007 through a postal questionnaire. The main issues raised by the Young People’s Panel included:
- the need to protect the countryside, the New Forest National Park and nature conservation sites should be protected;
 - the existing character of towns and villages should be protected;
 - new open spaces and play areas are a good idea; and
 - young people are worried about being able to find a job and being able to afford a home in the area.

- 2.4 In accordance with the Authority's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (Policy SCI-1), the Regulation 25 consultation included targeted consultation with interest groups (e.g. Town and Parish Councils, Young People's Panel Survey) and was integrated with work on the National Park Management Plan.
- 2.5 Copies of the '*Future Matters*' consultation document were available on both the National Park Authority and District Council websites and were also available to view in the following locations:
- New Forest National Park Authority's headquarters, South Efford House, Lymington during the times 8:45am and 5:00pm Monday to Friday
 - New Forest District Council's office, Appletree Court, Lyndhurst
 - Public libraries in Blackfield, Hythe, Lymington, Lyndhurst, Milford on Sea, New Milton, and Ringwood
- 2.6 The consultation comprised an Issues Paper setting out the Issues and Options for the New Forest National Park and District, as required by Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, together with a foreword and introduction, a response paper and a pre-paid reply envelope.
- 2.7 In addition adverts were placed in the local newspaper and through an article in the New Forest District Council news sheet 'New Forest Today'.

Main issues raised in the 'Future Matters' Reg. 25 Consultation and how they were taken on board

- 2.8 The Issues Paper was divided into 13 sections each concentrating on a different topic, with a corresponding section in the response paper. **A total of 146 organisations and 429 individuals gave their views.** However, not all respondents answered all sections, or all questions within each section. The main issues raised are set out in the table on the following pages. General themes which were strongly favoured included initiatives which support the locally distinctive character of the area. The spatial planning questions highlighted strong concerns about the density of development in the towns and larger villages, increased traffic levels and the impacts of major development proposals in South Hampshire and South East Dorset.

Issue raised in the 'Future Matters' consultation	How this issue has been addressed in the Management Plan and/or Core Strategy
<p>Respondents strongly supported 'managing and minimising the impact of development pressures in and around the National Park', particularly by 'protecting landscape character and natural habitats through addressing the impact of gradual small scale development'.</p> <p>Respondents felt that commoning and traditional farming practices should still continue to be supported.</p>	<p>This is a significant issues highlighted in the Management Plan and Core Strategy, both of which set out policies and actions to address this</p> <p>The Management Plan and Core Strategy support traditional land management practices, including commoning. The Core Strategy allows for affordable housing for commoners to support this.</p>
<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <p>The vast majority of respondents considered it important to conserve the distinctiveness of the cultural heritage of the area, particularly through supporting local skills and trades, reflecting local distinctiveness in new development, and recording oral history, traditions and language.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy outlines the national planning policy guidance on listed buildings and Conservation Areas and also contains a number of policies that seeks to conserve local distinctiveness.</p> <p>The Management Plan includes objectives and actions relating to local distinctiveness and the cultural heritage of the Park.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection and the Wise Use of Natural Resources</p> <p>There was a consensus that strategies and policies for the area should take account of the likely impacts of climate change. More importance was ascribed to managing the coastline and marine areas (though not necessarily through managed retreat) than to the issue of minimising the impact of flooding.</p> <p>High support for encouraging water and energy efficiency measures in all new development, and encouraging developers to use sustainable construction methods and materials.</p>	<p>Both the Core Strategy and Management Plan highlight the importance of climate change on the area and set out policies and / or actions to address this.</p> <p>Policies in the Core Strategy encourage sustainable construction and support more energy and water efficient development.</p>
<p>Housing</p> <p>High level of support for 'making the best use of the existing housing stock', by spending money on improving the stock, and by 'providing the right type of new housing to meet the needs of local communities'.</p> <p>Conversely there was little support for the need 'to address the housing needs of gypsies and travellers'.</p> <p>Although the provision of affordable housing was marginally less important to respondents, those that did respond considered that the focus should be on giving higher priority to housing people with strong local connections.</p>	<p>The National Authority Park is not the Housing Authority and cannot address this issue. Policies in the Core Strategy support appropriate levels and design of housing in the National Park.</p> <p>The Core Strategy includes a policy on provision for gypsies and travellers as required by national and regional planning guidance.</p> <p>The Core Strategy sets out policies requiring the provision of affordable housing in the National Park.</p> <p>The Management Plan strongly supports</p>

<p>Respondents considered that new housing should focus on the following types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ private sector housing with higher environmental standards, for example “Eco Homes” (BREEAM) “very good standards” ▪ new housing to the standards which will allow for easy adaptation to meet people’s changing needs (Lifetime homes’ standards) ▪ More small houses (1 & 2 bedrooms) ▪ More small family houses (2 & 3 bedrooms) 	<p>greater provision of affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>There are policies in the Core Strategy requiring new development to comply with the BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes standards, as well as supporting the principle of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>
<p>Economy</p> <p>There was support for closer working between colleges and local businesses, farm diversification to support the rural economy, and encouraging business development in rural areas through use of existing buildings.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy supports suitable farm diversification schemes and allows reuse of existing buildings for business development.</p> <p>The Management Plan supports local skills training and a sustainable rural economy and contains objectives to improve the financial viability of farming.</p>
<p>Transport</p> <p>One of the most supported issues was meeting the challenge of future growth, focusing on reducing the impact of traffic growth. This includes better public transport, better co-ordination of car, cycle and public transport routes and services and influencing lorry routing and restrictions.</p> <p>Respondents set out support for sustainable methods of transport, particularly alternatives to the car. Preferred means of action focused on better and cheaper public transport and a joined up transport network.</p>	<p>Both the Management Plan and Core Strategy focus on reducing the impacts of traffic on the Park’s special qualities.</p> <p>Both the Management Plan and Core Strategy support sustainable transport alternatives to the car, and direct new development to settlements which better public transport links.</p>
<p>Tourism</p> <p>The single most important tourism issue raised by respondents was the need to improve the management of access and travel arrangements.</p>	<p>Both the Management Plan and Core Strategy support sustainable transport</p>
<p>Leisure and Recreation</p> <p>The need to manage the impacts of recreational pressures on the environment of the National Park. Preferred approaches identified by respondents stated that a visitor and recreation strategy should address cycle ways, footpaths, location of car parks and alternatives to car use.</p> <p>Significant support for better understanding and enjoyment of the Park’s special qualities by local people and visitors.</p>	<p>Recreation management is primarily address through the Authority’s Recreation management Strategy.</p> <p>Addressed in the Management Plan</p>
<p>Health</p> <p>A major issue was the uptake of physical activity, which the vast majority of respondents thought was best tackled by more promotion of walking.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy supports the retention and provision of open space and public rights of way for environmental and social reasons such as health benefits.</p>
<p>Older People</p> <p>Respondents felt that service providers should</p>	<p>Policies encourage new homes to be built</p>

work together better to promote access to services and information for older people, as well as developing schemes to enable those who wish to stay independent in their own homes.	to the Lifetimes Homes standard; and support better access to services and facilities.
---	--

3. Additional Stakeholder Involvement 'New Forest, New Chapter' Events: Consultation Summary

<i>Who was invited to participate?</i>	A total of 190 local, regional and national organisations were invited to a series of 10 workshops. In total over 70 organisations were involved in the discussions. In addition, every ward councillor at County, District and Borough level representing wards within and immediately adjacent to the National Park was invited to a Councillors' Workshop held in February 2008.
<i>How were they invited?</i>	Invitees were drawn up from existing stakeholder lists used for other events and all participants were written to personally to invite them.
<i>When?</i>	October 2007 to March 2008 (6 months)

3.1 In mid-2007 the decision was taken to produce a separate Core Strategy for the National Park. Having taken this decision, the Authority set up a series of workshops to discuss the emerging Management Plan and Core Strategy. The *New Forest, New Chapter* workshops were held in the autumn and winter of 2007/2008. They brought together more than 100 people from 70 organisations and interest groups to discuss the direction the National Park should be taking now and over the next 10 to 20 years. Full details on the events can be found on the Authority's website, including the full list of participants, and the reports from each of the workshop events. Annex B of this Statement lists the organisations involved.

3.2 In all ten workshops took place over the course of 6 months, looking at a Vision for the National Park, key issues, objectives, selected strategic policies, priority actions and indicators. Following an inaugural workshop, topic groups met focusing on the two statutory National Park purposes and the associated socio-economic duty, before a concluding event was held in March 2008. In addition, a workshop was also held in February 2008 to which all 82 councillors at County, District and Borough level representing wards within and immediately adjacent to the National Park were invited. A smaller event - *the Forces for Change workshop* – was held in October 2007 to look at possible future trends affecting the area.

