



**New Forest National Park
Submission draft Local Plan 2016 – 2036**

**Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
(SHLAA)**

January 2018

Appendix C – Summary of rejected housing sites

Appendix C: Summary of rejected housing sites (either unsuitable, unavailable or unachievable) by Parish

Parish: Ashurst & Colbury

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reason for rejection
89	Ashurst	St Joseph's Retreat, Lyndhurst Road, Ashurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site is well located in relation to the village of Ashurst, it is very well treed and residential development would impact on the character of the area.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	The site has not been promoted by the owner and it is unclear if it is available for development. The site has many mature trees covered by TPOs which would need to be felled for residential development, impacting on the character of the area.
91	Ashurst	Telephone Exchange, Lyndhurst Road, Ashurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site is well located for the services in Ashurst, it also lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered suitable.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	This part brownfield site is in employment use. Given the proximity of the New Forest SPA to the site it is not considered to be suitable for housing development.
139	Ashurst	Land at Foxhills, Ashurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – this large scale development would fundamentally alter the character of this part of the National Park and run contrary to the local community's aim of keeping the New	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a large predominantly greenfield site that would constitute major development in the National Park. Development would effectively merged the village of Ashurst with the Totton urban area. The National Park boundary was designated in 2005 following extensive examination and this proposal would fundamentally change the landscape character of the area.

			Forest village of Ashurst separate from the adjacent Totton urban area (excluded from the National Park in 2005).			
140	Ashurst	Land to the south of the A35, Ashurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – this is a prominent greenfield site where development of the scale proposed would fundamentally alter the landscape character of the site.	The land is in single ownership and the landowner has confirmed that the site is available for development.	The land is in single ownership and no issues have been identified regarding the achievability of development.	This is a large, greenfield site that would constitute major development in the National Park. The review of the defined village boundary of Ashurst identified the clear boundary formed by the A35 and development of the scale proposed would have a significant impact on the landscape character.
154	Ashurst	Land to rear of 213 & 219 Lyndhurst Road, Ashurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – site lies outside the defined village boundary of Ashurst and is adjacent to the New Forest SPA.	Yes – the agent acting on behalf of the landowner has states that the site is available and could be completed by 2020.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This small site is located adjacent to the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites and is therefore not considered to be appropriate as a Local Plan housing allocation.
179	Ashurst	Part of the Ashurst Hospital Site	Rejected at Stage 2 - this brownfield site is well located for the services and transport links in Ashurst. However the site is also immediately adjacent to the New Forest SPA. Access to	Not currently - The landowner has confirmed that the site is not currently available for development and this is dependent on	Unclear - A legal 'reverser clause' included when the land was first transferred from the Open Forest has been explored and it	Brownfield land at Ashurst Hospital may become available during the Local Plan period. The site has some merits in terms of its proximity to the services and transport links in Ashurst. However, the site has yet to be deemed surplus to the NHS's healthcare requirements and further issues centre on the immediate proximity of the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites (which would restrict the

			the site is currently over Forestry Commission land and this would need to be addressed should the site become available during the Local Plan-period.	a decision from the NHS in 2018 confirming that part of the site being declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS.	has been concluded that this is not a barrier to development. However, the access to the site is currently owned by a third party and is unclear if access rights could be negotiated for residential use.	form of any future residential development); and the existing access arrangements which involve access over third party land. With these issues outstanding, it is considered premature to allocate the site for housing in the Local Plan.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Parish: Beaulieu

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reason for rejection
131	Beaulieu	St Leonard's Farm buildings, Sowley Lane, Beaulieu	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site comprises a range of listed buildings in an area with limited access to services. A more appropriate route to pursue residential use may be through an agreed Estate Plan.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a relatively remote part of the National Park and not an appropriate location for housing site allocations. The complex of buildings are a designated heritage asset and any residential development would need to be considered through the planning application process, having regard to their built heritage status and the optimum viable use.
132	Beaulieu	Land adjacent to 'Harlicks', Hatchet Lane,	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is detached from the village of	Yes – the site has been put forward by the	Yes - no legal issues have been identified	This site is detached from the village of Beaulieu and would result in additional development in the countryside. It is therefore not considered to

		Beaulieu	Beaulieu and has no safe pedestrian routes to Beaulieu or East Boldre.	landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	and the development of the site is considered achievable.	be a suitable location for additional housing in the absence of an Estate Plan setting out the wider plan for the future of the Estate.
133	Beaulieu	Land at Palace Lane, Beaulieu	Rejected at Stage 2 – this very small site is best pursued through the Estate Plans route or as a rural exception site.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This small site is fairly well located in terms of the services or Beaulieu and public transport. <u>There may be scope for a couple of Estate worker's dwellings or as a rural exception site.</u>

Parish: Boldre

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reason for rejection
5	Walhampton	Walhampton Hill, Lymington 0.4ha site adjacent to existing properties at Walhampton Hill.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is not well located in relation to existing services and settlements within the National Park and is detached from the town of Lymington.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is not located within or adjacent to any of the main villages within the National Park and permission has in the past (prior to National Park designation) been refused for residential development on the site.
66	Norleywood	Land adjacent to 'Butlers', Norleywood Road	Rejected at Stage 2 – this greenfield site is on the edge of the scattered settlement of Norleywood with	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of	The site is relatively detached from local services. An application for two dwellings on the site was refused in 1988 and dismissed at appeal due to the lack of justification for open market houses in the protected landscape. The site also lies within

			limited access to local services. The site also lies within 400m from the new Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable for housing development.	considered to be available.	the site is considered achievable.	400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable as a housing site allocation in the Local Plan.
97	Boldre	Land adjacent to 1 Frogmore Cottages, Norleywood, Boldre	Rejected at Stage 1 – the site includes land within Flood Risk Zone 3 on the latest maps available from the Environment Agency. It is also located within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and so is not suitable.	N/A	N/A	Rejected due to concerns over flooding and the proximity of the New Forest SPA.
169	Boldre	Site A, Coachman's Cottage, Southampton Road, Boldre	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is isolated from larger settlements within the National Park and is therefore not considered to be a suitable focus for new housing development.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is isolated from any nearby settlements. The site is small (0.1ha) and the allocation of a site for a single dwelling is not considered appropriate through the Local Plan Review.

170	Boldre	Site B, Coachman's Cottage, Southampton Road, Boldre	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is isolated from larger settlements within the National Park and is therefore not considered to be a suitable focus for new housing development.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is isolated from any nearby settlements. The site is small (0.07ha) and the allocation of a site for a single dwelling is not considered appropriate through the Local Plan Review.
182	Walhampton	Land adjacent The Dell, Brickfield Lane, Walhampton	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is not well located in relation to existing services and settlements within the National Park and is detached from the town of Lymington.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The Walhampton Hill area is not considered to be a suitable location for further residential allocations. The site is located within the Conservation Area and is detached from the main settlement of Lymington by the busy Bridge Road.

Parish: *Bramshaw*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
125	Bramshaw	Home Farm, Kewlake Lane, Bramshaw Currently in mixed agricultural, residential and storage use.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is in a relatively inaccessible location and does not relate to any particular settlement in the area.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site represents a cluster of buildings that do not relate particularly closely to existing settlements and services. The site is therefore not appropriate for allocation in the Local Plan. Depending on the heritage assets on the site, as case could be made for an enabling development linked to the locally listed buildings on the site.

155	Bramshaw	The Rosary Garage, Bramshaw	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not relate well to existing settlements in the National Park and lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA.	Yes - the agent acting on behalf of the landowners states that the site is available and could be completed by 2020.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site does not relate well to existing services and settlements within the National Park. It is also located within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be appropriate as a Local Plan housing allocation.
-----	----------	-----------------------------	---	--	--	---

Parish: Bransgore

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
19	Bransgore	Land adjacent to Meyrick Close, Bransgore 4.5ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 - development of this large greenfield site would result in the neighbouring urban area of Bransgore (outside the Park) extending into agricultural land within the National Park.	Yes - The landowner states the site is available for development which could commence within 5 years subject to the termination of the agricultural tenancy agreement.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The proposed large greenfield development (4.5ha) would extend the built form of Bransgore into the surrounding open countryside of the nationally protected landscape of the National Park.
55	Thorney Hill	Land adjacent to 1 Brick Lane, Thorney Hill, Bransgore 0.12ha site comprising	Rejected at Stage 2 – the settlement of Thorney Hill has very limited services and is not considered to be a suitable focus	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is	The site comprises a very well treed garden area linked to existing properties in a settlement with very limited services. This, allied to the very small size of the site and the proximity of the New Forest SPA, means it is not considered to be a suitable housing allocation site.

		rear gardens.	for new development. The site also lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	be available.	considered achievable.	
56	Thorney Hill	Land to the rear of 266 – 272 Burley Road, Thorney Hill 0.04ha site currently used for parking.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the settlement of Thorney Hill has very limited services and is not considered to be a suitable focus for new development. The site also lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The very small size of the site and the proximity of the New Forest SPA means it is not considered to be a suitable housing allocation site.
57	Bransgore	Land to the east of East Close Farm, Bransgore 0.14 ha site currently very overgrown.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is detached from settlements and would result in new dwellings in the open countryside.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The existing site is heavily planted with large trees on the boundaries. The area is of a rural character (woodland and open farmland) with some sporadic housing and not an appropriate location for further development.
101	Thorney Hill	Land adjacent to 'Forest Acre', Brick Lane, Thorney Hill	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the new Forest SPA. In addition, Thorney Hill has very limited services and is considered to be a	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not a suitable housing site allocation. In addition the settlement of Thorney Hill has very limited services and public transport links, with the nearest facilities 2 km away in Bransgore.

			suitable focus for housing development.			
126	Godwincroft	Land at The Glen, Lyndhurst Road, Godwincroft	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site is detached from settlements and would result in new dwellings in the open countryside.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is in a rural location and is surrounded by some residential development but also wide ranging views to the rear and front of the site across open landscape.

