

Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Post-Examination hearing sessions) – April 2019

Following receipt and consideration of the Inspector's letter dated 29 March 2019, this schedule sets out the ***Proposed Main Modifications*** to the Regulation 19 Submission draft New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016 – 2036.

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

Reference	Policy / Paragraph	Proposed Main Change	Reason for Proposed Modification (including representation no. if applicable)
MM1	Policy DP2	<p>Amend criterion (e) and (f) of Policy DP2 to state:</p> <p>e) development would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on amenity amenity is not adversely affected in terms of additional impacts, visual intrusion, overlooking or shading; and</p> <p>f) development would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts associated with traffic or pollution (including air, soil, water, noise and light pollution)</p>	<p>In response to discussions on Matter 3 of the Examination hearing sessions and the representations made by Turleys on behalf of the Barker-Mill Estate.</p>
MM2	Policy SP3	<p>Amend policy SP3 (and renumber the criterion) to state:</p> <p>“Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <p>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></p> <p>b) The impact on the local economy of permitting or refusing it;</p> <p>c) The cost of, and The scope for, <i>developing outside the New Forest National Park, or meeting the need for it in some other way...</i>”</p>	<p>For clarification in response to representations received at Regulation 19 stage from ABP (162/4/SP3) and to ensure consistency with national policy in paragraph 116 of the NPPF (2012).</p>

Chapter 5: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Reference	Policy / Paragraph	Proposed Main Change	Reason for Proposed Modification (including representation no. if applicable)
MM3	Policy SP6	<p>Amend Policy SP6 to state:</p> <p><i>“Proposals should protect, maintain and enhance nationally, regionally and locally important sites and features of the natural environment, including habitats and species of biodiversity importance, geological features and the water environment.</i></p> <p><i>Development which is likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) will not be permitted. Only where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh both the impacts on the special interest features of the SSSI and on the broader national network of SSSIs will an exception be considered.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals which adversely affect locally designated sites, priority habitats and species populations, protected species or those identified of importance by national or local biodiversity plans will be refused unless the Authority is satisfied that:</i></p> <p><i>(a) 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><i>(b) There are no alternative solutions; and</i></p> <p><i>(c) There are overriding reasons which outweigh the harm.</i></p> <p><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>To clarify the approach to compensation and net gain in biodiversity in response to representations received at Regulation 19 stage from Natural England, RSPB and the Friends of the New Forest (164/5/SP6, 147/07/SP6, 109/08/SP6).</p>

		<p><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><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 biodiversity (and any subsequent survey work it recommends).</i></p> <p>Add new footnote ^x: Nature in the New Forest: Action for Biodiversity, National Park Authority</p> <p>¹³ <i>In particular, for greenfield development, replacement dwellings, extensions affecting roof structures and those affecting identified biodiversity interests. The Authority’s biodiversity checklist provides guidance.</i></p>	
MM4	Policy DP8	<p>Amend Policy DP8 to state:</p> <p><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></p>	To implement Natural England’s advice contained in their Regulation 19 representation (164/7/DP8, 164/13/ HRA).
MM5	DP10	<p>Amend Policy DP10 to state:</p> <p><i>“Where there is an identified need, development should either provide for the enhancement of existing open space and amenity areas, or provide on-site open space to the minimum provision standard of 3.5 hectares of public open space per 1,000 population.”</i></p>	This proposed change arises from the discussions on Matter 5 of the Examination hearing sessions and the need to ensure consistency with national policy in paragraph 74 of the NPPF (2012).

		<p><i>Proposals that result in the loss of existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, will not be permitted unless:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or</i><i>b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or</i><i>c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.</i>	
--	--	---	--

