

**NEW FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN FIRST ALTERATION -
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS ON:**

- (A) PROPOSED POST-INQUIRY MODIFICATIONS AND**
- (B) THE COUNCIL'S DECISION NOT TO ACCEPT CERTAIN INSPECTOR'S
RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to ask Cabinet to consider the representations made in the recent public consultation on Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan First Alteration (in response to the Inquiry Inspector's Report)) and to recommend to Council that a Notice of Intention to Adopt the First Alteration can now be issued.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Council on 17 January 2005 agreed a number of Proposed Modifications to the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration in response to the recommendations of the Inquiry Inspector. The Council decided not to accept a small number of the Inspector's recommendations.
- 2.2 The Proposed Modifications, along with a statement giving reasons for not accepting certain recommendations, were published for public consultation over the period 11 February – 29 March.
- 2.3 A total of 64 people and organisations responded, making between them 190 representations, of which 114 were objections and 76 were support.
- 2.4 The Council now has to consider whether it is necessary to hold a further inquiry into any of the objections, or to issue further Proposed Modifications. If, having carefully considered all representations made during the February/March consultation, the Council decides that no further modifications need be made and that no further Inquiry is necessary, then the Plan can proceed towards adoption.
- 2.5 At this advanced stage in reviewing the Local Plan, the scope for further changes is limited to those arising from consideration of the representations received during the February/March consultation.

3. THE REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 The representations received, and recommended Council responses, are summarised in the schedules attached at Annex 1 to this report. There are separate schedules for
 - (A) Representations on Proposed Modifications;
 - (B) Representations on the Council's decision not to accept certain Inspector's recommendations.

- 3.2 The full representations have been placed in the Members' Room for Members to see.
- 3.3 The main issues raised in the representations on the Proposed Modifications relate to:
- Housing land supply, including the basis for the figures and the identification of reserve sites;
 - Affordable housing, including the proportion of affordable dwellings in new developments and the identification of settlements as 'rural' settlements where a higher proportion can be sought
 - The commitment to review employment land supply (supported)
 - Dibden Bay – including both support for and objections to the inclusion of a policy cross-referring to the Structure Plan policy and other Local Plan policies, as recommended by the Inspector
 - Transport – concerns over the safeguarding of highway land along the A326 Totton Western Bypass in relation to Dibden Bay and development proposals – also some objections to (and support for) the new policy for freight
 - New Forest – objections to the definition of back-up grazing land, and concerns over policies for the development/ replacement of buildings for employment purposes
 - Town centres – a concern from the Government Office for the South East that policies do not reflect fully the provisions of PPS6, Planning for Town Centres (published March 2005)
 - Site specific representations including objections to the reservation of land west of Crow Lane, Ringwood for housing and employment, the deletion of the Lynes Farm employment land reservation and the deletion of the open space allocation at Loperwood, Totton.
- 3.4 Other representations related to the Council's decision not to accept Inspector's Recommendations relating to:
- The possible allocation of land adjoining Fawley Power Station for employment development
 - The definition of areas close to town centres for the purpose of higher density development as 400 metres from the edge of the town centre
 - The possible identification of land at Loperwood, north of Totton for housing.
- 3.5 The recommended responses to the representations are set out in full in the schedules at Annex 1.

4. THE NEXT STAGES

- 4.1 It is recommended that, having regard to the reasons set out in the "Response" columns in Annex 1, no further modifications need be made to the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration and neither is it necessary to hold a further Public Inquiry.
- 4.2 Cabinet should therefore recommend to Council (13th June) that the Local Plan First Alteration can now proceed to adoption.
- 4.3 The Regulations specify that a Notice of Intention to Adopt should be published, stating that the First Alteration will be adopted 28 days after the publication of the notice. Unless the Secretary of State has issued a Direction not to adopt, the First Alteration will

become part of the statutory Development Plan after the 28 days. A Notice of Adoption is then issued. After this there is a 6 week period in which any person aggrieved by the plan and wishes to challenge its validity can apply on certain grounds to the High Court to have the whole plan or part of it quashed.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The consideration of environmental implications has been an integral part of the process of preparing the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration throughout the process.

6. FINANCIAL AND CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 None arising directly from this report.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet recommend to Council that:

- i) No further modifications be made to the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration in response to representations received on the Proposed Modifications and on the Council's decision not to accept certain Inspector's recommendations (as published on 11th February 2005);
- ii) No further Public Inquiry be held into the objections received;
- iii) The Council publishes the Notice of Intention to Adopt (28 days after the date of publication of the Notice) the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration incorporating the Proposed Modifications published on 11 February 2005, and that following the expiry of the period given in the Notice of Intention to Adopt, the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration be adopted;
- (iv) The Head of Policy, Design and Information be authorised, in publishing the adopted New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration, to make any necessary editing changes, corrections and updating which do not materially affect the Plan's proposals.

Further information:

Graham Ashworth
Team Leader, Policy & Plans
Tel: 023 8028 5352
E-mail: graham.ashworth@nfdc.gov.uk

Background papers:

Representations received on Proposed Modifications and the Council's decision not to accept certain Inspector's recommendations.

Annex 1 (A):

Representations on Proposed Modifications

New Forest District Local Plan 1st Alt.: Representations on Proposed Modifications

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
A3/Mod1	Support	35a	Countryside Agency	Support updated wording of paragraph A3.6 relating to New Forest National Park and former South Hampshire Coast AONB.	Support noted
A3/Mod1	Object	38a	Associated British Ports	Paragraph A3.6 should be amended to state that the New Forest Heritage Area has been revoked as well as the South Hampshire Coast AONB. If adopted in its current form the First Alteration will still show areas of the NFHA outside the NFNP.	No change. Paragraphs A3.6 and D1.2 state that the New Forest National Park is the definition of the New Forest relevant to planning which is used in the local plan.
B2/Mod2	Support	48a	Bellway Homes	Support Objective 14 which refers specifically to the Structure Plan requirements to provide 5480 dwellings and identify reserve provision for 500 dwellings.	Support noted
B3A/Mod1	Support	13b	Totton and Eling Town Council	Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.	Support noted
B3A/Mod1	Object	22a	Cancer Research UK/Hants. Assn. for Care of Blind	Object to the use of a different base date for housing land supply assessment. Data is untested. Object to reduced requirement to identify reserve sites for housing. Inspector's intention was that Loperwood sites should be released before land at Crow Lane. The Council should follow the Inspector's recommendations regarding housing land requirements.	No change. The most up to date monitoring data has been used in accordance with national guidance. PPG12 advises at paragraphs 6.31 and 6.32 that plans should be as up to date as possible at the time of adoption. The 2004 housing monitoring data used in the updated assessment of housing land supply has been agreed by the local and strategic planning authorities and was published in November 2004. In paragraph 2.4.103 of his Report the

