

Hyde Parish Council Response to New Forest National Park Local Plan Consultation Draft

Thank you for the opportunity to reply as a Parish Council

Please find the comments below for consideration in the formulation of the Draft Plan. If you have any queries please contact the clerk to Hyde Parish Council, Martine Coatham (parish.clerk@hyde-pc.gov.uk).

1.13 Support – Comment: We encourage working with other planning authorities around the National Park and beyond especially with the increased planning proposals for houses in southern England. Specifically to have a dialogue to encourage local areas for recreation near these developments and take the pressure from the Park.

1.24 Enforcement. – Comment: We would like to see the NPA invest more in education and training for parish councils, architects and agents to reduce enforcement issues and appeals.

2.7 Access and Recreation: We note that future development in southern England will result in an additional 1.05 million visits per annum. Comment: This plan should deal with this increase of what will be mainly day visitors and the effect on the Open Forest and the towns and villages. The N.P.A. appears to have no strategic policy which addresses this is of concern for the residents and the protection of the biodiversity.

3.2 - The vision seems fine – Comment: This is very wordy and has something for everyone. Any vision should reflect on what the New Forest should be in 50, and 100 years not so short term. We have noted that the F.C has produced a long term plan

POLICY 1 – no comment

POLICY 2 – Comment: We have concerns that just Fawley Power station and Dibden Bay is mentioned as there are other pressures with development and example being the 3,500 houses for Whiteley, and the proposed port development for Southampton docks . There will also be further development in East Dorset. This should also be mentioned in any plan.

POLICIES 3, 4 AND 5 - Fully support

POLICY 6 – Support - Comment: We feel that all development should have enough parking within the curtilage of the property AND consideration should be given where possible that a planning condition should be included that vehicles must be kept on the property to avoid damage to the condition of the SSSI etc as in mention further in the text at 6.14 AND Also a condition on a planning application that building sites should be secure from stock entering and becoming injured AND should as well be applied to deter children entering the site.

POLICY 7 – Support - Comment: Does not mention about the outflow from the sewage works for the main villages and does not mention run off from development.

POLICY 8 – Support – Comment: Consideration should be given that the designating of areas as SANGS could/would lead to the loss of backup land for Commoning.

POLICY 9 – Support – Comment: We are concerned that these new open spaces do not become urban parks but support bio-diversity and this should be secured by planning conditions. It is important that the surrounding planning authorities also apply this condition. (these areas are to take pressure off the Forest and be a buffer but may end up as mowed grass, cemeteries, or be built on).

POLICY 10 – Fully support – Comment: We suggest that you added that development should not be permitted in a areas which are at possible risk of flooding.

POLICY 11 AND 12 – no comment

POLICY 13 – Fully support. Comment: We note there is no reference in this policy for the use of wood and the benefits of well managed woodland as an example of the Pondhead Wood. There are many small pockets of woodland especially on the western escarpment that have potential.

POLICY 14 – Fully support Comment: We note that a lot of background artificial light comes from surrounding towns and cities. Any unnecessary light should be discouraged.

POLICY 15 - Fully support - see comments above at Policy 6.

POLICY 16 – Full support – Comment: In our view the continued urbanisation effect is caused by changes in the street scene with properties becoming enlarged both in the footprint and in height. The other factors are the boundary treatments and the laying down of tarmac and brick driveways. To retain the rural effect it should be considered that these changes should be controlled by planning conditions. We also note that part of the rural effect is continued by the local farmer's and commoner's buildings and activities. "Development should be sympathetic and in keeping with its surroundings" – see comments policy 36.

POLICY 17 – Support - comments as above at 16

POLICY 18 – Support - the lower figure of housing development to protect the special status.

POLICY 19 – Fully support - the smaller size will help with the affordable housing stock and we support the removal of permitted development rights to help maintain these smaller houses and their affordability. There should also be a specific reference to the retention of the bungalows with an increasing ageing population.

POLICY 20-21-22-23-24-25 -26 - 27- No comment

POLICY 28 – Fully Support - Comment: We should support suitable housing for local rural workers with a 100% affordable housing on rural exception sites. We would NOT accept any element of the marketing of open housing on these sites as this would negate the aims of the policy.

POLICY 29 – Fully support - Comment: We consider that a separate policy is essential if proper attention is to be given to housing essential workers.