Parish: Brockenhurst

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
7	Brockenhurst	Land adjacent to the Balmer Lawn Hotel	Rejected at Stage 1 due to concerns over flood risk. In addition the site is located close to the New Forest SPA making it unsuitable for a housing site allocation through the Local Plan.	Yes – the original 'Call for Sites' submission stated the site would be available within 5 years. In 2017 an application for housing on the site was submitted.	Yes - the agent representing the landowner states that the site could be built in the next 5 years.	The majority of the site lies with Flood Risk Zone 3 as identified by the Environment Agency's mapping and the New Forest SFRA. The site also lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA so is not considered suitable as a housing allocation.
8	Brockenhurst	Land adjacent to Harting / south of Forest	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site lies within the	Yes – the landowner states that the	No – the site is subject to a S106 agreement	The site is located within the defined village boundary of Brockenhurst. However, it is also subject to a S106 agreement requiring it to be

		View, Rhinefield Road, Brockenhurst	defined village boundary, the existing S106 agreement for the site – supported on appeal – indicates that the site is not available. The Inspector concluded that there is a continuing specific need for the S106 agreement to restrict the use of the land.	site is available for housing development.	which preclude residential use. A previous application to change the use of the land was refused on appeal.	retained as (private) open space. A previous application for residential use; and to change the use of the land, have both been refused, with the latter refused at appeal in November 2012.
28	Brockenhurst	New Forest Activity Centre, Rhinefield Road, Brockenhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing site allocation (or an amendment to the Defined Village settlement boundary).	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This site is located within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing site allocation. Residential development would not relate well to forming a logical extension to the defined village boundary.
69	Brockenhurst	Hunters Lodge, Sway Road, Brockenhurst 0.12 ha paddock site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is located immediately adjacent to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be a suitable site to amend the defined	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Residential development on the site was refused in the 1960s and 1970s due to concerns over impact on the local character. Given the site's proximity to the New Forest SPA, it would not be appropriate to amend the settlement boundary to incorporate it.

			village boundary to incorporate.			
83	Brockenhurst	Lane adjacent to Vinney's Close, Mill Lane, Brockenhurst	<i>The site was included in the Authority's draft Local Plan (October 2016) and planning permission was granted in Feb. 2017 for the development of 10 dwellings as a rural exception site.</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>The site was included in the Authority's draft Local Plan (October 2016) and planning permission was granted in Feb. 2017 for the development of 10 dwellings as a rural exception site (application ref. 16/00804).</i>
85	Brockenhurst	R A Sibley, Lyndhurst Road, Brockenhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is in employment use and given the very small scale of the site (0.035ha) the site is better retained in employment use.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available for development.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	This is a small brownfield site currently in employment use. Given the very modest size of the site (0.035ha) there will only be very limited scope for a modest mixed use re-development to include a small element of housing.
144	Brockenhurst	Land adjacent Tile Barn House, Tile Barn Lane, Brockenhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 - the surrounding area is rural in character with mature landscaping, and some low density residential development. The site is detached from the village of Brockenhurst and not considered suitable.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The surrounding area is rural in character with mature landscaping. The site is relatively detached from the defined village boundary of Brockenhurst and is not considered to be an appropriate focus for new housing land allocations through the Local Plan.

153	Brockenhurst	Land to the south of Brockenhurst railway station	Rejected at Stage 2 – the whole of the site is covered by habitat designations and it is therefore not suitable for housing.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available for development.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	The whole of the site is designated as a SSSI or SINC. It is therefore not considered to be appropriate for a housing site allocation.
161	Wootton	Wootton Barns, Wilverley Road, New Milton	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is located in a relatively isolated location, away from settlements and services and close to protected habitats. It is not considered suitable.	Yes – the landowner has stated the site is available now and development could be completed by 2020.	Yes - no issues have been identified regarding the achievability of developing the site.	This site is not well related to any settlements and is in an isolated location surrounded by a few properties and there are no public transport links. The site also lies in close proximity to arrange of protected habitats in the New Forest and is therefore not considered to be suitable as a housing allocation site.
164	Brockenhurst	Brockenhurst Manor Golf Club, Sway Road, Brockenhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – although adjoining the defined village boundary, the character of the site (having turned off Sway Road) is rural and the site is well treed. Development of the scale proposed (12 dwellings) would detrimentally affect the character of the site.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore	Yes - the land is in single ownership and the landowners have stated that development in this area would support the viability of the Golf Club.	The site has a rural character to it and is characterised by a number of trees. The scale of development proposed would fundamentally alter the character of the site. <u>There may be scope for a smaller rural exception site scheme</u> that is best considered through the development control process.

Parish: *Burley*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
2	Bisterne Close	Land adjacent to Uplands, Bisterne Close 2.5ha greenfield site, proposed residential use	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. There are also concerns regarding the consolidation of scattered development in the area.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies close to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing allocation on the basis of Natural England’s advice. Development would change the character of Bisterne Close; and would result in development encroaching into the open countryside.
41	Burley	Land adjacent to Deer Hall, Campden Park, Ringwood Road, Burley	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site has the potential for a small affordable housing development. It is relatively well located for the services in Burley village centre. There are however concerns regarding its availability and achievability.	Yes - the site is owned by Burley Parish Council who confirm it would be available within one year – this would require the nursery to relocate.	Unclear - access is currently provided by an easement under the freehold title over the drive to the adjacent property. Reference to restrictive uses set out in the title deeds.	<u>The site has potential as a rural exception site.</u> However, there are question marks over the achievability of the development due to the restrictive clause in the title deeds and the need to relocate the existing nursery. Given the size of the site it would best be taken forward through the Development Control process, rather than the Local Plan.
54	Burley	Garage court between 8 & 10 Meadow Close, Burley	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the brownfield site is well located for the services in Burley village centre, the site	Yes - The landowner states that the site is available. There may be	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is	The proximity of the site to the New Forest SPA means it is not considered suitable for a Local Plan allocation. Given the size of the site, <u>it is better suited to a small rural exception site scheme</u> which could be taken forward through the Development Control process, rather than the

			lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	an issue relating to loss of the parking area for the existing housing.	considered achievable.	Local Plan.
65	Burley Street	Land at Randalls Farm, Burley Street 1.2ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA. It is relatively detached from the services in Burley village centre, in a semi-rural area. It is therefore not considered to be suitable for housing.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This greenfield site is located in close proximity to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable for development. The site is accessed via an un-made road across the SSSI and is not suitable for an additional 30 dwellings
162	Burley	Oak Bark Bend, Chapel Lane, Burley	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is detached from the main part of the village of Burley. It is therefore not considered suitable.	Yes - the landowner has confirmed that the site is available.	Yes - the landowner states that there are no issues relating to viability and there are no legal issues affecting the achievability of residential development.	Buildings only cover small portion of the site, rest is grassland/grazing. The main in principle issue is the proximity of the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites to the site which means it is not considered to be suitable as a housing allocation site.
168	Burley	Moormans & Son Ltd, Ringwood	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400 metres of the	Yes - the landowner has put the site	Yes - no legal issues have been identified	This brownfield site is well located for the services in the village of Burley, but also lies close to the New Forest SPA. <u>The site has potential as a rural</u>

		Road, The Cross, Burley	New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable as a housing land allocation.	forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	and the development of the site is considered achievable.	<u>exception site</u> and is best progressed through this route rather than a Local Plan allocation.
--	--	-------------------------	---	---	---	--

Parish: Copythorne

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
9	Cadnam	Land north of Fir Tree Road, Cadnam 3.8ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable for a large greenfield housing site allocation.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a large greenfield site outside any of the defined New Forest villages. The site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and therefore is not considered suitable as a Local Plan housing allocation.
13	Ower	Land adjacent to The Beeches, Romsey Road, Ower	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park.	No – the landowner has stated that the site is not available for development.	Yes - the landowner has stated the site is economically viable to develop and development is achievable.	The site does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park. The settlement of Ower has very limited services.
16	Cadnam	Cadnam Works, Old Cross Road, Cadnam Existing employment site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is located adjacent to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing site.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is	The allocation of this site would entail housing development immediately adjacent to SPA/SAC/SSSI and the loss of an employment site. It is therefore not considered to be suitable as a housing site allocation.

