

COPYTHORNE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING – TUESDAY DECEMBER 9TH 2025

Item 9 - To discuss and approve the Parish Council response to the NFNPA Local Plan Reg 18 (Part 2) Consultation

BACKGROUND

At the November 11th 2025 Parish Council Meeting members agreed to approve the report presented for Item 9 at that meeting as a way of engaging with the NFNPA Local Plan Regulation 18 (Part 2) consultation.

A three hour Parish Council run “Drop In Session” to see and discuss various draft Local Plan documents was held on November 24th 2025 and was very well attended. A outline of the comments from residents who attended is attached to this report as Appendix A.

All residents that attended the “Drop In Session” were encouraged to submit their comments to the NFNPA, either via the online link (<https://nfnpalocalplan.commonplace.is/>) or in writing (Local Plan Review, New Forest National Park Authority, Lymington Town Hall, Avenue Road, Lymington, SO41 9ZG).

More information on the NFNPA Local Plan review can be found via this link:-

<https://www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/planning/local-plan/new-forest-national-park-local-plan-review-2025/>

CURRENT POSITION – NFNPA

The NFNPA non-statutory “Regulation 18 – Part 2” consultation started on November 5th 2025 and runs to December 19th 2025.

Five NFNPA “Drop in Sessions”, open to all, have been arranged by the NFNPA as follows:-

Tuesday 2 December 2025, **Redlynch Village Hall**, Vicarage Road, Redlynch SP5 2PG

Thursday 4 December 2025, **Colbury Memorial Hall**, Main Road, Ashurst, SO40 7EL

Friday 5 December 2025, **Sway Village Hall**, Middle Road, Sway SO41 6BB

Tuesday 9 December 2025, **Lyndhurst Community Centre**, Lyndhurst, SO43 7NY

Friday 12 December 2025, **Landford Methodist Hall**, Lyndhurst Road, Landford, SP5 2AF

Whilst most of these sessions will have taken place before the Parish Council meets to discuss this report, residents will continue to be encouraged to submit responses by December 19th 2025 with NFNPA publicity being used to assist with this on noticeboards and Facebook page.

Individual thoughts on each of the 64 planning policies within the draft Local Plan were requested from Parish Councillors and have been collated into a summary which is attached as Appendix B.

REQUIRED ACTION

1. That members consider the collated comments along with residents comments and agree on a Parish Council response to the NFNPA Regulation 18 (Part 2) Consultation.
2. The Clerk submits the Parish Council’s agreed response to the NFNPA by the deadline of December 19th.
3. The Clerk adds the Parish Council’s response to the Planning Page of the Council’s website as soon as it is submitted.

David Rigby

Clerk to Copythorne Parish Council

December 3rd 2025

ITEM 9 – COPYTHORNE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING – DECEMBER 9 2025

APPENDIX A – Residents Comments from Nov 24th “Drop In Session”

Comments, concerns and questions raised by members of the Parish

Village	Comment
Bartley	I do not agree with Defined Village
Winsor	I am directly affected. I do object to its “drip-drip” of information. Either all in or nothing
Winsor	I have numerous concerns about the proposal, the biggest one being safety concerns around the school and the road. (Strongly Object)
Winsor	Would have liked a representative from the NFNPA to have been present
Cadnam	Would have liked a representative from the NFNPA to have been present Thank you CPC for organising this
Cadnam	NFNPA representative would have been useful
Cadnam	Do not agree with defined village

Other comments made by various parishioners during the open session:

Defined Village

- No objections. Pretty much all spoke to saw it as an advantage

New development

- Almost all those who spoke to councilors had concerns about the safety aspect. The safety of children getting to school with another road to cross. Safety of all those travelling along Winsor Road. Safety at the Haywain Crossroads with yet more traffic.
- Car parking. Will there be sufficient for the number of dwellings. Will people park within the new development to drop off children causing blockages.
- Light Pollution from the dwellings
- Sewers. Can our pipes cope with the extra sewage that will be produced
- Flooding. The field is known to flood. How can we ensure the new development will not lead to flooding issues
- Loss of green field. Loss of wildlife.
- Concerns that the new development will make the village feel less rural/more built up.
- More pressure on our already under pressure GP surgeries

ITEM 9 – COPYTHORNE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING – DEC 9 2025

