

**PORTFOLIO: PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION****CABINET – 7 NOVEMBER 2012****LOCAL PLAN PART 2: SITES AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
– EXAMINATION****1. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

- 1.1 The Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management was submitted to the Secretary of State on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2012, following the Council decision on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2012 to submit the Plan. The Examination into the 'soundness' of the Plan by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary has commenced.
- 1.2 At an early stage in the Examination process, the Inspector conducting the Examination (Simon Emerson) advised the Council to undertake public consultation on a number of matters, as set out below. The consultation period was from 8<sup>th</sup> August to 19<sup>th</sup> September 2012.
- i. The 'soundness' of the Plan in the context of the final version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (published in March 2012)
  - ii. The NFDC Proposed Changes Schedule – changes proposed by NFDC to the Proposed Submission Document in response to representations received in the period 20<sup>th</sup> January to 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2012.
  - iii. The Errata List.
- # 1.3 The purpose of this report is to consider the representations received in response to this recent consultation. Appendix B sets out some further changes that are recommended by officers to be suggested to the Inspector. Members are asked to consider these recommended changes and also to consider whether any additional changes are needed in response to the representations received.
- 1.4 In addition, Section 4 deals with a proposed removal of a policy in response to issues raised by the Examination Inspector.

**2. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

- 2.1 In response to the consultation, the Council has received representations from 177 respondents. Some are additional representations from individuals or parties that made representations on the Submission document (83 in number) and others are from individuals or parties that had not previously commented (94 in number).
- # 2.2 Tables summarising the main representations are in Appendix A to this report. A schedule of all representations received (some summarised due to their length) is available for public viewing on the Council's web-site from the Local Plan Part 2 Examination page at: [newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=12878](http://newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=12878) . Copies of all full representations can also be viewed at Appletree Court, Lyndhurst. (Contact the Policy and Plans Team.)
- 2.3 All representations received have been registered, although some related more to the Submitted Plan than the matters which were the subject of this round of consultation.

However, for completeness it was considered appropriate to register all representations made and these will all be forwarded to the Examination Inspector for his consideration.

2.4 The matters generating the highest number of representations were:

- RING3 - residential and employment land allocation south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane. (The proposed changes included some minor amendments on detailed points.)
- MoS1- residential allocation to provide for local housing needs, north of School Lane, Milford on Sea. (The proposed change reduced the size of the allocation from 30 to 20 dwellings and reduced the associated provision of public open space required with the development.)

### **3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REPRESENTATIONS**

#### **Conservation and Enhancement of the Historic and Natural Environment**

3.1 Representations received from English Heritage and Natural England raise matters related to the 'soundness' of the Plan, and the adequacy of policies relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic and natural environment, which have arisen as a result of previous national planning policy guidance being replaced with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. Under previous national planning policy local planning authorities were advised that it was not necessary to have local planning policies which repeated national planning policy. This particularly affected the need to include policies relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and the natural environment in the Local Plan. However since the National Planning Policy Framework was introduced in March 2012 some of the detailed national planning policy guidance on these matters has been removed leaving a policy 'gap' which should be addressed by the addition of appropriate policies in the Local Plan.

- # 3.2 In response to the representations by English Heritage and Natural England, it is recommended that appropriate changes are made to the Plan. Discussions have taken place with English Heritage and Natural England to agree appropriate revisions to policies DM1 and DM2 and their supporting paragraphs, to be recommended to the Inspector. These are set out in Appendix B to this report.

#### **RING3 Land south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane and adjacent to Crow Arch Lane**

3.3 A significant increase in the number of representations was received on this proposal compared to the response to the Proposed Submission Document consultation in January - February 2012 (increase from 16 to 96 representations). Most of the representations related to concerns about the proposed development rather than specifically to the detailed matters in the Proposed Changes. No further changes to the Plan are recommended at this stage in response to the comments received.