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					<p data-bbox="1601 196 2111 687">Inspector provides a list of sites from which reserve housing sites should be selected to meet the Structure Plan requirement. The list includes the objector's sites, but nowhere does the Inspector say that the Loperwood sites should be released before land at Crow Lane. At paragraphs 2.4.102 to 2.4.104 the Inspector supports the existing identified reserve sites in Totton and Marchwood, but he goes on to state that reserve provision should be provided in other parts of the District in the interests of sustainability. He concludes that at least half the remaining reserve sites should be located in the western part of the District.</p> <p data-bbox="1601 724 2095 1027">Taking account of the updated assessment of land supply, not all of the sites recommended by the Inspector to meet the reserve provision are required. The identified reserve site at Crow Lane, Ringwood satisfies the additional reserve requirement and is consistent with the Inspector's recommendation to identify additional reserve land in the west of the District.</p>
B3A/Mod1	Object	32a	Persimmon Homes	<p data-bbox="938 1070 1578 1410">NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector.</p>	<p data-bbox="1608 1070 2111 1347">No change. The revised assessment of housing land supply does not include land at Calshot which was deleted in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations. The calculations used are those recommended by the Inspector, using the most up to date and published monitoring data as advised by paragraphs 6.31 and 6.32 of PPG12.</p> <p data-bbox="1608 1383 2066 1410">In paragraph 2.4.103 of his Report the</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.</p>	<p>Inspector provides a list of sites from which reserve housing sites should be selected to meet the Structure Plan requirement. The list includes the objector's sites. However, at paragraphs 2.4.102 to 2.4.104 although the Inspector supports the existing identified reserve sites in the east of the District at Totton and Marchwood, he goes on to state that reserve provision should be provided in other parts of the District in the interests of sustainability. He concludes that at least half the remaining reserve sites should be located in the western part of the District.</p> <p>Taking account of the updated assessment of land supply, not all of the sites recommended by the Inspector to meet the reserve provision are required. The identified reserve site at Crow Lane, Ringwood satisfies the additional reserve requirement and is consistent with the Inspector's recommendation to identify additional reserve land in the west of the District.</p> <p>At paragraph 2.4.105 of his Report the Inspector states that site c) (Polebarn Farm, Fordingbridge) should be identified as a reserve site in addition to Crow Lane, Ringwood "if required". He goes on to state that "It is for the local planning authority to choose which alternative to adopt." Polebarn Farm is not required to meet the reserve requirement.</p>
B3A/Mod1	Object	48b	Bellway Homes	<p>Principle of identifying reserve provision is supported, but reference to residual requirement in misleading. Structure Plan requires reserve provision for 500</p>	<p>No change. The principle of off-setting baseline surplus against the reserve requirement is considered in paragraph</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Objection Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>dwelling and sites should be identified accordingly - not appropriate to discount this requirement. Misleading to assume that future provision from existing commitments, sites identified in Urban Capacity Study and windfall developments can be discounted against reserve provision. This was not discussed adequately at the inquiry since only a small 'surplus' was identified at that time, but the revised figures have increased this significantly. The proposed modifications are contrary to Policy H4 of the Structure Plan and national guidance and will prejudice the Plan Monitor and Manage approach advocated in PPG3. Assumption that previous windfall rates will continue is not appropriate and should not lead to discounting of reserve provision. What is more important is monitoring of rates of development and retention of a reserve sites to address any shortfall. Discounting approach will prejudice ability of District Council to respond to any reduction in completion rates. Inspector's recommendations should be accepted, and site at Polebarn Farm Fordingbridge should be identified as a reserve site.</p>	<p>2.4.99 of the Inspector's Report. He supports this principle and uses it in setting out his land supply assessment.</p> <p>The Council has accepted the Inspector's recommendations on calculating housing land supply and has applied his assessment using the most up to date monitoring data in accordance with PPG12.</p> <p>At paragraph 2.4.105 of his Report the Inspector states that site c) (Polebarn Farm, Fordingbridge) should be identified as a reserve site in addition to Crow Lane, Ringwood "if required". He goes on to state that "It is for the local planning authority to choose which alternative to adopt." Polebarn Farm is not required to meet the reserve requirement.</p>
B3A/Mod1	Object	57a	New Forest Association	<p>Reserve housing sites are to be activated if annual dwelling completions fall below structure plan requirements. In this event, districts failing to meet their quota by recycling brownfield land should be required to release greenfield sites. In deciding completions required, decisions on relative environmental damage were taken. By exceeding the structure plan baseline, NFDC has unnecessarily increased population pressure within the New Forest.</p>	<p>No change. It is anticipated that around 70% of housing completions over the remaining plan period will take place on previously developed land.</p> <p>The assessed surplus over the Structure Plan baseline counts towards the reserve requirement. In other words, fewer greenfield sites need to be identified because more new development is being accommodated on previously developed sites within the built up areas.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the principle of off-setting the baseline surplus against the</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					reserve requirement in paragraph 2.4.99 of his Report.
B3A/Mod1	Object	58a	CPRE	Reserve housing sites are to be activated if annual dwelling completions fall below structure plan requirements. In this event, districts failing to meet their quota by recycling brownfield land should be required to release greenfield sites. In deciding completions required, decisions on relative environmental damage were taken. By exceeding the structure plan baseline, NFDC has unnecessarily increased population pressure within the New Forest.	<p>No change. It is anticipated that around 70% of housing completions over the remaining plan period will take place on previously developed land.</p> <p>The assessed surplus over the Structure Plan baseline counts towards the reserve requirement. In other words, fewer greenfield sites need to be identified because more new development is being accommodated on previously developed sites within the built up areas.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the principle of off-setting the baseline surplus against the reserve requirement in paragraph 2.4.99 of his Report.</p>
B3A/Mod2	Support	13c	Totton and Eling Town Council	Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.	Support noted
B3A/Mod2	Object	32b	Persimmon Homes	NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 32a.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.</p>	
B3A/Mod2	Object	48c	Bellway Homes	<p>Principle of identifying reserve provision is supported, but reference to residual requirement in misleading. Structure Plan requires reserve provision for 500 dwellings and sites should be identified accordingly - not appropriate to discount this requirement. Misleading to assume that future provision from existing commitments, sites identified in Urban Capacity Study and windfall developments can be discounted against reserve provision. This was not discussed adequately at the inquiry since only a small 'surplus' was identified at that time, but the revised figures have increased this significantly. The proposed modifications are contrary to Policy H4 of the Structure Plan and national guidance and will prejudice the Plan Monitor and Manage approach advocated in PPG3. Assumption that previous windfall rates will continue is not appropriate and should not lead to discounting of reserve provision. What is more important is monitoring of rates of development and retention of a reserve sites to address any shortfall. Discounting approach will prejudice ability of District Council to respond to any reduction in completion rates. Inspector's recommendations should be accepted, and site at</p>	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 48b.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				Polebarn Farm Fordingbridge should be identified as a reserve site.	
B3A/Mod3	Support	13d	Totton and Eling Town Council	Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.	Support noted
B3A.Mod3	Object	32c	Persimmon Homes	NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 32a.
B3A/Mod3	Object	48d	Bellway Homes	Object to inclusion of Crow Lane site in Table 2 and Policy H-1A. There are substantial highway safety concerns with this site. Polebarn Farm would be a	No change. Taking account of the updated assessment of land supply, not all of the sites recommended by the Inspector to