MM6	Para 5.61 and Policy DP12	<p>Amend paragraph 5.61 and Policy DP12 to state:</p> <p><i>“National Planning Practice Guidance sets out the ‘sequential test’ that will be used to assess all planning applications to direct development away from flood Zones 2 and 3 as the areas at highest risk of flooding. This will also need to take account of the broader considerations set out in the New Forest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2017, and consider all localised flood risk areas and all surface water flood risks. Only if there are no reasonably available suitable alternative sites should can development in areas of higher risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3) be considered by applying the ‘exception test’ as outlined in National Planning Practice Guidance.”</i></p> <p><i>Policy DP12: Flood Risk</i></p> <p><i>“Development proposals will not be permitted if they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) would increase the risk of coastal, fluvial, or surface flooding, or coastal erosion;</i> <i>b) do not comply with the sequential test, and, if necessary, the exception test (as outlined in National Planning Practice Guidance), or are inappropriate in high flood risk areas (as defined by the Environment Agency’s Flood Zones 2 and 3 categories and the New Forest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2017); or</i> <i>c) are not compatible with the appropriate Shoreline Management Plan and Coastal Defence Strategy.</i> <p><i>Relevant developments will require a flood risk assessment.”</i></p>	<p>In response to discussions on Matter 5 of the Examination hearing sessions and to ensure consistency with national policy on flood risk and the ‘exception test’ contained within the NPPF (2012).</p>
MM7	Para 5.67 and Policy SP14	<p>Amend the penultimate sentence in paragraph 5.67 to state:</p>	<p>This proposed change arises from the discussions on Matter 5 of the Examination hearing sessions and the need to have regard</p>

	<p><i>“The New Forest is not an appropriate location for large on-shore wind development due to insufficient wind speed and the impact such development would have on the landscape and statutory National Park purposes.”</i></p> <p>Amend Policy SP14 to state:</p> <p><i>“Development proposals for, or incorporating, renewable energy generation, other than wind energy, will be permitted where they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) are small-scale and provide energy for individual households or businesses, or for small local community facilities; and</i> <i>b) are located and designed to have minimal visual impact; and</i> <i>c) do not have adverse impact on the landscape character, heritage assets, natural beauty, wildlife, tranquillity or other special qualities of the National Park.</i> <p><i>Planning permission for renewable energy developments likely to have an adverse effect on a designated nature conservation site (including Natura 2000 sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves) will not be granted.”</i></p>	<p>to national policy (including the Written Ministerial Statement) on wind energy.</p>
--	--	---

Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic & Built Environment

Reference	Policy / Paragraph	Proposed Main Change	Reason for Proposed Modification (including representation no. if applicable)
MM8	SP16	<p>Amend Policy SP16 to state:</p> <p><i>“Proposals should protect, maintain or enhance nationally, regionally and locally important sites and features of the historic and built environment, including local vernacular buildings, archaeological sites and designed and historic landscapes, and, where appropriate, help secure a sustainable future for those heritage assets at risk.</i></p> <p>a) <i>Proposals will be supported where they conserve and enhance the significance or special interest of designated or non-designated heritage assets including their setting.</i> i.e. In particular where they:</p> <p>(i) it does do not harm the special interest, character or appearance of a Conservation Area or its setting, including spaces, street patterns, views, vistas, uses and trees which contribute to that special interest, character or appearance, having regard to the relevant conservation area character appraisal and management plan; and</p> <p>(ii) it does do not harm the significance, or result in the loss, of a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - scheduled monument (or a non-designated asset of archaeological interest of demonstrably equivalent significance); or - listed building, including through inappropriate siting, size, scale, height, alignment, materials, finishes (including colour and texture), design and form; or 	<p>This proposed modification arises following discussions at the Examination hearing session on Matter 6 and subsequent correspondence between the Authority and Historic England.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - registered historic park and garden, and particularly its layout, design, character, appearance and key views within, into and out; and, (iii) it makes a positive contribution to, or better reveals, or enhance the appreciation of, the significance or special interest of a heritage asset or its setting; and (iv) any harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals including securing its optimum viable use; and (iv) helps secure the long term conservation of a heritage asset. <p>b) Proposals will be resisted where they would harm the significance or special interest of a heritage asset unless any harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal, proportionate to the degree of harm and significance of the asset, including securing its optimum viable use.</p> <p>c) All development proposals that affect, or have the potential to affect, the significance or special interest of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, either directly or by being within its setting, will need to be accompanied by a clearly evidenced justification-heritage impact statement proportionate to the development and the significance or special interest of the asset, setting out how the impact of the development on the heritage assets and a suggested mitigation that is proportionate to the impact and significance of the assets, including any contribution made but its setting on that significance or special interest and how any harm has been avoided or minimised through careful design and mitigation.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		d) <i>Where proposals are likely to affect a site of known or potential archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment will also be required, including field evaluation where necessary.</i>	
--	--	--	--