## **MoS1 Land north of School Lane, Milford on Sea**

- 3.4 The change consulted on related to a proposed reduction in the size of the site allocation, to provide for 20 rather than 30 dwellings, with a corresponding reduction of public open space provision associated with the proposal. The change was proposed by Members to address some of the concerns raised by representations and the Parish Council. All representations received on the Proposed Changes to the MoS1 policy and text object to the revised proposal. Milford on Sea Parish Council consider the number of dwellings should be reduced further to a maximum of 10 units on the site with the original proposals for public open space re-instated. The Parish Council indicate that further sites may be allocated through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, a process which it is their intention to engage in. The owners of the MoS1 site have made representations wishing to see the original proposal (for up to 30 dwellings and a minimum of 2 ha of formal public open space) re-instated, confirming that this proposal was deliverable.
- 3.5 From the representations received it is evident that most of the public objections to the proposal relate to the principal of development on the site, which cannot be addressed through changes to site boundaries or the numbers of dwellings proposed. In preparing the Plan the Council appraised 9 potential sites around the edge of Milford on Sea as possible allocations to address local housing needs under policy CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy. The conclusion of the appraisal work was that the site north of School Lane was the preferred location to make an allocation for development which is deliverable.
- 3.6 The Parish Council has recently indicated its intention to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan to specifically address the issue of the 'CS12' housing land allocations for local needs and public open space. (Letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> September 2012). In the report to Cabinet in June 2012 on the Submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State, it was suggested that if clear arrangements were in place for the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan promoting alternative sites by the time of the Examination, then the District Council could agree to this way forward and ask for site MoS1 to be removed from the Local Plan. However, given the very advanced stage now reached in the Examination process, the Officers' view is that the Examination process should run its course and that any relevant recommendation of the Inspector should be awaited before commencing the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.7 All the matters relating to the MoS1 proposal are before the Examination Inspector for his consideration. He will consider whether or not the MoS1 proposal is 'sound' taking into account the evidence that is before him (which includes all the representations that have been made.). He has both the original allocation in the Submission document (for 30 dwellings) and the amended proposals (for 20 dwellings) before him.
- 3.8 In view of the representations received, Members may wish to consider whether or not the Proposed Change to MoS1 (the reduced site allocation) remains preferable to the original allocation, as proposed in the submitted Plan (Changes Nos. Ch4.1 – Ch4.5).

## **4. OTHER MATTERS**

### **4.1 Landscape features**

The Examination Inspector has commented with regard to the evidence behind Policy DM8, which relates to the protection of landscape features. His concerns relate to the adequacy of the evidence base used to justify the designation of landscape features.

- 4.2 Officers accept that the evidence base to support the review and re-designation of the proposed Landscape Features under proposed Policy DM8 would benefit from a more rigorous, evidence-based process of justification, with the proposed landscape features appraised against established criteria and this evaluation clearly documented. This is not a matter that can be addressed appropriately within the timescales necessary to progress with the Examination. Officers, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation have concluded that it is not appropriate to delay the potential adoption of the Sites and Development Management document in order to resolve this particular matter. The Inspector advised the Council on potential courses of action, and in discussion with the Portfolio Holder, it has been concluded that the following option suggested by the Inspector would be the Council's preferred way forward. Accordingly, the recommended course of action is to withdraw Policy DM8 and the proposed Landscape Feature designations, as set out in Appendix A: Part E of the Local Plan Part 2 (Document S1), and to save policy DW-E12 and the Landscape Feature designations of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21), pending an early review of these designations.

### **Dibden Bay**

- 4.3 A substantial number of representations were received regarding Dibden Bay from Associated British Ports and Southampton City Council referring to ABP's original representations and requesting that the plan should set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land at Dibden Bay suitable for the growth of the Port of Southampton (the representation can be seen in full on the Council's website at [newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=12878](http://newforest.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=12878) ).
- 4.4 Officers remain of the view that Dibden Bay is properly dealt with, as a "strategic site", in the Core Strategy. This matter was considered in detail at the Core Strategy Examination and an appropriate section, as agreed with ABP, is already included in the Council's Development Plan (see Core Strategy paragraphs 9.15 – 9.16).

## **5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS/CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS /EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 These were taken into account in drawing up the submission document, and carrying out the related assessments – in particular the Sustainability Assessment/Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment. A further Sustainability Assessment/Strategic Environmental Assessment of the suggested changes set out in Appendix B is being made available on the Council's website.