Main Issues Raised at the ‘New Forest, New Chapter’ events and how they were taken on board

Issues	How it has been addressed in the National Park Management Plan and/or Core Strategy
<i>Conserving and Enhancing the New Forest National Park</i>	
Opportunities should be taken for landscape and habitat restoration	One of the priority policies within the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> (2008) was to restore areas of connected habitat and reduce fragmentation (Policy PP1.2). This policy is carried through in Objective 2 in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> . Objective C1 in the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> sought to restore landscapes and semi-natural habitats in the New Forest, and included a range of policies to do this (CP1.1 – CP1.4).
Strong support for policies to deal with increasing development pressure	The <i>draft National Park Plan</i> (2008) included policies relating to local distinctiveness (PP2.1) and the protection of local character (PP2.4). Objective C2 and related policies in the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> sought to protect the National Park from the impacts of development pressure within and beyond the National Park. The final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> carries forward these objectives and policies. The <i>Submission draft Core Strategy</i> includes a number of policies relating to local distinctiveness (CP8), design principles (DP6) and residential density in the defined villages (DP9).
Policies to support the future viability of commoning were supported.	Policy CP3.1 in the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> sought to support the future viability of commoning through a range of measures. Policy DC12 aimed to protect back-up grazing land from a change of use to recreational horse keeping. Objective 3 in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> supports commoning through taking forward the priority recommendations of the <i>New Forest Commoning Review</i> (2007). The <i>Submission draft Core Strategy</i> seeks to ensure the future viability of commoning through maintaining the supply of back up grazing land and enabling commoners’ housing (Policy CP17). It also prevents the loss of back-up grazing land to recreational horse keeping (policy DP21).
The conservation of tranquillity should be included.	The <i>draft National Park Plan</i> (2008) identified the enhancement of the tranquillity of the New Forest as a priority objective (Objective P3), along side policies to protect this special quality (PP3.1 – PP3.3). The final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> includes a whole section on ‘Safeguarding Tranquillity’, with six priority actions identified.
<i>Understanding and Enjoying the National Park</i>	
Recreation pressure should be limited in sensitive areas and encouraged in more robust locations (including outside the National Park)	The Strategic Policy Approach in the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> included a zoning approach (pages 27 – 29) based on the sensitivity and level of risk to the natural environment. The zoning approach sought to focus recreation towards more robust areas. Objective U3 (and related policies) in the <i>draft Plan</i> aimed to manage the impacts of recreation on the National Park. In the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> Objectives 2 and 7 aim to ensure recreational impacts avoid impacts on the special

	<p>qualities of the Park, including the designated nature conservation sites and the most tranquil areas. The Authority's <i>Recreation Management Strategy</i> will contain a more comprehensive series of actions.</p>
<p>Improved understanding of the New Forest and its needs should be communicated to people in an organised and creative way</p>	<p>Objective U1 (and related policies) in the draft <i>National Park Plan</i> aimed to achieve a shared understanding of the special qualities of the National Park by local people, visitors and organisations. This is carried through in Objective 6 and related priority actions of the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i>.</p>
<p>Not convinced about the value of 'gateway centres' located near main entry points to the Park – instead local small-scale information points at key locations in the National Park and websites targeting visitors.</p>	<p>The draft <i>National Park Plan</i> made no reference to 'gateway centres'. Instead, policies UP2.3 and UP2.4 supported innovative forms of interpretation and the provision of visitor facilities within the main villages of the National Park. Objective 6 in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> carries forward these ideas and promotes the New Forest Centre in Lyndhurst as a primary source of information about the National Park.</p>
<p>There was strong support for creating more connected networks of routes for recreation on foot, cycle, horseback, pushchairs and wheelchairs.</p>	<p>Policy UP2.1 in the draft <i>National Park Plan</i> supported opportunities for safer and easier access to and within the National Park on foot, cycle and horseback. This is carried forward in Objective 7 (and related actions) in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i>.</p>
<p><i>Living and Working in the National Park</i></p>	
<p>Strong consensus that future development should be focused on the existing 'defined villages'.</p>	<p>Policy LP1.1 in the draft <i>National Park Plan</i> focuses small-scale development in the National Park to the four defined Service Villages of Ashurst, Brockenhurst, Lyndhurst and Sway.</p> <p>Policy CP9 in the <i>Submission draft Core Strategy</i> confirms the focus of the limited development that will take place in the Park to be the four 'defined' villages.</p>
<p>The priority should be providing more affordable housing for local people.</p>	<p>Policies LP1.3 and DC4 in the draft <i>National Park Plan</i> sought to restrict residential development to the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs. Objective 8 (and related priority actions) in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> seeks to provide more affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>Policy CP11 in the <i>Submission draft Core Strategy</i> states that at least 50% of residential development within the 'defined villages' should be affordable housing, with rural exceptions sites considered elsewhere. This is an increase from the current Local Plan target of 35%.</p>
<p>Debate about the degree to which business development should contribute</p>	<p>Objective L2 in the draft <i>National Park Plan</i> sought to develop a sustainable local economy which makes a clear contribution to the Park. The text to Policy LP2.2 stated that, '<i>particular support will be given to businesses that help to maintain the land based</i></p>

<p>directly to National Park purposes</p>	<p><i>economy and cultural heritage of the Park or contribute to the understanding and enjoyment of the Park's special qualities.'</i> Objective 9 (and related priority actions) in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> supports businesses that do not compromise the special qualities of the area.</p> <p>Policy Cp14 in the <i>Submission draft Core Strategy</i> supports employment opportunities where they do not have an adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park – in line with Policy C1 of the adopted <i>South East Plan</i> (May 2009).</p>
<p>Radical issues such as seasonal road closures, 'car free zones' and in the longer term road pricing should be investigated.</p>	<p>Policy LP3.3 in the draft <i>National Park Plan</i> sought to reduce the impacts of road traffic on the National Park through traffic and demand management, road design and landscaping. The supporting text outlined the various tools that may be used. Objective 10 in the final <i>National Park Management Plan</i> seeks to reduce the impacts of traffic on the National Park.</p>

Consultation with hard to reach groups

3.3 A variety of other means were undertaken to approach traditionally 'hard-to-reach' groups. These included work with local schools undertaken into 2007 where local school children were asked what they liked and disliked about the National Park and what they would like to see in the National Park in the future. Set out below is an example of the children's work. Issues identified included concerns over the impacts of traffic, litter and more development in the Park.



3.4 In addition, a drama based experience was organised with local schoolchildren to explore what local young people consider to be important issues for the future to be addressed in the Core Strategy and Management Plan. Actors from the Forest Forge Youth Theatre presented a short play at the concluding event which powerfully raised a number of current issues facing the New Forest (see image below from *New Forest New Chapter Workshop*, March 2008). Forest Forge had been commissioned by the National Park Authority to consult with young people from local schools (Ringwood School and Oak Lodge Special School) and use the arising issues and viewpoints to both inform the National Park Plan and to produce the short play. Issues identified included the perception



of young people in the National Park, challenges to do with transport and housing for local people.

- 3.5 The advice of those attending the workshops helped to inform the strategic policies and actions for three important documents for the National Park: the National Park Management Plan, the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (strategic planning policies) and the Recreation Management Strategy. During 2007 and 2008 the Authority also gave a number of presentations to the New Forest Consultative Panel (a discussion forum for over 80 voluntary and statutory organisations within the New Forest) and the New Forest Access Forum setting out the progress on the various documents and the timetable moving ahead.

4. Regulation 26 Consultation - consultation draft National Park Plan Consultation Summary

<i>Who was invited to comment?</i>	<u>Annex C</u> sets out the full list of organisations sent either a copy of the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> or a letter of notification at the start of the consultation period (including statutory consultees). Approximately 2,000 free hard copies of the Plan were sent out to people.
<i>How were they invited?</i>	<p>As well as the hard copies of the Plan that were distributed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A public notice was placed in three local newspapers (<i>Lymington Times/New Milton Advertiser, Salisbury Journal, Romsey Advertiser</i>) at the start of the consultation period; - A news release was issued on 19 August and received wide coverage in local newspapers and radio. - One hundred posters were produced and sent for display to a range of organisations including 39 parish and town councils within or adjacent to the National Park and 14 council and other offices with public display areas where reference copies of the Plan could be inspected. - The consultation on the draft Park Plan was the front page lead story in the Authority's <i>Park Life</i> newsletter distributed to 90,000 homes (all postcodes inside the boundary and those close to it). - The Plan was made available electronically on the Authority's website and received over 25,000 hits during the consultation period.
<i>When?</i>	18 August 2008 to 14 November 2008 (12 weeks)
<i>How many commented?</i>	A total of 9,724 responses were received, made up of 2,524 individual response forms, standard templates, letters or emails, and 7,200 signatures on a petition handed in by the Forest Uprising Group (FUG).