Chapter 7: Vibrant Communities

Reference	Policy / Paragraph	Proposed Main Change	Reason for Proposed Modification (including representation no. if applicable)
MM9	Policy SP19	<p>Amend Policy SP19 to state:</p> <p><i>“An additional 800 dwellings will be delivered within the New Forest National Park between 2016 and 2036. To meet this, new residential development will be permitted within the National Park to maintain the vitality of local communities and support local services where the proposal involves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>The development of sites allocated for housing in the Local Plan; (300 dwellings);</i> b) <i>The implementation of extant planning permissions; (standing at just over 100 dwellings at 31/03/17)</i> c) <i>The development of land previously unallocated or unidentified (windfall development) within the Defined Villages of the National Park (Policy SP4); (estimated at 400 dwellings over the Plan period, at an annual average of 20 dwellings per annum);</i> d) <i>Development that comes forward on appropriate rural exception sites (Policy SP28); and</i> e) <i>Housing for New Forest Commoners (Policy SP29); Estate Workers (Policy SP30) and tied agricultural dwellings (Policy DP31).”</i> 	<p>In response to discussions on Matter 7 of the Examination hearing sessions, the Regulation 19 representations submitted by Draycott Surveyors, to improve the clarity of the policy and clearly set out the various sources of housing supply within the National Park.</p>

MM10	New paragraph on housing supply to support Policy SP19	<p>Insert new paragraph 7.10 before the policy box (and renumber the remaining paragraphs of Chapter 7 as necessary) to read:</p> <p><i>“Policy SP19 indicates that 800 dwellings will be delivered up to 2036. This will be made up of the following components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Housing completions: Completions in the Plan period to date (between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2019) total 63 dwellings.</i> • <i>Extant planning permissions: Permissions as at 31 March 2019 total 114 dwellings.</i> • <i>Site allocations: The Local Plan’s five site allocations will result in approximately 300 dwellings up to 2036.</i> • <i>Windfalls. Windfalls will be comprised of dwellings arising from rural exception sites, commoners dwellings, estate workers dwellings and tied agricultural dwellings and other unallocated sites in Defined Villages. It is estimated that these will total 400 dwellings over the Plan period, at an average of 20 dwellings per annum.”</i> 	<p>In response to discussions on Matter 7 of the Examination hearing sessions to clarify the different elements of supply of housing land and to provide up to date figures.</p>
MM11	SP22	<p>Amend the wording of Policy SP22 to state:</p> <p><i>“Land at Whartons Lane, Ashurst is allocated for the development of around 60 residential dwellings. Detailed proposals for the site that meet the following site-specific requirements will be permitted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>The provision of on-site affordable housing for local people in housing need in accordance with the target of 50% affordable housing;</i> <i>50% of the dwellings must be provided as affordable housing for local people in housing need;</i> b) <i>All of the dwellings on the site will be limited to a maximum total internal habitable floor area of 100 square metres;</i> 	<p>In response to representations received at Regulation 19 stage: (i) highlighting that detailed site masterplanning may result in a slight variation (up or down) in the total number of dwellings proposed; and (ii) the findings of the New Forest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017).</p> <p>Criterion (a) revised in response to discussions at the Examination hearing session.</p>

		<p>c) <i>The site must be developed in a comprehensive manner;</i></p> <p>d) <i>Measures must be put in place to protect the trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders that border the site;</i></p> <p>e) <i>Contributions will be required to enhance the adjacent Whartons Lane Recreation Ground located opposite the site; and</i></p> <p>f) <i>Development proposals must provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by the service provider; and</i></p> <p>g) A site-specific flood risk assessment will be required and measures put in place to address any groundwater or surface water flooding issues identified.”</p>	
MM12	SP23	<p>Amend the wording of Policy SP23 to state:</p> <p><i>“Land at the former Lyndhurst Park Hotel is allocated for a mixed-use development including tourism and residential. The site has potential for around 50 dwellings alongside the retention of the historic elements of the existing building and development could include tourism uses. Residential development on the site should secure the future conservation of the heritage assets on the site. Detailed proposals for the site that meet the following site-specific requirements will be permitted:</i></p> <p>a) <i>The site must be redeveloped in a comprehensive manner;</i></p> <p>b) <i>The historic elements of the existing hotel building must be retained and could be used for a range of uses, including tourism and residential use. A detailed heritage assessment will be required to justify any proposals which harmed their retention;</i></p>	<p>In response to representations received at Regulation 19 stage from Hampshire County Council (151/08/SP23), the highway authority for this part of the National Park; and discussions at the Examination hearing session.</p>