APPENDIX B – COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

NEW POLICY	OLD POLICY	POLICY HEADING	SUPPORT AGAINST NEUTRAL COMMENT	COMMENTS
SP1	SP1	Supporting sustainable development	SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- --- Is the transport strategy robust enough to support these ambitions? SP1 a) I support the improved public transport links. SP1 f) great to see climate change resilience being addressed. Need to guard against national policies and directives that are in opposition to principles but over-ride them, giving purely a “top down” approach. Support and improve local transport links, five working days, Saturdays too, parish only has buses two days a week currently Traffic pollution an issue. Improve cycling/walking routes.
DP2	DP2	General development principles	SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	(f) and (g) use the word unacceptable. A word that is not clearly defined and open to interpretation. (h) Active travel can only be enabled with well maintained and safe pavements and cycle lanes. --- DP2 g) how would adverse impacts associated with traffic and pollution be addressed in the absence of suitable public transport or healthy walking and cycling routes? Small electric vehicles? These are very worthy aims, but difficult to balance against the new developments proposed later in the document. How will developments be measured objectively against subjective aims? Electric vehicles would help the traffic pollution issue.

SP3	SP4	Spatial Strategy	COMMENT	The defined village named Cadnam-Bartley on the proposed plan needs to have the name confirmed. I would like to know what is the reason the NFNPA want to make some of our parish a defined Village. Is it with the hope that there will be an increase in new dwellings?
			NEUTRAL	---
			SUPPORT	4.13 Strongly support the focus of addressing local needs. 4.15 Copythorne does not meet this policy in terms of public transport, walking or cycling focus to neighbouring Totton, Lyndhurst or Romsey for delivering new housing to help address local needs while at the same time ensuring development does not compromise the delivery of the two statutory National Park purposes – national planning policy recognises that national park authorities have an important role to play in delivering housing for local people within the context of a nationally protected landscape for example health appointments. 4.19 states it “seeks to sustain and enhance the local services and facilities” in Cadnam-Bartley. Does this include transport?
			SUPPORT	This policy should be examined more carefully and imaginatively to address the perceived need for more housing in the National Park.
SP4	SP3	Major development in the National Park	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Maximising transport opportunities is essential when looking at major developments. In the parish of Copythorne we have the tourist attraction Paultons Park. As the park grows, it becomes more important that traffic management and public transport is addressed.
			SUPPORT	Although I support this policy, I am bothered by the effect any large major urban development would have on the rural Parish of Copythorne.
			SUPPORT	4.32 This policy has a major impact for parishes such as Copythorne which has a major tourist attraction. In SP4, what national considerations would override the statutory purposes of the National Park? How big would the negative impact on the local economy override the first statutory purpose?

			SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	Copythorne has a huge tourist attraction and is a gateway to the New Forest
SP5	NEW	Land to north of Fawley Waterside	NEUTRAL	Although I am in support of this proposal, I have concerns regarding traffic congestion. My concern is that as the A326 gets more and more congested and drivers will be encouraged to take a detour through the National Park.
			SUPPORT	Although I support this particular policy I am never the less concerned that this is just Stage One in eventually developing the whole of the Waterside into one vast Freeport
			SUPPORT	SP5 iii. To create opportunities for active travel, through the creation of cycle routes and footpaths, to link to surrounding settlements and employment sites;
			NEUTRAL	---
			SUPPORT	Complete cycle and footpaths linking more hamlets across the areas for the workforce. Re-opening the Hythe Ferry and "Waterside" railway line too.
SP6	SP38	Infrastructure provision and developer contributions	SUPPORT	--
			AGAINST	I am against developers being simply able to buy infrastructure credits elsewhere
			SUPPORT	4.45 – should some of this detail be added to SP5 to ensure it is fully robust? Does the last sentence (<i>"In implementing this policy regard will be had to economic viability considerations at the site-specific level."</i>) give permission to the developer and planning officers to ignore the details of this policy?
			SUPPORT	4.47 Can more information be provided on how the process will work with regard to the authority and interaction with local residents to determine the extent of new/improved infrastructure needs.
				The last sentence of the policy 'In implementing this policy regard will be had to economic viability considerations at the 'site specific level' seems to indicate that a developer could make an argument that infrastructure