			Housing would also result in the loss of an employment site.	considered to be available.	considered achievable.	
23	Cadnam	Land at Pollards Moor Road, Copythorne 2.8ha greenfield site currently used for grazing.	Rejected at Stage 2 – concerns regarding the scale of development on a large greenfield site.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a large greenfield site outside any of the defined New Forest villages. While there is potential for some development within Cadnam, the preferred focus is on smaller (preferably brownfield) sites.
47	Bartley	Garages, Shepherds Close, Bartley	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable for Local Plan allocation.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing site allocation.
80	Cadnam	'Horseshoes', Southampton Road, Cadnam 0.75ha greenfield site to the rear of properties from Southampton Road.	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site is well screened and may have some merit, the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered suitable.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site has some merit for an infill development and would not have a wider landscape impact on the National Park. However, the proximity of the New Forest SPA means it is not considered suitable as a housing site allocation.
104	Ower	Garden Centre, Wigley, Ower	Rejected at Stage 1 – the site lies within Flood Risk Zones 2	N/A	N/A	The site was rejected due to concerns over flood risk.

			and 3 as defined by the latest Environment Agency mapping.			
116	Cadnam	Corner of Newbridge Road / Romsey Road, Cadnam Agricultural land.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is at high risk from surface water flooding based on Environment Agency mapping and the New Forest SFRA (2017).	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This site is a little detached from the main settlement and services in Cadnam and is affected by surface water drainage issues. On the basis of the New Forest SFRA work of 2017 the site is not considered to be appropriate for allocation through the Local Plan.
117	Cadnam	Land at 'The Yews', Southampton Road, Cadnam	Rejected at Stage 2 – this active employment site lies immediately adjacent to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable for housing.	No – the site was originally submitted through the 'Call for Sites' process. However a more recent application was submitted for continued employment use of the site.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The NPA included this site in its consultation draft Local Plan (October 2016). However, following Natural England's updated advice in Spring 2017, the site has been deleted from the Local Plan as a housing site due to the immediate proximity of the New Forest SPA. In addition, the Authority has received further applications for continuing employment use on the site since the original 'Call for Sites' submission in 2015.
118	Cadnam	Land adjacent to Uncle Tom's Cabin, Romsey Road, Cadnam Greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is considered to have development potential. However both the Environment Agency flood	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered	The NPA consulted on the potential allocation of this site in Summer 2017 as part of the consultation on potential alternative housing sites. The site lies beyond the New Forest SPA 400 metre zone but the updated SFFRA (2017) highlighted that the site is affected by surface water flooding and potential fluvial flooding. On

			mapping and the New Forest SFRA (2017) highlight that the site is at high risk from surface water flooding	be available.	achievable.	this basis it is not considered to be suitable for housing allocation in the Local Plan review.
119	Bartley	Land at Southampton Road, Bartley	Rejected at Stage 2 – this large greenfield site lies within very close proximity to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be a suitable housing site.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site adjoins the residential area of Bartley. However, it is also located within very close proximity to the New Forest SPA and therefore in accordance with Natural England's updated advice of Spring 2017 the site is not considered to be suitable as a potential Local Plan allocation.
122	Bartley	Land at Winsor Road Bartley 2.1ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this site relates reasonably well to the local settlement. However, access to the site is an issues and therefore the site is not currently considered to be suitable for residential development.	Not currently - the landowner has stated that although the site is not immediately available, it could be developed by 2020. Access issues would need to be addressed.	Not currently – although the site is in single ownership, the restricted access that currently exists to the sites affects its availability and the achievability of residential development.	This site relates reasonably well to the existing settlement. It is located outside the New Forest SPA 400 metres zone and is also not affected by flood risk when compared to other parts of the locality. However, access to the site is an issue and therefore it is not considered in its current state to be a deliverable site that can be included within the Local Plan.
165	Cadnam	Land to the south of Romsey Road, Cadnam	Rejected at Stage 2 – development would result in housing extending into the largely undeveloped	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of	The site is somewhat detached from the settlement of Cadnam and development would result in an encroachment into the surrounding landscape. In addition the New Forest SFRA highlights significant issues with surface water

			land to the east of Romsey Road. The site is also affected by surface water flooding.	is therefore considered to be available.	the site is considered achievable.	flooding in this area and therefore it is not considered to be suitable as a housing allocation.
175	Cadnam	Land at 'Hazelmere', Southampton Road	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be a suitable site allocation.	Not currently - the site submission states that the site is not currently available, but this could be addressed.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. The layout of the rural exception site development to the east at Rockram Close does not lend itself to the site being easily accessed, and therefore any development would need to be access from the A336 which may be an issue.
176	Cadnam	Cadnam Garden Centre, Southampton Road, Cadnam	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is currently operating as a garden centre and is located within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	Not currently – the site is operating as a garden centre and is therefore not currently available for residential use.	Yes - the current landowner states that there are no issues relating to legal covenants on the site.	This site is in active use as a garden centre and the landowner states that the site is not currently available for development. In addition, the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and so is not considered to be suitable for a housing allocation in the Local Plan.

Parish: *Denny Lodge*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
157	Holbury	Ipers Bridge, Holbury,	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies immediately adjacent	Yes - the agent acting on behalf of the	Yes - the 'Call for Brownfield	This does not relate well to settlements within the National Park and there is no safe pedestrian access to the nearby settlements located outside

			to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable. In addition, the site is rather detached from settlements and has poor pedestrian links to services.	landowner states that the site is available for development and this could be completed by 2020.	Sites' submission states that there are no covenants or ransom strips affecting the site and development is therefore achievable.	the National Park. In addition the site lies immediately adjacent to the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable as a residential allocation.
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

Parish: East Boldre

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
17	East Boldre	Land adjacent to Gaza Avenue and Matthews Lane, East Boldre 0.4ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable for housing.	Yes – the site was put forward through the 'Call for Sites' process as being available for housing.	No – the site is the subject of a restrictive covenant which prevents housing use.	This small infill site has merits as a housing site given the existing access and the surrounding residential uses. However, the proximity of the New Forest SPA to the site means that it is not suitable as a housing site allocation.
53	East Boldre	Open space, Sweyns Lease, East Boldre 0.4ha area of open space.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. Development would also result in the loss of public open space.	Yes – the site was put forward through the 'Call for Sites' process as being available for housing.	Unclear - the development of the open space would require compensatory provision and it is not clear how this could be achieved.	The site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing site allocation. In addition, development would result in the loss of public open space (which is also grazed) which would require alternative provision.

130	East Boldre	Land at Strawberry Fields, East Boldre	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site relates well to the surrounding area, the proximity of the New Forest SPA means that it is not considered to be suitable for housing.	Yes – the site was put forward through the ‘Call for Sites’ process as being available for housing.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site was included in the Authority’s consultation draft Local Plan (October 2016) and was considered to be suitable for residential development. However, Natural England’s updated advice on development close to the New Forest SPA has resulted in the site being deleted from the Submission draft Local Plan.
-----	-------------	--	--	---	--	--

Parish: Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
6	Linford	Former Linford Park Nursing Home 10ha former nursing home.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies in a relatively inaccessible location and does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site does not relate well the settlements within the National Park. The site is located in open countryside and is near to a number of protected habitats, including the New Forest SPA which would preclude a housing allocation. Planning permission has been refused prior to National Park designation for residential use.
99	South Gorley	Avon Valley Nurseries	Rejected at Stage 1 – the site lies within Flood Risk Zone 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. Part of the site also has national and international nature conservation designations.	N/A	N/A	The site was rejected at Stage 1 due to flooding and nature conservation issues. The whole site also lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered suitable as a housing site allocation.