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				more acceptable site - the Inspector acknowledged its sustainability attributes, and it would have no adverse impact on highway safety. Inspector also stated that Fordingbridge is a sustainable location for new residential development.	meet the reserve provision are required. The identified reserve site at Crow Lane, Ringwood satisfies the additional reserve requirement. At paragraph 2.4.105 of his Report the Inspector states that site c) (Polebarn Farm, Fordingbridge) should be identified as a reserve site in addition to Crow Lane, Ringwood "if required". He goes on to state that "It is for the local planning authority to choose which alternative to adopt." Polebarn Farm is not required to meet the reserve requirement.
B3A/Mod4	Support	13e	Totton and Eling Town Council	Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.	Support noted
B3A/Mod4	Support	50a	Mr J Bayliss	Support	Support noted
B3A/Mod4	Object	22b	Cancer Research UK/Hants. Assn. for Care of Blind	Object to the use of a different base date for housing land supply assessment. Data is untested. Object to reduced requirement to identify reserve sites for housing. Inspector's intention was that Loperwood sites should be released before land at Crow Lane. The Council should follow the Inspector's recommendations regarding housing land requirements.	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 22a.
B3A/Mod4	Object	32d	Persimmon Homes	NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 32a.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.</p>	
B3A/Mod4	Object	55a	A D Carr	<p>Object to identification of land west of Crow Lane as a reserve site. Development of this land for housing would place unacceptable pressures on the infrastructure of Ringwood including its schools, and on roads, particularly Christchurch Road and Crow Lane.</p>	<p>No change. The identified reserve site at Crow Lane is identified for possible future housing and employment needs. If the site is needed to be released then the developer will be required to provide for necessary infrastructure improvements to serve the development.</p> <p>The pressures on the infrastructure of Ringwood were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry.</p>
B3A/Mod4	Object	57b	New Forest Association	<p>Object to identification of a reserve site west of Crow Lane, Ringwood - will result in more over-provision.</p>	<p>No change. The Council has identified sites sufficient to meet the reserve requirement for the District.</p> <p>The requirement of Structure Plan policy H4 is to identify sites for 500 dwellings. However there is an assessed surplus</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					over the baseline requirement which the Council is able to off-set against the reserve requirement. New sites are identified to accommodate around 270 dwellings. In the event that the reserve sites are needed the Council will phase their release having regard to the overall land supply at that time.
B3A/Mod4	Object	58b	CPRE	Object to identification of a reserve site west of Crow Lane, Ringwood - will result in more over-provision.	<p>No change. The Council has identified sites sufficient to meet the reserve requirement for the District.</p> <p>The requirement of Structure Plan policy H4 is to identify sites for 500 dwellings. However there is an assessed surplus over the baseline requirement which the Council is able to off-set against the reserve requirement. Therefore new sites are identified to accommodate around 270 dwellings. In the event that the reserve sites are needed the Council will phase their release having regard to the overall land supply at that time.</p>
B3A/Mod4	Object	59b	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	All important major development sites should be identified - towns on the edge of the National Park are being targeted by developers. Windfall sites such as those in Avenue Road will produce large numbers of dwellings which will not provide for local affordable housing needs. Windfall sites should be identified in the local plan. Why hasn't the Webbs site been identified as it will produce more housing than Avenue Road sites etc?	<p>No change. The assessment of housing land supply includes allowances for the different forms of windfall development which are expected to contribute new dwellings over the plan period. This was debated in detail at the Inquiry and the Inspector considers what these allowances should be in his Report. The Council has followed the Inspector's recommendations, whilst up-dating the assessment to show the latest land supply monitoring data available.</p> <p>It would be unrealistic to attempt to</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					<p>identify all future windfall sites as allocations in the Plan and to restrict development to those sites.</p> <p>The Inspector considered objections seeking the allocation of the Webbs site for residential development at the Inquiry. His recommendation in section 7.3 of his Report is that no modification is made to the Plan.</p>
B3A/Mod5	Support	13f	Totton and Eling Town Council	Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.	Support noted
B3A/Mod5	Object	17a	Linden Developments Ltd	Rephrase final paragraph as follows: "Before planning permission is granted which would release a reserve site, the local planning authority will produce a Supplementary Planning Document which having regard to the overall land supply position may include guidance on phasing." (rest remains unchanged). This change is needed for clarification.	<p>No change. The Proposed Modification is sufficiently clear. Release of reserve provision will be determined by the local and strategic planning authorities in the first instance. The policy makes clear that proposals for housing development on the identified sites will not be permitted until the need to release the reserve provision is first established.</p> <p>On the question of phasing, the final paragraph of the policy reflects the likelihood that SPD will include guidance in phasing. The final sentence makes clear that it may be necessary only to release part of the identified land during the Plan period.</p>
B3A/Mod5	Object	22d	Cancer Research UK/Hants.	Object to the use of a different base date for housing	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
			Assn. for Care of Blind	land supply assessment. Data is untested. Object to reduced requirement to identify reserve sites for housing. Inspector's intention was that Loperwood sites should be released before land at Crow Lane. The Council should follow the Inspector's recommendations regarding housing land requirements.	22a.
B3A/Mod5	Object	31a	House Builders Federation	<p>Inspector accepted principle of carrying forward any surplus over baseline to count against reserve provision on the basis of a relatively small surplus (10% of reserve requirement). NFDC's revised figures suggest surplus of 70% of reserve requirement. This will inhibit operation of Plan Monitor and Manage approach, particularly if windfalls do not materialise, and is unlikely to have received the same support from the Inspector. Plan should make full provision for the reserve requirement of 500 dwellings, which will require the identification of additional reserve green field allocations.</p> <p>Also object to new final clause of Policy H-1A - it is not for the local planning authority to determine phasing of releases, as this is the role of the strategic planning authorities. This clause should be deleted.</p>	<p>No change. The principle of off-setting baseline surplus against the reserve requirement is considered in paragraph 2.4.99 of the Inspector's Report. He supports this principle and uses it in setting out his land supply assessment. He does not make his conclusions and recommendations conditional upon the baseline surplus being a particular proportion of the reserve requirement.</p> <p>The Council has accepted the Inspector's recommendations on calculating housing land supply and has applied his assessment using the most up to date monitoring data in accordance with PPG12.</p> <p>Taking account of the updated assessment of land supply, not all of the sites recommended by the Inspector to meet the reserve provision are required. The identified reserve site at Crow Lane, Ringwood satisfies the additional reserve requirement.</p> <p>On the subject of the proposed SPD and phasing, this would apply where only part of the reserve provision within the district is required to be released. Paragraph 2.20 of Supplementary Planning Guidance</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					<p>'Implementing Policy H4' provides the support for this and states that:</p> <p>'If only part of the reserve provision in a district is to be released for development, the choice of which part to release will be up to the local planning authority. ...'</p>
B3A/Mod5	Object	32e	Persimmon Homes	<p>NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.</p>	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 32a.
B3A/Mod5	Object	52a	Bovis Homes Ltd	<p>Object to principle of carrying forward surplus against baseline - contrary to principles of Plan Monitor and Manage approach and identification of 5 year supply. Council's approach will frustrate the operation of PMM and will not provide sufficient contingency provision should windfalls fail to come forward. Structure Plan reserve requirement should be addressed in full in</p>	<p>No change. The principle of off-setting baseline surplus against the reserve requirement is considered in paragraph 2.4.99 of the Inspector's Report. He supports this principle and uses it in setting out his land supply assessment.</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>Policy H-1A, and land north of Totton should be included as recommended by the Inspector.</p> <p>Also object to last clause of Policy H-1A - the strategic planning authorities determine whether reserve provision should be released, and local planning authority cannot introduce further phasing requirements</p>	<p>The Council has accepted the Inspector's recommendations on calculating housing land supply and has applied his assessment using the most up to date monitoring data in accordance with PPG12.</p> <p>On the subject of the proposed SPD and phasing, this would apply where only part of the reserve provision within the district is required to be released. Paragraph 2.20 of Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Implementing Policy H4' provides the support for this and states that:</p> <p>'If only part of the reserve provision in a district is to be released for development, the choice of which part to release will be up to the local planning authority. ...'</p>
B3A/Mod6	Support	13g	Totton and Eling Town Council	<p>Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.</p>	Support noted
B3A/Mod6	Object	32f	Persimmon Homes	<p>NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton</p>	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 32a.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.</p>	
B3A/Mod7	Support	13h	Totton and Eling Town Council	<p>Supports the exclusion of Land north of Totton, Loperwood Farm, land at Loperwood Lane, and northern part of Little Testwood Farm from reserve provision. Also supports the need for a more equitable distribution of housing allocations between the western and eastern parts of the District to ensure that both market and affordable housing needs can be met in locations where the need occurs.</p>	Support noted
B3A/Mod7	Object	30j	Government Office for the South East	<p>Not clear if requirement to identify sites on the proposals map has been complied with. (PPG3 paragraph 34). PPG3 states that sufficient sites should be shown to accommodate at least the first 5 years of housing development proposed in the plan. Site allocations should be reviewed and updated as the plan is reviewed and rolled forward.</p>	<p>No change. This matter was considered at the Inquiry and the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations are set out in paragraphs 2.4.114 to 2.4.119 of his Report. The Council has followed his recommendations.</p> <p>Following the Inspector's methodology and using the latest available monitoring data at the time of the Proposed Modifications, the Plan identifies 5.94 years supply on committed and identified sites from the anticipated date of adoption, whilst having full regard to need to develop brownfield sites before greenfield sites. Proposed Modification</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					<p>B3A/Mod7 provides for a new paragraph B3.10B which sets out the position.</p> <p>Not all committed sites are identified on the Proposals Map because some have come forward as windfall sites. However, all sites are identified in Appendix G5 of the Plan together with their remaining capacities (Proposed Mods: G5/Mod1) They are also published in Hampshire County Council's monitoring publication 'Housing Land Supply in Hampshire' 2004, which also sets out the anticipated annual completions on each site.</p>
B3A/Mod7	Object	31b	House Builders Federation	<p>Object to new paragraph B3.10B. PPG3 requires that the identification on the proposals map of at least 5 years worth of development. Identification of sites on the proposals map is key to Plan Monitor and Manage approach, and intended to safeguard against unrealistic windfall allowances. Committed sites with planning permission cannot be counted towards 5 year supply as they cannot perform a contingency or PMM function. NFDC can only demonstrate a 5 year supply by including existing commitments, some of which are not shown on the proposals map. Plan should set out clearly what the 5 year requirement is, how it has been calculated and how it will be met. This will mean identifying additional greenfield reserve sites.</p>	<p>No change. This matter was considered at the Inquiry and the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations are set out in paragraphs 2.4.114 to 2.4.119 of his Report. The Council has followed his recommendations.</p> <p>Following the Inspector's methodology and using the latest available monitoring data at the time of the Proposed Modifications, the Plan identifies 5.94 years supply on committed and identified sites from the anticipated date of adoption, whilst having full regard to need to develop brownfield sites before greenfield sites. Proposed Modification B3A/Mod7 provides for a new paragraph B3.10B which sets out the position.</p> <p>Not all committed sites are identified on the Proposals Map because some have come forward as windfall sites. However, all sites are identified in Appendix G5 of the Plan together with their remaining</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					capacities (Proposed Mods: G5/Mod1) They are also published in Hampshire County Council's monitoring publication 'Housing Land Supply in Hampshire' 2004, which also sets out the anticipated annual completions on each site.
B3A/Mod7	Object	32g	Persimmon Homes	NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.	See response to B3A/Mod1 representation 32a.
B3A/Mod7	Object	52b	Bovis Homes Ltd	Reference to PPG3 requirement in respect of 5 year housing land supply should be corrected; the PPG requires the identification of the sites on the proposals map. Plan does not deal adequately with Plan Monitor and Manage and identification of sites on the proposals map. Additional reserve greenfield sites should be identified, including land north of Totton as recommended by the Inspector.	No change. This matter was considered at the Inquiry and the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations are set out in paragraphs 2.4.114 to 2.4.119 of his Report. The Council has followed his recommendations. Following the Inspector's methodology

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					<p>and using the latest available monitoring data at the time of the Proposed Modifications, the Plan identifies 5.94 years supply on committed and identified sites from the anticipated date of adoption, whilst having full regard to need to develop brownfield sites before greenfield sites. Proposed Modification B3A/Mod7 provides for a new paragraph B3.10B which sets out the position.</p> <p>Not all committed sites are identified on the Proposals Map because some have come forward as windfall sites. However, all sites are identified in Appendix G5 of the Plan together with their remaining capacities (Proposed Mods: G5/Mod1) They are also published in Hampshire County Council's monitoring publication 'Housing Land Supply in Hampshire' 2004, which also sets out the anticipated annual completions on each site.</p>
B4A/Mod1	Support	35b	Countryside Agency	Support clarification of the definition of 'affordable housing'.	Support noted
B4A/Mod3	Support	13i	Totton and Eling Town Council	Agree	Support noted
B4A/Mod3	Object	17b	Linden Developments Ltd	Council's target, in Policy AH-1, should be to negotiate 'up to' 35% affordable dwellings.	No change. This matter has already been considered by the Local Plan Inspector (para. 2.5.34 of his report) who recommended against the wording suggested by this objector.
B4A/Mod3	Object	24a	New Milton Town Council	Object to requirement for affordable dwellings from sites of 0.5ha or 15 or more dwellings - this does not provide sufficient affordable dwellings. Requirement should be for any site of 5 dwellings or more to include	No change. This matter has already been considered by the Local Plan Inspector. See section 2.5 of his report and in particular paras. 2.5.30- 2.5.32.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				affordable housing, minimum 2 in number or 35% of the overall number of dwellings, whichever is the greater. Policies AH-1 and AH-2 could them be combined, which would simplify the guidelines.	
B4A/Mod3	Object	59c	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Finance (developers' contributions) should not be an alternative to building affordable housing.	No change. The matter was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Inspector's recommendation has been followed. Policy AH-1 makes it clear that a financial contribution will only be sought as a last resort.
B4A/Mod4	Support	13j	Totton and Eling Town Council	Agree	Support noted
B4A/Mod4	Support	49a	Bransgore Parish Council	Support inclusion of Bransgore in Policy AH-2	Support noted
B4A/Mod4	Support	51a	Mrs S Owen	Support inclusion of Bransgore in Policy AH-2, although this still will not meet Bransgore's affordable housing needs.	Support noted
B4A/Mod4	Object	61a	Milford-on-Sea Parish Council	Milford-on-Sea has a strong case for being considered a rural settlement for the purposes of affordable housing, like Bransgore, and should be included in Policy AH-2. It is unlikely that sites of 0.5ha or for 15 or more dwellings will come forward in Milford. Population of Bransgore is only 388 less than Milford. Part of Milford Parish is in the National Park, and Milford-on-Sea is included in the latest Rural Housing Strategy. Most likely providers of affordable housing in Milford will be developers, and for this to be effective site threshold must be lowered.	No change. The Inspector did not recommend Policy AH-2 should apply to settlements of over 3000 population. The Council has not accepted the Inspector's recommendation in relation to Bransgore for the reasons set out in the 'Statement of New Forest District Council's Response to the Local Plan Inspector's Recommendations'. A very low site threshold was already established for Bransgore in the adopted Local Plan (1999) because of its former status as a 'defined New Forest village'. Milford -on-Sea is not as constrained by the National Park as Bransgore .
B4A/Mod7	Support	35d	Countryside Agency	Support recognition at paragraph B4.17A that whilst	Support noted