				improvements could be too costly to be carried out? Is this the case? If so, surely if infrastructure improvements can't be delivered then the development shouldn't proceed.
			COMMENT	Planning officers should not ignore re-opening of Hythe Ferry
SP7	DP8	Safeguarding and improving water resources	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	5.25 should be re-worded to include Bartley as a known surface water flooding area
			SUPPORT	Great to see the climate change emergency (5.10) and Race to Zero (5.9) initiatives in the Plan. Agree with reducing the max allowable daily usage per person to 100 L/day
			SUPPORT	Broadly support this policy, however point e) the 100 litre usage? How can this be achieved and enforced? Is this applicable to all new homes regardless of size?
			SUPPORT	Increase water testing and daily usage resources
SP8	DP12	Flood Risk	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	5.25 should the Cadnam area be reworded Cadnam-Bartley as both these areas have been prone to surface water flooding.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	More clear drainage maintained. No more building on wetlands. Bartley/ Cadnam are High Flood Risk areas. Copythorne has a history of high flood risk, not to be ignored. Any more dwellings built in flood risk areas will increase the risks from surface water.
SP9	SP11	Sustainable Construction	SUPPORT	Pleased to see support given to proposals for development that mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.
			SUPPORT	Consider adding Surface Water flooding under (f)

			SUPPORT NEUTRAL COMMENT	5.30 What are the improved building standards to be applied to extensions and thermal upgrades? SP9 b) should “consider” be rephrased more strongly to “should have”? Would an applicant have to provide evidence that they have considered “small-scale” renewable. --- Correct sustainable construction of all dwellings using high quality materials to cover all aspects of the build, drainage and sewer infrastructure.
SP10	SP14	Renewable Energy	SUPPORT SUPPORT NEUTRAL NEUTRAL SUPPORT	The plan should encourage the installation of solar panels over car parks and car ports (an example of this is Paultons Park). However, I am against ground mounted solar panels in residential gardens --- --- ---
SP11	SP5	Nature conservation sites of international importance	SUPPORT COMMENT COMMENT NEUTRAL COMMENT	--- The last sentence seems to be designed to allow developers to develop the site regardless of impact. 6.8 “a target of 80% of SSSIs within the New Forest National Park to be in favourable condition by 2042” How does the SSSI site bordering Barrow Hill Road rank in terms of returning to a favourable condition? The final bullet point states “Applications for new net dwellings and other forms of overnight accommodation will be required to demonstrate nutrient neutrality”. Why does it not apply to other buildings such as residential outbuildings, large extensions etc? Is this addressed elsewhere in the plan? --- Any overnight sites, caravans, wild camping should provide correct facilities to demonstrate nutrient neutrality.

SP12	SP6	The natural environment, national; regional; and local	SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	The 2 nd and third sentences are a complete contradiction
			SUPPORT	Does SP12 apply to extensions and outbuildings? 6.23 I support the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.
			NEUTRAL	Second paragraph - the first part states that developments impacting SSSIs will not be permitted, then the second part says some may be considered? Which is it?
SP13	NEW	Biodiversity Net Gain	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Biodiversity net gain being delivered in a hierarchical manner is good. How will the National Park ensure that the applicant monitors that a 10% biodiversity net gain is achieved?
			COMMENT	I am against developers being able to buy national biodiversity credits
			SUPPORT	I agree with the hierarchy proposed 6.26 Great to see the reference to Bird bricks in new builds.
SP14	SP7	Landscape Character	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
SP14	SP7	Landscape Character	SUPPORT	'Development proposals will be permitted if they conserve and enhance the character of the New Forest's landscapes'. I'm not convinced that all new developments will actually enhance the character!
			SUPPORT	I am against development within SSSI's, I don't believe any development can enhance.
			SUPPORT	6.32 - I agree with "Landscape character cannot be solely determined by what is visible from a publicly accessible location, as this can change over time." I strongly agree with c) the character of largely open and undeveloped landscapes between and within settlements will not be eroded or have their setting harmed;

			SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	The landscape character of any build should compliment the area by it's design.
SP15	SP9	Green & blue infrastructure	SUPPORT	I am very happy and agree that the Authority will work with other partners and adjoining authorities to develop green/blue infrastructure
			COMMENT	Why is providing SANG mitigation in the National Park even being mentioned let alone being considered
			SUPPORT	I agree that SANG for development outside the park is not appropriate.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
DP16	DP10	Open Space	SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	The 2 nd sentence should be reworded to remove the bit about surplus to requirements.
			COMMENT	In the Copythorne PDS, it is stated that green open spaces are not generally open to the public. How would DP16 (Open Space) apply to the site allocation for 55 dwellings?
			SUPPORT	But as worded it is a little strange - section a) How on earth can open space be surplus to requirements in a national park? Given all the other worthy policies and support for the environment and wellbeing detailed in the rest of the plan.
			COMMENT	How would the open space apply to the allocation for 55 dwellings off Winsor Road
DP17	DP51	Recreational horse keeping	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---

