

PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy 2017
Table of responses to January 2017 consultation

PUSH GI Steering Group		
Authority (Officer)	Comment	Response
Gosport Borough Council (Jayson Grygiel)	<p><u>Page 12, Position Statement G1: Green Infrastructure, Para 2:</u> Change 2016 to 2017</p> <p><u>2.3.4 (p13):</u> May be worth mentioning that the public-facing brand for the SRMP work is now known as Bird Aware Solent. Website is currently being prepared.</p> <p><u>Figure 5, p32:</u> The Solent and Dorset Coast potential SPA (pSPA) is also applicable. pSPAs are given the same protection as European sites (see para 118 of the NPPF).</p> <p><u>Appendix 4, pp58 and 59:</u> Add – “Alver Valley Country Park Strategy (2014) Large parts of the Alver Valley have been used for gravel extraction and landfill operations. Subsequent restoration works have largely been completed and the area now encompasses a great diversity of habitats and landscapes including a range of wetlands, woodlands and grasslands. Gosport Borough Council has prepared a strategy for the Alver Valley Country Park which identifies issues that need to be addressed and key proposals to be implemented. Since the publication of the strategy a number of projects have been undertaken with funding from both PUSH and the Government’s Local Growth Funding through the Solent LEP. There are still a number of initiatives that need to be completed to fully establish the site as an accredited³⁵ Country Park. The Strategy can be viewed at: http://www.gosport.gov.uk/assets/avcpstrategy”</p> <p>35 - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/accredited-country-parks-in-england/accredited-country-parks-in-england#south-east</p>	<p>No change - The wording of Position Statement G1 is taken from the published PUSH Spatial Position Statement.</p> <p>Agreed – appropriate text in para 2.3.3 added.</p> <p>Agreed – Will be added to figure 5 map.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p>
New Forest District Council (Louise Evans)	<p>Please can you (or whoever would know) clarify what is now the intended status is of this document, bearing in mind that we do not have an agreed PUSH Strategy and only a PUSH Position Statement? What will the report to the PUSH Joint Committee actually be recommending? I ask this because with only a couple of weeks being given to comment on this document – having not seen earlier drafts – I am reluctant to spend much time going through the document at this late stage and giving you detailed comments when the reality is that the document will have no status in planning policy terms, so we could live with it as it is, even if we were not being entirely happy with everything in it. If it is clear that it is just an advisory document in support of the PUSH position statement, then we are OK with that.</p> <p>I note that ‘detailed GI projects and opportunities mapping will be contained in an associated PUSH (South Hampshire) GI Implementation Plan, which is yet to be drafted’, and I ask that if this work is still being progressed (?) there is proper consultation with all districts about the projects identified in their areas at an early stage to ensure that there is local support for projects and no conflict with work we are already doing ourselves.(We had issues with some of the projects that were identified for us in early versions of the GI Implementation Plan.)</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p> <p>PUSH authorities will be fully consulted during the preparation of the PUSH GI Implementation Plan 2017.</p>

<p>New Forest National Park Authority (David Illsley)</p>	<p><u>Para 1.1.6, fourth bullet point:</u> Welcome reference to SANGs in this paragraph. Natural England is increasingly seeking SANGs as part of new residential developments planned close to the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites as per the approach in areas like the Dorset Heathlands and the Thames Basin Heaths.</p> <p><u>Para 1.1.6, bullet points 7,8,9:</u> It is open to debate whether internationally protected habitats, nationally protected landscapes and nature reserves fully constitute 'green infrastructure' given that in many cases there will be access restrictions. If they are to be included on this list it is important that the wording in the final sentence in paragraph 1.1.7 and the first sentence in paragraph 1.1.8 regarding the impacts of growth on them is emphasised.</p> <p><u>Para 1.2.22:</u> This is a useful paragraph in summarising the position in relation to the Solent habitats. In terms of the New Forest's Natura 2000 sites, Natural England convened a meeting with NFDC, NFNPA, TVBC, SCC and Wiltshire Council in Autumn 2016 to discuss a shared approach to mitigating impacts from development close to the New Forest. Natural England supported the LPAs in developing their own mitigation strategies and agreed that best practice would be shared across the LPAs.</p> <p><u>Para 2.1.8:</u> Support the wording of this paragraph which succinctly summarises the legal 'duty of regard' which relates to National Parks contained within the Environment Act 1995.</p> <p><u>Para 2.3.7, sentences 3,4,5:</u> The Footprint Ecology Report on Changing patterns of visitor numbers within the New Forest National Park, with particular reference to the New Forest SPA (2008) concluded that housing development in the period 2006-2026 within 50 km of the New Forest will result in an additional 1.05 million person visits per annum.</p> <p><u>Para 2.3.8, second sentence:</u> See comment on paragraph 1.2.22 - Natural England convened a meeting with NFDC, NFNPA, TVBC, SCC and Wiltshire Council in Autumn 2016 to discuss a shared approach to mitigating impacts from development close to the New Forest. Natural England supported the LPAs in developing their own mitigation strategies and agreed that best practice would be shared across the LPAs.</p> <p><u>Para 2.4.3:</u> The National Park Authorities are also engaged in producing Local Plans for the areas they cover and are engaged through their roles as statutory consultees -in neighbouring authorities' plans.</p> <p><u>Para 3.1.2</u> Add following sentence to the end of the paragraph "The environmental and landscape designations are also key contributors to the quality of life enjoyed by residents or South Hampshire and are a major attribute to the sub-region in attracting investment."</p> <p><u>Figure 11, p38:</u> Query whether Lepe Country Park should appear on this map? It's currently not on there but is listed in Appendix 3 as forming part of the green grid network.</p> <p><u>Appendix 4, p47, Hampshire Waste and Minerals Plan (Adopted October 2013), para 2:</u> I'd suggest deleting this paragraph as it relates to the internal working arrangements between the minerals and waste planning authorities in Hampshire (including the NFNPA).</p>	<p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Agreed – wording amended slightly to increase emphasis.</p> <p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Supporting comment .</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Lepe Country park is an important component of the green grid available to residents of the PUH sub-region. It will be added to the map.</p> <p>Agreed – text deleted.</p>
---	---	--