## **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 None beyond existing budgets.

## **7. COMMENTS OF PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

- 7.1 I am satisfied that we have carried out the additional consultation requested by the Inspector in a thorough manner and I full endorse the conclusions and recommendations of the joint meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

## 8. COMMENTS OF ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL AND PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

The Panel and Committee considered the proposals at a special joint meeting on 24 October 2012 and resolved:

That the Cabinet be advised that the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the Planning Development Control Committee consider that:

- (i) The proposed amendments to Policy MOS1 Ch4.1, Ch4.2, Ch4.3, Ch4.4 and Ch4.5 in the Local Plan Part 2 Examination Document NFDC2: NFDC Proposed Changes Schedule should be withdrawn in favour of retaining Policy MoS1 and the supporting text (paragraphs 4.49 – 4.53) as in the Submitted Plan (Examination Document S1);
- (ii) The other proposed changes to the Examination Document, as set out in Appendices A and B to Report A are supported.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) that the proposed amendments to Policy MOS1 Ch4.1, Ch4.2, Ch4.3, Ch4.4 and Ch4.5 in the Local Plan Part 2 Examination Document NFDC2: NFDC Proposed Changes Schedule be withdrawn in favour of retaining Policy MoS1 and the supporting text (paragraphs 4.49 – 4.53) as in the Submitted Plan (Examination Document S1);
- (b) that the further Proposed Changes in Appendix B to Report D to the Cabinet be suggested to the Inspector; and
- (c) that Policy DM8 and the proposed Landscape Feature designations, as set out in Appendix A: Part E of the Local Plan Part 2 (Document S1), be withdrawn; and instead Policy DW-E12 and the Landscape Feature designations of the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration (Document S21) be saved pending an early review of these designations.

### **For further information contact:**

Graham Ashworth,  
Planning Policy Manager,  
Tel: 023 8028 5588  
e-mail: [graham.ashworth@nfdc.gov.uk](mailto:graham.ashworth@nfdc.gov.uk)

### **Background Papers;**

Published documents, including  
Background Papers to be made  
available with the Submission  
Document

Louise Evans  
Principal Policy Planner  
Policy and Plans Team  
Tel: 023 8028 5588  
e-mail: [louise.evans@nfdc.gov.uk](mailto:louise.evans@nfdc.gov.uk)

## Appendix A: Summary of Representations received on NPPF, Proposed Changes and Errata (August – September 2012)

### Matters attracting most representations

Subject (Policy/Paragraph)	No. of representations	Summary of main comments
RING3 Land south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane and adjacent to Crow Arch Lane	96	Object - traffic impact on adjoining roads. Access should not be from Crow Lane. Impact on countryside.
MoS1 Land north of School Lane	93	Object - impact on Green Belt, lack of opportunity to comment, does not comply with NPPF, special nature of the site, will not enhance the environment.
DM8 Protection of Landscape features	7	Not properly justified
LYM2 Land north of Alexandra Road	6	Object – impact on Green Belt, countryside, biodiversity, back-up grazing land. Traffic. Lack of public support for proposal.

### Main matters arising from representations

Subject (Policy/Paragraph)	Summary of comments	NFDC response
Dibden Bay	ABP consider the plan does not comply with the NPPF as the Council has not set out the requirements for development of the Dibden Bay site or planned pro-actively for its development. The needs of the Port of Southampton have not been taken into account and planned for.	See paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of main report
Housing land allocations	A number of representees say that the Plan is inconsistent with the NPPF in that it does not address housing needs. The plan should be subject to a further review given the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development. There is inadequate justification of the balance between need against harm in the light of the NPPF.	Dealt with in Core Strategy
Conserving the natural environment	Natural England advises that the Local Plan is unsound in that at present the Local Plan does not comply with NPPF para113, which requires the Local Plan to	Accept that additional policy needed

<b>Subject (Policy/Paragraph)</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>NFDC response</b>
	set out criteria based policies against which against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged.	
Conserving the historic environment	English Heritage advises that the Plan is unsound as it lacks a positive strategy / adequate policies regarding heritage assets to replace national policies in the former national Planning Policy Statements when it was superseded by the NPPF.	Accept that additional policy needed
Sopley Camp Policy SOP1	Site owners consider SOP1 is not in accordance with the NPPF – policy does not provide certainty. They consider that the land should be removed from the Green Belt and interpret the NPPF as directing that land which is not necessary to be kept permanently open should not be included within the Green Belt.	Disagree, no change recommended.
Employment development in the countryside	3 representees say that the Plan is inconsistent with para.28 of the NPPF regarding supporting economic growth in rural areas.	Dealt with in Core Strategy.
LYM2 Land north of Alexandra Road	Loss of Green Belt land, loss of back-up grazing land. Site generated greatest relative public opposition.	No change recommended.
MoS1 Land north of School Lane	<p>Most representees object in principal to the allocation of land in this location. Reduced site allocation from 30 to 20 dwellings has not reduced concerns about impact on the Green Belt and countryside. Additional concerns raised about the reduction in the associated public open space allocation.</p> <p>Several representations say there is no justification for the proposed change and the reduced site allocation.</p> <p>Site owners wish to see original site allocation for 30 dwellings and POS re-instated.</p> <p>Milford on Sea Parish Council consider 20 dwellings too many on this site - suggest further revision for provision of 'up to 10 affordable housing dwellings' on a site of a minimum of 3.5 hectares with the remainder as public open space and allotments. MoS PC also indicate their intention to engage in the 'Neighbourhood Plan process' to confirm the community's support of a lower number of affordable units on the MoS1 site and to bring</p>	See paragraphs 3.4-3.8 of main report.