			COMMENT	In terms of detrimental impact on the landscape is horse riding and keeping given higher priority than, say connected walking/cycle routes between villages and settlements? If not, how would this be demonstrated?
			NEUTRAL	What permission would be being sought for this policy to be considered?
			SUPPORT	---
DP18	DP52	Field shelters and stables	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
DP19	DP53	Maneges	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
SP20	DP13	Coastal Development	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	---
SP21	NEW	Coastal Change Management Area	SUPPORT	---

			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	Reinforcing sea defences is a high priority
SP22	SP15	Tranquillity and Dark Skies	SUPPORT	Reducing the impacts of light pollution on the 'dark skies' of the National Park and control of development to prevent artificial lighting from eroding rural darkness and tranquillity is very important, especially when a reasonably large development is built in the middle of a rural village.
			SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	Although it is acknowledged in 6.59 that pollutants can harm human health, there is no mention in 6.60 of mitigation with respect to reducing harm to human health. Eg vehicle emissions, wood burners etc. SP22 – There is a high emphasis on Light pollution in this policy. The tranquillity map in the landscape policy documents appears to show least tranquil areas (after high population areas) flank roads is traffic pollution. Is there anything in the Plan to mitigate against this?
			SUPPORT	However, it seems inconceivable that new developments will be able to adhere to this policy.
			COMMENT	Light pollution is a serious concern, Vehicles with stronger head lamps plus high watts on building using more electricity.
SP23	SP16	The historic and built environment	SUPPORT	I am very happy that adaptations that reduce carbon emissions will be supported where this would not harm the significance of the heritage asset or its setting.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	I agree with the reuse of historic buildings and seeing carbon emission reduction being addressed in the plan. The “whole building approach” when adapting for climate change is very sensible.

			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	I agree with the re-using of historic buildings and brownfield sites
DP24	NEW	Heritage	SUPPORT	I am thankful that Copythorne now has a Parish Design Statement.
			COMMENT	Sentence (b) should be changed from resisted to not allowed, Sentence (d) should add reference to consulting Historic England
			SUPPORT	This policy gives a realistic way forward to conserve our historic assets. It aligns with national planning policy as outline in 7.13. 7.16 what is the update for the next conservation specific management plan? Does this involve Parish Councils?
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Many old buildings have been demolished in the past, fine example recently the demolition of the Fawley Power Station chimney in 2021
DP25	SP17	Local Distinctness	NEUTRAL	How is this policy applied when only part of a village is defined?
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Fully support 7.26. In settlements bordering SSSIs this can be more difficult to manage.
			SUPPORT	But how is this balanced against developments outlined in section 8 which do exactly what this policy is seeking to guard against?
			SUPPORT	New developments, extensions, outbuildings
DP26	DP18	Design Principles	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Support 7.28 this talks about new development, does that include outbuildings and extensions? Good checklist in 7.30.

			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
DP27	DP34	Residential character of defined villages	SUPPORT COMMENT SUPPORT SUPPORT AGAINST	How is this policy applied when only part of a village is defined? To preserve residential character, reference to be made to Supplementary Design Guides, i.e. Neighbourhood Plans and Village/Parish Design Statements where they exist. Not all of the Defined Village of Cadnam/Bartley is actually in the villages some is in Winsor and some is in Copythorne. Also, part of Bartley in New Inn Road has been missed out. This will be important for the transition of parts of Cadnam-Bartley to Defined village. 7.34 Good to see reference to the open spaces and gaps when characterising Defined Villages. 7.35 How would appropriate development density be applied to Cadnam-Bartley when significant parts in the Defined village are Ribbon development? --- I am not convinced "Defined Villages" is such a good idea.
SP28	SP19	New residential development in the National Park	NEUTRAL COMMENT SUPPORT AGAINST	I would like to see a development of small bungalows for the elderly in our parish rather than housing aimed at the younger generation. This would allow older residents to be able to downsize but stay in the Parish. There needs to be the number of homes added to (d) rural exception sites. The reduction from the 4,940 new dwellings down to 950 is welcome to maintain the constraints within the National Park. Will neighbouring authorities be taking on this shortfall in housing need in their allocations? Against this policy as worded. The National Park open and green spaces should be sacrosanct, there should be only new developments on proper brownfield sites, meaning SP34 and maybe SP33 and SP35 would fall into this category. The supporting housing need information indicates that there is

