

COPYTHORNE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING – TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 8TH 2026

Item 11 - To discuss and approve the Parish Council's method of response to the NFNPA Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation.

BACKGROUND

In 2024 the NFNPA began a review of their Local Plan.

The Parish Council has previously responded to the two public consultations on the review below:-

March 2025 – Regulation 18 (Part 1) Local Plan Review Scope and Direction of Travel

December 2025 – Regulation 18 (Part 2) – Initial draft

Copies of responses sent can be found via this link:- <https://www.copythorne-pc.gov.uk/planning/>

CURRENT POSITION – NFNPA

On July 23rd 2026, the NFNPA approved the next stage of the review process, known as Regulation 19. Details of the papers presented along with a video of the meeting can be found on this link to the NFNPA website:- <https://www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/meeting/new-forest-national-park-authority-23-07-26-2/>

A public consultation on the Regulation 19 document started on August 17th 2026 and runs until September 30th 2026. Details on how the public can comment can be found on the NFNPA Online portal at <https://nfnpalocalplan.commonplace.is/>

The NFNPA have planned a series of “Drop In sessions” (2pm to 7pm) where local people will have the opportunity to see the proposals in more detail and help them to form an opinion on them. The sessions local to Copythorne are as follows:-

Friday September 4th – Bartley Village Hall, Bourne Road, Woodlands

Monday September 7th – Royal British Legion Hall, Southampton Road, Cadnam

Friday September 11th – Lyndhurst Community Centre, Main Car Park, Lyndhurst

An online session is also being held by the NFNPA on Thursday September 10th (4.00-5.30pm) <https://newforestnpa.gov.uk/LocalPlanReview>

To assist members of the Council to consider and formulate a response to the Regulation 19 public consultation, I have prepared draft comments on each of the 66 proposed policies within the “Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan. These draft comments have been created by:-

1. Using the comments submitted for the Regulation 18, Part 2 consultation as a base position.
2. Considering changes made by NFNPA to the Draft Local Plan as a result of the responses received by the NFNPA to the previous consultation.
3. Updating the previous comments submitted by the Parish Council to reflect thoughts on the changes.

(Cont'd./...)

(.../Cont'd.)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. Councillors have already been encouraged to attend at least one of the NFNPA “Drop In Sessions” and discuss the proposed Draft Local Plan with NFNPA officers and local residents to gain feedback.
2. Review the draft comments prepared by the Clerk which are attached to this report, having regard to the own thoughts and residents feedback.
3. Discuss the draft comments (referred to above) at the September 8th 2026 Council meeting.
4. Submit any suggested changes to the draft comments to the Clerk by Friday September 11th 2026.
5. The Clerk will prepare and circulate by Friday September 18th 2026 a revised response based on any changes suggested. Members to approve the final response by a simple majority.
6. The Clerk will submit the agreed response to NFNPA before the consultation deadline of September 30th 2026 and add a copy to the Planning page on the Council’s website.

David Rigby

Clerk to Copythorne Parish Council

August 28th 2026

COPYTHORNE PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO NFNPA LOCAL PLAN REVIEW –

REG 18 (PART 2) CONSULTATION				REG 19 CONSULTATION	
POLICY	POLICY HEADING	DEC 2025 RESPONSE	REGULATION 18 (PART 2) COMMENTS - DECEMBER 2025 FOR OCTOBER 2025 DRAFT	SEPT 2026 RESPONSE	REGULATION 19 COMMENTS - SEPTEMBER 2025 FOR JULY 2026 DRAFT
SP1	Supporting sustainable development	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.	SUPPORT	We note the inclusion of a new paragraph 4.12 on the Waste Hierarchy which aligns with principles we support. We also note the required renumbering of the original paragraph 4.12 to be 4.13
DP2	General development principles	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.	SUPPORT	We note and support the broadening of the third paragraph of this policy to include supportive references to biodiversity; ecosystems; and socio-economic wellbeing. It is pleasing to see the new point c) includes comments on climate change, flood resistance and resilience. Also, the addition of “Building for a Healthy Life” & “Healthy Streets” under point j), along with point n) regarding the inclusion of sustainable drainage are all very welcome.