Parish: Exbury & Lepe

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
10	Exbury	Exbury Estate Yard 0.76ha site proposed for a mixed use development	Rejected at Stage 1 – the site lies within the designated Historic Park & Garden.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Rejected at Stage 1 – the site lies within the designated Historic Park & Garden. The site may have some potential for appropriate office and commercial space.
11	Exbury	Land adjacent to Ramblers and Ivy Cottage 1 ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 - the village of Exbury has a very limited range of services.	Yes. A neighbouring landowner has an easement to share the septic tank with Ivy Cottage and this would need to be factored into any proposals.	Yes - the landowner states that the site is in single ownership and there are no ransom strips or other restrictions.	The rural village of Exbury has a limited range of services and is not one of the main settlements where the Authority is considering new housing development.
12	Exbury	Land to the rear of Erica Cottage 0.2ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 - the village of Exbury has a very limited range of services.	Yes - the site is owned by the Estate who confirm it is available for development but is not currently being marketed.	Yes - the Estate confirms the site is economically viable to develop and is therefore achievable.	The rural village of Exbury has a limited range of services and is not one of the main settlements where the Authority is considering new housing development.

Parish: *Fawley*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
26	Calshot	Fawley Quarry 11.8 ha sites currently used for sand and gravel extraction	Rejected at Stage 2 – the quarry site has an agreed restoration plan in place. The area is currently detached from local services and could only be considered as part of a wider scheme linked to the redevelopment of the adjacent Power Station site.	Yes - the site is owned by the Cadland Estate who state it is available for development.	Yes - a market report prepared on behalf of the landowner indicates that there is a viable market for development of this site.	The Fawley Quarry site has an agreed restoration scheme in place that does not involve residential use. The site does have the potential to support the proposed redevelopment of the adjacent former Fawley Power Station site through greenspace provision for example.
27	Calshot	Stag Close, Calshot Road, Calshot 6.6ha greenfield site proposed for a primary school linked to the redevelopment of Fawley Power Station site	<i>This proposal is for education use of the site (as part of a wider plan for the former Power Station site). It has therefore not been assessed in detail for residential use.</i>	N/A	N/A	This site has been proposed for educational use, rather than residential use. Given the HSE zones around the Fawley Refinery complex, it is accepted that new on-site school provision as part of the Fawley development will be located within the National Park.
49	Calshot	Land adjacent to 53 Tristan Close, Calshot 0.1ha site	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield site is below the site size threshold	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the	This is a very small site and could be pursued through the Development Control process <u>as a small rural exceptions site</u> . Consideration would need to be given to impacts on neighbouring

		currently used for parking.	to be considered for Local Plan allocation but may have the potential for a small affordable housing development.	housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	development of the site is considered achievable.	properties / amenity and access.
50	Calshot	Land adjacent to 50 Tristan Close, Calshot 0.03ha site currently used for parking and access.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield site is below the site size threshold to be considered for Local Plan allocation but may have the potential for a small affordable housing development.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a very small site and could be pursued through the Development Control process <u>as a small rural exceptions site</u> . Consideration would need to be given to impacts on neighbouring properties / amenity and access
51	Calshot	Parking area and land adjoining 1 Tristan Close, Calshot 0.06ha site	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield site is below the site size threshold to be considered for Local Plan allocation but may have the potential for a small affordable housing development.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a very small site and could be pursued through the Development Control process <u>as a small rural exceptions site</u> . Consideration would need to be given to impacts on neighbouring properties / amenity and access
63	Calshot	Land at St George's Close, Tristan Close,	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is currently in open	Yes - the landowner has put the site	Yes - no legal issues have been identified	Development would have limited landscape impact but would involve the loss of open space which would need to be compensated. Given the

		Calshot 0.5ha area of open space.	space use and its loss would need to be compensated.	forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	and the development of the site is considered achievable.	current open space use of the site, it is considered that adjacent land in the same ownership is more appropriate as a development allocation.
67	Stonehills	Land at Stonehill Farm, Fawley 0.6ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – Stonehills is a small hamlet and development would effectively extend the settlement of Fawley into the National Park.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Residential development was refused on the site prior to National Park designation due to conflicts with the development plan at the time. It is relatively well screened site and does have some pedestrian and public transport links north to Fawley.
68	Stonehills	Land off Stonehills, Fawley 1.8ha greenfield site currently used for grazing.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site would effectively extend the settlement of Fawley into the Park.	Yes – the landowner states that development could be completed within 2 - 3 years.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Residential development refused in the past due to conflicts with the development plan. The area is characterised by narrow country lanes and pedestrian access is poor. The site forms a large open paddock between Fawley and the settlement at Stonehills.
159	Langley	Land adjacent Langley Lodge Gardens	Rejected at Stage 2 – development of this this greenfield site would erode the National Park boundary in this area, which was established in 2005 following extensive examination. The site is therefore not considered to be suitable.	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available now and development could be completed by 2020.	Yes - the landowner has stated that there are no legal covenants or restrictions on the use of the site.	The site lies immediately adjacent to the National Park boundary, which was only established in 2005 following an extensive landscape assessment. Development of this greenfield site would not relate well to the settlements within the National Park and would result in the neighbouring urban areas extending further into the National Park which raises in principle concerns.

178	Calshot	Site of former Flying Boat Inn, Calshot Road, Calshot	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is a little detached from the village of Calshot. There is the possibility of the local community preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and this site could be progressed through this route.	Yes – the landowner states that development could be completed within 2 - 3 years.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is almost completely overgrown and has reverted to a greenfield site. The site is slightly detached from the village of Calshot and there are sites closer to the village available.
-----	---------	---	--	--	--	---

Parish: Godshill

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
110	Godshill	Land adjacent to Godshill Farm, Godshill Currently used for grazing	Rejected at Stage 2 - although the site is fairly well located within the village of Godshill, it lies in close proximity to a range of protected habitats and has no regular public transport links.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available for development.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	Residential development on the site has been refused on a number of occasions dating back to the 1960s. The village has some basic services, although it is not served by regular public transport. The proximity of the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites means it is not considered to be appropriate for a housing site allocation in the Local Plan.

Parish: Hale

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
109	Hale	Land adjacent to	Rejected at Stage	N/A	N/A	The site lies within the designated Hale Park

		Garden Cottage, Queen Street, Hale	1 – the site lies within the designated Hale Park Historic Park and Garden.			Historic Park and Garden and is therefore not considered to be suitable for housing development.
--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Parish: Hordle

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
44	Hordle	Land adjacent Miranda, Vaggs Lane, Hordle Greenfield site adjacent to existing dwellings	Rejected at Stage 2 – this site is not well located in relation to existing services and settlements within the National Park	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Development of the site would add to the scattered development which has already occurred in this part of the National Park. There are limited services available close to the site.

Parish: Hyde

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
100	Stuckton	Depot at Stuckton	<i>This site lies outside the National Park boundary and is therefore under New Forest District Council's planning remit.</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>This site lies outside the National Park boundary and is therefore under New Forest District Council's planning remit.</i>
103	Hyde	Hyde Garden	Rejected at Stage	Yes - the site	Yes - the 'Call	Previous application for 6 affordable dwellings on

		Centre, Gorley Lynch, Hyde	2 – although the site is fairly well located within the village of Hyde, it is still in active use as a garden centre and shop. The site lies in close proximity to the New Forest SAC and urban edge impacts would be a consideration.	has been put forward through the Authority's 'Call for Brownfield Sites' process for residential development.	for Brownfield Sites' submission states that residential development on the site is achievable.	the site refused in 2006 due to loss of employment site; concerns over impacts on nature conservation interests and impacts on the Conservation Area. <u>There may be some potential for underused or vacant parts of the brownfield site to come forward as a rural exception site</u> , subject to consideration of impacts on the adjacent New Forest SAC.
111	Hyde	Land adjacent Mabel's Cottage, Stuckton	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site is fairly well located in relation to surrounding buildings, the hamlet of Stuckton lacks facilities and has no regular public transport links.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	The hamlet of Stuckton is not considered to be a suitable location for the focus on new housing allocations in the National Park.
124	Hyde	Brookfields Farm, Stuckton Existing nursery site	Rejected at Stage 1 – parts of the site are located within Flood Risk Zone 3 as defined by the Environment Agency.	N/A	N/A	The site was rejected at Stage 1 due to concerns regarding flood risk.

Parish: Hythe & Dibden

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
18	Hythe	Land to the north of Southampton Road, Dibden 3.35ha greenfield site currently used for grazing	Rejected at Stage 2 – development of this site would result in the neighbouring urban area of Hythe (outside the Park) extending into the protected landscape of the National Park.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a large greenfield site on the fringes of the National Park where planning permission was refused in the past for residential use prior to the designation of the National Park. Development would result in an extension of the built form of Hythe into the nationally protected landscape of the National Park.
141	Hythe	Land adjacent Vine Cottage, Southampton Road, Hythe	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not relate well to settlements within the National Park and would result in neighbouring urban areas extending into the nationally protected landscape of the New Forest.	Yes - the land is in single ownership and available now. The landowner has also confirmed their willingness to work with neighbouring landowners to bring forward a more comprehensive development if required.	Yes - the land is in single ownership and the landowner has confirmed their view that the development of the site is viable.	This greenfield site does not relate to any of the rural settlements in the National Park. The boundary of the National Park was established in 2005 followed a detailed landscape assessment and it is therefore not considered appropriate to extend neighbouring urban areas into the National Park through greenfield developments that would impact on the character of the nationally designated landscape.