			AGAINST	expected to be a reduction of population within the park, but a shift in household make-up. So having identified a problem, rather than exploring imaginative solutions, the answer has been decided that building is the best solution. There seems to be a narrative (driven top down) that building has to happen in the park whatever, is there any evidence of local communities demanding new developments on green/open spaces in their community? I support point e) housing for commoners and agricultural and forestry workers. The output of the housing needs analysis has some very accurate numbers, but the inputs don't seem so much so. Who is determining local housing needs and how? To continue to nibble building within the National Park. There will not be a park left.
SP29	SP20	Specialist housing for older people (Use Class C2)	SUPPORT COMMENT NEUTRAL SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- This needs to have numbers of older people added otherwise it is completely open ended. I/m concerned that over time the third sentence as worded could lead to homes being occupied by younger people. --- Supported, as if done properly and well will help to address the shift in household make-up, alleviating the need for the volume of new developments There should be specialist housing for the older generation.
SP30	SP21	The size of new dwellings	SUPPORT COMMENT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- It needs to explicitly state that this applies to homes in the defined villages as well. I agree this will give a more balanced mix of housing and be less intrusive on land ---

			SUPPORT	Mixed sized buildings
SP31	SP22	Land at Whartons Lane, Ashurst (existing allocation) (Members are aware that consent has already been given on this site)	COMMENT SUPPORT AGAINST COMMENT	--- Remove the target of 50% affordable and make it a requirement. --- Should not be developed as an open space/green site Already underway
SP32	SP23	Land at Ashurst Hospital (existing allocation)	COMMENT SUPPORT COMMENT	--- --- 8.30 note: possible covenant to prevent dog or cat ownership; is this enforceable? --- Already allocated
SP33	NEW	Land at Knellers Lane, Ashurst	COMMENT COMMENT SUPPORT	--- Remove target for 50% affordable and make it 50% 8.32 Good to see an emphasis on improved cycle/pedestrian links. Should not be developed as an open space/green site ---
SP34	SP24	Land at the former Lyndhurst Park Hotel (existing allocation)	COMMENT	--- --- 8.37. good to see that traffic congestion is noted but no mention of the associated pollution for residents, businesses and tourists.

			SUPPORT	SP34 I agree with e) for a transport assessment with respect to Air Quality Management. The need for a local connection is supported.
			COMMENT	---
			COMMENT	Already underway, like the design
SP35	NEW	Land at Calpe Avenue, Lyndhurst	COMMENT	---
			COMMENT	There appears to be enough provision for C2 housing in Lyndhurst already
			---	---
			SUPPORT	As is an existing developed site and supports SP29
			---	---
SP36	SP25	Land south of Church Lane, Sway	COMMENT	---
			COMMENT	I am pleased to see a recognised need for proper sewage provision
			COMMENT	Good to see 8.42 off road pedestrian link supported in the plan.
			AGAINST	Should not be developed as an open space/green site
			---	---
SP37	NEW	Land to west of Brighton Road, Sway	COMMENT	---
			COMMENT	Yet more C2 provision
			---	---
			AGAINST	Should not be developed as an open space/green site
			---	---
SP38	NEW	Land to west of Winsor Road, Bartley	NEUTRAL	Bartley school is a Junior School, not a Primary. 55 dwellings including 50% affordable, can this be written as a maximum of 50% to ensure it does not end up being more.