SP3	Spatial Strategy	SUPPORT	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? 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? This policy should be examined more carefully and imaginatively to address the perceived need for more housing in the National Park.	SUPPORT	The differentiation between the existing “Defined Villages” (now called “Larger Defined Villages”) and the proposed “Defined Villages” (to be known as Smaller Defined Villages”) covered under paragraphs 4.20-4.22 is noted. We still have concerns about the reality of the availability of public transport as mentioned in paragraph 4.18 (para 4.15 in the Reg 18, Part 2 Review) and remain unconvinced as to how the strategic approach to “sustain and enhance the local services and facilities in the villages” will play out in this regard. Comments related to the re-drawing of the boundary of “Cadnam and Bartley “ are included in our response to DP28.
-----	------------------	---------	--	---------	---

SP4	Major development in the National Park	SUPPORT	Maximising transport opportunities is essential when looking at major developments. In the parish of Copythorne we have the tourist attraction Paultons Park and are a gateway to the New Forest. As the park grows, it becomes more important that traffic management and public transport is addressed. Although I support this policy, I am bothered by the effect any large major urban development would have on the rural Parish of Copythorne. 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	Whilst we continue to support this policy we are though disappointed to see that the paragraph relating to the impact of large tourist attractions that was within the Reg 18, Part 2 review (as para 4.32) has been removed.
SP5	Land to north of Fawley Waterside	SUPPORT	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. 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 SP5 iii. To create opportunities for active travel, through the creation of cycle routes and footpaths, to link to surrounding settlements and employment sites; Complete cycle and footpaths linking more hamlets across the areas for the workforce. Re-opening the Hythe Ferry and "Waterside" railway line too.	SUPPORT	We note the enhanced commentary regarding the level of remediation required (paras 4.39 and 4.40) and are pleased to see that the need to undertake this work are now included within this policy.

SP6	Infrastructure provision and developer contributions	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? 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 <i>‘In implementing this policy regard will be had to economic viability considerations at the ‘site specific level’</i> 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. Planning officers should not ignore re-opening of Hythe Ferry	SUPPORT	The paragraphs added (4.52 and 4.53) are welcomed as they go some way to adding more details about “cross authority involvement” in relation to mitigate the impact of development and improve infrastructure. We continue to have some concerns regarding the last sentence of the policy <i>‘In implementing this policy regard will be had to economic viability considerations at the ‘site specific level’</i> which 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.
SP7	Safeguarding and improving water resources	SUPPORT	5.25 should be re-worded to include Bartley with Cadnam as a known surface water flooding area. 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. 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? Increase water testing and daily usage resources. The inclusion of a preference for “Nature based SuDs” (clause c) is also supported.	SUPPORT	It is pleasing to see that alongside the continued inclusion of para 5.18 and 5.19 (previously 5.17 and 5.18) related to SuDS, additional para 5.20 builds on that. The statement that <i>“Development which does not implement SuDS or appropriate means of drainage will not be supported by the Authority”</i> is good to see. It is pleasing to see the addition of <i>“Where possible, natural flood management techniques should be explored and incorporated into development proposals”</i> to point a) of this policy. Protection of groundwater Source Protection Zones (point f) is also welcomed.