4.1 Following the *New Forest, New Chapter* sessions and meetings with many stakeholders, the Authority published the consultation *draft National Park Plan* in August 2008. This draft document combined the requirements for the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and the National Park Management Plan into a single document. There was support for this approach within the Inspector's Report into the Dartmoor National Park Core Strategy (February 2008) where the Inspector commented that,

"Given the statutory purposes of National Parks and national planning policy, in effect imposing material restraints on development other than that promoting the purposes of National Parks, together with the

overarching strategic role of the Management Plans, one has to wonder whether a Core Strategy in the same form as for conventional local planning authorities is needed at all.” – paragraph 3.7

“...I firmly believe there are opportunities for National Park Authorities and their umbrella organisations to explore and initiate ways of simplifying and bringing closer together the Local Development Framework and Management Plan process. This need not await central advice. It is in everyone’s interest to minimise costs, prevent apparent overlaps and duplication, and provide clarity and simplicity to achieve better public understanding...” – paragraph 3.10.

- 4.2 Annex 1 to the consultation draft Plan set out a consideration of policy options. Planning Policy Statement 12 (Local Spatial Planning, 2008) requires local planning authorities to, “...*seek out and evaluate reasonable alternatives, there is no point inventing alternatives.*” (paragraph 4.38). Policy options and alternatives must be consistent with the high level of protection afforded to the New Forest as a nationally protected landscape (See PPS7), and the statutory National Park purposes as set out in the Environment Act 1995. The range of options available is therefore limited.
- 4.3 The consultation period on the draft Plan ran for a period of 12 weeks from mid August 2008 to mid November 2008. During this period, a **total of 9,724 responses were received, made up of 2,524 individual response forms, standard templates, letters or emails, and 7,200 signatures on a petition handed in by the Forest Uprising Group** which related to the recreational horse keeping aspects of the draft Plan.
- 4.4 In accordance with the Authority’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement (Policy SCI-4), the consultation draft National Park Plan was circulated to statutory bodies, interest groups and parish councils within the National Park. The document (and supporting evidence) was posted on the Authority’s website; documents were made available for inspection at the Authority’s offices; press notices were prepared and there was significant publicity in the local and regional media.

Main Issues Raised

- 4.5 The consultation draft National Park Plan attracted a significant volume of comments during the 12 weeks public consultation period. As well as over 2,000 hard copies being distributed and over 25,000 hits on the Authority’s website, the document was the subject of numerous media articles. The main issues raised and how the Authority then took them into account in revising the Plans is set out below, and centred on:
- the *Vision* for the National Park was broadly supported, but many respondents felt it needed to be more concise;
 - the need to distinguish between the Core Strategy and the Management Plan was raised by a number of important consultees;

- the language and tone of the document received widespread criticism as being dictatorial and negative;
- the proposed affordable housing policies were queried with regard to the economic viability evidence;
- concerns were raised at the connotations of the term 'Service Villages' and the perceived over-development this might create in these villages;
- there was a consensus that the draft Plan failed to have due regard to the Authority's duty to foster the socio-economic well being of the 35,000 residents who live in the National Park;
- the proposed Zoning approach was widely criticised for the implication that parts of the National Park are less important;
- significant objection to the traffic and transport policies, and the need to clarify who had responsibility for traffic management; and
- the proposed recreational horse keeping planning policies attracted a large volume of objection – including a petition of 7,200 names.

4.6 During the consultation period, the Authority prepared an Explanatory Note on the recreational horse keeping policies; and a Questions and Answers Note that addressed a number of the key issues being raised. Copies of both these documents were widely distributed.

4.7 Following the end of the 12 week consultation period, the Authority wrote or emailed every respondent in December 2009 with a 'Next Stage' letter. This set out the total number of comments received; where and how the public could view all of the responses made; and an initial breakdown on the main issues raised. The letter also set out the next steps in the process – namely the setting up of a number of working groups to focus on the main areas of contention raised during the consultation (zoning, socio-economic issues, housing and 'Service Villages', traffic and transport, and recreational horse keeping). The letter also concluded by setting out an indicative timetable for the next stages in the process. This timetable was posted on the Authority's website and updated throughout 2009.

Main issues raised during the draft ‘National Park Plan’ consultation and how they were taken on board in preparing the final Management Plan and/or Submission draft Core Strategy

Topic: Service Villages and Housing	Response/Comments	
	Management Plan	Core Strategy
Conflicting views as to what the appropriate scale of development in the National Park should be. Views ranged from those who felt that there should be no new residential development to those who supported significant development in the Park.	Policies included in Core Strategy.	The adopted <i>South East Plan</i> (May 2009) sets out the housing requirement for the National Park at an additional 220 dwellings over the period to 2026. This is clearly set out in the Submission Core Strategy, which must be in general conformity with this requirement.
Greater emphasis needed on providing affordable housing, specifically for local people and commoners.	A section on affordable housing for local people and commoners is included in final Management Plan.	Promoting affordable housing to meet local needs feature prominently in the revised Core Strategy Vision and the Strategic Objectives. The affordable housing policies are based on robust and up-to-date evidence regarding economic viability. The Submission Core Strategy also supports commoners’ housing.
Concerns raised over the number of second homes in the Park which has pushed up the price of land.	Not included specifically in the Management Plan, but affordability of local housing is given priority as part of the Plan’s objectives and actions.	Second homes in the National Park currently stand at approximately 3% of the housing stock. As a local planning authority, the National Park Authority is not able to restrict second homes as no planning permission is required.

<p>Conflicting views on the concept of Service Villages. Some felt that the dispersed growth of settlements was a more sustainable option to that of identifying villages where development would be focused. Some supported the concept as simply a continuation of the planning policy of the last decade or more.</p>	<p>Development policies are not included in the Management Plan.</p>	<p>All references to 'Service Villages' have been removed. The Submission Core Strategy now refers to 'Defined Villages' – the term used in successive New Forest District Local Plans since the 1990s. Dispersed growth across the National Park did not receive support at the <i>New Forest New Chapter</i> events or the <i>Service Villages and Housing Working Group</i>. The Sustainability Appraisal concluded dispersed growth was a less sustainable option that would be contrary to national planning policy.</p>
<p>The term 'Service Villages' sends out all the wrong signals and the existing term 'Defined Villages' should be used instead.</p>	<p>The term service villages is not used in Management Plan.</p>	<p>It was agreed that the term 'Service Villages' could have negative connotations. All references to 'Service Villages' have been replaced with the existing 'Defined Villages' term.</p>
<p>There should be more importance and greater emphasis on safeguarding/improving community facilities and services.</p>	<p>This is given emphasis in the final Management Plan.</p>	<p>Policy CP10 in the submission document supports the retention of existing community facilities and supports the development of essential community facilities in the National Park.</p>
<p>Some support for widening the number of Service Villages to include some settlements in areas of the Park other than in the east as has been proposed.</p>	<p>Spatial planning policies are not included in Management Plan.</p>	<p>The 'Defined Villages' identified in the revised Core Strategy are consistent with those identified in successive New Forest District Local Plans dating back to the 1990s. There was limited support for this option at the <i>Service Villages and Housing Working Group</i> held in 2009.</p>

Important that account is taken of the existing infrastructure, for example schools and whether growth in housing can be accommodated.	This is covered in the Core Strategy, but the Management Plan clarifies that low levels of development are appropriate in the National Park.	All major infrastructure providers have been consulted on the draft Plan. It must also be remembered that the provision of an additional 220 dwellings over the Plan period will increase the dwelling stock by only 1.5%.
General support for allowing limited open market housing to enable subsidising of affordable housing.	Policies included in Core Strategy.	The affordable housing policies allow up to 50% open market housing in the 'Defined Villages' to enable the provision of affordable housing.
Topic: Developing a Diverse Economy	Response/Comments	
	Management Plan	Core Strategy
Many concerns raised about whether the Plan placed too much emphasis on nature conservation and does not reflect the economic and social well-being of the population and therefore the National Park has failed in its statutory duty to seek to foster the economic, social and well-being of the local community.	Socio-economic issues are given greater emphasis in the final Management Plan, with the aim of providing a more balanced overall approach.	The Submission Core Strategy includes a specific Strategic Objective to develop a diverse and sustainable local economy – reflecting the Authority's socio-economic duty. The Core Strategy chapter on the 'Sustainable Local Economy' recognises this duty.
Conflicting views on the scale and type of economic development that is appropriate to the New Forest.	Regional and national guidance makes it clear that development should be small-scale. The final Management Plan highlights the importance of an economy that supports local communities while not being detrimental to the special qualities of the Forest.	Policy C1 of the adopted <i>South East Plan</i> confirms that the emphasis of development in the National Park will be on 'small scale proposals' that do not conflict with the statutory National Park purposes. This policy forms part of the statutory 'development plan' for the Park and is reflected in the Submission Core Strategy policies on the economy.