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				target is 35%, schemes that propose higher provision will be welcomed.	
B4A/Mod8	Support	35c	Countryside Agency	Support paragraph B4.18A which notes that 35% is a realistic target but recognises that level of need would justify a higher target.	Support noted
B5/Mod2	Support	17c	Linden Developments Ltd	Support inclusion of 3ha reserve employment site at Crow Lane.	Support noted
B5/Mod2	Object	16b	R.A.Frampton	Object to inclusion of reserve employment land at Ringwood. The site is surrounded by unsuitable roads. Existing traffic problems - town centre already gridlocked for hours.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry.
B5/Mod3	Support	29a	Lymington Precision Engineers & Co	Welcome intention to undertake an urgent review of employment land and supply, as consider that an inadequate range and choice of employment sites has been provided in the District as a whole and in identified sub-areas. Wish to participate in the study.	Support noted
B5/Mod3	Support	62a	New Forest Business Partnership	Welcome proposed review of employment land requirements as consider that insufficient employment sites have been identified to serve future economic needs of the District.	Support noted
B5/Mod4	Support	35e	Countryside Agency	Welcome clarification that port development may be permitted at Dibden Bay provided that it complies with Structure Plan Policy E6.	Support noted
B5/Mod4	Support	38c	Associated British Ports	Support modification to paragraph B5.11 which correctly reflects the Inspector's recommendation with regard to port development at Dibden Bay. Note link between this and intention to carry out a review of employment land.	Support noted
B5/Mod4	Object	60b	English Nature	Object to reference to port development at Dibden Bay (see also objection to C13/Mod4, new Policy DW-	No change. The Council does not have grounds for going against the Inspector's

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				C2A).	recommendation to include this policy, which in any case only refers to other policies that already exist in the Structure Plan and Local Plan. The Inspector was aware of the designations relating to Dibden Bay, and of the decision on ABP's applications when making his recommendation to include this policy.
C1/Mod2	Support	35f	Countryside Agency	Support encouragement for developers to provide 'lifetime homes'.	Support noted
C1/Mod2	Object	24b	New Milton Town Council	Need to clarify the meaning of the phrase 'lifetime homes' in paragraph C1.1D	<p>No change. The Inspector's recommendation has been followed.</p> <p>The following information may be of help to this objector: Lifetime Homes standards are a recognised model for the design of accessible housing. They are designed to achieve accessible and convenient housing particularly in relation to the needs of disabled people and those with restricted mobility, but also for other users. They incorporate design features or standards that add to the convenience of a home and provide for easy adaptation to meet the changing needs which might occur throughout a family's life cycle. The criteria are similar to, but go somewhat beyond the requirements of Building Regulations Part M. Lifetime Homes do not however incorporate the additional space requirements necessary for occupation by wheelchair users. Wheelchair housing therefore requires additional specific design features and space requirements to accommodate the living needs of wheelchair users. In the</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					social sector, many properties are already built to this standard or close to it.
C1/Mod3	Support	42a	Future Energy Solutions	Welcome proposed modification to paragraph C1.4	Support noted
C3/Mod1	Object	35g	Countryside Agency	Broadly support paragraph C3.1 but suggest re-wording to include a reference to permitting agricultural development that is 'in keeping with local landscape character'.	No change. Protection of landscape character is achieved by other policies, e.g. DW-E30, Section C3, NF-E1, Section D1, NF-E4, Section D2 and CO-E1, Section E1.
C3/Mod2	Object	59d	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Policy DW-E26 is vague - it could present a threat to conserving the Green Belt and lead to misinterpretations.	No change. Policy DW-E26 amended as per Inspector's recommendation, and is clearer in its references to development that is inappropriate in the Green Belt.
C3/Mod4	Support	35h	Countryside Agency	Support retention of Marchwood-Hythe Strategic Gap; would not wish to see any development in this area that would impact significantly on its landscape character.	Support noted
C3/Mod4	Object	38d	Associated British Ports	In paragraph C3.9, revert to original plan text which described Dibden Bay as flat and featureless - no reason is given for this modification. Change 8th sentence to accord with Inspector's wording to state '...provided that the need for the development is shown to outweigh...' - should reflect Structure Plan Policy EC6 accurately, not re-write it. Rephrase last sentence in accordance with Inspector's recommendation, omitting, '...but the amount of land taken for development should be minimised to retain as much of the Strategic Gap as possible.' - this is a significant departure from the Inspector's recommendation, and introduces a limitation on the location and scale of port development contrary to the Inspector's recommendations and the Structure Plan Review. It is also inconsistent with C13/Mod4.	No change. Wording regarding visual characteristics of Dibden Bay has been updated to reflect New Forest District Landscape Character Assessment adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Final sentence of paragraph reflects general purpose of including land in Strategic Gaps.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
C3/Mod4	Object	44a	Mr Martin Hart	Object to reference to possibility of port proposals - this does not follow the findings of the public inquiry	No change. The Council does not have grounds for going against the Inspector's recommendation to include this policy, which in any case only refers to other policies that already exist in the Structure Plan and Local Plan. The Inspector was aware of the designations relating to Dibden Bay, and of the decision on ABP's applications when making his recommendation to include this policy.
C3/Mod4	Object	60c	English Nature	Object to reference to port development at Dibden Bay (see also objection to C13/Mod4, new Policy DW-C2A). Support reference to Dibden Bay SSSI.	No change. The Council does not have grounds for going against the Inspector's recommendation to include this policy, which in any case only refers to other policies that already exist in the Structure Plan and Local Plan. The Inspector was aware of the designations relating to Dibden Bay, and of the decision on ABP's applications when making his recommendation to include this policy.
C3/Mod5	Support	35i	Countryside Agency	Welcome updating of paragraph C3.12 to take into account New Forest National Park and revocation of South Hampshire Coast AONB	Support noted
C4A/Mod1	Support	35j	Countryside Agency	Support strengthened approach to nature conservation	Support noted
C4A/Mod2	Support	35k	Countryside Agency	Support strengthened approach to nature conservation	Support noted
C4A/Mod3	Support	35l	Countryside Agency	Support strengthened approach to nature conservation	Support noted
C5/Mod1	Support	35m	Countryside Agency	Welcome proposed modification to Policy DW-E33 as this updates it in accordance with PPS7.	Support noted
C7/Mod1	Support	25a	Southern Water	Support the proposed modifications to paragraph C7.6 which recognises the need for the local authority to seek advice on sustainable drainage techniques.	Support noted

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
C7/Mod1	Support	47a	Wessex Water	Support principles outlined in paragraph C7.6A regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems. Maintenance issue is very important and long term arrangements need to be secured through planning obligations that attach to the land.	Support noted
C9A/Mod2	Object	38e	Associated British Ports	Modification to paragraph C9.24A and new paragraph C9.24B do not reflect Inspector's recommendation. Re-instate last sentence of C9.24A, and add new paragraph stating that preparation of strategy would be premature until such time as a decision is made on the necessary A326/A336 junction improvements required to serve any future port proposals at Dibden Bay, and clarifying the position with regard to land no longer required for highway improvements in the plan period (the fact that land is not required for highway improvements does not justify its release for development - see PPG12/PPS12). Text of paragraph C9.24B is not clear.	<p>No change. The Inspector's recommendations here are in some tension with (a) his own preceding reasoning and (b) government policy and guidance. The Council has had therefore to exercise its discretion rather than follow his recommendations slavishly.</p> <p>First, in paragraph 3.23.5 of his report the Inspector says that a review of the performance of the A326 Totton Western Bypass should not be held up pending possible further port development proposals under Structure Plan Policy EC6: but his recommendation appears to say the opposite. The Council considers that the former is the more reasonable view.</p> <p>Second, in the same paragraph the Inspector seeks a mechanism for the release of the safeguarded land should the local highway authority conclude that it is no longer required, and his suggested additional wording for paragraph C9.24A of the Plan reflects this. But such a mechanism already exists as set out in PPG12 paragraph 6.26 and PPS12 paragraph 2.33, and in the spirit of PPS12 paragraph 2.31 the reasoned justification of which paragraph C9.24A of the Plan forms a part should not seek to recreate that mechanism but should</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
C9A/Mod2	Object	46a	George Wimpey UK Ltd	<p>Proposed new paragraph C9.24B fails sufficiently to reflect the Inspector's intentions / recommendations. Reference to Dibden Bay is disingenuous in the light of the Secretary of State's decision on the port proposals - a development on this scale cannot now be anticipated. Proposed modification gives no impetus to HCC to review the highway strategy in this area. Inspector's wording regarding land no longer required for highway improvements should be used - see his paragraphs 3/23.3 and 3.23.5. Need to get on with review and release all land unnecessarily blighted by the inappropriate highway reservation, as per advice in PPG12/ PPS12.</p>	<p>simply refer to it.</p> <p>No change. The Inspector's recommendations here are in some tension with (a) his own preceding reasoning and (b) government policy and guidance. The Council has had therefore to exercise its discretion rather than follow his recommendations slavishly.</p> <p>First, in paragraph 3.23.5 of his report the Inspector says that a review of the performance of the A326 Totton Western Bypass should not be held up pending possible further port development proposals under Structure Plan Policy EC6: but his recommendation appears to say the opposite. The Council considers that the former is the more reasonable view.</p> <p>Second, in the same paragraph the Inspector seeks a mechanism for the release of the safeguarded land should the local highway authority conclude that it is no longer required, and his suggested additional wording for paragraph C9.24A of the Plan reflects this. But such a mechanism already exists as set out in PPG12 paragraph 6.26 and PPS12 paragraph 2.33, and in the spirit of PPS12 paragraph 2.31 the reasoned justification of which paragraph C9.24A of the Plan forms a part should not seek to recreate that mechanism but should simply refer to it.</p> <p>Finally, Objection 46a suggests that the proposed new paragraph C9.24B should</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					not refer to Dibden Bay: yet the Council is in fact following the Inspector's lead in doing just that.
C9A/Mod4	Support	35n	Countryside Agency	Support new policy DW-T5A Freight sites and routes as this seeks to promote more sustainable freight options. Policy could be strengthened by ensuring that freight development does not have a significant impact on the National Park by increasing traffic in the Park.	Support noted
C9A/Mod4	Support	62b	New Forest Business Partnership	Note Inspector's recommendation regarding identification of freight sites and wish to know when it will be implemented.	Support noted
C9A/Mod4	Object	38f	Associated British Ports	Text should be added before Policy DW-T5A as recommended by the Inspector stating that the local planning authority will identify and where appropriate protect sites and routes both of existing and potential which could be critical in developing infrastructure for the movement of freight. Delete last sentence of C9.42B. Delete first sentence of Policy DW-T5A and replace with Inspector's recommended wording, 'Freight generating development will be located to promote opportunities for service by rails and waterways'. ABP support principle of policy but object because proposed wording dilutes Inspector's recommendation substantially. Welcome last part of policy referring to disused transport sites.	No change. The opening paragraph of the Inspector's recommended policy, based on paragraph 45 of PPG13, is worded not as a local plan policy but as a statement of policymaking intent. Its proper place is in the reasoned justification of policy rather than in the policy itself. Moreover, the Inspector does not recommend that the sites and routes in question actually be identified in the Plan now: indeed this would be likely to delay the adoption of the First Alteration as a whole. The Council has therefore taken the Inspector's recommendation as identifying a matter realistically to be addressed in the next round of policymaking. In the meantime, the proposed Policy DW-T5A sets out a practical way of dealing with individual development proposals which reflects the Inspector's concerns, and the text which follows explains how the Council will further develop the policy in the future, in accordance with those concerns and following adoption of the