SP8	Flood Risk	SUPPORT	5.25 should the Cadnam area be reworded Cadnam-Bartley as both these areas have been prone to surface water flooding. More clear drainage maintained. No more building on wetlands. Bartley/ Cadnam are High Flood Risk areas. Various parts of 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.	SUPPORT	It remains a marked concerns that our Reg 18 , Part 2 comments about the omission of Bartley as a known surface water flooding area from para 5.25 (now 5.27) have not been taken on board. It is though good to see that this policy has been expanded to include a more detailed requirement for Flood Risk Assessments. Our other comments from the Reg 18, Part 2 review remain relevant.
SP9	Sustainable Construction	SUPPORT	Pleased to see support given to proposals for development that mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Consider adding Surface Water flooding under (f) 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.	SUPPORT	It is disappointing that “<i>Surface Water</i>” flooding is not explicitly mentioned in point i Our other comments from the Reg 18, Part 2 review remain relevant.
SP10	Renewable Energy	SUPPORT	It is good to see that the plan supports the installation of solar panels over car parks and car ports (an example of this is Paultons Park). We are against ground mounted solar panels in residential gardens.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

SP11	Nature conservation sites of international importance	NEUTRAL (as currently presented – See comments)	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.	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP12	The natural environment, national; regional; and local	SUPPORT	The 2nd and third sentences are a complete contradiction Does SP12 apply to extensions and outbuildings? 6.23 I support the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. 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?	SUPPORT	We are pleased to see more in the first paragraph of SP12 relating to what is considered “irreplaceable habitat. The weakening of para two by changing the wording from “..will not be permitted.” to “..will not ordinarily be permitted.” Is disappointing. Although the inclusion of “<i>replacement of driveways and road side verges</i>” is welcomed. Addition of new paragraph (6.26) regarding protection for Great Crested Newts is good to see.
SP13	Biodiversity Net Gain	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? I am against developers being able to buy national biodiversity credits. I agree with the hierarchy proposed 6.26 Great to see the reference to Bird bricks in new builds.	SUPPORT	The new opening paragraph of SP13 is good to see, making it clear that mitigation or compensation is a last resort. The expansion of the penultimate paragraph to include a wider range of bio-diversity enhancement features is very good news and goes well beyond the previous wording which was limited to “<i>bird bricks</i>”.

SP14	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. I am against development within SSSI's, I don't believe any development can enhance. 6.32 - I agree with <i>"Landscape character cannot be solely determined by what is visible from a publicly accessible location, as this can change over time."</i> 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. The landscape character of any build should complement the area by it's design.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP15	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. Why is providing SANG mitigation in the National Park even being mentioned let alone being considered	SUPPORT	It is good to see in paragraph 6.39 (previously 6.35) specific types of blue infrastructure. The inclusion within the policy (point g) of <i>".. nature-based solutions to address climate change, strengthen bio-diversity, manage flood risk, and enhance air and water quality.."</i> is a pleasing addition.
DP16	Open Space	SUPPORT	The 2nd sentence should be reworded to remove the bit about surplus to requirements. In the Copythorne Parish Design Statement, 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? 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, how would the open space apply to the allocation for 55 dwellings off Winsor Road?	SUPPORT	We welcome the addition of commentary related to <i>"..integrate open space with the wider green and blue infrastructure network"</i> in the opening paragraph of this policy makes good sense.

DP17	Recreational horse keeping	SUPPORT	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? What permission would be being sought for this policy to be considered?	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP18	Field shelters and stables	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
DP19	Maneges	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
SP20	Coastal Development	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
SP21	Coastal Change Mgmt Area	SUPPORT	Reinforcing sea defences is a high priority	SUPPORT	
SP22 and SP23	Tranquillity (SP22) and Dark Skies (SP23) (Previously one policy (SP22) for Reg 18, Part 2)	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. Although acknowledged in 6.59 that pollutants can harm human health, there's 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? However, it seems inconceivable that new developments will be able to adhere to this policy. Light pollution is a serious concern, Vehicles with stronger head lamps plus high watts on building using more electricity.	SUPPORT	We support the separation of the previous SP22 into two parts. SP22 – This policy focusing on other aspects of tranquillity is well worded and will help protect the “<i>..special quality of the New Forest National Park..</i>” (Para 6.65) SP23 - We welcome the “<i>..avoidance-first approach to external lighting..</i>” in this policy.

