



Kevin Ward and Caroline Mulloy
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

22 June 2018

Dear Mr Ward and Ms Mulloy,

Thank you for your letter dated 12 June 2018 regarding the examination of the New Forest National Park Local Plan. We have now considered your initial questions and set out below are the Authority's responses.

1. Modifications

- 1.1 We can confirm that the schedule of proposed minor modifications (Core Document 07) was not subject to public consultation prior to submission in May 2018. The proposed modifications have been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal / SEA and Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- 1.2 In your letter you state, "*In our view some of the modifications are not genuinely minor as they alter the meaning of the policy.*" The National Park Authority has therefore been asked:
 - (i) for its views of the modifications listed in Appendix 1 of your letter; and
 - (ii) to prepare a revised schedule which includes only those modifications which are genuinely minor.
- 1.3 Taking the first of these, the NPPG confirms that having received representations on the publication version of the Local Plan (Regulation 19), planning authorities should submit the Local Plan, "*...and any proposed changes it considers appropriate...*" for examination (paragraph 004 Reference ID: 12-004-20160519). We recognise that authorities have only limited scope to recommend minor modifications to the submitted Local Plan to the appointed Inspector(s). These will typically be limited to factual updates, clarification and corrections to wording and typically do not extend to the insertion or deletion of policies.
- 1.4 Set out below is a table summarising the views of the National Park Authority on the 16 proposed modifications that you highlighted in your letter of 12 June.

| Reference | Proposed Modification | NFNPA review response |
|-----------|--|--|
| MIN-06 | <p>Amend policy SP3 to state: <i>“Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</i></p> <p><i>a) The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations; and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy</i></p> <p><i>b) The impact on the local economy of permitting or refusing it;</i></p> <p><i>c) The cost of, and The scope for, developing outside the New Forest National Park, or meeting the need for it in some other way...”</i></p> | <p>The NPA considers MIN-06 to be a minor modification. The proposed re-wording does not add any additional criteria and instead proposes a re-ordering of the wording. In addition, the proposed modification conforms to national policy contained within paragraph 116 of the NPPF (2012) and the wording in paragraph 7.30 of the draft Local Plan (see MIN-34).</p> |
| MIN-12 | <p>Amend Policy SP6 a) to state: <i>“It has been demonstrated that suitable measures for mitigating or compensating adverse effects will be provided and maintained in order to achieve a net gain in biodiversity value where possible, and no net loss; and”</i></p> <p>Add a new paragraph before the last paragraph: <i>“In cases where it is not possible to fully avoid or mitigate for the loss of biodiversity interests resulting from a development, appropriate compensation will be secured for any residual losses via on or off site compensation measures. The latter may include the provision of compensatory habitats elsewhere”.</i></p> | <p>The NPA considers MIN-12 to be a clarification of how compensation should be considered, rather than a change to the policy approach. Natural England requested the inclusion of this wording to clarify the approach to compensation (see 164/5/SP6).</p> <p>On review the NPA understands your view that the proposed deletion of <i>“where possible, and no net loss”</i> (which responds to Natural England’s support for net gains in biodiversity), may constitute a more than minor modification. Consequently, the NPA requests that modification MIN-12 be considered through the Examination process.</p> |
| MIN-13 | <p>Amend Policy SP6 to state: <i>“In addition, opportunities to enhance ecological or geological assets, and the water environment should be maximised, particularly in line with the Authority’s ‘Action for Biodiversity’x local Biodiversity Action Plan priorities.</i></p> <p>Create new paragraph at end of Policy SP6 and amend to state: <i>“Applicants will be required to demonstrate the impacts of their proposal on biodiversity, and for certain types of development¹³ by submission of an preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which should outline the mitigation and enhancement measures needed to achieve a net gain in</i></p> | <p>The inclusion of the <i>“water environment”</i> in MIN-13 is considered a minor modification. It does not alter the policy approach and is consistent with the first sentence of the policy. The inclusion of reference to the NPA’s <i>“Action for Biodiversity”</i> clarifies the previous reference to a <i>“local biodiversity action plan”</i>. This does not change the policy approach. The proposed new footnote provides a specific document reference.</p> <p>The proposed wording that follows <i>“Ecological Appraisal”</i> is a clarification of what the Ecological Appraisal involves, and this does not change the policy requirement for the</p> |

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| | <p>biodiversity (and any subsequent survey work it recommends).” Add new footnote x: Nature in the New Forest: Action for biodiversity, National Park Authority</p> | <p>Appraisal to be completed. The wording is consistent with the advice from Natural England in its representation.</p> <p>On review the NPA understands your view that the proposed inclusion of “...to achieve a net gain in biodiversity” - which responds to Natural England’s representation - may constitute a more than minor modification. Consequently, the NPA requests that MIN-13 is considered through the Examination process.</p> |
| MIN-19 | <p>Amend Policy DP8 to state: “In addition, all new residential development within the Southern Water company supply area of the National Park should be designed to achieve a required level of 110 litres maximum daily allowable usage per person, in line with the Government’s Housing Optional Technical Standard for water efficiency. This standard will be encouraged in new homes elsewhere across the National Park area.”</p> | <p>On review the NPA understands your view that the proposed modification in MIN-19 constitutes more than a minor change. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process.</p> |
| MIN-25 | <p>Delete criterion (iv) of clause a) and insert the following new criteria b) and c) in policy SP16: b) Where development proposals will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset, permission will be refused. c) Where development proposals will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Renumber the remaining criteria.</p> | <p>On review the NPA understands your view that the insertion of these additional criteria (to reflect the wording in Section 12 of the NPPF) represents a more significant change than a simple rewording of the deleted criterion (iv) of clause a). Therefore we would request that this proposed modification be considered through the Examination process.</p> |
| MIN-28 | <p>Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: “<i>Land at Whartons Lane, Ashurst is allocated for the development of around 60 residential dwellings.</i>”</p> | <p>The NPA considers the proposed inclusion of the word “around” in MIN-28 to be a minor amendment. The proposed modification does not indicate that the final quantum of development would necessarily be higher or lower than 60 dwellings, but it reflects the reality that detailed site plans may result in a site layout that is not exactly 60 dwellings.</p> |

