

## **Revised Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications – 4 July 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 which were submitted for independent examination alongside the draft Local Plan in May 2018.

Following correspondence with the appointed Planning Inspectors in June and July 2018, the Authority has subsequently reviewed the schedule of proposed modifications. This schedule sets out the **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 <del>or compensating</del> adverse effects will be provided and maintained in order to achieve a net gain in biodiversity value <del>where possible, and no net loss</del>; and”</i></p> <p>Add a new paragraph before the last paragraph: <b><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></b></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, <b>and the water environment</b> should be maximised, particularly in line with <b>the Authority’s ‘Action for Biodiversity’</b><del> local Biodiversity Action Plan priorities.</del></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 development<sup>13</sup> by submission of an <del>preliminary</del> Ecological Appraisal, <b>which should outline the mitigation and enhancement measures needed to achieve a net gain in biodiversity</b> (and <del>any subsequent survey work it recommends).</del>”</i></p> <p>Add new footnote x: <b><i>Nature in the New Forest: Action for biodiversity, National Park Authority</i></b></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)

<p>MAIN-03  (Previously MIN-19)</p>	<p>Policy DP8</p>	<p>Amend Policy DP8 to state: “<i>In addition, all new residential development within the <del>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.</del></i>”</p>	<p>To implement Natural England’s advice contained in their representation (164/7/DP8, 164/13/ HRA)</p>
---	-------------------	---	---

**Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic & Built Environment**

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

## 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: <b><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></b>	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: <b><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></b>	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: <b><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></b>	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, <b><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></b>	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: <b><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></b>	Amendment made in response to representations received from the Environment Agency (145/01/SP25) highlighting concerns regarding flood risk.
MAIN-10 (Previously MIN-42)	SP30	Amending paragraph (c) to state: <b><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></b>	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>MAIN-11 (previously MIN-06)</p>	<p>SP3</p>	<p>Amend policy SP3 to state: “<i>Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</i></p> <p>a) <i>The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations; <b>and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy</b></i></p> <p><del>b) <i>The impact on the local economy of permitting or refusing it;</i></del></p> <p>c) <b><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></b></p>	<p>For clarification in response to representations received from ABP (162/4/SP3) and to ensure consistency with national policy.</p>
<p>MAIN-12 (Previously MIN-28)</p>	<p>SP22</p>	<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 <b>around</b> 60 residential dwellings.</i>”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>MAIN-13 (Previously MIN-32)</p>	<p>SP24</p>	<p>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 <b>around</b> 40 residential dwellings.</i>”</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>MAIN-14 (Previously MIN-39)</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.36</p>	<p>Add additional wording at the end of paragraph 7.36 to state: “<b><i>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.</i></b>”</p>	<p>In response the publication of details of the proposed route of the England Coast Path by Natural England.</p>
<p>MAIN-15 (Previously MIN-40)</p>	<p>SP26</p>	<p>Amend the wording in the first sentence of the policy to state: “<i>Land at Calshot Village is allocated for <b>around</b> 30 dwellings and cemetery use.</i>”</p>	<p>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.</p>