Parish: Landford

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
42	Landford	Forest View, Landford Site currently used as a single gypsy pitch. Proposed use for an additional gypsy pitch.	Development potential for gypsy use (rather than housing) - the site is already in use as a single gypsy pitch. There is an existing access and the site is well screened from the wider landscape.	The site is owned by an existing gypsy who has confirmed that the site has capacity for an additional pitch.	The site is owned by an existing gypsy who has confirmed that the site has capacity for an additional pitch.	The site has been proposed for gypsy use, rather than housing. The site has been used as a single gypsy pitch for a number of years. It is well screened from the surrounding area and benefits from an existing access. Landford itself has a basic range of local services.
112	Landford	Land adjacent Shamba, Lyndhurst Road, Landford	Rejected at Stage 2 – although Landford does have some basic services, this backland greenfield development would detrimentally change the character of the area.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	Development in this location would comprise backland development and extend the built form of Landford to the west. It is therefore not considered to be a suitable housing site.
158	Landford	The New Forest Lodge, Southampton Road, Landford	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is detached from existing settlements and residential development in this location would not relate well to services within the National Park.	Yes - the landowner states that the site is available for development and this could be achieved in two phases by 2025	Yes - the 'Call for Brownfield Sites' submission made on behalf of the landowner states that there are no legal covenants or restrictions.	This site is detached from the settlement of Landford, with no pavements along road to Landford. It is therefore not considered to be particularly suitable for residential use.

Parish: Lymington & Pennington

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
14	Pennington	Land to the north of Ramley Road, Lymington	<i>Excluded as the site does not lie within the New Forest National Park.</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>The site lies outside the National Park (within New Forest District Council's planning remit) and so has not been assessed by the NPA.</i>
71	Lymington	Land off Ridgeway Lane, Lymington 6ha greenfield site currently used for grazing.	<i>The majority of the site is within New Forest District Council's planning remit - only the access route from Ridgeway Lane is within the National Park.</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>No dwellings are proposed in the National Park as part of this 'Call for Sites' submission. The principle of housing development on the adjacent land is for New Forest District Council to assess.</i>
77	Pennington	Wainsford Road, Pennington Grazing land.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site forms part of the open countryside of the National Park and does not relate well to existing services and settlements.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Although close to the built up area of Pennington the site is surrounded by countryside and is immediately adjacent to a SSSI. Public transport links are poor despite the proximity of Lymington.
146	Pennington	Land at Oak Cottage, 50 Ramley Road, Pennington	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site does not relate well to existing services and settlements. Development	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is	The site adjoins the urban area of Lymington & Pennington. The National Park boundary was established in 2005 following a detailed landscape assessment and development in this area would have the effect of extending the adjacent urban area into the nationally protected

			would extend the neighbouring urban areas of Lymington and Pennington into the protected National Park.		considered achievable.	landscape of the New Forest. The site does not relate well to settlements within the National Park and it is not clear how development in this area would benefit the local communities within the National Park.
147	Pennington	Land at Ramley Road, Pennington	Rejected at Stage 2 - the site does not relate well to existing services and settlements. Development would extend the neighbouring urban areas of Lymington and Pennington into the protected National Park.	Yes - the site has been promoted for residential development by the landowner who has confirmed that the site is available for development.	Yes - the site has been promoted for residential development by a developer and is in single ownership. There are no identified issues relating to viability or other legal issues.	The site adjoins the urban area of Lymington & Pennington. The National Park boundary was established in 2005 following a detailed landscape assessment and development in this area would have the effect of extending the adjacent urban area into the nationally protected landscape of the New Forest. The site does not relate well to settlements within the National Park and it is not clear how development in this area would benefit the local communities within the National Park.
171	Pennington	Sadlers Farm Workshops, Lower Pennington Lane	Rejected at Stage 2 - site is part of scattered development down a country road, with open countryside around the site.	Yes - the site has been promoted for residential development by the landowner who has confirmed that the site is available for development.	Yes - the site has been promoted for residential development by a developer and is in single ownership. There are no identified issues relating to viability or other legal issues.	The site is part of scattered development down a country road, with open countryside around the site. The site is somewhat separate from nearby Lymington & Pennington and has no public transport links. Residential development would also result in the loss of an employment site.

Parish: Lyndhurst

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
40	Lyndhurst	Land to the rear of Tyrell Lodge, Southampton Road 0.15ha site	Rejected at Stage 2 – planning permission on the site has been refused in the past due to a range of concerns, including highway access.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Previous planning applications for single dwellings on the site have been refused due to impacts on the Conservation Area, neighbouring properties and the A35. The site also lies within close proximity of the New Forest SPA and so would not be a suitable extension to the Defined Village boundary.
45	Lyndhurst	Garage court, adjacent to 1 Beechen Lane, Lyndhurst 0.03ha garage area.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield site lies outside of the defined village boundary. It may have the potential for a small affordable housing development.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Given the proximity of the New Forest SPA to the Clayhill area, it is not considered appropriate to extend the Defined Village boundary to incorporate this site. <u>The site may have potential as a rural exception site</u> to be progressed through the Development Control process.
58	Lyndhurst	Garden Close, Lyndhurst 0.07ha garage site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield site is located within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	Not currently – the landowner has stated that the site is not currently available, but would be available by 2020.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies within close proximity to the New Forest SPA and therefore is not considered to be suitable as a Local Plan allocation. <u>The site's potential as a rural exception site</u> development is better progressed through the development control process.
59	Lyndhurst	Garages, Notherwood	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield	Not currently – the landowner	Yes - no legal issues have	The site lies within close proximity to the New Forest SPA and therefore is not considered to be

		Avenue, Lyndhurst 0.04ha garage site.	site is located within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	has stated that the site is not currently available, but would be available by 2020.	been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	suitable as a Local Plan allocation. <u>The site's potential as a rural exception site</u> development is better progressed through the development control process.
60	Lyndhurst	Garden Close, Lyndhurst 0.04ha garage site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this brownfield site is located within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	Not currently – the landowner has stated that the site is not currently available, but would be available by 2020.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies within close proximity to the New Forest SPA and therefore is not considered to be suitable as a Local Plan allocation. <u>The site's potential as a rural exception site</u> development is better progressed through the development control process.
93	Lyndhurst	Land adjacent to 'Harmony', Chapel Lane, Lyndhurst 0.75ha greenfield site currently used for grazing.	Rejected at Stage 2 – concerns regarding the landscape impact of developing the site from the countryside to the south of the village.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available for development.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	The site is fairly well related to the village of Lyndhurst. However, there are concerns regarding the landscape impact of developing the site. Chapel Lane currently forms a clear boundary to the defined village.
94	Lyndhurst	Land adjacent to Queen's House, Lyndhurst 1.5ha site comprising gardens and parking.	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site is well located in relation to services, concerns regarding the development of one	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether the site is available for	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is	The site is within the Lyndhurst Conservation Area and immediately adjacent to a Listed building. There may be a smaller part of the site (adjoining the surgery and club) that could have some development potential.

			of the few open spaces in the village; loss of trees and impacts on heritage assets.	development.	achievable on the site.	
95	Lyndhurst	Fenwick Hospital, Pikes Hill, Lyndhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the hospital provides an important community service which should be retained.	No - the site is in active healthcare use and is not being promoted for housing development.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	The site remains in active healthcare use. Should it become available, the brownfield site is located within the defined village boundary and could include an element of residential use in the future as part of any comprehensive redevelopment.
96	Lyndhurst	Football Ground, Wellands Road, Lyndhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site provides an important recreational facility for the village and is located close to the New Forest's protected habitats.	Unknown – the site was not promoted by the landowner and is current in active recreational use.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	Although the site adjoins the Defined Village boundary of Lyndhurst, it is also immediately adjacent to the Open Forest and the SPA habitat. Allied to that, the loss of the sports pitch would require replacement provision. On this basis it is not suitable for a housing site allocation through the Local Plan.
121a	Lyndhurst	Ineos site, Beechen Lane, Lyndhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the brownfield site has an existing access and the potential to be redeveloped for a mix of uses. However, the proximity of the	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - planning consent has been granted on the site previously and development is considered to be viable. The site is in a single	The brownfield part of the site relates relatively well to the settlement. However, significantly this employment site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and therefore on the basis of Natural England's advice of Spring 2017 the site is not considered suitable as a residential allocation.