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| MIN-29 | Add an additional criterion (g) to state that: <i>“A site-specific flood risk assessment will be required and measures put in place to address any groundwater or surface water flooding issues identified.”</i> | On review the NPA understands your view that the insertion of an additional criterion regarding flood risk constitutes a more significant change. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process. |
| MIN-30 | Amend criteria (e) to state: <i>“Redevelopment proposals for the site should be accompanied by a Transport Assessment, given the proximity of the site to the designated Lyndhurst Air Quality Management Area. Adequate parking provision must be made on-site;”</i> | On review the NPA understands your view that the proposed modification in MIN-30 to require a Transport Assessment constitutes a more significant change. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process. |
| MIN-32 | Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: <i>“Land to the south of Church Lane, Sway is allocated for the development of around 40 residential dwellings.”</i> | The NPA considers the proposed inclusion of the word “around” in MIN-32 to be a minor amendment. The proposed modification does not indicate that the final quantum of development would necessarily be higher or lower than 40 dwellings, but it reflects the reality that detailed site plans may result in a site layout that is not exactly 40 dwellings. |
| MIN-35 | Amend criteria (b) to state: <i>“The majority of the dwellings At least 50% of the dwellings provided within the National Park must be smaller dwellings (less than 100 square metres) to meet the identified local housing need for smaller dwellings.”</i> | The NPA considers the proposed modification in MIN-35 to be a minor amendment. The modification seeks to clarify the meaning of the criteria, as the requirement in the Submission draft Local Plan for the “...majority of the dwellings to be smaller dwellings...” was felt to be open to interpretation. The NPA does not consider the proposed amendment significantly alters the meaning of the policy, but it does improve its clarity and precision. |
| MIN-36 | Amend criteria (c) to state: <i>“Proposals must be implemented as an integral and contiguous part of the redevelopment of the whole Power Station site pursuant to an approved comprehensive redevelopment masterplan and an integrated transport strategy for the entire Fawley Power Station site.”</i> | The proposals for the redevelopment of the former Fawley Power Station site straddle two local authority areas and the need for a detailed transport assessment is widely accepted. However, the NPA understands that the proposed addition of wording regarding an integrated transport strategy does insert an additional requirement. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process. |

| | | |
|--------|--|--|
| MIN-37 | Amend criteria (d) to state that, “ <i>Any loss of the designated SINC habitat must be kept to an essential minimum and compensated through the enhancement of the biodiversity value of the remaining habitat and/or the compensatory provision of alternative habitats of equivalent or higher value to achieve a net gain for biodiversity.</i> ” | On review the NPA understands your view that the proposed modification in MIN-37 (although only affecting one word), does constitute a change in policy emphasis and a firming up of the policy requirement. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process. |
| MIN-38 | Add an additional criterion (e) to state: “ A site-specific flood risk assessment will be required and measures put in place to address any flooding issues identified to ensure that the development will be safe for its lifetime. ” | On review the NPA understands your view that the insertion of an additional criterion regarding flood risk constitutes a more significant change. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process. |
| MIN-39 | Add additional wording at the end of paragraph 7.36 to state: “ The proposed route of the England Coast Path runs adjacent to the south western boundary of the site allocation. Development proposals for the site should not prejudice the delivery of this new section of footpath. ” | The NPA considers MIN-39 to be a minor modification to the supporting text to the proposed site allocation. The proposed route of the England Coast Path is not part of the site allocation in Policy SP26 and the proposed modification simply seeks to provide a factual update on the Coast Path. |
| MIN-40 | Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: “ <i>Land at Calshot Village is allocated for around 40 dwellings and cemetery use.</i> ” | The NPA considers the proposed inclusion of the word “ <i>around</i> ” in MIN-40 to be a minor amendment. The proposed modification does not indicate that the final quantum of development would necessarily be higher or lower than 30 dwellings, but it reflects the reality that detailed site plans may result in a site layout that is not exactly 30 dwellings. We would also highlight a small typographical error in the proposed minor amendment. Policy SP26 refers to 30 dwellings and consequently the proposed minor modification should also refer to “ <i>around 30 dwellings</i> ” (rather than 40 dwellings). |
| MIN-42 | Amending paragraph (c) to state: “ <i>The housing is subject to an occupancy condition and remains available for Estate Workers, or last employed as Estate Workers, in perpetuity; and...</i> ” | MIN-42 has been proposed to bring the Estate Workers policy in line with the approach taken to agricultural workers dwellings. On review we can understand the position that the proposed insertion of reference to those last employed as Estate |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | Workers does alter the coverage of the policy. We would therefore request that this proposed modification is considered through the Examination process. |
|--|--|--|

1.5 In conclusion, the Authority has reviewed the 16 proposed modifications contained in the Appendix of your letter dated 12 June 2018. We remain of the view that of these, 6 are genuinely minor and do not significantly alter the interpretation of the policy. In accordance with the NPPG (paragraph 024 Reference ID 12-024-200140306) we would ask you to consider the revised schedule of proposed minor modifications (**Appendix 1** to this response) as part of the submission Local Plan.