			COMMENT	This at first glance seems to mirror the Whartons Lane (SP31) site? Hence where is the need? And, it's not in Bartley, it's in Winsor.
			COMMENT	The main concern from residents at the drop were 1. Worried about inadequate sewage infrastructure 2. Worried about increased traffic along by the school. 3. Residents who had adult children living were not aware of the eligibility criteria to go on the NFDC housing register.
			AGAINST	Should not be developed as an open space/green site. Any need for housing could more than be accommodated by development already scheduled for Bartley and within a short distance in the Calmore/Totton area (that have more amenities and better transport links)
			AGAINST	Deep concern re traffic flow, already congested with moving traffic and parked vehicles from residents living in Winsor Road. Concerns about the drainage/sewer infrastructure. Dangerous crossing in/out of school by foot or vehicle.
SP39	NEW	Land to the south of Hamptworth Road, Landford	COMMENT	--- At first glance the rest of the area is pre-dominantly ribbon development along existing roads, any departure from this requires careful consideration. ---
			AGAINST	Completely unsuitable, should not be developed as a open space/green site ---
SP40	NEW	Land to the east of The Ridge, Redlynch	COMMENT	--- At first glance, this will need much more research before agreeing to any planning proposal. ---
			AGAINST	Should not be developed as an open space/green site

SP41	SP27	Affordable housing within the defined villages and allocated sites	NEUTRAL COMMENT COMMENT AGAINST AGAINST	I would like to see a maximum of 50% affordable housing on any proposed site This seems to have been written with allowing developers scope for providing less than 50% affordable. Also, not sure about the last but one sentence about the mix of rented v shared ownership. What happened to the bit about being for local people? Interesting to see no affordable housing on 1-2 net new dwellings. What prevents landowners/developers from splitting up land into 1-2 dwelling developments to circumvent affordable housing targets? Against as worded currently. The evidence for affordable housing isn't clear, in the New Forest Housing Needs Assessment section 2, paragraph 2.30 it states that 'Despite the level of need being high, it is not considered that this points to any requirement for the local planning authorities to increase their respective Local Plan housing requirements due to affordable needs' Also the 50% figure appears to be driven by limit of acceptance of financial impact of provision of affordable housing that a developer is willing to bear. Again are there other ways of addressing affordable accommodation needs rather than just building. Losing so much agricultural and grazing land already in rural areas.
SP42	SP28	Rural exception sites	SUPPORT SUPPORT NEUTRAL SUPPORT	I support this policy but feel that it was not upheld when considering the New Inn Road development as Bartley does not have access to local transport Yes to being in perpetuity. Agree with 100% affordable housing. Should a limit on development size be detailed? Only building on brownfield sites though

DP43	SP29	New Forest Commoners' dwellings	SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- --- --- --- Small dwelling
DP44	SP30	New dwellings for estate, agricultural and forestry workers	SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- --- --- --- Small dwelling
DP45	DP32	Removal of agricultural occupancy conditions	SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- --- --- Could dwellings considered in this policy not be used to support DP44? ---
SP46	NEW	Self and custom house building	SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- --- --- --- ---

DP47	SP33	Land at Forest View, Landford for gypsies and travellers	SUPPORT	--- --- --- --- ---
DP48	SP33	Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople	SUPPORT	--- --- --- The local connection should be looked at stringently for any occupancy. ---
DP49	DP35	Replacement dwellings	SUPPORT COMMENT SUPPORT SUPPORT SUPPORT	--- It does not make clear the floor space rules for homes inside Defined Villages Can DP49 and DP50 be applied at the same time? If not. What is the criteria for separating them. Interesting to see the definitions of floorspace for original and proposed extensions, conservatories and outbuildings in 8.92 DP50 shouldn't be allowed as a reason to construct a replacement dwelling 30% larger than an original as seems to be the case currently. If it is allowed it should be stated in DP49 that a replacement dwelling can be 30% larger than the original. ---
DP50	DP36	Extensions to buildings	SUPPORT COMMENT	--- It does not make clear if the 30% rule applies inside a Defined Village.

			SUPPORT	Can DP49 and DP50 be applied at the same time? If not. What is the criteria for separating them. Interesting to see the definitions of floorspace for original and proposed extensions, conservatories and outbuildings in 8.92
			SUPPORT	DP50 shouldn't be allowed as a reason to construct a replacement dwelling 30% larger than an original as seems to be the case currently. If it is allowed it should be stated in DP49 that a replacement dwelling can be 30% larger than the original.
			SUPPORT	---
DP51	DP37	Outbuildings	SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	Subservient guidelines would be helpful. "Clearly subservient is too open ended.

			SUPPORT	---
			AGAINST	No
SP52	SP39	Local community facilities	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Within reason
SP53	SP42	Maintaining and improving Business Floorspace	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	9.17 - I agree with not encouraging general warehousing for the reasons mentioned.