			New Forest SPA means the site is not considered suitable for housing.		ownership.	
121b	Lyndhurst	Vernalls Farm, Lyndhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – development of this large predominantly greenfield site would have a detrimental impact on the landscape of the National Park. The majority of the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The Vernalls Farm site is a large greenfield site falling almost entirely within the New Forest SPA 400 metres zone and is therefore not considered to be appropriate for allocation through the Local Plan on the basis of Natural England's updated advice of May 2017.
127	Lyndhurst	Land to the rear of Swiss Cottage, Clay Hill, Lyndhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be a suitable housing site allocation or amendment to the existing defined village boundary.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies outside of the current defined village boundary of Lyndhurst and within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. On the basis of Natural England's updated advice in May 2017 it would be inappropriate to extend the settlement boundary or to allocate the site for development given the proximity of the SPA to the site.
137	Lyndhurst	Land north of Bournemouth Road,	Rejected at Stage 2 – the majority of the site lies within	Yes - the whole site is in the sole ownership of the	Yes - no legal issues have been identified	The development of this 15ha site would represent major development within the National Park. The site would represent by far the largest

		Lyndhurst. 15.6 hectare greenfield site.	400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable for housing. This large greenfield site would also represent a major development in the National Park.	Trust who have stated that the site is available and could be developed within 3 years.	and the development of the site is considered achievable.	housing site in the National Park and would need to be justified against the NPPF's major development test. In addition, the majority of the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and therefore is not considered suitable for residential development.
--	--	--	---	---	---	--

Parish: Melchet Park & Plaitford

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
102	Plaitford	Former B & W Nurseries site, Plaitford	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies immediately adjacent to the new Forest SPA and is therefore not suitable as a housing site allocation. In addition, it does not relate particularly well to surrounding settlements and services.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes – the landowner stated that viability will depend on mix of affordable and market housing proposed.	This large redundant horticultural site has been vacant for more than a decade. The site is located immediately adjacent to the internationally protected habitats in the New Forest and is therefore not appropriate for a housing allocation in the Authority's Local Plan. The site is considered to be more appropriate for employment use.

Parish: Milford-on-Sea

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
39	Keyhaven	Aubrey Farm and Vidle Van Farm, Keyhaven Proposal to use a number of parcels and land and buildings for a mix of uses.	Rejected at Stage 1 – Several areas of the site fall within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 3.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Part of the Vidle Van Farm buildings lie within Flood Zone 3 and the site at Aubrey Farm lies immediately adjacent to Flood Zone 3.

Parish: Minstead

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
79	Castle Malwood	Castle Malwood Depot, Minstead 6.2ha employment site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA, in a relatively inaccessible location and does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is remote from any settlements or facilities. It is surrounded by the open landscapes of the National Park and there are nationally / internationally protected habitats nearby.
167	Minstead	Hazel Hill Yard, Seamans Lane, London Minstead, Lyndhurst	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is not	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of	The site is slightly detached from the small village of Minstead, which itself only has 3 essential services and no public transport links. The site also lies in close proximity to the New Forest SPA and the Local Plan is not looking to allocate sites

			particularly well related to existing settlements and services.	is therefore considered to be available.	the site is considered achievable.	for single dwellings.
--	--	--	---	--	------------------------------------	-----------------------

Parish: Netley Marsh

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
1	Ower	Agricultural field situated adjacent to Romsey Road, Ower Proposal for use as a travelling showpeople site	Rejected at Stage 2 - Previous application refused on the site in 2015. The updated Assessment of needs for travelling showpeople identifies a need within the National Park. Concerns regarding landscape impact of greenfield development.	Yes - the site was put forward by the landowner and is considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	An application of use of the site for 4 travelling showpeople plots was refused in February 2015 due to concerns regarding the landscape impact of the development at this prominent gateway to the National Park. There are some locational merits to the site and a brownfield development in the area may be preferable.
15	Bartley	Land opposite The Thatched Cottage, Bartley Road, Bartley 1.7ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the relatively large greenfield site is not well located in relation to existing services and settlements within the National Park. Bartley has limited local facilities.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Development of the site would add to the scattered development which has already occurred in this part of the parish, within an essentially open agricultural landscape some distance from the village of Bartley.

64	Woodlands	Millvina Close, Woodlands	Rejected at Stage 2 - there are relatively limited services in the area and therefore Woodlands is considered to be a suitable focus for new housing allocations. The site is better suited to a rural exception site development.	Yes - the site was put forward by the landowner and is considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This area of Woodlands has only a basic range of services in the area. On this basis it is not considered to be an appropriate focus for housing land allocations and small-scale development in the locality <u>would be better suited to rural exception site development.</u>
70	Woodlands	Woodlands Road, Woodlands, Netley Marsh Currently used for grazing.	Rejected at Stage 2 - this greenfield site forms an open, undeveloped paddock along the long linear line for development. There are limited local facilities in the vicinity of the site.	Yes - the site was put forward by the landowner and is considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Planning permission was refused in the 1950s for larger scale residential development in this area. Development of the site would add to the scattered development which has already occurred in this part of the National Park
81	Loperwood	Loperwood Park Farm, Calmore 1.2 ha site within curtilage of existing dwelling.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this greenfield site does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park.	In the longer term - the landowner has stated that the land is not currently available, but would be by 2020 and 2025.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site does not relate well to the settlements within the National Park and is separated from Calmore by the A326. It is therefore not considered to be a suitable housing site.

105	Ower	Golden Meadow, Romsey Road, Ower	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies in a relatively inaccessible location and does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park. It is therefore not considered to be a suitable housing site.	Yes - the site has been for sale for some time and is considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This predominantly greenfield is located on the edge of the National Park and is not particularly well located in relation to existing settlements, although there are public transport links close to the site. The site is not considered to be suitable for a housing allocation, but may have some merit as a travelling showpeople's site given its brownfield status and proximity to the main road network on the edge of the National Park.
128	Woodlands	300 Woodlands Road, Woodlands 0.05ha residential curtilage.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park and would add to the linear, ribbon development in the area.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site does not relate well to services and settlements within the National Park. Further infill along Woodlands Road would further reinforce the ribbon development along the road. The NPA would not be looking to allocate sites for single dwellings through its Local Plan.
138	Ashurst Bridge	Land at Ashurst Bridge	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not relate well to the settlements and services within the National Park and would effectively extend the neighbouring urban areas into the nationally protected landscape of the National Park.	Yes – the site has been put forward by the landowner and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site does not relate well to the existing settlements in the National Park and would instead appear to extend the neighbouring urban areas of Calmore and Totton into the National Park. Its allocation would be contrary to the NPPF's requirement for development in rural areas to be focused toward settlements and services.

145	Woodlands	Land adjacent to 229 Woodlands Road, Woodlands	Rejected at Stage 2 – there are relatively limited services the area and therefore the site is not considered suitable for a housing allocation.	Yes - The site has been put forward by a developer who has an interest in the site. The site is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - The site has been put forward by a developer who has an interest in the site. The site is therefore considered to be available and achievable.	This area of Woodlands Road is characterised by generally linear development and there is only a basic range of services in the area. On this basis it is not considered to be an appropriate focus for housing land allocations and small-scale development in the locality <u>would be better suited to rural exception site development.</u>
183	Netley Marsh	Land at Ringwood Road, Netley Marsh	Rejected at Stage 2 – this small brownfield site may be better suited to a rural exception site development.	Yes - the owner has stated that the site is available for development between 2020 and 2025.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	Development in this location would perpetuate the rather linear character of residential development on this part of Southampton Road. <u>The site may have some merit as a potential rural exceptions site</u> but is not considered to be particularly suitable as a Local Plan housing allocation.
184	Netley Marsh	Hand Car Wash site, Ringwood Road, Netley Marsh	Rejected at Stage 2 – this small brownfield site (capacity of 2 dwellings) may be better suited to a rural exception site development.	Yes - the owner has stated that the site is available for development between 2020 and 2025.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This is a very small site (capacity for two dwellings) that would be more appropriately pursued through the planning application route rather than a Local Plan allocation.