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					First Alteration. In the Council's view the wording of the second sentence in the proposed Policy DW-T5A is clearer than that recommended by the Inspector but achieves the same effect.
C11/Mod1	Support	47b	Wessex Water	Support deletion of second sentence from paragraph C11.6, as adequacy of infrastructure can be a material consideration in determining planning applications.	Support noted
C11/Mod1	Object	47c	Wessex Water	In new paragraph C11.7A, the reference to water treatment should read waste water treatment.	No change. The phrase water treatment infrastructure encompasses any form of water treatment including waste water.
C11/Mod1	Support	25b	Southern Water	Support amendments to paragraph C11.6 and addition of new paragraph C11.7 and Policy DW-P1A, which recognise the need for the local planning authority to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure and the need for additional water and sewerage infrastructure.	Support noted
C11/Mod3	Support	42b	Future Energy Solutions	Welcome proposed modification to paragraph C11.15(iv)	Support noted
C11/Mod4	Support	42c	Future Energy Solutions	Welcome proposed modifications to paragraphs C11.19 - C11.22A, but suggest updating first sentence of paragraph C11.20A.	Support noted
C11/Mod4	Object	59e	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Do not support inefficient on-shore wind farms which destroy the environment/ bird life	No change. The plan does not propose on-shore wind farms - it notes that potential for their development is limited in this District because of environmental impact and insufficient wind speeds.
C11/Mod4	Object	35o	Countryside Agency	Paragraph C11.21 should place more emphasis on protection of the landscape when assessing proposals	Misquote from PPS22 will be corrected through editing.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				for renewable energy in the National Park, the AONB, SSSIs and the Green Belt. Text should also refer to nationally important sites as well as internationally important designations - see PPS22 paragraph 11..	
C13/Mod2	Object	38g	Associated British Ports	Reference to New Forest National Park extending to old shoreline at Dibden Bay has no relevance as the land between this and to coast is reclaimed. Reference to Dibden Bay is uncalled for - boundary of National Park is no closer to the shore here than in other places. State that New Forest comes to the shore at Calshot and Fawley Power Station.	No change. Paragraph is factually correct.
C13/Mod4	Support	38h	Associated British Ports	Support proposed new policy for Dibden Bay and accompanying diagrammatic map notation. Reference to container port in paragraph C13.15A should be changed to deep sea terminal.	Support noted
C13/Mod4	Object	53a	RSPB	Object to inclusion of a new policy and text relating to port development at Dibden Bay. Secretary of State's decision to refuse recent proposals for a deepwater container port at this site was clear. There are other credible alternatives that will meet national container port needs up to at least 2015 (London Gateway and Felixstowe South). Any previous provision for the port at Dibden Bay in the Structure Plan rEview and the Hampshire, Portsmouth & Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan have been overtaken by events. There is therefore no longer any justification for including a policy for the port. Furthermore, Dibden Bay has now been designated a SSSI, and is under consideration for inclusion in the Solent & Southampton Water Special Protection Area. Policies likely to damage an SPA in local plans should be subject to Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations.	No change. The Council does not have grounds for going against the Inspector's recommendation to include this policy, which in any case only refers to other policies that already exist in the Structure Plan and Local Plan. The Inspector was aware of the designations relating to Dibden Bay, and of the decision on ABP's applications when making his recommendation to include this policy.
C13/Mod4	Support	35p	Countryside Agency	Welcome clarification of Dibden Bay proposals and reasons for showing the site diagrammatically on the	Support noted

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				proposals map.	
C13/Mod4	Object	60a	English Nature	Object to inclusion of new paragraph C13.15B and new Policy DW-C2A for Dibden Bay. Position relating to development of this site has altered significantly since the adoption of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review. Secretary of State has concluded that a port cannot be developed that complies with the various tests for nature conservation in that location. It is therefore inappropriate to raise expectations that a port development may be permitted at Dibden Bay; in the light of the Secretary of State's decision, it is a retrograde step to introduce this policy. Dibden Bay is an important area for nature conservation. Since completion of the Structure Plan Review it has been designated an SSSI, and is therefore protected from inappropriate development. The new policy does not reflect this situation.	No change. The Council does not have grounds for going against the Inspector's recommendation to include this policy, which in any case only refers to other policies that already exist in the Structure Plan and Local Plan. The Inspector was aware of the designations relating to Dibden Bay, and of the decision on ABP's applications when making his recommendation to include this policy.
C13/Mod5	Support	35q	Countryside Agency	Support proposed modification to Policy DW-C7 which encourages development proposals to make provision for public access along the coast.	Support noted
D1/Mod1	Support	35r	Countryside Agency	Support updated references to the New Forest National Park and the National Park Authority.	Support noted
D1/Mod1	Object	38i	Associated British Ports	Delete paragraph D1.5A - appears that Council intends to continue to apply New Forest Heritage Area designation to areas outside the National Park. Wrong to state that areas outside the National Park have any relationship to it in terms of landscape or grazing land - if this were so they would be in the National Park. Paragraph D1.5B is sufficient to make the only point that needs to be made.	No change. Paragraph D1.2 states that the boundary of the National Park replaces the New Forest Heritage Area boundary, and this is reflected in Proposed Modification Allmaps/Mod4. Paragraph D1.5A is factually correct.
D1/Mod7	Support	35s	Countryside Agency	Support Policy NF-E3 Loss of grazing land and its related text	Support noted

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
D1/Mod7	Support	57d	New Forest Association	NFA note NFDC's response to Inspector's recommendations in respect of back-up grazing land, and will seek to map out areas meeting criteria in paragraph D1.22.	Support noted
D1/Mod7	Support	58d	CPRE	CPRE note NFDC's response to Inspector's recommendations in respect of back-up grazing land, and will seek to map out areas meeting criteria in paragraph D1.22.	Support noted
D1/Mod7	Object	34a	Marc Paronio	<p>Definition of 'potential' for back-up grazing should be modified to reflect Inspector's recommendations and address issues including identified local need, the quality of the land, history of previous use and the prospect of the land being available for back-up grazing purposes. Regard should also be had to land formerly in the New Forest Heritage Area but excluded from the National Park - the grazing criterion was given equal weight in defining the National Park boundary. The Council's modified definition will blight land that will never be used in connection with the Forest, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in terms of proximity to the New Forest, it is surely the location of the commoner that is important - land with common rights of pasture is very widespread, including land in built-up areas - it is the exercise of the rights that is important - definition of land 'with potential' for grazing is too wide - should only include land that has recently been used 	No change. Definition of land with potential for back-up grazing is considered appropriate. Policy only applies to land within the National Park boundary.
D1/Mod7	Object	38j	Associated British Ports	Delete proposed penultimate sentence of paragraph D1.22 and the three bullet points and replace with alternative criteria which refer to identified need for back-up grazing, proximity to the New Forest and quality, and likelihood of use for this purpose. Criteria proposed in modification are too wide and effectively cover all open land around the New Forest. Nor do they address issues raised by Inspector.	No change. Definition of land with potential for back-up grazing is considered appropriate. Policy only applies to land within the National Park boundary.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
D4/Mod2	Support	35t	Countryside Agency	Support modifications to Policy NF-B2 as this provides for new buildings for business purposes either to replace existing buildings or to accommodate enterprises which support farming.	Support noted
D4/Mod2	Object	39a	Beaulieu Estate	Delete from Policy NF-B2 'as part of farm diversification projects...which support the farming business' and add to end of policy that farm diversification projects which support the farming business will be permitted in new, replacement or existing buildings. Amended text does not achieve purpose of Inspector's recommendations and limits the replacement of buildings more strictly than PPS7. PPS7 enables replacement of buildings for economic development purposes and does not tie this to farm diversification. Inspector's own proposed modifications are not in line with his stated objectives.	No change. Policy has been amended in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation.
D4/Mod2	Object	40a	Exbury Gardens	Delete from Policy NF-B2 'as part of farm diversification projects...which support the farming business' and add to end of policy that farm diversification projects which support the farming business will be permitted in new, replacement or existing buildings. Amended text does not achieve purpose of Inspector's recommendations and limits the replacement of buildings more strictly than PPS7. PPS7 enables replacement of buildings for economic development purposes and does not tie this to farm diversification. Inspector's own proposed modifications are not in line with his stated objectives.	No change. Policy has been amended in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation.
D5/Mod2	Support	35u	Countryside Agency	Welcome new Policy NF-TM11 which permits conversion of farm buildings to tourist accommodation; support notion that this should support agricultural enterprise; welcome diversification of local economy in the District.	Support noted
D6/Mod2	Support	35v	Countryside Agency	Welcome inclusion in the policy of small scale farm	Support noted