		<p>c) <i>The design and scale of the redevelopment of the site must conserve and or enhance the character of this part of the Lyndhurst Conservation Area;</i></p> <p>d) <i>Redevelopment proposals must retain the important trees on the site that contribute to the open verdant setting and the site's edge-of-village location;</i></p> <p>e) <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></p> <p>f) <i>Proposals for C3 residential use must provide on-site affordable housing for local people in housing need as close to the Authority's target of 50% affordable housing as is viable. Viability will be demonstrated through an open book approach;</i></p> <p>g) <i>All of the dwellings on site will be limited to a maximum total internal habitable floor area of 100 square metres;</i></p> <p>h) <i>Any proposals for C2 use (i.e. where no affordable housing for local people would be provided) must be accompanied by a legal agreement requiring the occupancy to be limited to those with a local connection.</i></p> <p>i) <i>Development proposals must ensure future access to existing water supply infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes; and</i></p> <p>j) <i>Development proposals must incorporate measures to mitigate potential significant urban edge impacts on adjacent protected habitats.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

MM13	SP24	<p>Amend the wording of policy SP24 to state:</p> <p><i>“Land to the south of Church Lane, Sway is allocated for the development of around 40 residential dwellings. The site will also provide 1 hectare of informal greenspace provision for the local community. Detailed proposals for the site must meet the following site-specific requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) The provision of on-site affordable housing for local people in housing need in accordance with the target of 50% affordable housing; 50% of the dwellings must be provided as affordable housing for local people in housing need;</i> <i>b) All of the dwellings on the site will be limited to a maximum total internal habitable floor area of 100 square metres;</i> <i>c) The site must be developed in a comprehensive manner;</i> <i>d) Residential development on the site will be limited to the part of the site that lies outside the New Forest Special Protection Area 400 metre zone (illustrated in the red shading on the map below);</i> <i>e) Measures should be put in place to protect the trees that fringe the site that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders;</i> <i>f) 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> <i>g) The use of the remainder of the site (green shading) that lies within the New Forest SPA 400 metre zone for informal greenspace will be supported. Proposals should be accompanied by details of the proposed layout and long-term management arrangements for the greenspace provision; and</i> 	<p>In response to representations received at Regulation 19 stage (150/01/SP24) highlighting that detailed site masterplanning may result in a slight variation (up or down) in the total number of dwellings proposed; and discussions at the Examination hearing session.</p> <p>Criterion (a) revised in response to discussions at the Examination hearing session.</p>
------	------	--	---

		<p><i>h) Development proposals must provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by the service provider.”</i></p>	
MM14	Policy SP25	<p>Amend the wording of the criteria of Policy SP25 to state:</p> <p><i>“As part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the adjacent brownfield Power Station site, adjoining land to the south of the site within the National Park is allocated for around 120 dwellings. Detailed proposals for the site must meet the following site-specific requirements:</i></p> <p><i>(a) The provision of on-site affordable housing for local people in housing need in accordance with the target of 50% affordable housing; 50% of the dwellings in the Southern Quarter of the development site must be affordable housing to meet local needs;</i></p> <p><i>(b) 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></p> <p><i>(c) 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></p> <p><i>(d) 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></p> <p><i>(e) 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></p>	<p>In response to representation made at the Regulation 19 stage by the Environment Agency, Hampshire County Council, the RSPB and the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust; and discussions on Matter 10 of the Examination hearing sessions to improve the clarity of the policy.</p> <p>Criterion (a) revised in response to discussions at the Examination hearing session.</p>