<b>Subject (Policy/Paragraph)</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>NFDC response</b>
	forward other deliverable sites in small clusters around the village.	
RING3 Land south of Ringwood, west of Crow Lane and adjacent to Crow Arch Lane	Objections to the amendments – consider original text to 5.31 and 5.32 preferable. Concerns expressed about traffic impacts and access from the east (Crow Lane). Access should be from Christchurch Road. Access road across RING1 site should be provided before RING3 is developed. Remove reference to a developer led master plan – should be a Local Authority led SPD as originally stated. Concerns about impact on the environment, and National Park. Not enough consultation.	No change recommended.
RING4.1	One comment – Town Council want the Furlong Car Park Town Centre Opportunity site limited to ‘in the southern part of the Furlong Car Park fronting Meeting House Lane.’	No change recommended. The proposed policy enables this matter to be resolved at a later date through detailed work.



## Appendix B: Further Proposed Changes

Further Proposed Changes to be suggested to the Inspector following the further consultation period in August – September 2012.

Change No.	Policy/ Para. No.	Proposed Change	Reason
Ch2.19	DM1	Delete policy and replace with new DM1 – see below *	To make the Plan sound following changes in National Planning Policy and the introduction of the NPPF
Ch2.20	Paras.2.7-2.8	Delete paras. 2.7 – 2.8 and replace with new paras. 2.7a, 2.7b, 2.7c and 2.8, and new Figure 3 – see below *	To make the Plan sound following changes in National Planning Policy and the introduction of the NPPF
Ch2.21	DM2	Delete policy and replace with new DM2 – see below **	To make the Plan sound following changes in National Planning Policy and the introduction of the NPPF
Ch2.22	Paras.2.9 – 2.11	Delete paras. 2.9 – 2.11 and replace with new paras. 2.9, 2.10 and 2.11a, 2.11b, and 2.11c - – see below **.	To make the Plan sound following changes in National Planning Policy and the introduction of the NPPF
Ch2.23	Para.2.15	Amend fifth sentence of paragraph to read:  .....Having regards to the recommendations in this study, the types of renewable energy development that could be considered within the framework set by Policy DM3, subject to satisfactory compliance with the criteria set out above, could include, <i>but not limited to</i> : i. biomass energy plants of up to 2.5MWe using	Revision to clarify intent, with clarification that the 2.5MW figure is in relation to electrical megawatts as opposed

Change No.	Policy/ Para. No.	Proposed Change	Reason
		local biomass resources;.....	to thermal megawatts.
Ch2.24	Para. 2.28	Amend paragraph 2.28 to read:  2.28 Policies in this Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect existing areas of public and private open space – both informal (amenity) and formal (sports pitches) (See Policy DM7 ); and</li> <li>• set out the principles of a Green Infrastructure Strategy to be developed for each of the towns and main villages. (See Policy DM9).</li> </ul> <p>Important landscape features are also protected by saved policy DW-E12 (protection of landscape features) from the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration and the Landscape Feature designations of that Plan identified on the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration Proposals Maps. There will be an early review of landscape feature designations.</p>	In response to the Inspector's concerns about the evidence base used in the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2.
Ch2.25	Paras. 2.31	Amend para. 2.31 to read: Policy DM7 and <del>DM8 above</del> <i>saved policy DW-E12 from the New Forest District Local Plan First Alteration</i> relate to specific 'green features' which make a significant contribution to the green infrastructure within the towns and villages.	To up-date the text following the Council decision to withdraw policy DM8.
Note:	Policy DM8	Withdrawn – see paragraphs 4.1-4.2 of Report.	