1.6 On further review, we understand your queries regarding 10 of the proposed minor modifications and accept that they could be considered to alter the interpretation of the policy and therefore be more significant. We acknowledge that Inspectors can only recommend ‘main modifications’ (changes that materially affect the Local Plan policies) if asked to do so by the Authority. Given this, **Appendix 2** to this response contains a schedule of what are considered to be more significant proposed modifications. In your letter you state that, “...*the other modifications* [i.e. those not considered to be minor] *can be taken into account throughout the examination...*” and we would request that this is done.

2. Habitats Regulations

2.1 The National Park Authority is aware of the recent legal judgement in the *People Over Wind and Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta* case, which ruled that mitigation measures should be assessed as part of an appropriate assessment (rather than at the screening stage). As recently indicated via the Programme Officer, we are working with our consultants on the implications of the legal judgement on the submitted Habitats Regulation Assessment of the draft Local Plan. We will be in the position to fully answer this query by Monday 2 July 2018 and thank you for agreeing to the extension in time to respond to this query.

3. Housing

3.1 In response to the points raised in your letter regarding the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, we have prepared a Housing Trajectory and this is set out in full in **Appendix 3** to this response. The Trajectory sets out the anticipated delivery of housing in the New Forest National Park over the plan period from the various sources – namely extant permissions, proposed housing site allocations and windfall delivery. We have also provided some text commentary to accompany the Trajectory.

4. Open Space

4.1 In response to your query, we can confirm that the open space standards set out in Policy DP10 are based on the *PPG17 Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study for the New Forest Area* (Bennett Leisure and Planning Ltd, 2007). This is Core Document 76. The open space standards were developed for the Authority’s existing Core Strategy and we consider that they remain appropriate.

- 4.2 The existing open space standards are based on provision per 1,000 population. Annual monitoring data indicates that the National Park Authority has not consented any development that has resulted in the loss of public open space since the date of the open space assessment. In addition, the population of the National Park has only increased at a very low level since the preparation of the open space assessment. Consequently the Authority decided not to undertake an update of the open space assessment as part of the Local Plan review as it was considered that the existing study remained fit for purpose in the context of a nationally protected landscape with low levels of new development.
- 4.3 In coming to this conclusion, we had regard to national policy in the NPPF (2012) which confirms that the evidence base to support a Local Plan review should be proportionate and tightly focused on the particular issues affecting an area. In reviewing the local planning policies for the National Park, the Authority identified the key issues affecting the New Forest that needed to be addressed and supported by updated evidence base studies. Given the typically small-scale of housing development in the National Park (meaning that on-site open space provision will not be viable in most cases), open space provision associated with new development is usually in the form of a financial contribution towards the enhancement of existing open spaces in the National Park.
- 4.4 The original open space study (Bennett Leisure and Planning Ltd) was jointly commissioned by the National Park Authority and New Forest District Council, By way of background, New Forest District Council is also proposing to retain the open space standards in their Submission draft Local Plan (June 2018).
- 4.5 In terms of the consultation undertaken with Sport England during the preparation of the Local Plan, Sport England are not listed as a 'specific consultation body' in the relevant Planning Regulations and consequently there is no legal obligation to consult Sport England on an emerging Local Plan as a matter of routine. The Authority has not therefore directly notified Sport England of the various stages in the Local Plan review process. We consider the relevant evidence base and draft policy to be proportionate and appropriate to the scale of the issue in the National Park. Therefore there have not been any further discussions with Sport England since they submitted their representations on the Submission draft Local Plan earlier this year.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 The National Park Authority hopes that the responses contained within this letter provide clarity in response to the queries raised. As outlined above, we will respond on the points raised regarding the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the draft Local Plan by Monday 2 July 2018. We also look forward to receiving the Matters, issues and Question paper, draft hearing Programme and Guidance notes in due course.

Yours sincerely

David Illsley
Policy Manager

Appendix 1 – Revised Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications – 22 June 2018

Following the 6-week consultation on the National Park Authority’s proposed Submission draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage), the Authority considered the representations made and prepared a schedule of proposed minor modifications to the Local Plan. These were submitted for independent examination alongside the draft Local Plan in May 2018.

Following correspondence with the appointed Planning Inspectors in June 2018, the Authority has subsequently reviewed the schedule of proposed modifications. This has resulted in the proposed modifications being separated into two schedules:

- (i) *Proposed Minor Modifications* - which in the Authority’s opinion do not alter the overall impact of the draft Local Plan or change its direction, or affect the substance or soundness of the document. They are focused on factual updates, clarification, and corrections to wording and are contained within Appendix 1.
- (ii) *Proposed Main Modifications* – which are being recommended by the Authority to the Inspectors through the examination process and are contained within Appendix 2.

For each minor amendment within this schedule, information on the proposed change and the reason for the change is given. Where new text is proposed it is shown in bold and where text is proposed for removal it has been struck through as set out below.