Parish: New Milton

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
24	Wootton	Land at Wootton Hall Farm, Tiptoe Road, New Milton 1.6ha greenfield site currently used for grazing.	Rejected at Stage 2 – the relatively large greenfield site is not well located in relation to services and settlements within the National Park. The site also lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA. Development of the site would also add to the scattered development which has already occurred in this part of the National Park. There are limited services available close to the site and it is therefore not considered to be a suitable site to focus new housing.
30	Bashley	Land adjacent Redcliffe Garden Centre, Bashley Road, New Milton Small area currently used for parking.	Rejected at Stage 2 – this site is not well located in relation to existing services and settlements within the National Park	Unclear - the site has not been put forward by the landowner and therefore its availability is uncertain.	Unclear - The site has not been put forward by the landowner and therefore its achievability is unclear.	Development of the site would add to the scattered development which has already occurred in this part of the National Park. There are limited services available close to the site. The Bashley area is not considered to be an appropriate focus for new development and the deliverability of this site is unclear.
31	Bashley	Land south of Bashley Post Office Small site currently used for car storage	Rejected at Stage 2 - The site lacks any pedestrian access along the road. The village of Bashley has only a very basic range of services.	Unclear – the Town Council has identified a possible problem with ownership with a small strip of land between the highway and the site.	Unclear – the Town Council has identified a possible problem with ownership with a small strip of land between the highway and the site.	There are limited services available close to the site. Planning permission for a single residential caravan on the site refused and dismissed at appeal in 2009.

32	Bashley	Former Bashley Saw Mill 0.5ha former commercial saw mill on the edge of Bashley	Rejected at Stage 2 – planning permission for residential use has been previously refused due to highway concerns. Bashley has limited services and is not a focus for new housing allocations in the Local Plan.	Yes - an outline application for residential development on the site was submitted in 2017, confirming that the site is available.	Yes - the 'Call for Sites' submission confirms that development is achievable and the Authority received an outline application in 2017 for development.	Although previously in employment use, the site is now largely overgrown. Previous applications for residential use have been refused for a variety of reasons, including concerns over highways access and visibility. Bashley is not a focus for new housing site allocations in the Local Plan. <u>The site may have potential as a rural exception site.</u>
33	Bashley	Land adjacent to Sunnyholm', Bashley Common Road Small plot in the linear development along Bashley Common Road	Rejected at Stage 2 – the settlement of Bashley has limited services and is not a focus for new development in the Authority's Local Plan.	Unclear - the site was proposed by New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	Unclear - The site was proposed by New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	Planning permissions have been repeatedly refused on the site for residential development dating back to the 1950s. The settlement of Bashley has limited services and is not a focus for new development in the Authority's Local Plan.
34	Ossemsley	Land adjacent to Ossemsley Manor	Rejected at Stage 2 – this a relatively isolated site that is not close to services or facilities. Ossemsley itself is a small cluster of buildings.	Unclear - the site was proposed by New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	Unclear - The site was proposed by New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	The site is located in a relatively isolated area of the National Park, well away from any settlements or services. Residential development would also involve the loss of allotments.
35	Bashley	Bashley Cross Roads, opposite junction with	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is detached from the limited	Unclear - the site was proposed by	Unclear - The site was proposed by	The original pair of dwellings on the site were permitted as agricultural worker's dwellings. The site lies in an open location over a kilometre from

		Stem Lane	services in Bashley and is considered to be a suitable location for new development.	New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	the nearest settlement and is not considered to be a suitable location for additional housing development.
36	Bashley	Ossemsley South Drive – Junction with Bashley Road Currently used an open pasture	Rejected at Stage 2 – this is a relatively large greenfield site on the edge of a settlement (Bashley) with very limited services and is not a suitable focus for new development in the Local Plan.	Unclear - the site was proposed by New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	Unclear - The site was proposed by New Milton Town Council in 2009, rather than the land owner.	This relatively large greenfield site has an open aspect to the north and west and is currently an open pasture. Bashley itself has a limited range of services and the site is not particularly accessible by means other than the car.
136	New Milton	Land north east of Pennywell Gardens, New Milton	Rejected at Stage 1 – the site includes land within flood risk zone 3 as defined by the Environment Agency.	N/A	N/A	The site is not considered to be suitable for residential development due to flood risk.
156	Bashley	Silver Street Nursery, Bashley Road, Bashley	Rejected at Stage 2 – this site is not well located in relation to existing services and settlements within the National Park.	Yes - the landowner states that the site is available for development and could be completed by 2020.	Yes - no issues have been identified regarding the achievability of developing the site.	The settlement of Bashley is not considered to be an appropriate focus for new housing development given the limited range of services. The emerging New Milton Neighbourhood Plan supports this position and confirms that sites within Bashley are more appropriately progressed as rural exception sites.

Parish: Redlynch

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
114	Redlynch	Milkhills Farm, Goggs Lane, Redlynch	Rejected at Stage 2 – the brownfield site is detached from local services and settlements (Redlynch is 1.2km away).	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	The site does not relate well to existing settlements and is not an appropriate focus for new residential development through a Local Plan allocation. The site does not adjoin an existing defined village nor is it located in a settlement where local services either are available, or a likely to be provided during the Local Plan period.
115	Redlynch	Orchards, Kiln Lane, Redlynch	Rejected at Stage 2 – the settlement of Redlynch has some basic facilities. However, the site is quite prominent and has protected trees.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	Yes - the site has been put forward in the past for possible residential development, but is not currently being actively promoted.	There is a significant TPO designation all along the road frontage of the site which restricts access.
150	Redlynch	Land at Rollington Bungalow, Princes Close, Redlynch	Rejected at Stage 2 – settlement of Redlynch has a limited range of services and therefore is not identified within the Local plan	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered	The site relates reasonably well to the settlement of Redlynch which does have some basic services. The settlement of Redlynch is not a focus for new housing land allocations in the Authority's Local Plan due to the limited employment opportunities but <u>the site could alternatively be considered through the rural</u>

			settlement hierarchy as a suitable location for further open market housing allocations. The site has potential as a rural exception site.	be available.	achievable.	<u>exception site</u> route to meet some of the identified housing needs in this rural community.
151	Redlynch	Land at Goggs Lane, Redlynch	Rejected at Stage 2 – the landowner is seeking 5 open market dwellings which does not conform to the Authority’s planning policies. The site is on the outer fringes of Redlynch, situated on a narrow rural lane with no footpath.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is on the outer fringes of Redlynch, and is situated on a narrow rural lane with no footpath. The site is detached from the village and would result in a relatively isolated residential development in the open countryside.

Parish: Ringwood

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
3	Poulner, Ringwood	Land of Hillside Cottage, Cowpitts Lane, Poulner Common, Ringwood Greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 – although the site is related to existing housing, development would result in the neighbouring urban area of Ringwood (outside the Park) extending into the National Park.	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable	The site lies adjacent to the settlement of Ringwood (located outside the National Park). Therefore there is an in principle concern regarding the extension of neighbouring urban areas into the protected landscape of the National Park.

74 and 75	Hightown, Ringwood	Land at Lynes Farm, east and west of Noule Lane, Ringwood 4ha site within National Park. Proposed to be used as a SANG to serve adjacent residential development	The land within the National Park (4ha) is proposed for SANG use linked to the proposed residential development on the 28ha site west of Noule Lane (outside the Park). It is therefore for New Forest District Council to assess the housing potential of the site outside the Park.	N/A	N/A	The housing element of this proposal lies entirely outside the National Park within New Forest District Council's planning remit. It is for New Forest District Council to assess the housing potential of the site through their Local Plan review.
76	Ringwood	Land north of Moortown Lane, Ringwood 11ha site within the National Park. Proposed to be used as a SANG to serve the adjacent residential development	The land within the National Park (11ha) is proposed for SANG use linked to the proposed residential development on the site to the west. (outside the Park). It is therefore for New Forest District Council to assess the housing potential of the site outside the Park.	N/A	N/A	The housing element of this proposal lies entirely outside the National Park within New Forest District Council's planning remit. It is for New Forest District Council to assess the housing potential of the site through their Local Plan.
148	Ringwood	Forest Corner Farm, Ringwood	<i>The site has been proposed for employment purposes and has therefore not</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>The site has been proposed for employment purposes and has therefore not been assessed as a potential housing site.</i>

			<i>been assessed as a potential housing site.</i>			
163	Ringwood	Hedge House, Hangersley Hill, Forest Corner, Hangersley, Ringwood	Rejected at Stage 2 – this small site (2 dwellings are proposed) is not located particularly well in terms of settlements and services.	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This site is not well sited in relation to existing settlements within the National Park and would represent the loss of an employment site. With only 2 dwellings proposed, the site is better taken forward through the development control route rather than a Local Plan allocation.