			SUPPORT	9.19 - I support retaining existing employment sites. Good to see the issue of parking and traffic addressed directly.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	If correct procedure followed
DP54	SP43	Redevelopment and extensions to existing employment buildings	SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	This is supported but it needs to be mentioned that there is always the danger of “chicken houses2 becoming workshops, becoming offices, becoming bungalows”.
			SUPPORT	I believe it is important to retain employment in communities.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	But depends on type of business
SP55	SP48	The land-based economy	SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	Paragraph a (ii) contradicts Policy SP42 which releases back up grazing land for Affordable Housing
			SUPPORT	9.22 - I support the direction of travel for the Farming in Protected Landscapes programme. I support the emphasis on land management linked to the National Parks main aims. Affordable housing for Commoners is an important aspect to achieve this.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Depending on type of trade
DP56	DP50	New agricultural and forestry related development	SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Especially support the consideration of the building or structure size.

			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Depends on the size
DP57	DP49	Re-use of farm buildings	SUPPORT	Good to see that the National Park is looking after the commoners.
			SUPPORT	
			SUPPORT	Support the emphasis on commoners having priority for buildings
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	If it helps the farmer.
DP58	DP40	Loss of local retail facilities		---
			SUPPORT	---

			SUPPORT	---

DP59	DP41	Retail development outside of the defined settlement boundaries	SUPPORT	Good to see support for our local village shops and farm shops.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	Good to see support for small scale and farm shops
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	---
SP60	SP46	Sustainable tourism development	SUPPORT	---
			COMMENT	This is broadly supported but wherever possible attention needs to be paid to linking up local transport services.

			SUPPORT	SP60 how do “Airbnb” type properties fit into this policy?
			SUPPORT	---
			NEUTRAL	---
DP61	DP61	Holiday parks and campsites	SUPPORT	I support the relocation of campsites within the National Park to less sensitive areas. Fully restoring the existing sites to an appropriate New Forest landscape is essential.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	9.49 and 9.50 I support both the Article 4 Directions for pop up and temporary campsites.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	If a reasonable size
SP62	NEW	Telecommunications and Digital infrastructure	SUPPORT	To reduce impact, can masts be painted green or be camouflaged with greenery?
			COMMENT	This Policy needs to be strengthened for G5 telecom masts which by their very nature are particularly intrusive and will cause visual harm if not carefully sited and disguised to be as unobtrusive as possible.
			SUPPORT	I support the provision of IT infrastructure and the conditions imposed to minimise visual, tranquillity and character impacts. The condition to remove the equipment once redundant is important. 9.57 - I agree the Solent Freeport Fawley Waterside tax site is the obvious site to meet this need.
			SUPPORT	---
			SUPPORT	IT infrastructure is always important.
DP63	SP54	Transport Infrastructure	SUPPORT	Should this policy also include horse riding? Horse riding is a very important mode of transport in the National Park

			COMMENT	This is far too “woolly”, and needs to spell out minimum acceptable levels of transport that must be provided for new developments
			COMMENT	10.3 support the New Forest Tour 10.8 what kind of traffic management initiatives would be considered? Not sure how this is going to work in rural settlements like Copythorne. Minimal lighting, narrow lanes, lack of footpaths /cycle lanes affects the safety of active travel. Heavy traffic to Lyndhurst and Romsey. There are no public transport links for health appointments or linking to railway stations. There is a bus service suitable for food shopping or visiting family in Totton.
			SUPPORT	---
			AGAINST	Leave the Waterside as it is
SP64	SP55	Sustainable transport and access	SUPPORT	I support this policy but currently feel that Copythorne Parish is being overlooked. We have virtually no public transport, no cycle routes and roads and pavements are in poor state of repair.
			COMMENT	From what I heard at the recent NFNPA Community Transport Summit, at the moment the National Park is removing rather than enhancing cycling and walking infrastructure!
			COMMENT	This is a great wish list but in reality, when some of these have been proposed they conflict greatly with the National Park’s strategic objectives. Can the Design statement help overcome this? 10.21 - I am led to believe the LCWIP has removed the link from Copythorne to Lyndhurst. Does that conflict with SP63? 10.22 - The “utility network” appears to have very low priority in the last presentation I saw on the LCWIP.
			SUPPORT	Especially more joined up no-vehicle routes.
			SUPPORT	We need a link between Copythorne and Lyndhurst