SP23 SP24	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. 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. I agree with the re-using of historic buildings and brownfield sites	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP24 DP25	Heritage assets	SUPPORT	I am thankful that Copythorne now has a Parish Design Statement. Sentence (b) should be changed from resisted to not allowed, Sentence (d) should add reference to consulting Historic England 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? Many old buildings have been demolished in the past, fine example recently the demolition of the Fawley Power Station chimney in 2021	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP25 DP26	Local Distinctness	SUPPORT	How is this policy applied when only part of a village is defined? Fully support 7.26. In settlements bordering SSSIs this can be more difficult to manage. But how is this balanced against developments outlined in section 8 which do exactly what this policy is seeking to guard against? Relevant to new developments; extensions; and outbuildings.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

DP26 DP27	Design Principles	SUPPORT	Support 7.28, this talks about new development, does that include outbuildings and extensions? Good checklist in 7.30.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review (other than to note the re-numbering of para 7.30 to 7.29).
DP27 DP28	Residential character of defined villages	SUPPORT	With regard to the proposed “Cadnam-Bartley” Defined Village we would appreciate more understanding as to why the boundaries have been drawn where they have, in particular the gaps between settlements. Please can there be clarity of what it means in terms of development for properties that sit within a Defined Village. 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. 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?	SUPPORT	We note that comments made regarding the boundaries of the “Cadnam-Bartley” Smaller Defined Village made at the Reg 18, Part 2 stage have resulted in a redrawing to include areas adjoining the previous boundaries. Whilst noting the comments about “<i>..local character..</i>” and “<i>..local distinctiveness..</i>” etc. in paragraphs 7.32-7.34, our continued expectation is that the Copythorne Parish Design Statement will continue to be recognised when planning applications for properties within the Smaller Defined Village are considered.

SP28 SP29	New residential development in the National Park	AGAINST (as currently presented – see comments)	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 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? Has the redevelopment of unoccupied properties in disrepair been considered? Would like to see a development of small bungalows for the elderly in our parish rather than housing aimed at younger generation. This would allow older residents to be able to downsize but stay in 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? To continue to nibble building within the National Park. There will not be a park left.	AGAINST	Whilst continuing to stand by the comments made to the Reg 18, Part 2 review we note that the following has been added to this policy:- <i>“Net new open market housing delivered within the National Park will be restricted to “principal residency in perpetuity.”</i> <i>“Affordable housing delivered within the National Park will have local connection criteria applied.”</i> With regard to the comments made in our response to the Reg 18, Part 2 review we note the renumbering of SP34 to SP35; SP 33 to SP34: and SP35 to SP36).
----------------------	---	--	---	----------------	--

SP29 SP30	Specialist housing for older people (Use Class C2)	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.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP30 SP31	The size of new dwellings	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 Mixed sized buildings	SUPPORT	We note that all net new dwellings permitted in the National Park will have a maximum total internal habitable floor area of 100 square metres, whether inside or outside of a defined village. We also note the possibility of some affordable housing being larger than 100 square metres where supported by the relevant statutory housing authority against robust evidence.
SP31 SP32	Land at Whartons Lane, Ashurst (existing allocation)	NEUTRAL	Remove the target of 50% affordable and make it a requirement. Should not be developed as an open space/green site Already underway	NEUTRAL	Whilst this site is nearing completion we remain disappointed the 50% affordable housing is a target not a requirement.
SP32 SP33	Land at Ashurst Hospital (existing allocation)	NEUTRAL	8.30 note: possible covenant to prevent dog or cat ownership; is this enforceable? Already allocated	NEUTRAL	Our previous comment regarding paragraph 8.30 (now paragraph 8.33) remains. It is pleasing to see a new point within this policy regarding the need to “.. carry out adequate transport assessment and design..”.
SP33 SP34	Land at Knellers Lane, Ashurst	NEUTRAL	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	NEUTRAL	In addition to our previous response to the Reg 18, Part 2 review it is good to see an additional point within this policy requiring “the submission of a drainage strategy for the whole site.”.