General support for ensuring that care is taken to ensure that economic growth does not harm the special qualities of the New Forest.	See above	Agree – this comment reflects policy C1 in the South East Plan which states that ‘...proposals which support the socio-economic well-being of the Park will be encouraged where they do not conflict with the statutory National Park purposes...’ Policy CP17 reflects this in ensuring that economic growth does not harm the special qualities.
General support for allowing a wide range of farm diversification developments.	Retained in final Management Plan.	Appropriate farm diversification projects are supported through policy CP17 in the Submission Core Strategy.
Topic: Recreation	Response/Comments	
	Management Plan	Core Strategy
More emphasis needed on education and involvement as a way of managing visitor pressures and preventing damage to the ‘special qualities’ of the Park.	Stronger emphasis is given to education as means of recreation management in final Management Plan.	This issue is primarily addressed in the Management Plan.
Unclear whether the Plan aims to encourage more visitors or not.	Text has been added to the management Plan clarifying that quality of experience, rather than numbers of visitors is the aim.	The Core Strategy seeks to support sustainable tourism that provides opportunities for enjoying the Park’s special qualities, rather than encouraging visitors per se.
Need to emphasise role of Lyndhurst as main provider of visitor facilities.	The importance of the main villages and surrounding towns mentioned in terms of visitor facilities.	The Submission Core Strategy recognises the role of Lyndhurst as ‘The Capital of the New Forest’ and the role of the New Forest Centre (in the middle of Lyndhurst) as the main visitor centre in

		the Park.
<p><u>Recreational Horse Keeping</u> Major concerns raised about details of the recreational horse keeping policies, especially in relation to the density of horses per hectare and the suggested criteria for assessing new facilities for recreational horse keeping use.</p>	Recreational horse keeping policies are not included in revised Management Plan.	The recreational horse keeping policies have been revised following two independently facilitated Recreational Horse Keeping Working Group meetings and the newly set up New Forest Equine Forum (who have endorsed the revised policies). The revised stocking density figure reflects the latest DEFRA guidance.
Do not accept that there has been any loss of back-up land due to recreational horse keeping.	See above.	The <i>New Forest Commoning Review</i> (2007) identifies the need to protect back-up grazing land from competing land uses, included recreational horse keeping. The adopted <i>South East Plan</i> also states that back up grazing land should be protected.
<p><u>Dogs and Car Parks</u> Numerous comments were received on proposal for making some car parks dog-free (note – this policy was contained in the draft Recreational Management Strategy).</p>	Policies on dog-free car parks are not included in the Management Plan.	Policies on dog-free car parks not included in the Core Strategy.
Topic: Conserving and Enhancing the National Park	Response/Comments	
	Management Plan	Core Strategy

<p><u>Natural Environment</u> The Plan should set out guiding principles for woodland management in line with the Forestry Commission's comprehensive Management Plan for the area.</p>	<p>Broad policies for woodland management are included, but in less detail than the specific Forest Design Plans or Ancient and Ornamental Woodland plans for the Crown Lands.</p>	<p>Woodland Management is principally covered in the Management Plan. Core Strategy Objective 7 supports land management that sustains the special qualities of the National Park.</p>
<p>Greater emphasis should be placed on integrating woodland design in landscapes and conservation of ancient woodlands.</p>	<p>Broad policies are included, but will be covered in more detail in the Biodiversity Action Plan and Landscape Strategy (in production).</p>	<p>Broad policies contained in the Management Plan.</p>
<p>General support for sustainable land management practices especially commoning, although some concerns raised about over-grazing in some areas.</p>	<p>Commoning objectives are retained in the final Management Plan.</p>	<p>Core Strategy Objective 7 encourages land management that sustains the special qualities of the National Park. Policy CS17 supports the future viability of commoning.</p>
<p>General concern about where the money would come from to achieve and maintain the high number of nature conservation sites in the Park.</p>	<p>This issue is noted in the plan, to be resolved through further discussion.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There is a national Government Service Agreement target for 95% of SSSIs to be in 'favourable' or 'recovering' condition by 2010.</p>
<p><u>Built Environment</u> Greater emphasis needed on conserving and enhancing the historic built environment in the Park.</p>	<p>Objectives and actions relating to the built environment are included in the plan.</p>	<p>The Submission Core Strategy contains a section on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, setting out the framework for the management of the areas through Character Appraisals and Management Plans.</p>
<p>General support for buildings of high quality design, particularly on previously developed land.</p>	<p>This is included in the final Management Plan.</p>	<p>Policies CP7 (Built Environment); CP8 (Local Distinctiveness) and DP6 (Design Principles) support high quality design. The Authority is also preparing a Building Design Guide SPD.</p>

Topic: Traffic and Transport	Response/Comments	
	Management Plan	Core Strategy
Strong concerns about the possibility of road pricing, road closures and car park closures.	These examples of possible traffic management are not included in the final Management Plan.	These are not included in the Submission Core Strategy.
Needs to be made clearer about who is responsible for transport in the area and emphasise the main agencies working together (including those with transport responsibilities in adjacent areas).	Greater emphasis on roles and responsibilities, and particularly the role of the local highway authorities, is included in final plan.	Reference is made within the submission document to the Hampshire and Wiltshire Local Transport Plans, clarifying the respective responsibilities for transport in the New Forest.
General support for traffic management measures, for example HGV regulation, quiet road surfaces, traffic calming and reducing speed limits.	Retained in final plan.	The submission document refers to supporting Hampshire County Council in implementing traffic demand measures in the National Park. Reference is also made to introducing reduced speed limits in the villages.
Comments noted that a reduction in car use is largely dependent on improvements in public or community transport and other modes of transport and both must take place together.	Greater emphasis on sustainable transport is included in the final plan.	Comments noted. Policy CP19 supports sustainable forms of transport and local transport initiatives.
Topic: Development Control Policies	Response/Comments	

	Core Strategy
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC1: Control of Development</u></p> <p>The wording of policy DC1 does not fully reflect PPS7 (para 21). DC1 currently states that conservation and enhancement will be 'given priority' over other considerations. However, PPS7 states that conservation should be given 'great weight' in planning policies. Suggest the policy is re-considered as the emphasis does not reflect PPS7.</p>	<p>The Authority notes the concerns raised that policy DC1 in the draft Plan did not accurately reflect national guidance in PPS7. The introduction to the Submission Core Strategy now includes the relevant text from PPS7 confirming that the conservation of the natural beauty and the landscape should be given 'great weight' in development control decisions. This wording contained in national planning policy is felt to be so integral to the Plan that it warrants inclusion. With this in place, a specific policy is not felt to be required.</p> <p>The Core Strategy also now includes reference to the statutory National Park purposes and Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995, which states that the first purposes should only take precedence as a last resort after every effort has been made to reconcile any conflicts (commonly known as the Sandford Principle).</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC2: General Development Criteria</u></p> <p>Requiring development to comply with the voluntary Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM standards is too onerous and uneconomic for developers.</p>	<p>The recently adopted New Forest District Council Core Strategy (October 2009) requires developments to meet certain Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM standards. This is based on a standard developed for the South Hampshire sub-region and it is considered appropriate to apply it within the National Park.</p>
<p>The supporting text refers to preparing SPD for car parking and open space. In prescribing this approach have you taken account of PPS12 (para. 6.1) which states that SPDs should not be prepared with the aim of avoiding the need for examination.</p>	<p>Following discussions with the Government Office for the South East, the Submission Core Strategy now includes open space and sustainable construction standards within the policy text. Car parking standards will be dealt with separately. This is consistent with the approach taken in the recently adopted New Forest District Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Should include effects on water resources, coastal processes and water quality effects.</p>	<p>The Submission Core Strategy now includes a specific policy on water resources and the coast following feedback from a number of consultees.</p>

<p><u>Development Control Policy DC3: New Residential Development</u></p> <p>The lack of a specific housing allocation contradicts PPS3 and will not be taking forward the RSS requirements for 220 dwellings over the period 2006 to 2026.</p>	<p>The <i>draft National Park Plan</i> was prepared before the Government's <i>Proposed Changes to the South East Plan</i> were published – within which the National Park was given a housing requirement for the first time. The Submission Core Strategy acknowledges this housing requirement in both the introduction and the housing section of the document. Policy CP12 confirms that the South East Plan requirement of 220 additional dwellings in the period to 2026 will be accommodated within the National Park.</p>
<p>In terms of rural exceptions, it is not supported by evidence of its viability and practicality as required by PPS3.</p>	<p>The Submission Core Strategy affordable housing policies have been informed by an up to date affordable housing economic viability study focusing on the National Park (October 2009). This evidence – required by PPS3 – supports the Authority's proposed affordable housing thresholds and percentages.</p>
<p>The restrictive housing policy will result in an imbalance of population in rural areas. Those settlements with existing facilities should be identified – need to establish a hierarchy.</p>	<p>The housing policies within the Core Strategy essentially continue the approach adopted for many years within the New Forest. The scale of housing is consistent with the regional housing requirement sets out in the adopted South East Plan (May 2009). The submission document does establish a basic hierarchy, with Ashurst, Brockenhurst, Lyndhurst and Sway identified as 'Defined Villages' due to the range of facilities they provide.</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC4: Affordable Housing</u></p> <p>Comments were received opposing the provision of single dwellings for commoners.</p>	<p>The provision of single dwellings for New Forest commoners is a well established planning policy within the New Forest in successive Local Plans. The scheme is also supported through the recommendations of the New Forest Commoning Review (2007).</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC5: Replacement Dwellings</u></p> <p>Need to define the term 'abandonment of Residential use.'</p>	<p>The term 'abandonment' is defined in the Submission Core Strategy.</p>

