

Working to Protect the New Forest



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reply to: -

Brookley Farmhouse Sway Road Brockenhurst Hampshire SO427RX
01590 623935 brookleyfarmhouse@btinternet.com

Sent as attachment to Email only

8 June 2015

Policy Team (policy@newforestnpa.gov.uk)
New Forest National Park Authority
Lymington Town Hall
Avenue Road
Lymington SO41 9ZG

Dear Sirs,

Updating the National Park Management Plan Response to First Draft

1. New Forest Association (NFA) looks forward to the opportunity to be a constructive partner in achieving the plan's aims over the next five years. Most especially given the Plan's underlying theme stated on page 4 as *the conservation of the special qualities of the Forest*.
 2. None of the additional and changed paragraphs are objectionable. TT9, TT10 and TT11 are welcomed as they demonstrate that recreational activities can be used to help the whole of the Park community, rather than just the narrow commercial sector. National Planning Policy Framework (113) impinges on LH9 and elsewhere. We sometimes forget it is not just dwellings that require planning permission but any recreational infrastructure.
- NFA is pleased that HCC has committed to action in this area but questions the specific nature of TT4. A defined solution is proposed without the problem being quantified and the merits of a range of solutions available compared. Why is this not just a sub set of TT5 and TT6?
4. It is noted that ST1 has been achieved.
 4. Safeguarding Tranquillity ST2. NFA regrets that its request that the definition of this project should be *Agree ways to maintain and enhance the tranquil areas of the National Park over time* has not been adopted in the revision. The word tranquillity embraces a multitude of qualities, all of which contribute to and none of which diminish *the special qualities of the Forest*. Tranquillity may even be considered shorthand for the first purpose. NFA believes the project to be of crucial importance embracing projects listed elsewhere such as TT1 to TT7 and ST3 to ST4 and most crucially the management of visitors as discussed in 4.17 etc. The importance of this project warrants an unqualified definition. (NFA hopes that by 2020 some implementation has followed agreement.)
- NFA believes that the inclusion of the subsidiary comment about aircraft diminishes the critical importance of ST2 and, if a separate project is not warranted for aircraft intrusion, NFA would prefer it be not included rather than appear in ST2. (See para 5).

Working to Protect the New Forest



5. The solution to *conservation of the special qualities of the Forest* is largely where the problems stem from - beyond its boundaries. There is reference to this in LH10 (which may be the most important project in the whole plan) and EP6, but much more needs to be done in identifying and implementing alternative recreational sites to relieve what NFA considers to be unsustainable visitor pressure on the Park. NFA considers at a minimum a project to identify potential sites should be included.

6. The inclusive format of the plan leads to a difficulty.

NFA believes there are two problems that stand head and shoulders above the rest in endangering the *conservation of the special qualities of the Forest*. In the long term it is the loss of the next generation through lack of affordable housing and the loss of commoners' holdings and in the short term through unsustainable visitor pressure. (NFA would welcome comment from NFNPA on this two sentence summary).

NFA feels the document would be of more value and would have greater relevance and acceptability to the Park community if re-constructed in way that, while shorter, gave greater prominence to important matters and more readily linked often quite trivial matters to the over arching objective.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Graham Baker'.

Graham Baker, NFA Planning Committee