SP34 SP35	Land at the former Lyndhurst Park Hotel (existing allocation)	NEUTRAL	8.37. good to see that traffic congestion is noted but no mention of the associated pollution for residents, businesses and tourists. I agree with e) for a transport assessment with respect to Air Quality Management. The need for a local connection is supported. Already underway, like the design	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP35 SP36	Land at Calpe Avenue, Lyndhurst	NEUTRAL	There appears to be enough provision for C2 housing in Lyndhurst already As is an existing developed site and supports SP29	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review other than to not a reduction from 60 to 50 units and the additional requirement for a <i>“drainage strategy for the whole site.”</i>
SP36 SP37	Land south of Church Lane, Sway	NEUTRAL	I am pleased to see a recognised need for proper sewage provision Good to see 8.42 off road pedestrian link supported in the plan. Should not be developed as an open space/green site	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP37 SP38	Land to west of Brighton Road, Sway	NEUTRAL	Yet more C2 provision Should not be developed as currently an open space/green site	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

SP38 SP39	Land to west of Winsor Road, Bartley Winsor	AGAINST (as currently presented, due to the number of concerns of both members and residents)	Bartley school is a Junior School, not a Primary School. The Parish has a separate infant school in Copythorne. 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. 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 with them currently were not aware of the eligibility criteria to go on the NFDC housing register. 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) 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.	AGAINST (as currently presented, due to the number of concerns of both members and residents)	We note that additional commentary regarding this site has been added since the Reg 18,Part 2 review. Paragraphs 8.55 and 8.56 are not disputed, although - for residents without the benefit of their own vehicle - transport links to anywhere outside of the very local area are limited to a short period bus service to/from Totton on two adjoining days per week, leaving no service at all for the other five days. Paragraph 8.57 would benefit from the inclusion of reference to the Copythorne Parish Design Statement. In paragraph 8.58 it would be more correct to describe the site as being surrounded by existing residential development as it sits behind existing housing (to the north, east and south) along both Southampton Road and Winsor Road. As such the proposed development is in opposition to the recommendations in Section 7.7 of the adopted Copythorne Parish Design Statement. We note that the statement from Southern Water regarding connections to their existing infrastructure need further assessment. Since the Reg 18, Part 2 review a further 3 site-specific requirements have been added to the 8 already included in this policy, bring the total to 11. This is the longest site of any of the site allocations. In looking in detail as the policy we have the following comments:- Opening para - It is disappointing that the 50% affordable housing requirement has been watered down to a target. Surely a minimum requirement should be quoted.
--------------	---	--	---	--	---

			A mix of properties by height and size would be beneficial (including accessible designs to some properties to aid “downsizing”). Some of the other proposed “Site Allocation” policies have a site-specific reference to open spaces. We would like to see similar for this site as well and would want to work with any proposed developer on what that might look like (play area; orchard planting; pond (might help with drainage?); allotments; possible parking accessible for school drop off/collection) Given the justified concerns of residents relating to drainage (both foul and surface water) within the local area, we would want to see a requirement for these matters to be included in a site-specific requirement. Surface water drainage should be by the use of green (nature based) SuDs rather than grey SuDS where possible. As per Policy SP7 c) with Points 5.17 and 5.18 also of note. Whilst it is pleasing to see site-specific requirement b), it is strongly felt that this should be expanded to consider in detail the overall impact of circa 110 vehicles (avg. 2 per dwelling) on traffic issues in a wider area than just the ingress/egress point and proximity to Bartley Junior School. Concerns have been raised by residents that this development will make the village feel less rural.		Point a – We note the addition of the words “open market” in front of dwellings (SP 31 refers) Point b – It is good to see this new point which reflects concerns regarding both transport needs and road safety (in particular with regards to the school) has been expanded following our Reg 18, Part 2 comments. The Health Streets Audit is welcomed. Points c & d – Previously points b & c, unchanged. Point e – We are delighted to see this new point relating to drainage concerns has been included as previously requested by us at the earlier review stage. Point f – Previously point d, unchanged. Point g – Again, we are pleased to see that this reflects comments made by us at the Reg 18, Part 2 stage. Point h, i, j & k – Previously points f, g, h & i, unchanged.
SP39 SP40	Land to the south of Hamptworth Road, Landford	NEUTRAL	At first glance the rest of the area is pre-dominantly ribbon development along existing roads, any departure from this requires careful consideration.	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