Insertion of text

~~Removal of text~~

Chapter 1: Introduction

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|--|---|
| MIN-01 | Paragraph 1.17 | Inert new paragraph to state: <i>“In January 2018 the Government published ‘A Green future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment’. The Environment Plan sets out the Government’s goals for improving the environment, within a generation. It details how the Government will work with communities and businesses to do this. The Plan includes the commitment to continue to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of National</i>” | Factual update in response to the publication of the Government’s 25 year Environment Plan in January 2018. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <i>Parks, while recognising that they are living landscapes that support rural communities.”</i> | |
|--|--|--|--|

Chapter 2: Profile of the New Forest National Park

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|--|---|
| MIN-02 | Para 2.6 | Amend paragraph 2.6 under the ‘Cultural Heritage’ subheading to state at the end of the existing paragraph: “ <i>The cultural heritage of the National Park extends beyond its rich built environment and includes the long history of commoning in the New Forest. Commoning has helped shape the mosaic of landscapes, biodiversity and character of the National Park.</i> ” | In response to representations received from the Commoners Defence Association (118/05/Para2.6) highlighting the contribution of commoning to the cultural heritage of the National Park. |
| MIN-03 | Para 2.10 | Amend paragraph 2.10 to state: “ <i>Other smaller settlements with a basic range of local services within the National Park include Beaulieu, Burley, Cadnam, East Boldre, Landford, Netley Marsh and Woodgreen.</i> ” | In response to representations received (170/3/2.10). |

Chapter 3: Vision and Objectives

No minor modifications proposed.

Chapter 4: Strategic Policies and Development Principles

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|---|---|
| MIN-04 | SP1 | Amend criteria (b) of Policy SP1 to state: “ <i>Has a positive impact on the ability of the natural environment to positively contribute to society through the provision of food and water, regulation</i> ” | For clarification in response to representations received from CPRE New Forest Branch (142/03/SP1). |

| | | | |
|--------|------------|---|---|
| | | <i>of floods, prevention of soil erosion and disease outbreaks, and non-material benefits such as recreation.</i> | |
| MIN-05 | Para. 4.8 | Amend paragraph 4.8 to state: <i>“Major development is therefore only permitted within protected landscapes in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest, as outlined in the NPPF. In short, proposals have to demonstrate that they are absolutely necessary; in the public interest; and that there is no practical alternative before they can be supported.”</i> | For clarification in response to representation received from ABP (162/3/4.8) and to ensure consistency with national policy. |
| MIN-06 | Policy SP3 | Amend policy SP3 to state: <i>“Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</i> a) <i>The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations; and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy</i> b) The impact on the local economy of permitting or refusing it; c) <i>The cost of, and The scope for, developing outside the New Forest National Park, or meeting the need for it in some other way...</i> | For clarification in response to representations received from ABP (162/4/SP3) and to ensure consistency with national policy. |
| MIN-07 | Para. 4.20 | Amend paragraph 4.20 to state: <i>“The Spatial Strategy also reflects the proximity of the National Park to surrounding urban areas which provide a range of services. These areas are more appropriate locations for development.”</i> | In response to representations received from Wiltshire Council (153/4/Spatial Strategy) and to ensure the Authority’s Local Plan only provides planning policy coverage for development proposals within the National Park. |

Chapter 5: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|--|--|
| MIN-08 | Para 5.8 | Amend Para 5.8 to state: " Currently 53% The condition of the National Park's SSSI-area is in favourable condition⁸ has been gradually improving over the last decade, but currently about 43% is in unfavourable but recovering condition⁸ " Amend footnote 8 to state: " State of the Park Report 2016, and Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre Annual Biodiversity Monitoring Reports 2017 " | To provide clarity on the trends for SSSI condition in response to representations received from RSPB and Friends of the New Forest (147/05/Para 5.8, 109/05/Para 5.8, 5.11) |
| MIN-09 | Para 5.8 | Amend Para 5.8 to state: " <i>Trends in a variety of key species, such as the curlew, appear to show declines which reflect a variety of pressures, and the densities of several protected birds, including nightjar, woodlark, and Dartford Warbler are relatively low compared with other lowland heathland areas.</i> " | To provide greater clarity about the condition of protected species in response to representations received from RSPB and Friends of the New Forest (147/05/Para 5.8, 109/05/Para 5.8, 5.11) |
| MIN-10 | Policy SP5 | Amend Policy SP5 to state: " However, d <i>Development may satisfy the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations if sufficient and effective measures are put in place to avoid or fully mitigate any likely significant adverse effects of the proposal (either individually or in combination with other plans and projects) through its lifetime on the designated sites. A contribution to the Authority's Habitat Mitigation Scheme and/or the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership's Scheme will enable developers to ensure that mitigation measures are secured for the recreational impacts of their development. The type of development and situations where recreational impacts can be mitigated are described in the Authority's Habitat Mitigation</i> | To clarify that the Authority's Habitat Mitigation Scheme and the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership's Scheme are designed to only mitigate the recreational impacts of development, and other impacts will be considered separately in response to representation received from Natural England (164/4/SP5) |

| | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Scheme Guidance Note and the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Explanatory Note.</p> <p><i>Avoidance and mitigation may not be possible in some cases due to the impacts, scale, type or proximity of the proposed development...</i></p> <p>Amend Paragraph 5.14 to state: <i>“However, due to the impacts, scale, type or proximity of the proposed development...”</i></p> | |
| MIN-10A | Para 5.15 | Amend: <i>“Details of the mitigation measures can be found in the Authority’s Habitat Mitigation Scheme¹¹ and those for that of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership Scheme can be found in the Authority’s Habitat Mitigation Scheme Guidance Note¹¹ and the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy Explanatory Note¹².”</i> | To clarify where the details of the mitigation measures can be found. |
| MIN-11 | New paragraph after Para 5.17 | Add a new paragraph after Paragraph 5.17 to state: <i>“Terrestrial Waders and Brent Goose sites located on land outside the boundaries of the Solent SPAs can support these birds, and details are outlined in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy.”</i> | To provide reference to Waders and Brent Goose sites in response to the representation received from Natural England. (164/4/SP5) |
| MIN-14 | Footnote to Policy SP6 | In footnote 13 amend to state: <i>“In particular, for greenfield development, replacement dwellings, and extensions affecting roof structures, and those affecting identified biodiversity interests. The Authority’s biodiversity checklist provides guidance.”</i> | To implement Natural England’s advice contained in their representation (164/5/SP6) |
| MIN-15 | Para 5.24 | Add wording to Para 5.24: <i>“The diverse landscape of the New Forest, including the ancient woodlands, mature trees and hedgerows, heathlands...”</i> | To emphasise the importance of trees and hedgerows in the landscape in response to the representation received from Godshill Parish Council (31/05/SP7) |

| | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|---|
| MIN-16 | Para 5.25 | Add wording: " <i>The Authority will seek to ensure that the high quality, diverse, historic and distinct landscapes and seascapes...</i> " | To ensure that historic landscapes are also considered in response to the representation received from Hampshire County Council (151/02/ SP1, DP2, Para 5.25) |
| MIN-17 | Para 5.34 | Amend Para 5.34 to state: " <i>The Authority will also support the Environment Agency, Southern Water and Natural England, water companies, and surrounding authorities in the development of any strategic solution to reducing nutrient inputs to the Solent and River Avon internationally designated nature conservation sites from wastewater discharges. Developments that could affect these sites will be considered under Policy SP5."</i> | To implement Natural England's advice contained in their representation (164/7/DP8, 164/13/ HRA) |
| MIN-18 | Para 5.39 | Add wording before last sentence in Paragraph 5.39 to state: " Together with the potential for water abstraction impacts on nature conservation interests, the highest standards of water efficiency need to be adopted. " | To implement Natural England's advice contained in their representation (164/7/DP8, 164/13/ HRA) |
| MIN-20 | Para 5.59 | Amend Para 5.59 to state: " <i>Within the National Park the Shoreline Management Plan proposes to 'Hold the Line' (i.e. maintain or upgrade the level of protection provided by existing coastal defences) in built-up locations on the coast between Hurst Spit and Elmer's Court outside Lymington, between Sowley and Saltershill, and around Calshot such as around Lymington, but proposes 'No Active Intervention' (i.e. a decision not to invest in providing or maintaining any defences) elsewhere. for other less inhabited areas</i> | Clarification of the areas covered by 'Hold the Line' and 'No Active Intervention' in the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan in response to the representation received from Beaulieu Estate (170/1/5.59) |
| MIN-21 | Policy DP13 | Change Policy DP13 d) to state, " <i>...protect or enhance coastal habitats and species, including all designated nature conservation sites; and "</i> | To emphasise the importance of designated nature conservation sites along the coast in response to the representation received from RSPB and HOIWWT (147/09/DP13, 155/5/DP13) |

| | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|---|
| MIN-22 | Policy SP14 | Add to clause c) of Policy SP14, to state: "...on the landscape character, heritage assets , natural beauty, wildlife, tranquillity or other special qualities of the National Park." | To emphasise the importance of the historic environment in response to the representation received from Historic England (138/15/SP14, Para 5.70) |
| MIN-23 | Para 5.70 | Add to paragraph 5.70 to state: "...to protect the natural, historic and built environment... " | To emphasise the importance of the historic environment in response to the representation received from Historic England (138/15/SP14, Para 5.70) |

Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic & Built Environment

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|---|--|
| MIN-24 | Paragraph 6.15 | Add the following text to the end of paragraph 6.15: " Some archaeological assets may not be scheduled but are still nevertheless demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, and therefore will be subject to the policies for designated heritage assets, in accordance with the NPPF. " | To clarify the implementation of Policy SP16 and to refer to national policy set out in the NPPF. (Historic England 138/16/Para 6.1 – 6.18) |
| MIN-26 | Paragraph 6.17 | Move existing paragraph 6.17 to become a new paragraph 6.9, and renumber the remaining paragraphs accordingly. | To ensure the Plan reads more clearly with regard to the supporting text on the assessment of harm. (Hampshire County Council 151/03/Chapter6) |

Chapter 7: Vibrant Communities

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|---|---|
| MIN-27 | SP21 | Amend the second paragraph in the policy to state: " <i>This policy applies to applications resulting in net new dwellings.</i> " | To clarify the policy wording. |