MM15	SP26 and supporting text	<p>Amend paragraph 4.19 to reflect the fact that the proposed housing site allocation at Calshot Village (Policy SP26) has been deleted from the Local Plan.</p> <p>4.19 <i>“Provision is also made in the Local Plan for development in the National Park to support the redevelopment of the brownfield former Fawley Power Station site and to support the socio-economic well-being of the community at Calshot. These This allocations has has have been informed by consideration of the Government’s major development test. and the Authority’s duty to foster the socio-economic well-being of local communities in the National Park.”</i></p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.28 and delete paragraphs 7.35, 7.36 and Policy SP26 as follows:</p> <p>7.28 <i>“As well as assessing the capacity of the defined villages, the Authority has considered the potential of other settlements to accommodate development. —and two further housing allocations within the National Park are proposed in the Fawley / Calshot area. In terms of the rest of the National Park, significant parts of the New Forest are affected by flooding and over two thirds of the National Park lies within or adjacent to internationally protected habitats. These factors, allied to the landscape protection afforded to the whole of the New Forest through primary legislation, significantly restrict the potential for further housing allocations. Consequently, outside the two further land-use allocations proposed adjacent to the former at Fawley Power Station and Calshot, the housing needs arising within the rest of the National Park will predominantly be met through appropriate rural exceptions schemes in or adjacent to settlements with basic local services.”</i></p>	Proposed allocation at Calshot Village to be deleted from the Local Plan following discussions at the Examination hearing session.
------	--------------------------	--	--

	<p><u>Calshot Village</u></p> <p>7.35 The redevelopment of Fawley Power Station will deliver infrastructure improvements for the area, provide local employment opportunities and significantly improve the services on offer. Linked to the Authority's duty to foster the socio-economic well-being of local communities within the National Park, the nearby community of Calshot should benefit from these improvements. The village has pockets of relative deprivation and there is an opportunity to broaden the range of housing available in the village and provide local community facilities through the provision of a new primary school close to the village. This will provide a connection between the village of Calshot and the Fawley Power Station site and a focal point for the local community in Calshot.</p> <p>7.36 A number of improvements – including landscape and public realm enhancements – can be implemented without the need for additional development. In addition to these improvements, the village would benefit from a more mixed community with a better balance of housing tenures. Land adjacent to St George's Church Hall has been identified as an important site to the village and is relatively unconstrained.</p> <p><u>Policy SP26 – Land at Calshot Village</u></p> <p>Land at Calshot Village is allocated for 30 dwellings and cemetery use. Detailed proposals for the site must meet the following site specific requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 50% of dwellings must be provided for affordable housing for local people in housing need; b) All of the dwellings on the site will be limited to a maximum total internal habitable floor area of 100 square metres floor area of 100 square metres; 	
--	---	--

		<p>e) The site must be developed in a comprehensive manner and ensure the proposed layout of the residential and cemetery uses are compatible;</p> <p>d) Measures should be put in place to protect the trees in the centre of the site that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders;</p> <p>e) The enhancement of St George's Hall for the benefit of the local Calshot community should form part of the plans; and</p> <p>f) Development proposals must ensure future access to existing wastewater and water supply infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</p>	
MM16	Ashurst Hospital site allocation policy and supporting text	<p>Delete paragraph 7.20 and it has been superseded by the inclusion of the Ashurst Hospital site allocation policy:</p> <p>"Brownfield land may become available at the Ashurst Hospital site during the Plan period, but this is dependent on a future decision from the NHS. Should the Ashurst Hospital site be deemed surplus to the requirements of the NHS within the Plan period, the Authority will consider the best uses for this brownfield site. The immediate proximity of the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) to the site would limit the type of any future residential use of the hospital site."</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.21 to ensure consistency with the inclusion of the Ashurst Hospital site allocation policy:</p> <p>"Consequently attention has focused on The east of the village, which is less constrained by flood risk and the range of national and international habitat designations that cover the Open Forest to the west of Ashurst. In doing so Consideration has also been given to the Ashurst Village Design Statement (formally adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document in June 2013) which highlights the</p>	In response to discussions at the Examination hearing session into the proposed Ashurst Hospital site allocation policy (March 2019).