SP40 SP41	Land to the east of The Ridge, Redlynch	NEUTRAL	At first glance, this will need much more research before agreeing to any planning proposal. Site is currently an open space/green site	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP41 SP42	Affordable housing provision within the defined villages and on allocated sites	AGAINST (as currently presented – see comments)	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? 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'. Further clarification regarding the apparent dichotomy is required please 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.	AGAINST (as currently presented – see comments)	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP42 SP43	Rural exception sites	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	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review, other than to add disappointment that <i>"basic level of services and facilities"</i> in point d of this policy is no longer defined as it was in the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

DP43 DP44	New Forest Commoners' dwellings	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
DP44 DP45 (retitled at Reg 19 stage)	New dwellings for estate, agricultural and forestry workers New Forest Estate Workers Dwellings	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
DP46 (added at Reg 19 stage)	New dwellings for agricultural and forest workers	---	-----	SUPPORT	-----
DP45 DP47	Removal of agricultural occupancy conditions	SUPPORT	Could dwellings considered in this policy not be used to support DP44?	SUPPORT	We note that bullet point 4 of paragraph 8.88 reflects our comment at the Reg 18, Part 2 review stage.
SP46 SP48	Self and custom House Building	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
DP47	Land at Forest View, Landford for gypsies and travellers.	NEUTRAL	-----	---	Removed for Reg 19 Consultation Draft
DP48 SP49	Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople	SUPPORT	The "local connection" requirement should be looked at stringently for any occupancy.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

SP50 (added at Reg 19 stage)	Allocation of land at Ringwood Road, Netley Marsh for Travelling Showpeople's use	N/A	N/A	NEUTRAL	Whilst this new policy was discussed (and agreed by a majority) at the NFNPA Full Authority meeting on July 23rd 2026 it was surprising that it was omitted from the index and the relevant pages (137-138) were omitted from Reg 19 document that had been circulated for the meeting. Clearly, the index and the page numbering show that a space had been left for the details to be inserted? Travelling Showpeople have been a part of the local community in Netley Marsh for many years (Coles Yard has 12 pitches) and the ORS report makes the case for a further six pitches being required in the local area during the life cycle of the 2024-2043 Local Plan. We assume that is important for both family and logistical reasons that a second site be found near to the existing one? We are not sure though that the proposed site off Ringwood Road is suitable. The portion of the site which the Local Plan seeks to allocate is on a marked slope and reasonably adjacent to existing housing along Ringwood Road. Land further into the overall parcel of land is more even. A great deal of ground work would be needed to create east-west levels within the site. The likely tenants/ purchasers of the site would – by virtue of point b of the policy - need to have local connections to the National Park and so would therefore be readily identifiable. So, have they been asked as to whether they find the site suitable for their needs. If they don't feel it is suitable then surely the policy fails as there is unlikely to be other qualifying occupier?
--	---	-----	-----	---------	---