| | | | |
|--------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <i>Proposals for replacement dwellings, will be assessed against Policy DP35 and proposals for commoner's dwellings., Estate Workers dwellings and agricultural / forestry workers dwellings will be assessed against their specific policies."</i> | |
| MIN-28 | SP22 | Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: <i>"Land at Whartons Lane, Ashurst is allocated for the development of around 60 residential dwellings."</i> | In response to representations received (44/02/SP22/2) highlighting that detailed site masterplanning may result in a slight variation (up or down) in the total number of dwellings proposed. |
| MIN-31 | Paragraph 7.27 | Add additional wording to para. 7.27 to state: <i>"The site is located within a short, level walk of the existing services within the village, including the station, shops and school. The provision of a safe, off-road pedestrian link from the Jubilee Fields Sports Ground to Church Lane through the site will be supported. The site will also provide additional community benefits..."</i> | In response to representations received from local residents and to encourage the integration of the site allocation with the adjacent facilities and services within the village. |
| MIN-32 | SP24 | Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: <i>"Land to the south of Church Lane, Sway is allocated for the development of around 40 residential dwellings."</i> | In response to representations received (150/01/SP24) highlighting that detailed site masterplanning may result in a slight variation (up or down) in the total number of dwellings proposed. |
| MIN-33 | SP24 | Amend the wording of criteria (f) to state that, <i>"The access to the site off Church Lane must ensure adequate visibility splays and provide safe access to the school and on foot to the village centre;"</i> | In response to representations from Hampshire County Council (151/09/SP24), the highway authority for this part of the National Park. |
| MIN-34 | Paragraph 7.30 | Reword paragraph 7.30 to state: <i>"This confirms that planning permission should be refused for major developments in these areas except major development should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. The assessment of such proposals should include:</i> | To ensure consistency with national policy contained within paragraph 116 of the NPPF (2012). |

| | | | |
|--------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy.</i> • <i>The cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need in some other way; and</i> • <i>Any detrimental impact on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.</i> | |
| MIN-35 | SP25 | Amend criteria (b) to state: “ The majority of the dwellings At least 50% of the dwellings provided within the National Park must be smaller dwellings (less than 100 square metres) to meet the identified local housing need for smaller dwellings.” | To provide clarity in response to representations received from Fawley Waterside (152/07/SP25). |
| MIN-39 | Paragraph 7.36 | Add additional wording at the end of paragraph 7.36 to state: “ The proposed route of the England Coast Path runs adjacent to the south western boundary of the site allocation. Development proposals for the site should not prejudice the delivery of this new section of footpath. ” | In response the publication of details of the proposed route of the England Coast Path by Natural England. |
| MIN-40 | SP26 | Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: “Land at Calshot Village is allocated for around 30 dwellings and cemetery use. ” | In response to representations (e.g. 45/03/SP26/1/2/3) highlighting that detailed site masterplanning may result in a slight variation (up or down) in the total number of dwellings proposed. |
| MIN-41 | SP29 | Amend the policy wording to state: “As with other new dwellings in the National Park, the total internal habitable floorspace of the dwelling should not exceed 100 square metres. ” | To ensure consistency of terminology with the policy wording for other net new dwellings permitted under the Local Plan. |
| MIN-43 | Para. 7.74 | Amend the final sentence to state: “ <i>The Authority will continue to impose appropriate planning conditions to remove permitted development rights to extend and / or alter approved</i> | In response to representations received regarding the relationship between policy DP35 and DP36 (158/1/DP35). |

| | | | |
|--------|------------|---|---|
| | | <i>replacement dwellings other than in accordance with Policy DP36 to ensure that the stock of smaller dwellings in the National Park is maintained.”</i> | |
| MIN-44 | DP35 | Remove the superfluous full stop at the end of the fifth paragraph. | To correct a grammatical error. |
| MIN-45 | DP36 | Amend the third paragraph of the policy to state: “ <i>In exceptional circumstances a larger extension may be permitted to meet the genuine family needs of an occupier who works in the immediate locality. In respect of these exceptional circumstances, the total internal habitable floorspace of an extended small dwelling must not exceed 120 square metres.</i> ” | To provide clarity in the interpretation of the policy. |
| MIN-46 | Para. 7.83 | Amend paragraph 7.86 to state, “ <i>Within the context of the development that takes place within the National Park, developer contributions may be required towards: highway and transportation works; affordable housing...</i> ” | For clarification and in response to representations received from Hampshire County Council (151/12/ Infrastructure Provision (Paragraph 7.83). |

Chapter 8: A Sustainable Local Economy

No minor modifications proposed.

Chapter 9: Transport & Access

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|---|---|
| MIN-47 | SP55 | Amend Policy SP55 to read: “ <i>The Authority will promote safer access and more sustainable forms of transport to and within the National Park for access to services and amenities and for enjoyment, health and well-being...</i> ” | To provide clarity that this policy supports utility walking and cycling, as well as for leisure purposes. (New Forest Access Forum 165/05/SP55) |

Chapter 10: Monitoring and Implementation

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|---|---|--|
| MIN-48 | Chapter 10: Implementation and monitoring | Include following new indicator under Objective 2 in Chapter 10: "Number of heritage assets on the "Heritage At Risk" Register" . No target - contextual indicator only. | To include more indicators relating to the historic environment. (Historic England 138/23/implementationandmonitoring) |

Annex 1: New Forest National Park Special Qualities

No minor modifications proposed.

Annex 2: Car Parking and Cycle Standards

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|-----------|--------------------|---|--|
| MIN-49 | Annex 2 | Include explicit reference in Annex 2 to parking standards for retail units as per the new table set out below: | The Authority's adopted Development Standards SPD sets out the Authority's parking standards and refers to the Hampshire County Council Parking Standards as the starting point for other use classes not specifically listed. For clarity the parking requirements for retail units should specifically be set out in the Local Plan. The requirement for parking for retail units are also the same standards as those adopted by New Forest District Council in their Parking Standards SPD (2012). |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p><i>allocating affordable housing and the National Park Authority will liaise with the relevant housing authority when affordable housing is granted permission. New Forest District Council is the housing authority for the majority of the National Park and set out below is a summary of the local connections criteria applied by the District Council in allocating affordable housing for local people.”</i></p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

Appendix 2 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications – 22 June 2018

Following the 6-week consultation on the National Park Authority's proposed Submission draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage), the Authority considered the representations made and prepared a schedule of proposed minor modifications to the Local Plan. These were submitted for independent examination alongside the draft Local Plan in May 2018.