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				shops as part of farm diversification projects, and criterion (iii) which clarifies the type of development that might be acceptable.	
E11/Mod3	Support	5a	Brena L. Williamson	Pleased proposals for housing at Calshot are not going ahead. Suggest the site is used for a Youth Hostel, gardens, car parks etc. It would provide employment for local people.	Support noted
E11/Mod2	Support	12a	Rev. Mrs. Stephne Van Der Toorn	Support deletion of proposals for residential development at Calshot because of the inadequate community facilities there.	Support noted
E11/Mod2	Support	35w	Countryside Agency	Support deletion of proposed Calshot Regeneration Area.	Support noted
F1/Mod3	Support	35x	Countryside Agency	Support new Policy BU-1 and identification of a sequential approach to considering proposals for retail and other development proposals, which accords with national government policy and the principle of sustainable development.	Support noted
F1/Mod3	Object	30a	Government Office for the South East	<p>New policy does not fully reflect PPS6 (published 21 March 2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should specify development to which it applies as per PPS6 (retail, leisure, offices, arts, culture & tourism); - Reference to 'need' in BU-1 does not reflect requirements of PPS6 in respect of assessing need, scale of development and sequential test; - References to out of centre sites should include reference to linkages with centre - Text should include distance thresholds as set out in PPS6 Table 2 Annex A - Policy should clarify that applicants only have to demonstrate need if their proposed town centre uses are in out of centre locations and not in accordance with the development plan - BU-1 references to existing development and 	<p>No change. The Modifications proposed by the Council to town centre policies follow and were based on the Local Plan Inspector's recommendations and the Government Guidance current at the time they were drafted (including the consultative draft of emerging PPS6).</p> <p>GOSE's comments have been considered in detail and the question asked – would the detailed changes to the policy suggested by GOSE result in a material change to development control decisions relating to these policies? It is concluded that revisions to the policy to address GOSE's comments are unlikely to have a material impact on decision making. This</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>buildings do not accord with PPS6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be an indicative upper limit for the scale of development at different centre types - Policy and text should have regard to Circular 3/2005 Changes of Use of Buildings and Land 	<p>is concluded because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a.) the policies as drafted are broadly in line with the Government policy for town centres as now stated in PPS6; b.) PPS6 will in any event be a material consideration when considering planning applications in town centres (Para.3.2 of PPS6); and c.) the need to follow Government Guidance on the assessment of need is specifically recognised in both Policy BU-1 (last sentence) and supporting paragraph F1.8. <p>It is noted that in GOSE's covering letter it is stated that "these objections are made not because the Secretary of State necessarily opposes the objective of the policy, but because of the way in which the policy is expressed".</p> <p>The Council's view is that at this very late stage in the process, addressing such points of detail would not justify delaying adoption of the First Alterations. Para.6.32 of PPG12 states:</p> <p>"However, where the plan is very close to adoption when new information becomes available, it may be preferable to adopt the plan and then start an early review of the plan. In general, close to adoption in these circumstances will be where any modifications process has already been completed, and/or where no further modifications to the plan are expected to be made."</p> <p>Although the Local Plan Inspector concluded that the town centre policies to be "to some extent dated". He concluded</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					<p>(para.6.1.1) "I do not consider that they are so out-of-date that they make wholesale amendment of the First Alterations necessary before it can be adopted."</p> <p>The Council recognise that the review of current town centre policies and the updating of town centres strategies will be a key area of work for the Local Development Framework. This has been reflected in the Local Development Scheme for 2005.</p>
F2A/Mod1	Object	30b	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-TC1 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.</p>
F2A/Mod2	Object	30c	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-TC2 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.
F2A/Mod3	Object	30d	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-TC3 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.</p>
F2A/Mod4	Object	30e	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-TC4 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
F4A/Mod3	Object	30f	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-CE7 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.</p>
F5A/Mod1	Support	21a	L.T.Gardner	Policy BU-LC3 should apply to partially completed residential developments. Residential status of Dreamland site should be protected.	Support noted
F5A/Mod1	Support	63a	Mr J E Holt	Policy BU-LC1,3,5,& 6 - apply to all partially completed residential developments - support safeguarding of residential amenities.	Support noted
F5A/Mod1	Object	30g	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-LC3 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
F5A/Mod2	Support	21b	L.T.Gardner	Policy BU-LC5 should apply to partially completed residential developments. Residential status of Dreamland site should be protected.	Support noted
F5A/Mod2	Support	63b	Mr J E Holt	Policy BU-LC1,3,5,& 6 - apply to all partially completed residential developments.	Support noted
F5A/Mod2	Object	30h	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-LC5 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p> <p>These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.</p>
F5A/Mod3	Support	21c	L.T.Gardner	Policy BU-LC6 should apply to partially completed residential developments. Residential status of Dreamland site should be protected.	Support noted
F22/Mod3	Support	63c	Mr J E Holt	Policy BU-LC1,3,5,& 6 - apply to all partially completed residential developments.	Support noted
F5A/Mod3	Object	30i	Government Office for the South East	Not clear why policy BU-LC6 has been retained given the introduction of Policy BU-1. PPG12 advises against over-elaborate plan-making.	<p>No change. The Council has followed the recommendation of the Inspector. He did not recommend that any of the policies referred to should be removed from the plan following the addition of the new policy he recommended (Policy BU-1) in section F1.</p>

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					These policies all give clear guidance on how the Council will make development control decisions. Relying on policy BU-1 alone would give rise to a great degree of uncertainty and in the Council's view, would fall short of the expectations of para. 3.1 of PPG12.
F14/Mod2	Support	43a	Sandleheath Parish Council	Support reduction in impact of traffic in High Street, Fordingbridge. Note that to prevent any further deterioration in conditions for pedestrians there should be no further expansion of industry / development in the villages west of Fordingbridge.	Support noted
F20/Mod2	Object	36a	Miss Susan Wood	Object to deletion of Policy MS-1A; this will lead to: (1) development that will destroy the village characteristics of the area and create an urban area as opposed to a rural area (2) loss of the amenities of large family houses in gardens which are an essential part of the area adjoining the village (3) increased housing density which roads and other services will be unable to sustain - there is already an acute drainage problem (4) possible extension of blocks of flats into the village - these are often holiday homes that contribute nothing to the community.	No change. Policy MS-1A is contrary to national planning guidance, and the Inspector concluded that local circumstances do not provide sufficient justification to depart from this. There has been no change in local circumstances since the inquiry that would justify rejection of his recommendation. Other policies in the local plan provide a basis for controlling development that is out of character with an area, or which would overload local services. Policy DW-E8, Section C1 controls development within areas of houses with large gardens that are defined as Areas of Special Character.
F21/Mod3	Object	24c	New Milton Town Council	Wish to retain existing policy NM-13 - do not want habitable accommodation above first floor level along the cliff top.	No change. Policy as amended reflects Inspector's recommendation.
F22/Mod3	Object	2b	Miss B Moody	Object to RW-2. Do not build in the Furlong.	No change. This matter was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Modification proposed is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (para.6.49.13). This requires an

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					assessment of the need for the development on this site as part of consideration of development proposals.
F22/Mod3	Object	6b	Frank Hales	Object to development in Furlong because of loss of parking.	No change. This matter was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Modification proposed is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (para.6.49.13).
F22/Mod3	Object	10b	Mr H.E.Sharp	Object to policy RW-2 - there should be no further development in the Furlong area. Already congestion in the area and access problems.	No change. This matter was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Modification proposed is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (para.6.49.13). This requires an assessment of the need for the development on this site as part of consideration of development proposals.
F22/Mod3	Object	56a	Ringwood Town Council	No development must be considered at The Furlong (Policy RW-2) until current car parking problems are resolved.	No change. This matter was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Modification proposed is in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation (para.6.49.13). This requires an assessment of the need for the development on this site as part of consideration of development proposals.The issue of car parking is covered in criteria 'e' of the policy.
F22/Mod5	Support	9a	Dr. R. P. F. Scott	Support deletion of development proposals at Lynes Farm (RW-12A)	Support noted
F22/Mod5	Support	14a	C.A.Mathews	Good common sense.	Support noted
F22/Mod5	Support	64a	Miss F D Ivery	Support deletion of proposal	Support noted
F22/Mod5	Object	28a	Mr R G H Keen and Dr E D	Object to deletion of Lynes Farm employment	No change - These matters were