					With regards to the opening paragraph of this policy, we can understand the residential and storage uses but seek more clarity on what - in relation to this policy – is the business use? We note all of the policy points and feel that they are all valid. Although we feel that the drainage strategy needs to include the land to the south of the proposed site allocation.
DP49 DP51	Replacement dwellings	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.	SUPPORT	It is our understanding that this policy doesn't distinguish between dwellings in or outside of Defined Villages. The additional clarity provided by the new paragraphs 8.100 and 8.101 is welcomed.
DP50 DP52	Extensions to buildings	SUPPORT	It does not make clear if the 30% rule applies inside a Defined Village. 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.	SUPPORT	The greater detail for this policy from that within the Reg 18, Part 2 review adds clarity on how this policy will work. The final paragraph relating not permitting rainwater drainage on residential extensions be discharged into a foul or combined sewer in order to minimise the risk of sewer flooding and protected water quality is welcomed. As is the mandatory requirement to submit a "Build Over Application to the waste water service provider for their approval.

DP51 DP53	Outbuildings	SUPPORT	Guidelines on how “subservient” is defined would be helpful. “Clearly subservient is too open ended.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP52 SP54	Local community facilities	SUPPORT	Within reason	SUPPORT	The addition to the policy of a requirement for evidence of non-viability is strongly supported.
SP53 SP55	Maintaining and improving Business Floorspace	SUPPORT	9.17 - I agree with not encouraging general warehousing for the reasons mentioned. 9.19 - I support retaining existing employment sites. Good to see the issue of parking and traffic addressed directly. If correct procedure followed	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP54 DP56	Redevelopment and extensions to existing employment buildings	SUPPORT	This is supported but it needs to be mentioned that there is always the danger of “chicken houses2 becoming workshops, becoming offices, becoming bungalows”. I believe it is important to retain employment in communities. But depends on type of business	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
SP55 SP57	The land-based economy	SUPPORT	Paragraph a (ii) contradicts Policy SP42 which releases back up grazing land for Affordable Housing 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. Depending on type of trade	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.

DP56 DP58	New agricultural and forestry related development	SUPPORT	Especially support the consideration of the building or structure size. Depends on the size	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP57 DP59	Re-use of farm buildings	SUPPORT	Good to see that the National Park is looking after the commoners. Support the emphasis on commoners having priority for buildings If it helps the farmer.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP58 DP60	Loss of local retail facilities	SUPPORT	-----	SUPPORT	-----
DP59 DP61	Retail development outside of the defined Village boundaries	SUPPORT	Good to see support for our local village shops and farm shops.	SUPPORT	Good to see support for our local village shops and farm shops.
SP60 SP62	Sustainable tourism development	SUPPORT	This is broadly supported but wherever possible attention needs to be paid to linking up local transport services. How do "Airbnb" type properties fit into this policy?	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
DP61 DP63	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. 9.49 and 9.50 I support both the Article 4 Directions for pop up and temporary campsites. If a reasonable size	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review, other than to note the renumbering of paragraphs 9.49 and 9.50 as 9.50 and 9.51.

SP62 SP64	Telecomms and Digital infrastructure	SUPPORT	To reduce impact, can masts be painted green or be camouflaged with greenery? 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. 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. IT infrastructure is always important.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review, we note that much of this type of infrastructure falls under national planning laws and policies. We also note that paragraph 9.57 is now 9.58
DP63 DP65	Transport Infrastructure	NEUTRAL (Still needs some refining)	Should this policy also include horse riding? Horse riding is a very important mode of transport in the National Park This is far too “woolly”, and needs to spell out minimum acceptable levels of transport that must be provided for new developments 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 limited (two weekdays only) bus service suitable for food shopping or visiting family in Totton.	NEUTRAL	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review. It is though good to see “iv. private car” removed from point 1b of this policy.

SP64 SP66	Sustainable transport and access	SUPPORT	We 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. From what we have heard at the recent NFNPA Community Transport Summit, at the moment the National Park is removing rather than enhancing cycling and walking infrastructure! 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. Especially more joined up no-vehicle routes. We need a link between Copythorne and Lyndhurst.	SUPPORT	No change to comments made in respect of the Reg 18, Part 2 review.
--------------	----------------------------------	---------	--	---------	---