POLICY 30 – Fully support – Comment: This supports rural workers and some estate workers and agree that these dwellings have a conditions that they cannot be sold with a condition similar to the Commoner's Housing scheme perhaps. There should be a definition of "estate" to include that it is a working estate and run as a business and contributing to the Forest economy. We have concerns that the owners of large private houses and gardens could apply for an estate worker's house in the grounds.

POLICY 31 – Fully support

POLICY 32 – Support - Comment: We ask that this approach is rigorously adhered to as otherwise it means the loss of affordable rural housing and a financial windfall for developers.

7.61 The alternative should not be supported for self-build sites – Comment: We have concerns that there will be a spurt of garden grabbing.

POLICY 33 – no comment – but we do note that in the NFDC there are enough sites earmarked for the future.

POLICY 34 – no comment

POLICY 35 – Support with Concerns. Comment: We support the policy as written, the limit of 30% is very clear. The alternative could lead to discord among neighbours and bad feeling towards councillors when applicants do not get what they want. It throws up concerns about the size of replacements which would open up property to over-development, therefore it should be clear that replacements have no greater floor space than the original. Concerns that if restricted to present footprint that a low flat-ish subservient property could become a tall building and change the street scene, producing the sense of urbanisation as in the point made in policy 16.

The principle of two for one is acceptable if the replacement building is in keeping as in the previous point made in 16 about changing the character of the hamlets and villages.

POLICY 36 – Support – Comment: strongly ask for a definition of conservatories which suddenly become an extra room above the 30% and should in our view be included in the habitable floor space. We note “Extensions to existing buildings will be permitted provided that they are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage”, but the planning officers’ interpretations of appropriate and in keeping etc. is often contrary to the parish council’s view. We would like much more notice taken of local experience and knowledge and VDSs because parish and town councillors know what is appropriate to their area and should not have to accept inappropriate decisions.

POLICY 37 – Strongly support – Comment: We have concerns that outbuildings are becoming separate dwellings without planning. The height of many garages/outbuildings allows habitable space and increases the bulk of the building, we suggest catslide roofs would be much less bulky and prevent upstairs living accommodation.

POLICY 38 – No comment

POLICY 39 – Strongly support

POLICY 40 - support – Comment: We prefer the idea of small scale with enough parking on site and would like strong conditions that control future use.

POLICY 41. - support

POLICY 42 – Strongly support

POLICY 43 – no comment

POLICY 44 – Comment only: We consider this to be 'woolly' and we are not clear what this means and could be simplified and clarified. It does not define the activity and could lead to multi-uses of a site. There is the difficulty that non-residential buildings could be converted to holiday lets and which then become permanent residences with no control.

POLICY 45 – support with concerns – Comment: as above we consider there is a need for a specific policy for buildings converted to holiday lets. There should be proper control – not a pig shed without insulation and boded. Without a firm policy this will mean no outbuildings and farm building will be safe as the developers will target the New Forest.

POLICY 46 - Support with concerns – Comment: We are concerned that the New Forest is becoming an elite destination. There should be room for working class people to come on holiday. There is a shortage of camping sites and the idea of 'Pop up' camp sites during the peak period of summer should not be restricted. Toilets and showers can be hired on a temporary basis. We consider well managed temporary sites should be available for visitors who want a simple, inexpensive camping holiday and owners should be assisted by the NPA to provide education/information about “what to do and not to do”. These sites also offer extra income to the farmers and Commoners around the Forest who use their fields for camping as part of their diversification. This policy needs more thought and work to get it right, using article 4 designation could be a step too far, and would effect scout and guides and others – and possibly village events that use fields.

POLICY 47 – Strongly support

POLICY 48 – Support – Comment: We think it needs to be clearer on what 'reuses' are acceptable.

POLICY 49 - Support - Comment: We note it does not mention animal welfare.

POLICY 50 - Support - Comment: We ask that this also mentions specifically liveryes and riding stables.

POLICY 51 Strongly support - Comment: We note that this also does not deal with the so called mobile shelters that never move.

POLICY 52 – Support - Comment: Maneges should be in a suitable location and should avoid grazing land but we appreciate that they keep shod horses off the Open Forest, we suggest that a planning condition be imposed that – they are removed if they are no longer used.

9.16 – Do not support the alternative, KEEP annex 2.

POLICY53 – No comment

POLICY 54 – Support – Comment: We note the need for joined up cycle routes as cycling has become popular and is a government policy, This will be an asset to residents and visitors especially if the routes are not on busy roads. Also a reduction in sign clutter would be appropriate.