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
			Keen	reservation. Principal reason for Inspector's recommendation was a Highways Agency standard objection that was not subject to proper debate. Inspector recognised that Lynes Farm is located sustainably, that development there would not affect the National Park landscape, and that any loss of wildlife corridors could be rectified by landscaping. Land at Lynes Farm should be identified as a reserve housing and employment site, as it could provide benefits to the town including a distributor road to relieve Eastfield Lane. The South East Plan is likely to require more land to be identified for housing.	considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation. No decisions have yet been reached on District Housing requirements in the S E Plan.
F22/Mod5	Object	56b	Ringwood Town Council	Policy RW-12A (reservation of land west of Nouale Lane, south of A31) should remain in the plan. It is the ideal location for employment use as it adjoins the A31 which should enable a direct link to the site rather than increasing the volume of traffic using the already congested roads through the town.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod5	Object	62c	New Forest Business Partnership	Note with concern the proposed deletion of the employment reserve site at Lynes Farm, Ringwood.	Alternative reserve employment provision is provided by the Crow Lane site.
F22/Mod6	Support	62d	New Forest Business Partnership	Please that consideration is given to reserve site west of Crow Lane.	Support noted
F22/Mod6	Object	1a	Mr & Mrs B Knight	Object to land west of Crow Lane being identified as reserve site for housing and employment development. Delete policy RW-12B. Should not build up to the National Park boundary. Concerned about impact of development on the New Forest. This area should have been in the National Park.	No change - These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation. Ringwood is not in the National Park.
F22/Mod6	Object	2a	Miss B Moody	Delete policy RW-12B. No need for more houses. Lane is grade listed material. Not enough medical facilities.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
F22/Mod6	Object	3a	Malcolm Steeden	Delete Policy RW-12B. Land at Crow Lane should not be allocated for employment of housing development.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	4a	Mr L.L. Course	Object to RW-12B - reserve employment and housing allocation west of Crow Lane. Impact on local roads.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	6a	Frank Hales	Object to RW-12B Housing reserve.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	8a	Mr and Mrs D Wallis	Object to policy RW-12B Land west of Crow Lane. Castleman Road is already saturated with traffic. Object to development unless a new feeder road is built.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	10a	Mr H.E.Sharp	Object to Policy RW-12B development west of Crow Lane. Inadequate infrastructure - roads, drainage, schools, medical, recreation etc.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	11a	Mr A C Gulliver	Object to development until a relief road is made available to stop traffic along Hightown Road and Castleman Way.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	16c	R.A.Frampton	The housing allocation should be restricted to 5 hectares. Highways surrounding the site will not	No change - These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				support the level of traffic generated. The areas set aside for development should be the absolute minimum to meet the Inspector's recommendations.	The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation. The 7ha figure in the policy includes allowances for the distributor road, open space and landscape provision as well as for the housing needed to meet the Inspector's recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	16d	R.A.Frampton	Delete (iv) of RW-12B. Funding improvements to B3347/A31 junction will only lengthen the timescale for the urgency of the need for a distributor road to be constructed. No employment development until traffic infrastructure has been totally implemented.	No change – There is no proposal to provide the full distributor road in the foreseeable future so these junction improvements are needed. All of the traffic infrastructure requirements set out in the policy are a requirement if development is to take place.
F22/Mod6	Object	17d	Linden Developments Ltd	The principle of the policy is strongly supported, but small change sought. Amend end of second para. of policy RW-12B to read: "... Will be used up in the plan period(by 2011) or there is a further unmet need for employment land which cannot be met on the allocated sites."	No change – The policy as worded reflects the Council's intentions relating to the possible release of this land and is consistent with the wording of Policy RW-12A in the Deposited Plan which formed the basis of the Inspector's recommendation on a reserve employment site.
F22/Mod6	Object	18b	Julie Hammans	Delete reserve land for residential and employment development and distributor road at Crow Lane. Keep as greenfield site. Impact on countryside and surrounding environment. Ringwood cannot cope with more traffic.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	19b	Malcolm Hammans	Keep as greenfield site. Remove distributor road from A31 to B3347. Impact on countryside and surrounding environment. Increased traffic, noise, pollutionServices already stretched and will not cope..	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	20a	The Ringwood Society	Reserve site for employment and housing land west of Crow Lane should only be allocated when new higher	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				capacity arrangements for road traffic have been designed and agreed, and implemented before the site is developed. NFDC should not have accepted Inspector's conclusion that the existing road network can cope with the extra traffic.	Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	28c	Mr R G H Keen and Dr E D Keen	Object to reservation of land at Crow Lane for residential and employment uses. Will not provide the same community benefits as Lynes Farm could because of its restricted size. Will not provide as much of the eastern distributor road, and all its traffic will pass through the town centre.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	35y	Countryside Agency	Whilst Ringwood is not in the National Park, its sensitive location next to the New Forest means that it would be beneficial to include a reference to the design and siting of new development on land west of Crow Lane.	No change - These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation. The Crow Lane site is separated from the National Park by existing development.
F22/Mod6	Object	41a	Hampshire County Council	Object to proposed housing and employment reserve site West of Crow Lane Ringwood (Policy RW-12B) on the grounds that: - no provision has been made to assess the quality or quantity of the mineral (sand and gravel) that the site contains - there is no consideration of opportunities or options for prior extraction to avoid sterilisation of mineral resources by built development. If site is to be retained as a reserve site, policy should be amended to refer to safeguarding of mineral deposits, assessment of the quantity and quality of the reserve, and agreement with HCC about any mineral extraction. HCC does not wish to delay development of the site unnecessarily and is prepared to negotiate for only a proportion of the reserve to be extracted.	No change. Minerals issues will be addressed in a development brief (which will be a Supplementary Planning Document) in the event that the site is allocated for development. Hampshire County Council Accepts this approach.
F22/Mod6	Object	54a	Mr & Mrs A Goulton	Object to reservation of land for employment and	No change. These matters were

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				housing west of Crow Lane, and to proposed distributor road. Proposals will not ease pressure on roads such as Hightown and Parsonage Barn - these will still be the most direct routes for residents to access schools and town centre. Schools etc already at capacity and will not be able to accommodate increased numbers. Hightown Road has become a death trap following recent developments in the area.	considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F22/Mod6	Object	56c	Ringwood Town Council	Request deletion of Policy RW-12B (Land west of Crow Lane) in favour of Policy RW-12A. Insufficient attention has been paid to creating the necessary infrastructure to support the Crow Lane site, particularly in relation to traffic links. No land is reserved to enable link road to the A31 and the B3347, and the already congested roads in the town will not be able to cope with the additional proposed traffic.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
F24/Mod10	Object	7a	R J Latham	Object to deletion of Policy TE-22 Land at Loperwood Lane for public open space. Although Totton as a whole may have adequate open space, Calmore does not, particularly in view of new development to the south of Calmore Crescent. The land should be safeguarded against future housing development which would be intrusive. Important to keep this as a green area.	No change - the Inspector considered the needs for open space in the locality at Inquiry.
F24/Mod10	Object	13a	Totton and Eling Town Council	Retain policy TE-22 Public open space allocation at Loperwood Lane, Totton. It is unwise to dispense with this site, which has previously been identified and designated for open space purposes, until the district has undertaken the assessment of needs and opportunities. The Town Council believes that as a matter of principle formal open space should be located as close as possible to the people that use it. The Inspector suggesting land north of Loperwood could provide better facilities is not helpful and pre-supposes that in future this will be	No change - the Inspector was aware of the intention to undertake a full open space, sport & recreation study at the time of the Inquiry, yet still recommended deletion of this allocation.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				urban land. The Inspector's suggestion that land allocated for open space in TE-24 is more easily developed is questionable. The comments about the suitability of the land for open space are noted but these have been considered before and have not justified preventing the land being designated as open space.	
F24/Mod10	Object	15b	Mr Frank Bright	Object to deletion of allocation for public open space at Loperwood. Retain Policy TE-22. Deletion of policy would increase threat of development on this area.	No change - the Inspector's recommendation has been followed. The Inspector considered the needs for open space in the locality at Inquiry.
F24/Mod10	Object	37a	Councillor G Dart	Object to deletion of Policy TE-22, public open space allocation Loperwood Lane. It is needed to serve local development. Inspector's conclusion that there is no significant open space shortfall in Totton is not accepted. Site is not appropriate for housing in view of its proximity to the New Forest National Park. It is significant that previous local plans have always retained this land for public open space. Additionally, policies CO-E1, DW-E27 and DW-E33 combine to add weight to the case for protecting this historically important former Loperwood Manor land.	No change - the Inspector's recommendation has been followed. The Inspector considered the needs for open space in the locality at Inquiry. The modifications do not propose housing on this land.
G2/Mod1	Object	59f	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	The Webbs site is likely to be a site primarily for housing, not industry	No change. The Inspector's recommendation relating to the Webb's site has been followed.
G5/Mod1	Object	59g	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Query estimate of only 40 dwellings on Webbs site. Avenue Road housing sites should be included in the figures.	No change. The Inspector's recommendation relating to the Webb's site has been followed. The assessment is based at April 2004 which was before the approval of the Avenue Road sites, therefore they are not identified separately in Appendix G5 of the Plan. These are windfall sites for which a general allowance has been made

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
					within the assessment of housing supply.
Allmaps/Mod 1	Object	59h	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Manor Farm area was previously in the AONB that was withdrawn under the National Park designation - when will it be reconsidered for inclusion?	No change. There is no proposal to re-instate the former South Hampshire Coast AONB or to include Manor Farm in any other landscape designation. It remains in the Green Belt.
Allmaps/Mod 4	Support	38b	Associated British Ports	Support deletion of the New Forest Heritage Area. Request that boundary of National Park be drawn correctly.	Support noted
Allmaps/Mod 4	Support	57e	New Forest Association	Accept that appropriate New Forest boundary for local plan purposes is the agreed National Park boundary. Seek assurance that land which enjoyed protection prior to creation of Heritage Area and National Park boundary (i.e. Green Belt) will still be protected	Support noted
Allmaps/Mod 4	Support	58e	CPRE	Accept that appropriate New Forest boundary for local plan purposes is the agreed National Park boundary. Seek assurance that land which enjoyed protection prior to creation of Heritage Area and National Park boundary (i.e. Green Belt) will still be protected	Support noted
PMW/Mod3	Support	38	Associated British Ports	Support deletion of the New Forest Heritage Area. Request that boundary of National Park be drawn correctly.	Support noted
PM1/Mod3	Support	38k	Associated British Ports	Support deletion of the New Forest Heritage Area. Request that boundary of National Park be drawn correctly.	Support noted
PM1/Mod5	Object	15a	Mr Frank Bright	Object to deletion of allocation for public open space at Loperwood. Retain Policy TE-22. Deletion of policy would increase threat of development on this area.	No change - the Inspector considered the needs for open space in the locality at Inquiry.
PM1A/Mod3	Support	13k	Totton and Eling Town Council	Agree	Support noted