\*Ch2.19 and Ch2.20

## Heritage

### Policy DM1: Heritage and Conservation

a.) Development proposals and other initiatives should conserve and seek to enhance the historic environment and heritage assets, with particular regard to local character, setting, management and the historic significance and context of heritage assets.

In particular:

- All heritage assets will be protected in proportion to their significance. The more significant the heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation.

- Development proposals should conserve or enhance the significance, character and appearance of heritage assets.
- Any development that may affect archaeological remains should demonstrate the likely impact upon the remains and where appropriate, include mitigation measures to reduce that impact. Any information gained as a result of the investigation should be publicly available.
- Development proposals should respect historic road, street and footpath patterns that contribute to the character and quality of an area.

**b.) In assessing the impact of a proposal on any heritage asset, account will be taken of:**

- the impact of the proposal on the heritage asset and its significance, with regard to the nature of the significance of the heritage asset and the value that it holds for this and future generations
- the impact of the proposal on the setting of the heritage asset
- the impact of the proposal on public access to, and enjoyment and appreciation of, the heritage asset.

**If there would be harm to the heritage asset account will be taken of:**

- how any conflict between climate change objectives and the conservation of the heritage asset is addressed and mitigated
- whether the public benefits of a proposal outweigh any harm caused to the heritage asset. Exceptions to the principle of safeguarding heritage assets from inappropriate development will only be considered where substantial harm is avoided and where the public benefits of a proposed development can be clearly demonstrated to outweigh the level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

**c.) Where appropriate and necessary to secure the long term future of a heritage asset, in particular where it is in a poor condition or at risk, an exception may be made to other local plan policies, providing:**

- the nature of the heritage asset means it is not suitable for all reasonable uses of the site which accord with local plan policies
- the proposal will not materially harm the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, and is sympathetic to its conservation
- any variance in, or departure from, other policies, is minimised to that necessary to secure the heritage asset, and the benefits of securing the long term conservation of the heritage asset outweigh the disbenefits.

**d.) The local planning authority will work with others, and in particular with local communities, to identify, record and give appropriate recognition to heritage assets not subject to a national designation, but which are of local significance.**

2.7a Heritage assets include listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, locally listed buildings, locally listed historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, historic landscapes, and locally important historic road, street and, footpath patterns, and the setting of these assets. Identified heritage assets in the Plan Area are set out in Figure 3. The Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record (AHBR) is the Historic Environment Record for Hampshire County Council. The Historic Environment Record (HER) provides the evidence base.

- 2.7b Many heritage assets are not formally designated, for example, sites with archaeological interest may not currently be designated as ancient monuments, and locally distinct buildings valued by a local community, may not be listed buildings. Local heritage assets may be identified through Local Distinctiveness SPD, Conservation Area Appraisals, and neighbourhood/ community plans, and should be supported by an evidence base that records information on the significance of the heritage asset.
- 2.7c Historic road, street and footpath patterns can help provide local identity, links between features of historic importance and clues as to the pattern of growth and development of settlements. The Local Distinctiveness Supplementary Planning Documents and Conservation Area Appraisals will help identify historic streets and footpath patterns which are particularly important.
- 2.8 The Policies/Proposals Maps identify Conservation Areas, Sites of historic interest (not on the register), and Burgage plots. Listed buildings and Ancient Monuments are not shown on the Proposals Maps.

**Figure 3: New Forest District (outside the National Park) Identified Heritage Assets**

<b>Conservation areas</b>	Ashlett Creek, Fawley (part) 2000 (original designation 1993) Bickton 1999 (original designation 1981) Breamore (part) 2000 (original designation 1981) Buckland, Lymington (part) 1999 (original designation 1988) Damerham 2000 (original designation 1976) Eling (Totton) 2000 (original designation 1979) Fordingbridge 1999 (original designation 1975) Hanger Farm, Totton 2000 (original designation 1986) Harbridge 1999 (original designation 1993) Hazel Farm, Totton 1999 (original designation 1996) Hythe 2000 (original designation 1978) Ibsley 1999 (original designation 1981) Lymington 1999 (original designation 1977) Lymington (Kings Saltern) 2001 Martin 2000 (original designation 1974) Milford-on-Sea 1999 (original designation 1975) Old Milton Green, New Milton 1999 (original designation 1993) Ringwood 1999 (original designation 1983) Rockbourne 2000 (original designation 1976) Royal Naval Armaments Depot, Marchwood 1999 (original designation 1997) Sopley 1999 (original designation 1976) Whitsbury 2000 (original designation 1976)
<b>Listed Buildings*</b>	1665 buildings
<b>English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens</b>	Breamore Park SU155192
<b>Hampshire Register of Historic Parks and Gardens (not on the National Register)</b>	On the Hampshire Register of Historic Parks and Gardens: <a href="http://hants.gov.uk/landscape-and-heritage/historic-environment/parks-gardens.htm">hants.gov.uk/landscape-and-heritage/historic-environment/parks-gardens.htm</a> Including the following identified on the Proposals/Policies Maps:

	<p><b>Everton:</b> Efford House SZ 299943</p> <p><b>Fordingbridge:</b> Burgate Manor (Game Conservancy), Fordingbridge SU 153146 Fryern Court SU 143161</p> <p><b>Milford-on-Sea:</b> Newlands Manor, Milford-on-Sea 286933 SZ</p> <p><b>Ringwood:</b> Somerley Park, Ringwood Forest 132082 SU</p> <p><b>Sandleheath:</b> Sandle Manor SU 136148</p> <p><b>Totton:</b> Testwood House, Testwood Lane, Totton 360144 SU</p>
<b>Burgage plots</b>	<p>Nos. 2 to 24 High Street Lymington Nos. 45 to 51 High Street Lymington Nos. 55 to 58 High Street Lymington Nos. 63 to 75 High Street Lymington Nos. 124 to 131 High Street Lymington Nos. 43 to 48 St Thomas' Street Lymington</p>
<b>Scheduled Ancient Monuments *</b>	<p>On the National Heritage List (<a href="http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/default.aspx">list.english-heritage.org.uk/default.aspx</a>)</p>
<b>NOTES:</b>	
*	<p>Designated Heritage Asset not specifically identified on the Proposals/Policies Map</p>
<i>For further information - The Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record</i>	<p>Historic Environment Record (HER) for Hampshire County Council provides supplementary information: <a href="http://hants.gov.uk/landscape-and-heritage/historic-environment/historic-buildings-register.htm">hants.gov.uk/landscape-and-heritage/historic-environment/historic-buildings-register.htm</a></p>

**\*\*Ch2.21 and Ch2.22**

## **Nature Conservation**

2.9 As set out in Core Strategy policy CS3, the overall objective is that developments should protect, and where possible, enhance biodiversity.

### **Policy DM2: Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity**

**Development proposals which would be likely to adversely affect a designated or candidate Special Area of Conservation (SAC), classified or potential Special Protection Area (SPA), or listed Ramsar site will not be permitted unless there is no alternative solution and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest which would justify the development.**

**Development proposals within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which would be likely to adversely affect the site will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development outweigh both the adverse impacts on the site and any adverse impacts on the wider network of SSSIs.**

**Development which would result in damage to or loss of a site of biodiversity or geological value of regional or local importance (including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Regionally Important Geological / Geomorphological Sites (RIGGS), and habitats of species of principal importance for biodiversity) will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the site, and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity/ geodiversity.**

**Development proposals will be expected to incorporate features to encourage biodiversity, and retain and where possible enhance existing features of nature conservation value within the site. Existing ecological networks should be identified and maintained to avoid habitat fragmentation, and ecological corridors should form an essential component of green infrastructure provision in association with new development to ensure habitat connectivity.**

**Where development is permitted, the local planning authority will use conditions and/or planning obligations to minimise the damage, provide mitigation and site management measures, and where appropriate, compensatory and enhancement measures.**

**Development will not be permitted which would adversely affect species of fauna or flora that are protected under national or international law, or their habitats, unless their protection can be adequately secured through conditions and/or planning obligations.**

2.10 Sites of national and/or international importance to nature conservation (SSSIs, SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites, National Nature Reserves) are shown on the Proposals Maps. These designations are not made through the development plan process. They are subject to international and national legislation and procedures. Candidate and potential designations will be considered as if they have been designated, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. Many Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are also designated as sites of international importance.

2.11a Locally designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) are not shown on the Proposals Map as the areas subject to this designation may change, or be added to over the Plan period.

2.11b Where compensatory measures are required, these shall result in no net loss to biodiversity, factoring in such considerations as the certainty with which the measures will deliver the requisite biodiversity value and the time it will take before the measures deliver the requisite biodiversity value.

2.11c Work on the New Forest Biodiversity Action Plan, covering the whole of New Forest District and the National Park, is being lead by the National Park Authority.