<p><u>Development Control Policy 6: Extensions to dwellings</u> Conflicting views on the proposed 30% growth rule. Some felt that it was too restrictive; others felt that it should be greater.</p>	<p>The Authority receives a significant amount of planning applications for extensions to dwellings (nearly 1,200 between 2006 and 2009). Proposals to extend dwellings can affect the local character of the New Forest and it is considered to be important to limit the size of extensions. The 30% extension floor space limitation builds on those contained within previous Local Plans covering the National Park. In exceptional circumstances a larger extension may be permitted – demonstrating that a level of flexibility is applied.</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC7: Outbuildings</u> Not allowing house owners to use their outbuildings for office space contradicts the objective of encouraging more people to work from home and thus reduce journeys to work.</p>	<p>The supported text to the planning policy on ‘Outbuildings’ has been revised to state that, “...<i>the use of outbuildings to support home working and home-based businesses will be considered acceptable where this does not involve a change of use of the main dwelling or have an adverse impact on the residential amenities to adjoining occupiers or the special qualities of the National Park.</i>”</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy 8: Extensions to all Non-Residential Buildings and Uses</u> Policy too restrictive; does not allow for future needs of the community, services in villages, education, infrastructure, and enabling employment uses to expand.</p>	<p>The draft National Park Plan included policies that supported small scale development to meet National Park needs, including employment, retail and main community facilities in the ‘Service Villages’ (policy LP1.1). Policy LP1.2 also supported the provision of essential local community facilities in villages across the National Park. The Submission Core Strategy maintains these principles, and also supports appropriate retail development and the redevelopment and extension of existing employment sites.</p>
<p>Unclear whether this policy covers tourism and leisure.</p>	<p>Having reviewed the consultation comments, the Submission Core Strategy now includes a specific policy on tourism development in the National Park (policy CP16).</p>

<p><u>Development Control Policy DC10: Dwellings for agricultural or forestry workers in the New Forest</u></p> <p>The definition of ‘agricultural worker’ should be broadened to include key workers, or that if housing is no longer required for agriculture, should be offered to a housing association.</p>	<p>Annex A to Planning Policy Statement 7 (<i>Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</i>, 2004) sets out national planning policy with regard to agricultural and forestry workers and key workers are not included within this definition.</p> <p>Policy DC11 in the <i>draft National Park Plan</i> stated that “...<i>the local planning authority will seek to restrict the occupancy of the dwelling to a person in local housing need...</i>” This wording has been retained in the Submission Core Strategy (policy DP14) and builds on the approach taken in the Exmoor National Park 2001-2011 and the North Yorkshire Moors Core Strategy.</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC11: Removal of agricultural occupancy conditions</u></p> <p>The advice in PPS7 Annex A paragraph 17 has not been fully reflected which is worded as ‘the need for a dwelling for someone solely, mainly or last working in agriculture or forestry.’</p>	<p>The policy on the removal of agricultural occupancy conditions has been amended in the Submission Core Strategy to reflect the need for a dwelling for someone “...<i>solely, mainly or last working in agriculture or forestry...</i>” to ensure the policy is consistent with national planning policy in PPS7.</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy DC12: Recreational horse keeping</u></p> <p>Some support for the intentions of this policy to protect agricultural land and reduce the visual and environmental impacts of horse keeping on the landscape.</p>	<p>The recreational horse keeping policy section of the Core Strategy has been reviewed through the independently facilitated Recreational Horse Keeping Group Meetings and the newly established New Forest Equine Forum. The policies have been endorsed by the Equine Forum and acknowledge the valuable contribution equine activities make to the local New Forest economy. The policy also recognises that horse keeping can have adverse landscape impacts and this is fully reflected in the first criterion of policy DP21.</p>

<p><u>Development Control Policy DC13 & 14: Field Shelters, Stables and maneges</u></p> <p>A less restrictive approach should be taken to allow stables and maneges outside residential curtilages. Previous policy has been working satisfactorily for the last decade and does not need to be changed.</p>	<p>The policy in the submission document is less prescriptive on the design of field shelters and introduces more flexibility on the siting of stables (subject to them being located close to existing buildings).</p> <p>The Submission Core Strategy recognises that the availability of maneges can reduce the use of the Open Forest and supports the development of outdoor maneges where they do not result in any detrimental impact on the landscape and ecology of the New Forest and does not involve the installation of lighting. The text of the policy is the same as the existing planning policy for maneges in the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (2005).</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy 16: Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas</u></p> <p>Policy is too prescriptive and goes beyond the requirements of national policy without justification from an evidence base.</p>	<p>The Authority has reviewed the need for a policy on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, in light of the advice from the Government that Core Strategies should not duplicate national planning policy. Having regard to this advice, the Submission Core Strategy summarises the national planning policy position with regard to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and confirms that applicants should have regard to existing planning policy on these topics.</p>
<p><u>Development Control Policy 17: Retail within Service Villages</u></p> <p>The proposed levels of 50% and 40% are too high. There is concern that this would lead to the degradation of the villages' character and appearance, reducing the quality of shopping and services available to locals and possibly leading to vacant units or empty frontages if offices. The percentages are also queried in relation to particular villages, for example Sway could sustain a significant reduction in retail provision but not Burley, whilst Brockenhurst already has a fair proportion of non-retail uses.</p>	<p>The proportions of retail uses sought within the defined villages set out in the draft National Park Plan are identical to the existing planning policies of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (2005), and those in the 1999 Local Plan. The policy is therefore very well established and seeks to ensure that retail facilities are maintained in the main village shopping areas. However, the policy also recognises that there is a need for other facilities within the village centres, and seeks to make provision for these without prejudicing the shopping function of the centres. Hence the allowance for a proportion of non-A1 uses.</p> <p>The shopping frontages are surveyed annually, and the most recent survey (June 2009) indicated that Brockenhurst and Lyndhurst currently have 68% and 63% A1 uses respectively (compared to the minimum of 50% set out in the policy); and Sway and Ashurst have 37% and 54% A1 uses respectively (compared to the policy minimum of 40%).</p>

<p><u>Development Control Policy 19: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</u> The provision of encampments seems unjustified in light of the restrictions on dwellings for the remaining local population.</p>	<p>The partial review of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East regarding the provision of accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople is currently underway. This is proposing pitch requirements for the combined area of New Forest District and the whole of the National Park. The Authority must reflect this work through its planning policies.</p>
<p>Bullet point 2 does not appear to include advice from Circular 4/2007, paragraph 9 – accommodating showpeoples’ business on site. Bullet point 2 does not appear to include all advice on planning policies as set out in Circular 1/2006, annex C, paragraph 3 (they refer to parking, turning and landscape issues).</p>	<p>The submission Core Strategy confirms that applicants should also refer to Circular 01/2006 <i>Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites</i> and Circular 04/2007 <i>Planning for Travelling Showpeople</i>. In addition to this, the list of criterion in the policy has been expanded to refer to parking and storage areas.</p>

5. Additional Stakeholder Involvement – 2009

- 5.1 Following the conclusion of the formal consultation on the draft *National Park Plan*, the Authority initiated a number of additional stakeholder exercises to target the key topics raised during the consultation. Details of these working groups and meetings (including the list of attendees, the background papers for each meetings and the meeting notes) can be found on the Authority's website at:

http://www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/index/aboutus/our_work/consultations/closed_consultations/national_park_plan/working_groups.htm

- 5.2 Detailed background papers were prepared for all of the working groups, parish quadrant meetings, and the ward councillors' workshop. These essentially set out a summary of the key issues raised during the consultation period on the draft National Park Plan, the relevant policies and text from the consultation draft Plan, the existing planning policies covering the National Park and examples of the approach taken in other National Parks.

Topic Working Group meetings

- 5.3 The National Park Authority set up a series of topic working groups between March – April 2009 which focused on the issues that generated the most interest and concern during the consultation on the draft National Park Plan. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss in detail the key points raised and to suggest alternative approaches or ways in which the relevant policies could be amended or improved in preparing the final National Park Management Plan and Submission Core Strategy. Based on a review of the consultation comments received in 2008, a range of local organisations and statutory bodies were invited to the workshops to ensure that the diversity of views expressed on the issues raised during the consultation process were properly represented.
- 5.4 A total of six workshops were held between March - April 2009. Each Working Group was chaired by a National Park Authority member and the discussions were led by Authority planning officers. Draft notes of each meeting were agreed by participants and additional comments, if received, are included in the final notes which were published on the Authority's website. The main conclusions were:

Zoning: 15 organisations attended the session. It was generally agreed that the Forest is already divided into zones (e.g. the Open Forest, the European sites of nature conservation), and that adding an additional layer of zoning would cause confusion. It was also felt that the National Park should be treated as a whole, and that zoning implies that some areas are less valued than others. These conclusions are reflected in the final Management Plan and Submission Core Strategy documents.