		<p><i>value that residents of Ashurst place on the greenfield land around the edge of the village. The Village Design Statement expresses the desire to prevent the coalescence of the village and West Totton.”</i></p> <p>Add new policy, supporting text and site allocation to state:</p> <p><u>Ashurst Hospital</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The Ashurst Hospital site comprises previously developed land with access to a range of local services, including the train station and local shops. The site immediately adjoins the existing Defined Village boundary of Ashurst and is located within Flood Zone 1 for fluvial flooding.</i> <i>2. Health Commissioners have confirmed that much of the existing accommodation at Ashurst Hospital is no longer fit for purpose and there is an opportunity to make a more efficient use of the site. Large parts of the site have been declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS and are vacant. The more modern Snowden Building at the west of the site currently contains the Birthing Centre and is to be retained. It is likely that this building will need to be extended to accommodate the future healthcare services that will continue to be delivered from the Ashurst Hospital site and policy XX supports this.</i> <i>3. Policy XX allocates the site for a mix of residential (C2 care home use or extra care) and retained healthcare provision. It is considered that the surplus part of this previously developed site can deliver around 30 units - although the exact number will depend on the final form of residential development, which will in turn be guided by the need to avoid impacts on the adjacent protected habitats. Viability modelling for the Local Plan indicates that the redevelopment of the Ashurst Hospital site (including site</i> 	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>clearance costs) is unlikely to achieve the 50% affordable housing policy target.</i></p> <p>4. <i>The site allocation policy highlights the natural and built environment constraints and opportunities on the Ashurst Hospital site. The site lies adjacent to the New Forest SSSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites and the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Local Plan identifies the potential for a range of possible effects from development on these protected sites, including recreation pressure, urban edge effects including cat predation and the loss or damage to off-site supporting habitats.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Policy XX therefore requires development to be confined to the previously developed land to the north of the site and the strengthening of the planted boundary to the adjacent Natura 2000 site designations. Mitigation measures for potential urban edge effects could include the use of legal covenants (e.g. preventing cat or dog ownership) and arrangements for grounds maintenance. The requirement to ensure no adverse impact on the adjacent national and internationally protected habitats will also influence the form of the C2 care home or extra care residential development on site.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Elements of the existing built development on the site date back to the 1830s. The former historic workhouse building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset due to its 19th Century origins and the degree to which the building has survived to a large extent. The Victorian Chapel on the site was constructed sometime between 1869 and 1896 and the exterior remains in good condition. The former workhouse building and Victorian Chapel have heritage significance and Policy XX confirms the Chapel will be retained as part of the redevelopment of the site. The policy requires a detailed heritage assessment to be undertaken to</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>justify proposals that would result in the loss of the former workhouse building.</i></p> <p><u>Policy XX - Land at Ashurst Hospital</u></p> <p><i>Land at Ashurst Hospital is allocated for a mixed-use development comprising:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retained (and potentially extended) healthcare provision in the western part of the site (focused on the Snowden Building) – illustrated in blue on the map below; and</i> ▪ <i>Around 30 residential units (Use Class C2 care home or extra care use) on the remaining previously developed part of the site (i.e. on the footprint of the existing buildings and car park).</i> <p><i>Detailed proposals for the site that meet the following site-specific requirements will be permitted:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>The site must be redeveloped in a comprehensive manner and detailed proposals for residential development will need to ensure the retained healthcare uses on the site can operate efficiently;</i> b) <i>Built development will be confined to the previously developed land to ensure the existing green buffer remains to the south of the site and the New Forest’s protected habitats.</i> c) <i>The Victorian Chapel will be retained as part of the redevelopment. A detailed heritage assessment and structural survey will be required to justify the loss of the former workhouse buildings;</i> d) <i>Redevelopment proposals must retain the protected trees on the site;</i> 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>e) Proposals for extra care use (that is not C2 Use) must provide on-site extra care affordable housing for local people in housing need as close to the Authority’s target of 50% affordable housing as is viable. Viability will be demonstrated through an open book approach;</p> <p>f) Proposals for C2 care home use must be accompanied by a legal agreement requiring the occupancy to be limited to those with a local connection;</p> <p>g) All of the dwellings on site will be limited to a maximum total internal floor area of 100 square metres;</p> <p>h) Development proposals must incorporate measures to mitigate potential significant urban edge impacts on adjacent protected habitats. The existing southern boundary between the site and the adjacent protected habitats should be retained and strengthened with the planting of native species. Proposals should seek to enhance both its role in buffering the designated sites and supporting species of principal importance for biodiversity. A detailed application for the site will be subject to a full appropriate assessment; and</p> <p>i) Development proposals must provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by the service provider.</p>	
MM17	SP27	<p>Amend the wording of Policy SP27 to state:</p> <p><i>“50% of net dwellings developed within the defined village boundaries of Ashurst, Brockenhurst, Lyndhurst and Sway and on sites allocated for residential development in the Local Plan will be provided as affordable homes to meet local needs. In practice:</i></p> <p>a) <i>On developments of 1 – 2 net new dwellings, no affordable housing will be sought;</i></p>	In response to discussions on Matter 8 of the Examination hearing sessions to clarify that regard will be given to the viability of development.