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
PM1A/Mod4	Support	13l	Totton and Eling Town Council	Agree	Support noted
PM2/Mod3	Support	38m	Associated British Ports	Support diagrammatic indication of area to which new Dibden Bay policy applies.	Support noted
PM2/Mod4	Support	38n	Associated British Ports	Support deletion of the New Forest Heritage Area. Request that boundary of National Park be drawn correctly.	Support noted
PM2A/Mod3	Support	38l	Associated British Ports	Support deletion of the New Forest Heritage Area. Request that boundary of National Park be drawn correctly.	Support noted
PM4/Mod5	Object	59i	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Efford Horticultural Research Station is not within the Lymington/ Pennington boundary.	No change - modification does not propose the inclusion of site in the built-up area boundary, site remains within the Green Belt.
PM6/Mod4	Object	28b	Mr R G H Keen and Dr E D Keen	Object to deletion of Lynes Farm employment reservation. Principal reason for Inspector's recommendation was a Highways Agency standard objection that was not subject to proper debate. Inspector recognised that Lynes Farm is located sustainably, that development there would not affect the National Park landscape, and that any loss of wildlife corridors could be rectified by landscaping. Land at Lynes Farm should be identified as a reserve housing and employment site, as it could provide benefits to the town including a distributor road to relieve Eastfield Lane. The South East Plan is likely to require more land to be identified for housing.	No change - These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation. No decisions have yet been reached on District Housing requirements in the S E Plan.
PM6/Mod5	Support	17e	Linden Developments Ltd	Strongly support reserve housing and employment land at Crow Lane.	Support noted
PM6/Mod5	Object	16e	R.A.Frampton	The housing allocation should be restricted to 5 hectares. Highways surrounding the site will not	No change - These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				support the level of traffic generated. The areas set aside for development should be the absolute minimum to meet the Inspector's recommendations.	The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation. The 7ha figure in the policy includes allowances for the distributor road, open space and landscape provision as well as for the housing needed to meet the Inspector's recommendation.
PM6/Mod5	Object	18a	Julie Hammans	Delete reserve land for residential and employment development and distributor road at Crow Lane. Keep as greenfield site. Impact on countryside and surrounding environment. Ringwood cannot cope with more traffic.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
PM6/Mod5	Object	19a	Malcolm Hammans	Keep as greenfield site. Remove distributor road from A31 to B3347. Impact on countryside and surrounding environment. Increased traffic, noise, pollution. Services already stretched and will not cope..	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
PM6/Mod5	Object	28d	Mr R G H Keen and Dr E D Keen	Object to reservation of land at Crow Lane for residential and employment uses. Will not provide the same community benefits as Lynes Farm could because of its restricted size. Will not provide as much of the eastern distributor road, and all its traffic will pass through the town centre.	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.
PM6/Mod5	Object	32h	Persimmon Homes	NFDC's revised housing land supply calculations are based on Hampshire County Council's 2004 Housing Land Supply Monitoring Report. However, this includes sites that should now be deleted (e.g. Top Camp, Calshot), or that are already counted elsewhere (e.g. sites identified as 'Other Proposals' or reserve sites), or that have a slower completion rate (e.g. Hanger Farm, Totton). Further land needs to be identified to meet the reserve requirement, and the sites at Loperwood Lane and Loperwood Farm, Totton were recommended for this purpose by the Inspector. The local planning authority has misinterpreted the	See response to 32a.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>Inspector's conclusions, which were that reserve land should be identified around towns in the eastern part of the District as these were the most accessible and sustainable locations. PPG3 advises a search sequence which includes location and accessibility. The Crow Lane site will require specific amelioration and increased land take for roads, which makes it less sustainable than the Loperwood Lane sites. Objector recommends adding Loperwood Lane, Loperwood Farm and Polebarn Farm to the proposed list of reserve housing sites.</p>	
PM6/Mod5	Object	41b	Hampshire County Council	<p>Object to proposed housing and employment reserve site West of Crow Lane Ringwood (Policy RW-12B) on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no provision has been made to assess the quality or quantity of the mineral (sand and gravel) that the site contains - there is no consideration of opportunities or options for prior extraction to avoid sterilisation of mineral resources by built development. <p>If site is to be retained as a reserve site, policy should be amended to refer to safeguarding of mineral deposits, assessment of the quantity and quality of the reserve, and agreement with HCC about any mineral extraction. HCC does not wish to delay development of the site unnecessarily and is prepared to negotiate for only a proportion of the reserve to be extracted.</p>	No change. Minerals issues will be addressed in a development brief (which will be a Supplementary Planning Document) in the event that the site is allocated for development. Hampshire County Council accepts this approach.
PM6/Mod5	Object	54b	Mr & Mrs A Goulton	<p>Object to reservation of land for employment and housing west of Crow Lane, and to proposed distributor road. Proposals will not ease pressure on roads such as Hightown and Parsonage Barn - these will still be the most direct routes for residents to access schools and town centre. Schools etc already at capacity and will not be able to accommodate increased numbers. Hightown Road has become a death trap following recent developments in the area.</p>	No change. These matters were considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. The Council does not have grounds for going against his recommendation.

Mod Number	Object / Support	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
PM6A/Mod4	Object	16a	R.A.Frampton	The area shown on the proposals map (PM6A/Mod4) should bear resemblance to the proposed development envisaged. Uses proposed are more extensive than the area indicated.	No further modification proposed. The Inspector recommended that the general location to which policy RW-2 related should be indicated on the proposals map. It is not the intention of the notation used to identify a particular site area.

Annex 1 (B):

**Representations on the Council's decision not to accept certain
Inspector's recommendations**

New Forest District Local Plan 1st Alt.: Representations on decision not to accept certain Inspectors' Recommendations

Insp Rec	Object / Support	LPA Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
2.7.6	Object	27a	Hinton Properties	Land adjoining Fawley Power Station should be allocated for employment as recommended by the Inspector. Inclusion of the land in the National Park is to be challenged in the High Court, and until the outcome is known, the Council's decision not to allocate the site is premature and unreasonable.	No change. The Inspector recommended that the site be considered as a possible employment site but that the benefits of development be weighed against landscape and scenic beauty interests of the National Park. The site is now in the National Park. The Council has considered the Inspector's recommendation and concludes that allocation of this site is unlikely to be compatible with the purposes of National Park designation unless it is deemed essential to support the economic interests of the National Park.
3.2.33	Support	45a	Mr J K Burrows	Support proposal to retain definition of area for higher density development in paragraph C1.1C as about 100m from the outer edges of the centres defined on the proposals maps. 400m is too wide an area and will include low density housing, and areas with poor access. An exact measurement will cause anomalies and could divide sites.	Support noted
3.2.33	Support	59a	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Do not wish to see high density residential development up to 400m from town centres - would have an adverse impact on the character of the town and worsen parking problems	Support noted
3.2.33	Object	23a	Zing Property Development	Definition of sites close to town centres should be those within 400m of the outer edges of the centres defined on the Proposals Map. No link between 100m criterion and any reassessment of accessibility. Limiting high density to 100m from town centre restricts development on sites that are accessible to	No change. 100m distance is considered a fair reflection of closeness to town centres given the scale of the towns and town centre characteristics in this District. Note that policy does not limit high density development to within 100m of town

Insp Rec	Object / Support LPA	Objection Number	Object Name	Representation summary	Response
3.2.33	Object	26a	Pennyfarthing Construction Ltd	<p>Definition of sites close to town centres should include those within 400m as recommended by the Inspector. 100m definition disregards sustainability principles set out in PG3, and will result in lower densities in locations within walking distance of the town centre. Local planning authority is concerned about character and appearance, but this is a design issue. Increased densities do not necessarily have an adverse impact - depends on design.</p>	<p>No change. 100m distance is considered a fair reflection of closeness to town centres given the scale of the towns and town centre characteristics in this District. Note that policy does not limit high density development to within 100m of town centres - it provides a minimum density for sites within such an area, but does not specify a maximum for sites there or elsewhere. It also seeks high density development at locations where good pedestrian and public access to local and town centre facilities exists or can be created.</p>
3.2.33	Object	33a	White Young Green Planning	<p>Definition of sites close to town centres should be those within 400m of the outer edges of the centres defined on the Proposals Map. No link between 100m criterion and any reassessment of accessibility. Limiting high density to 100m from town centre restricts development on sites that are accessible to the centre, contrary to spirit of PG3. Effects on character should be dealt with separately as in Policy DW-E1A(i). No planning justification for not accepting Inspector's recommendation.</p>	<p>No change. 100m distance is considered a fair reflection of closeness to town centres given the scale of the towns and town centre characteristics in this District. Note that policy does not limit high density development to within 100m of town centres - it provides a minimum density for sites within such an area, but does not specify a maximum for sites there or elsewhere. It also seeks high density development at locations where good pedestrian and public access to local and town centre facilities exists or can be created.</p>

Insp Rec	Object / Support LPA	Object Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
----------	----------------------	---------------	------	------------------------	----------

3.2.33	Object	57c	New Forest Association	NFA are persuaded by the Inspector's detailed analysis of the distances around defined town centres. Area for high density development should be shown on proposals maps.	No change. 100m distance is considered a fair reflection of closeness to town centres given the scale of the towns and town centre characteristics in this District. Note that policy does not limit high density development to within 100m of town centres - it provides a minimum density for sites within such an area, but does not specify a maximum for sites there or elsewhere. It also seeks high density development at locations where good pedestrian and public access to local and town centre facilities exists or can be created'. Definition on proposals maps of areas for high density development would be unduly prescriptive - criteria in policy provide sufficient guidance.
--------	--------	-----	------------------------	---	---

3.2.33	Object	58c	CPRE	CPRE are persuaded by the Inspector's detailed analysis of the distances around defined town centres. Area for high density development should be shown on proposals maps.	No change. 100m distance is considered a fair reflection of closeness to town centres given the scale of the towns and town centre characteristics in this District. Note that policy does not limit high density development to within 100m of town centres - it provides a minimum density for sites within such an area, but does not specify a maximum for sites there or elsewhere. It also seeks high density development at locations where good pedestrian and public access to local and town centre facilities exists or can be created'. Definition on proposals maps of areas for high density development would be unduly prescriptive - criteria in policy provide sufficient guidance.
--------	--------	-----	------	--	---

7.40.18	Object	22c	Cancer Research UK/Hants Assn. for Care of Blind	Land at Loperwood should be identified as a reserve housing site. Object to the use of a different base	See response to 22a (at B3A/Mod1).
---------	--------	-----	--	---	------------------------------------

Insp Rec	Object / Support LPA	Objection Number	Name	Representation summary	Response
				<p>date for housing land supply assessment. Data is untested. Object to reduced requirement to identify reserve sites for housing. Inspector's intention was that Loperwood sites should be released before land at Crow Lane.</p> <p>The Council should follow the Inspector's recommendations regarding housing land requirements.</p>	