Socio-Economic issues: 17 organisations attended the session. The Working Group concluded that a greater emphasis should be given to the National Park's duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of the local communities within the National Park. In addition to encouraging businesses that contribute to the statutory Park purposes, the Core Strategy should support businesses that maintain a sustainable local economy and do not conflict with the Park purposes. It was also felt that the policies should not prevent the modest expansion of small businesses in local communities outside the 'defined villages'. These conclusions are reflected in the final Management Plan and Submission Core Strategy documents.

Housing and 'Service Villages': 16 organisations attended the session. The Working Group concluded that development in the National Park should be focused on meeting local needs, rather than wider needs that are best met in surrounding urban areas. Development should be focused on the delivery of affordable housing, although the proposed affordable housing policies were queried in light of the economic viability evidence. It was agreed that the term 'Service Villages' had negative connotations, with alternatives including the existing 'Defined Villages' raised. Some participants felt that development should be considered across the National Park, rather than being focused on the larger villages. The Submission Core Strategy refers to 'Defined Villages' and states that exceptions schemes will be considered across the rest of the National Park. The Submission draft Core Strategy affordable housing policies have been prepared in light of up to date evidence on economic viability.

Traffic and Transport issues: 20 organisations attended the session. The idea of road pricing, road closures, car park location and car free zones were all acknowledged to be contentious. However, most participants felt that at this stage no measures should be excluded as part of a range of tools for managing traffic in the National Park in the longer term. However, if retained they must be explained better in terms of who had the main responsibility for delivering measures. In general, non-regulatory and more positive means of managing traffic should be given greater emphasis as a means of delivering the policies. Both the Submission Core Strategy and the Management Plan reflect this latter point. They do not include reference to road pricing, road closures and car park location.

Recreational Horse Keeping: Two independently facilitated working group sessions were held focusing on the recreational horse keeping issues (run by Dialogue Matters). The two sessions were attended by between 20 – 25 participants (excluding Authority staff and members). The sessions acknowledged the contribution horse keeping makes to the local economy, and also the benefit of a positively worded planning policy to manage the impacts of horse keeping. It was also concluded that a New Forest Equine Forum should be established to carry forward the work on the policies and provide a discussion forum for horse keeping issues in general. The revised recreational horse

keeping policies in the Submission Core Strategy have been developed through the Equine Forum and endorsed by them.

Parish Council Meetings

- 5.5 There are 37 town and parish councils within the National Park. These parishes are divided into quadrants and in April – May 2009 the Authority hosted four parish quadrant meetings. Every town and parish council within the Park was invited to send two representatives to the meetings. At the meetings, Authority officers fed back on the conclusions of the working groups and discussed suggested ways forward in preparing the final Management Plan and Submission Core Strategy with the local parish councillors. In total 48 parish councillors, representing 28 of the councils within the Park, attended the quadrant meetings. Authority officers and members have also attended in excess of 30 parish council meetings in 2008 and 2009 to discuss the development of the Management Plan and Core Strategy.

Ward Councillors meeting

- 5.6 Ward councillors from the constituent local authorities (Hampshire County, Wiltshire Council, New Forest District and Test Valley Borough) covering the National Park were invited to a meeting on 22 April 2009 which reported back on the main issues raised during the consultation on the draft National Park and discussed recommended ways forward. The meeting was attended by 17 local councillors representing areas in the National Park or immediately adjoining it.

New Forest Equine Forum

- 5.7 One of the main conclusions from the independently facilitated Recreational Horse Keeping Working Groups held in April 2009 was that an independent New Forest Equine Forum should be set up (as discussed in paragraph 5.4). The Authority followed up on this recommendation and since July 2009 a total of 5 meetings have been held. The Forum members comprise a range of organisations and individuals with an interest in horsekeeping and the focus for the first six months of discussions has been on agreeing the revised Submission Core Strategy policies on recreational horsekeeping.

Further meetings with Statutory Bodies

- 5.8 Further meetings were held on an individual basis with a range of key stakeholders and statutory bodies to discuss specific representations made on the consultation draft National Park Plan and potential ways forward for both the Management Plan and the Core Strategy.

Public Meeting

- 5.9 Following the workshops, it was decided to hold a public meeting to set out the Authority's response and proposed approach to address the main issues raised. It was held on 2 September 2009 and attended by

approximately 200 people. At the meeting Authority staff outlined the likely revisions to both the Management Plan and the Core Strategy, and the meetings included a public question and answer session.

6. Publication of the Submission draft Core Strategy – February 2010

6.1 Having concluded the additional stakeholder consultation during 2009, the Authority prepared a final National Park Management Plan and the Submission Core Strategy. The Authority shared an initial working version of the Submission Core Strategy with the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) and a number of other local partners in late 2009. Following meetings with the Government Office, further amendments were made to the Submission draft Core Strategy before it was considered by the Authority's members at the December 2009 Authority meeting.

6.2 In accordance with Regulation 27 of the amended 2008 Planning Regulations, the Submission Core Strategy was made available through the following methods.

- Copies of the document were made available for inspection at the Authority's main office in Lymington, as well as the Authority weekly planning surgery in Lyndhurst.
- The document was available to view and download on the Authority's website, alongside a statement of the representations procedure.
- Statutory consultees received a copy of the Core Strategy document and a statement of the representations procedure.
- Those who commented on the consultation draft National Park Plan received written notification that the Submission Core Strategy had been published.
- A press notice was placed in local newspapers stating that the submission document had been published, where it was available, and the duration of the consultation period.

Annex A: Specific and General Bodies consulted at Regulation 25 Stage (‘Future Matters’ – Issues and Options)

Organisations

Active for Life
Agricultural & Allied Workers
Applemore College
Applemore Recreation Centre
Artsway
Ashley Infants School
Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council
Ashurst Hospital
Associated British Ports
Association of Hampshire and Isle of
Wight Local Authorities
Atlantic Housing Association Ltd
Avon Tyrrell Activity Centre
Avon Valley Archaeological Society
Barker Mill Estates
Beaulieu Parish Council
Beaulieu Young Farmers' Association
Berthon Boat Company Ltd
Boldre Parish Council
Bournemouth and West Hants Water
Co
Bovis Homes (SE) Limited
Bramshaw Parish Council
Bransgore Residents Association
Breamore Parish Council
British Gas Properties
British Horse Society
British Telecommunications plc
Brockenhurst College
Brockenhurst Parish Council
British Trust for Conservation
Volunteers
Burton Parish Council
Calmore Infant School
Calshot Activities Centre
Camping and Caravanning Club
Caravan Club
Christchurch Borough Council
Christchurch Community Partnership
Churches together in Ringwood and
District
Citizens Advice Bureaux
Commoners' Defence Association
Community Action Hampshire
Community Association (Hordle)
Community Association (Ringwood
and District)
Community First, New Forest
Copythorne Parish Council
Council for National Parks
Council for the Protection of Rural
England
Country Land and Business
Association
Countryside Agency
Countryside Education Trust
(Beaulieu)
Cranborne Chase and West Wilts
Downs AONB
CTC
Damerham Parish Council
DC Planning Ltd
Dean and Dyball
Defence Estates
DEFRA
Denny Lodge Parish Council
Dept. of Health/ SE Public Health
Group
Dibden Allotments Charity
Disabled Children and Families Team
Dorset County Council
DUA Architecture and Planning
Supervision
East Boldre Parish Council
East Dorset Community Partnership
East Dorset District Council
Ellingham and Ringwood FC
Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley
Parish Council
English Heritage
English Partnerships
English Tourist Board
Enichem UK Ltd
Environment Agency
EON UK plc
Esso Petroleum Company Ltd
ET Private Hire
Exbury and Lepe Parish Council
Exbury Estate
Exxon Mobil
Fawley Parish Council
Federation of Small Businesses
Fordingbridge Business Forum
Fordingbridge Society
Fordingbridge Town Council
Forest Arts Centre
Forest Bus (New Forest and Romsey
Mobile Community project)