		<p>b) On developments of between 3– 10 net new dwellings, a target of 50% affordable housing will be sought on site. Exceptionally, at the discretion of the National Park Authority, financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision will be accepted on smaller sites;</p> <p>c) On development sites of 11 dwellings or more, a target of 50% affordable housing will be sought on site must be made on-site.</p> <p>The layout and design of affordable housing will be appropriately integrated into each development. Local connection criteria will be applied to affordable housing to ensure local needs are met.</p> <p>The tenure (social and affordable rented, intermediate, shared ownership and other) of affordable homes will be based on up-to-date evidence of local needs. A suitable mix will be determined through liaison with the local housing authority and the starting point is to seek 75% social/affordable rented tenure and 25% shared ownership / intermediate housing.</p> <p>The proportion and tenure mix of affordable housing sought will take into account evidence on viability.”</p>	
MM18	SP28	<p>Amend the wording of Policy SP28 to state:</p> <p>“Small-scale affordable housing developments may be permitted as “exceptions” on sites in or adjoining villages to meet the identified needs of local people in these areas. Proposals for exception sites should:</p> <p>a) meet a particular local need that cannot be accommodated in any other way;</p> <p>b) be subject to a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) to ensure that the dwellings provide for low-cost housing for local needs in perpetuity;</p>	<p>In response to discussions on Matter 8 of the Examination hearing sessions to clarify that open market housing will not be supported on rural exception sites.</p>

		<p>c) <i>be capable of management by an appropriate body, for example a Registered Provider, the Authority, or a community land trust or similar accredited local organisation; and</i></p> <p>d) <i>be located where there are appropriate local services (e.g. shops, schools and public transport).</i></p> <p>The expectation is that 100% of the housing on rural exception sites will be affordable.”</p>	
MM19	SP30	<p>Amend the wording of criterion (c) of Policy SP30 to state:</p> <p><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>	In response to representations received from the Beaulieu Estate (173/01/SP30/2) at Regulation 19 stage to clarify that Estate Workers’ Housing would also be available to retired Estate Workers.
MM20	Policy SP33	<p>Amend the wording of criterion (b) of the second part of Policy SP33 - focusing on further proposals for the provision of permanent and / or transit accommodation to meet an established need of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople - to state:</p> <p><i>“Occupancy of the site will be restricted to gypsies and travellers, and travelling showpeople with a local connection to the New Forest National Park;”</i></p> <p>Update the policy criterion numbering to avoid duplication.</p>	In response to discussions on Matter 9 of the Examination hearing sessions to fully reflect the coverage of the policy.
MM21	Policy DP34	<p>Amend the wording of Policy DP34 to state:</p> <p><i>“To ensure the conservation and enhancement of the built heritage of the Defined Villages, development proposals within the villages must be informed by consideration of the character of the local area. The four Defined Villages are rural areas often characterised by spacious residential plots set within mature landscapes and. Development densities should reflect the strong built heritage of the Defined Villages, and their locally distinctive character and location within a nationally protected landscape.”</i></p>	This proposed change arises from the discussions on Matter 7 of the Examination hearing sessions.

Chapter 8: A Sustainable Local Economy

Reference	Policy / Paragraph	Proposed Main Change	Reason for Proposed Modification (including representation no. if applicable)
MM22	Policy DP44	Amend the wording of Policy DP44 to state: <i>“The redevelopment of established employment sites for industrial, office, and-business and low-key storage uses will be permitted throughout the National Park where:”</i>	In response to discussions on Matter 12 of the Examination hearing sessions to clarify the policy intentions.