Parish: Sopley

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
20	Bransgore	Land north of Burnt House Lane, Bransgore 8.1ha greenfield site.	Rejected at Stage 2 - development of this large greenfield site would result in the neighbouring urban area of Bransgore (outside the Park) extending into agricultural land in the National Park.	Yes - The landowner states that the site is available and could be developed in the next 5 years.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The proposed large greenfield development (8.1ha) would extend the built form of Bransgore into the surrounding open countryside of the nationally protected landscape of the National Park.
21	Bransgore	Land north of Derritt Lane, Bransgore 0.5ha greenfield site currently in agricultural use.	Rejected at Stage 2 - development of this large greenfield site would result in the neighbouring urban area of Bransgore (outside the Park)	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered	The proposed development is less visible from the open countryside around Bransgore. It would however, extend the built form of Bransgore into the nationally protected landscape of the surrounding National Park which raises in-principle concerns.

			extending into agricultural land within the National Park.		achievable.	
22	Bransgore	Land off Ringwood Road, Bransgore 3.3ha greenfield site currently in agricultural use	Rejected at Stage 2 - development of this large greenfield site would result in the neighbouring urban area of Bransgore extending into agricultural land within the National Park	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The proposed development would extend the built form of Bransgore into the surrounding open countryside of the nationally protected National Park which raises in-principle concerns.
106	Bransgore	Hague Nurseries, Burnt House Lane, Bransgore	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site has an open aspect to the surrounding National Park landscape. Development would result in the neighbouring urban area of Bransgore (outside the Park) extending into the National Park.	Unknown – the site has been identified from discussions with planning officers and therefore its availability would need to be explored.	Unknown – the site has been identified from discussions with planning officers and therefore its achievability would need to be explored.	There are concerns regarding the principle of extending neighbouring urban areas into the National Park. If the site were to come forward, <u>it would be more appropriate as a rural exception site</u> rather than a housing site allocation. The settlement of Bransgore is also the focus for significant development in the New Forest District Local Plan, focusing on the area outside of the National Park.
172	Bransgore	Summers Rush, 78 Burnt House Lane, Bransgore	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is not related to any settlement in the National Park; and is quite visually	Yes - the landowner has stated that the site is immediately available.	Yes - The site is in single ownership. The landowner state that the delivery of a residential	The settlement boundary of Bransgore – which also forms the National Park boundary – is clearly defined by Burnt House Lane. As is acknowledged within the landowner’s ‘Call for Brownfield Sites’ submission, development in this location would read as an extension of Bransgore

			separated from the rest of the settlement of Bransgore. The area has a rural character.		scheme on the site is considered to be a viable and deliverable proposal.	into the National Park and the site is therefore not considered to be suitable.
--	--	--	---	--	---	---

Parish: Sway

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
4	Pitmore Lane	Drays Nurseries, Pitmore Lane, Sway 2.6ha site currently comprising horticultural glasshouses.	Rejected at Stage 2 – concerns regarding residential development in an area that is not well related to any services or settlements within the National Park.	Yes - the landowner has stated that it would be available within 1 year.	Yes – although the site has an existing use value and residential development would need to provide a reasonable return for the landowner.	The site is detached from the main settlements within the National Park and therefore is not well related to transport links and local services (such as schools). Development would also result in the loss of an employment site.
43	Sway	Land at Coombe Grange, Coombe Lane, Sway Existing care home on large plot.	<i>Planning permission was granted for the development of 4 dwellings on the site in December 2016 (application ref. 16/00457)</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>Planning permission was granted for the development of 4 dwellings on the site in December 2016 (application ref. 16/00457)</i>
72	Sway	Sway Garage and Workshops,	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is currently	Yes - the landowner	Yes - no legal issues have	Although the site would represent previously developed land it is located some distance outside

		Barrows Lane, Sway 0.43ha of mixed use employment.	in employment use, is detached from the village of Sway and lacks access to local facilities on foot.	states that the site is not currently available, but could be developed by 2020.	been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	the main settlement and is accessed by a narrow lane.
120	Pitmore Lane	Pitmore Farm, Pitmore Lane, Sway	Rejected at Stage 2 – concerns regarding residential development in an area that is not well related to any services or settlements within the National Park.	Unknown – the site is not being actively promoted for housing by the landowner.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	The site is detached from the main settlements within the National Park and therefore is not well related to transport links and local services (such as schools). Development would also result in the loss of an employment site
134	Sway	Land at Oakfield, Boundway Hill, Sway	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is detached from the village of Sway and development would represent further infill in an area characterised by piecemeal development.	Yes - The landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is detached from the main village of Sway and is located on a rural road with no dedicated footpaths.
142	Sway	Land rear of Jubilee Court / Hollies Close, Sway	Rejected at Stage 2 - site appears more related to the adjoining countryside than to the nearby settlement of Sway	Unknown – the site is not being actively promoted for housing by the landowner.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether	The site is relatively well located for the services and facilities within the village of Sway. However, the access to the land – which itself appears to be in a number of ownerships – may be an issue and its availability is not clear.

			and due to its availability being unclear the site is not considered to be suitable.		development is achievable on the site.	
149	Sway	Land at South Sway Lane, Sway	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is not contiguous to the defined village boundary of Sway has a very rural character with fields and mature landscaping. Pedestrian links from the site to the village centre are poor.	Yes - the landowner has stated that two parcels of land are available, with potentially another 4 parcels of land in different ownership available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site has a rural character and is largely surrounded by open fields which appear to be in an agricultural use or as paddocks. There are a few scattered, low density residential properties around the site. There is no pavement on South Sway Lane – the services in Sway not safely walkable. The site is detached from the existing Defined Village boundary and is not considered appropriate for a residential allocation.
173	Sway	Former Arnewood Court Turkey Farm, Barrows Lane, Sway	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not relate well to settlements within the National Park and is not close to local facilities and services.	Yes - the landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is detached from the settlement of Sway (1.35km away) and is not considered to be a sustainable or suitable location to focus new housing development within the National Park.
177	Sway	The Silver Hind, Station Road, Sway	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within the defined shopping frontage of Sway and solely residential use would be contrary to the development plan.	Yes - the landowner has stated that the site is available for development.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	This site is in the defined village of Sway with the associated community facilities and proximity to public transport. However, housing would be contrary to the 'development plan' which seeks to maintain the defined village shopping frontages and prevent their loss to higher value uses such as a residential. It is therefore not considered to be suitable.

Parish: *Wellow*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
98	Canada	Abbotts Farm, Canada Currently in agricultural / horticultural use	Rejected at Stage 2 –the site lies within 400m of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable.	Unknown – although the site has been the subject of previous planning enquiries.	Unknown - the site was not put forward by the owner and it is unknown whether development is achievable on the site.	The site has been the subject of previous planning enquiries. However, it is also located within close proximity of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered appropriate as a potential housing site allocation in the Local Plan. In addition, the settlement of Canada and very few facilities.

Parish: *Whiteparish*

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
107	Whiteparish	Land south of Jewsons, Common Road, Whiteparish	Rejected at Stage 2 – concerns regarding residential development in an area that is not well related to any services or settlements within the Park.	Unknown – the site has been identified following a number of planning enquiries. The site is not being actively promoted for residential use.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is detached from the main settlements within the National Park. Development would also result in the loss of an employment site.
166	Whiteparish	The Pound, Common Road,	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site does not	Yes - the site is in a single	Unknown - part of the	The site is in a relatively isolated location, detached from the village of Whiteparish.

		Whiteparish	relate well to existing settlements and services and is not considered to be a suitable location to focus residential development.	landownership and the owner states that the site is available now.	site is a Registered Common. An application to remove this designation is in progress. At this stage it is not possible to conclude development is achievable.	The site also appears to include some land designated as a common and it has not been confirmed whether this designation has been formally removed.
--	--	-------------	--	--	--	---

Parish: Woodgreen

Ref.	Settlement	Address	Suitability	Availability	Achievability	Summary of reasons for rejection
46	Woodgreen	Land between 10 & 11 Hill Close Estate, Woodgreen 0.04ha site	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site is located within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and is therefore not considered to be suitable for a housing site allocation.	Yes - the landowner has put the site forward for housing and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes - no legal issues have been identified and the development of the site is considered achievable.	The site is on the edge of the small village of Woodgreen and lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA.
108	Woodgreen	Land adjacent to Ivydene Woodgreen	<i>Permission granted in March 2015 (application reference 14/01033) to incorporate redundant builders</i>	N/A	N/A	<i>Permission granted in March 2015 (application reference 14/01033) to incorporate redundant builders yard into residential curtilage of Ivydene - now implemented so site no longer available.</i>

			<i>yard into residential curtilage of Ivydene - now implemented so site no longer available.</i>			
174	Woodgreen	Land to the rear of The Horse and Groom, High Street, Woodgreen	Rejected at Stage 2 – the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA. In addition, access to the site from 'The Alley' may be an issue.	Yes - the landowner has stated that the site is available now.	Yes – the landowner wishes to secure residential development to assist in funding the improvements at the pub.	The site relates well to the settlement of Woodgreen. However, the site lies within 400 metres of the New Forest SPA and therefore on the basis of Natural England's latest advice (2017) is not considered to be suitable as a housing allocation. Access to the site may also be challenging given the existing width of 'The Alley'.