Forest Edge School
Forest Forge
Forestry Commission
Freightliner Ltd
Friends of the Earth (New Forest)
Goadsby and Harding Commercial
Godshill Parish Council
Government Office for the South East
Greenclose Ltd
Grosvenor Taxes
Gypsy Council
Hale Parish Council
Hampshire and Portsmouth Learning Partnership
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Hampshire Association of Parish and Town Councils
Hampshire Coalition of Disabled People
Hampshire Conservation Volunteers
Hampshire Constabulary
Hampshire Council for Voluntary Youth Services
Hampshire County Council
Hampshire County Federation of Women's Institutes
Hampshire Cycling/CTC
Hampshire Deaf Association
Hampshire Economic Task Group
Hampshire Federation of Women's Institutes
Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society
Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service
Hampshire Gardens Trust
Hampshire Police Authority
Hampshire Scouts
Hampshire Wildlife Trust
Hamptworth Estate
Hants and IOW Active Sports Partnership
Hardley School
HCFE Childrens Forum
Help the Aged
Hesley Hall Ltd
Hightown Hill Residents Association
Highways Agency
Hill House School
Home Builders Federation
Homeleigh
Hordle Parish Council
Hordle Walthampton
Hounslow School
Howard Sharp and Partners

Humphreys and Dancer
Hurn Parish Council
Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd
Hyde Housing Association
Hythe and Dibden Parish Council
Hythe and Dibden Woodland and Waterside Group
Hythe Business Partnership
Hythe Sailing Club
Innogy Plc
Institute of Chartered Foresters
It's Your Choice
Job Centre Plus
John Phillips Planning Consultancy
Kingfisher Housing Group
Kitewood Estate (West) Ltd
Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
Landford Parish Council
Learning Skills Council
Legal Services Partnership
Lennon Planning Ltd
Level Ltd
Linden Angoras
Linden Developments Ltd
Luken Beck Partnership Ltd
Lymington and District Chamber of Commerce and Industry Limited
Lymington and District Naturalists
Lymington and Pennington Town Council
Lymington Chamber of Trade
Lymington Community Association
Lymington District Neighbourhood Watch
Lymington Harbour Commissioners
Lymington Society
Lyndhurst Chamber of Trade
Lyndhurst Parish Council
Lyndhurst Police Station
Malcolm Judd and Partners
Marchwood Parish Council
Martin Parish Council
McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd
Melchett Park and Plaitford Parish Council
Mercury Telecommunications Ltd
Merryhill Envirotec Ltd
Meyrick Estate (and Country Land and Business Association)
Michael Waite Chartered Surveyors
Milford Environment Group
Milford-on-Sea Parish Council
Milford-on-Sea Traders
Millbrook Furnishing Industries Ltd
MIND Southampton and New Forest
Minstead Parish Council

Minstead Study Centre
 MODCATS - Members of Disabled
 Community Aiding themselves
 successfully
 Mono Consultants Ltd
 Mott MacDonald
 National Farmers' Union
 National Grid Transco
 National Schizophrenia Fellowship
 National Trust
 Natural England
 Netley Marsh Parish Council
 Network Rail
 New Forest and Hampshire County
 Show
 New Forest (East) Sports Council
 New Forest (West) Sports Council
 New Forest Access for All
 New Forest Access Forum
 New Forest and Romsey Victim
 Support
 New Forest Area Conservation
 Volunteers
 New Forest Association
 New Forest Association of Local
 Councils
 New Forest Beagles
 New Forest Bird Group
 New Forest Business Partnership
 New Forest Consultative Panel
 New Forest Cycling Club
 New Forest Disability Information
 Service
 New Forest District Council
 Councillors
 New Forest District Council LTH
 New Forest Dog Owners Group
 New Forest East Constituency Labour
 Party
 New Forest Equestrian Association
 New Forest Friends of the Earth
 New Forest Hounds (Combined Hunts)
 New Forest Mencap
 New Forest National Park Authority
 members
 New Forest Off-Road Cyclists
 New Forest National Park Authority
 New Forest Police
 New Forest Pony Breeding and Cattle
 Society
 New Forest Pony Publicity Group
 New Forest Primary Care Trust
 New Forest Runners Club
 New Forest Tourism Association
 New Forest Village Shops Association
 New Forest Villages HA
 New Forest, Totton and Romsey
 Victim Support Scheme
 New Milton and District Chamber of
 Trade and Commerce
 New Milton Book Shop Ltd
 New Milton Community Association
 New Milton Scout Centre
 New Milton Tenants
 New Milton Town Council
 New Milton, Barton-on-Sea and
 District Residents Association
 Newforce
 Ninth Centenary Trust
 Noadswood Secondary School
 North West Forest Children and
 Families Forum
 NTL
 Nursling and Rownhams Parish
 Council
 O2 Uk
 Oaks Tree Farm
 Orange Personal Communications
 Owen Davies Architects
 Partnership Exchange Fellow
 Paul and Company
 Peacock and Smith
 Pennington 1st School
 Pennington Residents Association
 Persimmon Homes South East
 Pre-School Learning Alliance
 Priestlands School
 Primary Care Trust
 Pro Vision Planning and Design
 Probus Club (New Forest East)
 Probus Club (New Milton and District)
 Pylewell Estate
 Raglan Housing Association
 Ramblers Association
 Ramblers Association (NF Branch)
 Rapleys
 Raymond Building Ltd
 Redlynch Parish Council
 Resthaven
 Ringwood and Fordingbridge Footpath
 Society
 Ringwood CAB
 Ringwood Chamber of Trade and
 Commerce
 Ringwood School
 Ringwood Town Council
 Rockbourne Parish Council
 Romsey Extra Parish Council
 Royal Forestry Society
 Royal Lyminster Yacht Club

Royal Mail Group c/o Atisreal
 Royal Society for Protection of Birds
 Royal Yachting Association
 RPS Group
 RPS Planning
 RSPCA
 Rural Development Service
 Rushington Manor Residents' Association
 RWE power (Fawley Power Station)
 Salisbury District Council
 Salisbury Health Care NHS
 Salvation Army
 Sandy Balls Estate
 Savills
 SCA Community Care Services
 SCOPAC
 Secondsite Property
 Shipyard Residents Hythe
 Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council
 Solent Protection Society
 Somerley Estate
 Sopley Parish Council
 South Central Strategic Health Authority
 South City FM
 South Downs Joint Committee
 South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)
 South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)
 South East Regional Countryside Committee Youth Hostels' Association
 South Hampshire Enterprise Agency
 South West England Regional Assembly (SWRA)
 South West Forest Children and Families Forum
 South West of England Regional Development Agency
 South West Trains
 Southampton and Fareham Chamber of Commerce
 Southampton and New Forest Magistrates Courts
 Southampton City Council
 Southampton Partnership
 Southampton Uni Hos NHS Trust
 Southern and South East Arts
 Southern Electric
 Southern Tourist Board
 Southern Water
 Southlands School
 Sparsholt College
 Spinnaker Housing Group
 Sports England
 St Barbe Museum
 St Lawrence Vicarage
 St Leonards and St Ives Parish Council
 Stonham
 Stratford Tony Parish Council
 SUSTRANS
 Sway Parish Council
 Sway Women's Institute
 Swaythling Housing Society
 Synergy Housing Association
 Tanner and Tilley
 Taylor Woodrow Developments
 Team Elite
 Tenant Farmers Association
 Tenants Executive Consultative Group
 Terence O'Rourke Ltd
 Test Valley Borough Council
 Testvale Survey
 Testwood Secondary School
 Tetlow King Planning
 The Arnewood School
 The Burgate School
 The Environment Centre
 The Fordingbridge Society
 The Handy Trust (Hythe and Dibden Youth Trust)
 The Housing Corporation
 The National Grid Company plc
 The New Forest Trust
 The Planning Inspectorate
 The Princes Trust (Hampshire Office)
 The Probus Club of the New Forest
 The SAA Project
 T-Mobile UK
 Totton and Eling Town Council
 Totton and Eling Community Association
 Totton Business and Professional Women
 Totton College
 Totton Youth Centre
 Tourism South East
 Turley Associates
 United Nations Association (Lymington)
 University of Portsmouth
 University of Southampton
 Vail Williams
 Verderers of the New Forest
 Verwood Parish Council
 Vodafone Limited

Waterside Neighbourhood Centre
Partnership
Wellow History Society
Wellow Parish Council
Wessex Petroleum Ltd
Wessex Water
West Hampshire NHS Trust
West Hampshire Trust
Western Challenge Housing
Association
White Young Green
Whiteparish Parish Council
Wilts and Dorset Bus Co Ltd
Wiltshire County Council
Winchester City Council
Woodgreen Parish Council

Woolf Bond Planning
Wordsworth House
World Association of Girl Guides and
Scouts
World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)
New Forest Group
Youth and Family Matters
Youth Forum
Youth Hostels Association South
Region
Youth Offending Team
South East Protected Landscapes

Plus over 80 individuals

Annex B: Organisations that participated in the New Forest New Chapter Events (October 2007 – March 2008)
(note this represents 76 of the 190 organisations originally invited to participate)