Following correspondence with the appointed Planning Inspectors in June 2018, the Authority has subsequently reviewed the schedule of proposed modifications. This has resulted in the proposed modifications being separated into two schedules:

- (iii) *Proposed Minor Modifications* - which in the Authority's opinion do not alter the overall impact of the draft Local Plan or change its direction, or affect the substance or soundness of the document. They are focused on factual updates, clarification, and corrections to wording.
- (iv) *Proposed Main Modifications* – which are being recommended by the Authority to the Inspectors through the examination process.

This schedule contains the proposed main modifications and provides information on the reason for the change. Where new text is proposed it is shown in bold and where text is proposed for removal it has been struck through as set out below.

Insertion of text

~~Removal of text~~

Chapter 1: Introduction

No main modifications proposed.

Chapter 2: Profile of the New Forest National Park

No main modifications proposed.

Chapter 3: Vision and Objectives

No main modifications proposed.

Chapter 4: Strategic Policies and Development Principles

No main modifications proposed.

Chapter 5: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Main Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| MAIN-01 (Previously MIN-12) | Policy SP6 | <p>Amend Policy SP6 a) to state: <i>“It has been demonstrated that suitable measures for mitigating or compensating adverse effects will be provided and maintained in order to achieve a net gain in biodiversity value where possible, and no net loss; and”</i></p> <p>Add a new paragraph before the last paragraph: <i>“In cases where it is not possible to fully avoid or mitigate for the loss of biodiversity interests resulting from a development, appropriate compensation will be secured for any residual losses via on or off site compensation measures. The latter may include the provision of compensatory habitats elsewhere”.</i></p> | To clarify the approach to compensation and net gain in biodiversity in response to representations from Natural England and RSPB (164/5/SP6, 147/07/SP6) |
| MAIN-02 (Previously MIN-13) | Policy SP6 | <p>Amend Policy SP6 to state: <i>“In addition, opportunities to enhance ecological or geological assets, and the water environment should be maximised, particularly in line with the Authority’s ‘Action for Biodiversity’ local Biodiversity Action Plan priorities.</i></p> <p>Create new paragraph at end of Policy SP6 and amend to state: <i>“Applicants will be required to demonstrate the impacts of their proposal on biodiversity, and for certain types of development¹³ by submission of an preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which should outline the mitigation and enhancement measures needed to achieve a net gain in</i></p> | To implement Natural England’s recommendations and clarify the biodiversity action plan in response to the representations received from Natural England and the Friends of the New Forest (164/5/SP6, 109/08/ SP6) |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| | | <i>biodiversity (and any subsequent survey work it recommends).</i> Add new footnote x: Nature in the New Forest: Action for biodiversity, National Park Authority | |
| MAIN-03 (Previously MIN-19) | Policy DP8 | Amend Policy DP8 to state: <i>“In addition, all new residential development within the Southern Water company supply area of the National Park should be designed to achieve a required level of 110 litres maximum daily allowable usage per person, in line with the Government’s Housing Optional Technical Standard for water efficiency. This standard will be encouraged in new homes elsewhere across the National Park area.”</i> | To implement Natural England’s advice contained in their representation (164/7/DP8, 164/13/ HRA) |

Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic & Built Environment

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| MAIN-04 (Previously MIN-25) | Policy SP16 | Delete criterion (iv) of clause a) and insert the following new criteria b) and c) in policy SP16: b) Where development proposals will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset, permission will be refused. c) Where development proposals will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Renumber the remaining criteria. | For clarity, and to reflect the wording in the NPPF. (PegasusLife 143/02/SP16; Historic England 138/17/SP16) |

Chapter 7: Vibrant Communities

| Reference | Policy / Paragraph | Proposed Minor Change | Reason for Change (including representation no. if applicable) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| MAIN-05 (Previously MIN-29) | SP22 | Add an additional criterion (g) to state that: <i>“A site-specific flood risk assessment will be required and measures put in place to address any groundwater or surface water flooding issues identified.”</i> | In response to representations received (numerous) and the findings of the New Forest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017). |
| MAIN-06 (Previously MIN-30) | SP23 | Amend criteria (e) to state: <i>“Redevelopment proposals for the site should be accompanied by a Transport Assessment, given the proximity of the site to the designated Lyndhurst Air Quality Management Area. Adequate parking provision must be made on-site;”</i> | In response to representations received from Hampshire County Council (151/08/SP23), the highway authority for this part of the National Park. |
| MAIN-07 (Previously MIN-36) | SP25 | Amend criteria (c) to state: <i>“Proposals must be implemented as an integral and contiguous part of the redevelopment of the whole Power Station site pursuant to an approved comprehensive redevelopment masterplan and an integrated transport strategy for the entire Fawley Power Station site.”</i> | Amendment made in response to representations received from Hampshire County Council (151/10/SP25) and representations highlighting concerns regarding infrastructure improvements. |
| MAIN-08 (Previously MIN-37) | SP25 | Amend criteria (d) to state that, <i>“Any loss of the designated SINC habitat must be kept to an essential minimum and compensated through the enhancement of the biodiversity value of the remaining habitat and/or the compensatory provision of alternative habitats of equivalent or higher value to achieve a net gain for biodiversity.”</i> | To provide clarity in the policy wording in response to representations received from the RSPB (147/11/SP25/2) and the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust (155/6/SP25). |
| MAIN-09 (Previously MIN-38) | SP25 | Add an additional criterion (e) to state: <i>“A site-specific flood risk assessment will be required and measures put in place to address any flooding issues identified to ensure that the development will be safe for its lifetime.”</i> | Amendment made in response to representations received from the Environment Agency (145/01/SP25) highlighting concerns regarding flood risk. |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| <p>MAIN-10 (Previously MIN-42)</p> | <p>SP30</p> | <p>Amending paragraph (c) to state: “<i>The housing is subject to an occupancy condition and remains available for Estate Workers, or last employed as Estate Workers, in perpetuity; and...</i>”</p> | <p>In response to representations received from the Beaulieu Estate (173/01/SP30/2) to clarify that Estate Workers’ Housing would also be available to retired Estate Workers.</p> |
|--|-------------|--|--|

Appendix 3 – New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 – 2036 Housing Trajectory (June 2018)

1. The New Forest National Park housing trajectory takes as its starting point the draft housing provision figure in Policy SP19 of the Authority's Submission draft Local Plan. The draft Local Plan emphasises that delivery of housing should be assessed within the context of the two statutory National Park purposes (and associated duty), and the quantum of housing set out in Policy SP19 is framed by those considerations.
2. The various elements comprising the trajectory are:
 - Past completions - Net new housing completions in years 2016/17 and 2017 /18
 - Predicted housing supply – made up of small and large windfall sites and housing site allocations within the draft Local Plan, and a future windfall allowance
 - PLAN line – shows the total housing to be delivered over the life of the draft Local Plan, as an annualised figure
 - MANAGE – shows the annual number of completions needed to meet the National Park's housing provision taking into account shortfalls and surpluses in delivery in previous years.
3. As noted in the Authority's Housing Topic Paper (CD115) the Authority has a proven track record of delivery of housing on windfall sites. This equates to an average of around 23 net new dwellings since April 2006, against an annualised housing requirement of 11 dwellings in the Authority's adopted Core Strategy (2010). This housing trajectory assumes a similar level of windfall delivery, which also includes such sources as housing arising from a change of use from offices under permitted development rights. Consequently the Authority concludes that an estimated future delivery of 20 dwellings from windfall sites is appropriate based on previous delivery.
4. The Authority has not explicitly set out a separate estimate of housing supply from the provision of rural exception sites, commoners dwellings, estate workers dwellings and tied agricultural dwellings as these are expected to come forward under the general umbrella of windfall sites. They have therefore already been factored into the estimate of 20 windfall dwellings per year.

New Forest National Park Authority: Housing Trajectory (as at 31 March 2018)

| | Past development during Plan period | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTALS |
|--------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|
| | | 2016 / 17 | 2017 / 18 | 2018 / 19 | 2019 / 20 | 2020 / 21 | 2021 / 22 | 2022 / 23 | 2023 / 24 | 2024 / 25 | 2025 / 26 | 2026 / 27 | 2027 / 28 | 2028 / 29 | 2029 / 30 | 2030 / 31 | 2031 / 32 | 2032 / 33 | 2033 / 34 | 2034 / 35 | 2035 / 36 | Plan period 2016 - 2036 |
| Completions | Completions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Net new housing completions | 9 | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 34 |
| Allocations | Allocations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Land at Whartons Lane, Ashurst (Policy SP22) | | | | 30 | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 60 |
| | Land at the former Lyndhurst Park Hotel, Lyndhurst (Policy SP23) | | | | | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 50 |
| | Land south of Church Lane, Sway (Policy SP24) | | | | | | 20 | 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 40 |
| | Land adjacent to the former Fawley Power Station (Policy SP25) | | | | | | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | 120 |
| | Land at Calshot village (Policy SP26) | | | | 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 30 |
| Windfalls | Windfalls | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Unallocated small sites with planning permission | | | 34 | 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 79 |
| | Unallocated large sites (10 or more units) with planning permission: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | * Watersplash Hotel, Brockenhurst | | | 12 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24 |
| | * Land to the North East of Vinney's Close, Brockenhurst | | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 |
| | * Tatchbury Manor, Winsor | | | | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 |
| | Future windfall | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Predicted windfall completions (small & large sites) | | | | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 320 |
| | Housing supply (windfalls and allocations) | 9 | 25 | 56 | 57 | 90 | 100 | 70 | 70 | 50 | 50 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 777 |
| | Cumulative housing supply | 9 | 34 | 90 | 147 | 237 | 337 | 407 | 477 | 527 | 577 | 597 | 617 | 637 | 657 | 677 | 697 | 717 | 737 | 757 | 777 | 777 |
| | PLAN - Housing requirement (annualised) | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 800 |
| | MONITOR - number of dwellings above or below housing requirement | -31 | -15 | 16 | 17 | 50 | 60 | 30 | 30 | 10 | 10 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -20 | -23 |
| | MANAGE - Annual requirement taking account of past and projected completions | 42 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 38 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 32 | 43 | 23 | |

Housing Trajectory (as at 31 March 2018)