Avon Tyrell UK Youth Activity Centre	Hyde Parish Council
Boldre Parish Council	Hythe and Dibden Parish Council
Bramshaw Parish Council	Institute of Chartered Foresters
Bransgore Parish Council	Lepe Country Park
British Horse Society (Hampshire)	Lyndhurst Parish Council
Brockenhurst College	National Farmers Union
Brockenhurst Parish Council	National trust
Calshot Activities Centre	Natural England
Campaign to Protect Rural England	New Forest Access for All
Camping and Caravanning Club	New Forest Access Forum
Caravan Club	New Forest Association
Commoners Defence Association	New Forest Centre
Community First, New Forest	New Forest Club Cricket Association
Copythorne Parish Council	New Forest District Council
Countryside Education Trust (Beaulieu)	New Forest Dog Owners Group
Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB	New Forest Equestrian Association
Dorset County Council	New Forest Friends of the Earth
Earth Events and Liquid Logistics	New Forest Golf Club
Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council	New Forest Hounds
Environment Agency	New Forest National Park Authority
Exbury Estate	New Forest Sports Council
Fawley Parish Council	New Forest Tourism Association
Forest Holidays	Newforce
Forestry Commission	Pylewell Estate
Girlguiding UK	Ringwood and Fordingbridge Footpath Society
Godshill Parish Council	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Salisbury District Council
Hampshire Constabulary	South East Protected Landscapes
Hampshire Council for Voluntary Youth Services	South West Regional Assembly
Hampshire County Council	St Barbe Museum
Hampshire Gardens Trust	Sway Parish Council
Hordle Parish Council	Test Valley Borough Council
Hurst Castle and Hurst Castle Ferry	Tourism South East
	Valesmoor Farm
	Verderers of the New Forest
	Wiltshire County Council

Annex C: Regulation 26 Consultees

List of statutory consultees and other organisations sent either a copy of the draft National Park Plan or a letter of notification at the start of the consultation period

Agricultural and Allied Workers National Trade Group	Cranborne Chase & West Wilts Downs AONB
Alderholt Parish Council	Crown Estate
AONB Unit	Defence Estates
Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council	Defra
Associated British Ports	Denny Lodge Parish Council
Association of National Park Authorities	Dept. of Health/ SE Public Health Group
Avon Tyrrell UK Youth Activity Centre	Don Wark Consultancy
Avon Valley Archaeological Society	Dorset County Council
Barker Mill Estates	Downton Parish Council
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Earth Events & Liquid Logistics
Beaulieu Parish Council	East Boldre Parish Council
Boldre Parish Council	East Dorset District Council
Bournemouth & West South Hants Water	East Hampshire AONB Office
Bournemouth International Airport Ltd	Eastleigh Borough Council
Bournemouth University	Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council
Boyer Planning Ltd	English Heritage
Bramshaw Golf Club	English National Park Authorities Association
Bramshaw Parish Council	Environment Agency
Bransgore Parish Council	Esso Petroleum Company Ltd
Breamore Parish Council	Exbury & Lepe Parish Council
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority	Exbury Estate
British Gas Properties	Exmoor National Park Authority
British Horse Society (Hampshire)	Fawley Parish Council
British Telecommunications plc	Fordingbridge Town Council
Brockenhurst College	Forest Forge Theatre
Brockenhurst Parish Council	Forest Holidays
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy Ltd	Forestry Commission
BTCV Southern Central Hampshire	Girlguiding UK
Burley Parish Council	Godshill Parish Council
Burton Parish Council	Government Office for the South East
Cadland Estate	Government Office for the South West
Calshot Activities Centre	Greenpeace
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Gypsy and Traveller Unit
Camping and Caravanning Club	Hale Parish Council
Caravan Club	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Hampshire Association of Parish & Town Councils
Chilterns Conservation Board	Hampshire Constabulary
Christchurch Borough Council	Hampshire Council for Voluntary Youth Services
Citizens Advice Bureau	Hampshire County Council
Civil Aviation Authority	
Commoners' Defence Association	
Community Action Hampshire	
Community First, New Forest	
Copythorne Parish Council	
Council for National Parks	
Countryside Education Trust (Beaulieu)	

Hampshire County Federation of
 Women's Institutes
 Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological
 Society
 Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service (New
 Forest North)
 Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service
 Hampshire Gardens Trust
 Hampshire Primary Care Trust
 Hampshire Young Farmers Club
 Hamptworth Estate
 Hants and Isle of Wight Strategic Health
 Authority
 Health and Safety Executive
 Heppenstalls
 High Weald AONB Unit
 Highways Agency
 Historic Buildings and Monuments
 Commission for England
 Hoburne Limited
 Home Builders Federation
 Hordle Parish Council
 Housing Corporation
 Hurn Parish Council
 Hurst Castle & Hurst Castle Ferry
 Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd
 Hyde Housing Association
 Hyde Parish Council
 Hythe & Dibden Parish Council
 Hythe & Dibden Woodland & Waterside
 Conservation Group
 Institute of Chartered Foresters
 Isle of Wight Council
 Kent Downs AONB
 Kris Mitra Associates Ltd
 Landford Parish Council
 Lennon Planning Ltd
 Lepe Country Park
 Linden Developments Ltd
 Longdown Activity Farm
 Luken Beck Partnership Ltd
 Lymington & District Chamber of
 Commerce & Industry Limited
 Lymington & Pennington Town Council
 Lymington Chamber of Trade
 Lymington Harbour Commissioners
 Lyndhurst Parish Council
 Lyndhurst Residents Association
 Malcolm Judd & Partners
 Marchwood Parish Council
 McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd
 Melchett Park & Plaitford Parish Council
 Mercury Telecommunications Ltd
 Meyrick Estate (& Country Land &
 Business Association)

Milford-on-Sea Parish Council
 Ministry of Defence
 Minstead Parish Council
 Minstead Study Centre
 Mott MacDonald
 National Farmers' Union
 National Grid
 National Trust
 Natural England
 Netley Marsh Parish Council
 New Forest & Hampshire County
 Show
 New Forest Access For All
 New Forest Access Forum
 New Forest Association
 New Forest Association of Local
 Councils
 New Forest Bird Group
 New Forest Business Partnership
 New Forest Centre
 New Forest Club Cricket Association
 New Forest Consultative Panel
 New Forest District Council
 New Forest Dog Owners Group
 New Forest Equestrian Association
 New Forest Friends of the Earth
 New Forest Golf Club
 New Forest Green Party
 New Forest Hounds
 New Forest Hounds (Combined
 Hunts)
 New Forest Pony Breeding and
 Cattle Society
 New Forest Primary Care Trust
 New Forest Sports Council
 New Forest Tourism Association
 New Forest Trust
 New Forest Village Shops
 Association
 New Forest Villages HA
 New Forest Young Persons' Forum
 New Milton Town Council
 newforce
 Ninth Centenary Trust
 North Wessex Downs AONB
 NTL
 Nursling & Rownhams Parish
 Council
 O2 UK
 Orange Personal Communications
 Paul Jackson
 Paultons Park
 Persimmon Homes South East
 Powergen
 Priestlands School

Primary Care Trust
 Pylewell Estate
 Raglan Housing Association
 Ramblers Association
 Ramblers Association (New Forest Branch)
 Redlynch Parish Council
 Registered Social Landlords
 Ringwood & Fordingbridge Footpath Society
 Ringwood Chamber of Trade
 Ringwood School
 Ringwood Town Council
 Rockbourne Parish Council
 Romsey Extra Parish Council
 Royal Lyminster Yacht Club
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
 RPS Group
 RSPCA
 RWE npower (Fawley Power Station)
 Salisbury District Council
 Salisbury Health Care NHS
 Sandleheath Parish Council
 Sandy Balls Estate
 Savills
 SCOPAC
 Solent Blue Line
 Solent Forum
 Solent Protection Society
 Somerley Estate
 Sopley Parish Council
 South Downs Joint Committee
 South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)
 South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)
 South West England Regional Assembly
 South West of England Regional Development Agency
 Southampton & Fareham Chamber of Commerce
 Southampton Airport
 Southampton City Council
 Southampton Solent University
 Southern Electricity
 Southern Water
 Sparsholt College
 St Barbe Museum
 St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council
 Surrey Hills AONB Office
 Sway Parish Council
 Swaythling Housing Society
 Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
 Terence O'Rourke
 Test Valley Borough Council
 Testwood Secondary School
 Tetlow King Planning
 The Forest Rambling Club
 T-Mobile UK
 Totton & Eling Town Council
 Totton College
 Tourism South East
 Turley Associates
 Valesmoor Farm
 Verderers of the New Forest
 Vodafone Limited
 Wellow History Society
 Wellow Parish Council
 Wessex Water
 West Sussex County Council
 White Young Green
 Whiteparish Parish Council
 Whitsbury Parish Council
 Wightlink Isle of Wight Ferries
 Wilts & Dorset Bus Co Ltd
 Wiltshire County Council
 Wiltshire Police
 Wiltshire Wildlife Trust
 Winchester City Council
 Woodgreen Parish Council
 World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF)
 New Forest Group
 Youth Hostels Association