	<p><u>Page 47:</u> Change District Local Plans to 'Local Plans'.</p> <p><u>Page 50, line 2, East Hampshire District Local Plan HRA:</u> Something for the SDNPA and/or EHDC to clarify, but the South Downs NPA only became fully operational in April 2011 so this cannot be correct.</p> <p><u>Page 52, Test Valley Local Plan HRA, first sentence:</u> Something for TVBC to clarify – the Council's Revised Local Plan 2011-2029 was adopted in January 2016.</p>	<p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended</p>
Stuart Roberts (SRMP)	<p>It is good to see the references to the SRMP and its strategy within this document: those look fine apart from two small details which I would ask you to amend as follows:</p> <p>Para 2.3.4 – please use the phrase "coastal rangers" instead of "countryside rangers" - that's the term which the Partnership uses and is much more geographically appropriate!</p> <p>Appendix 4 page 53 – please replace the web address which the much shorter one of our about-to-be-launched new website: www.birdaware.org</p>	<p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p>
Environment Agency (Charlotte Lines)	<p>The implementation plan and ongoing monitoring is going to be key to the successful delivery, how is this going to be taken forward monitored a T&F group?</p> <p>I have a few comments which I hope you find helpful, I have structured them in order of the document.</p> <p>Para 1.2.21- I think some further explanation of what is an ecological network is and how LPA's are expected to use this in their plan making process would be helpful as it's not clear to me if this is relevant.</p> <p>PUSH spatial position statement – should the strategic priorities be the strategic projects? Where are the priorities within the document? I think it would be helpful to keep the same terminology throughout.</p> <p>After 'make provision for these strategic and their local GI proposals should it be priorities or projects? Again different terminology.</p> <p>Should there be reference to monitoring in the statement? We will need to show how well we are doing each year which will be dependent on local monitoring the implementation of GI. I also think we should be placing much more emphasis on describing the natural capital value on each project and I believe it should be part of the position statement or if not in the statement should be part of the GI project criteria.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.7 – the New Forest NPA have done some work on the natural capital value of the new forest it would be good to draw out the key facts and figures here to support the strategy.</p> <p>Section 3 – think it would be helpful to have a map here showing the PUSH area the NPA's</p> <p>Para 4.1.2 – I really think there would be value in LA's quantify the natural capital value/ecosystem services of their individual GI projects and it should be added as part of the criteria, as well as being identified in the implementation plan.</p>	<p>Agreed – text added to monitoring section.</p> <p>Agreed – Definition of ecological networks in Glossary has been amended.</p> <p>Wording of PUSH Position Statement G1 is taken from the PUSH Spatial Position Statement and can not be modified. However, wording is consistent with section 4 of this strategy.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>There is an existing monitoring section (Section 4.7).</p> <p>Agreed – text added to project criteria.</p> <p>Key facts/figures will be added to the final document where informative/illustrative.</p> <p>Map of PUSH NPAs at Figure 9 of Appendix 2 already included.</p> <p>Text added. Will also be a feature of the GI Implementation Plan.</p>

Winchester City Council (Clare Penny)	I have read the Strategy with interest, and the only omission I can see is in the list of GI Planning projects (page 55). Winchester City Council is currently preparing a Green Infrastructure Strategy. Please could you include this in the table beneath our GI Study, as you have done with Eastleigh?	Agree – text added.
South Downs National Park Authority (Katharine Stuart)	My only comment relates to the last couple of sentences of paragraph 2.4.5. The South Downs GI Framework is not yet complete. I suggest wording along the lines of: 'The South Downs National Park is in the process of preparing a GI Framework in partnership with all the District Authorities which adjoin or have an area within the South Downs National Park.'	Noted – text amended.
Eastleigh Borough Council (Marijke Ransom)	<p>PARA. 1.1.1 Underline – “key green Infrastructure (GI) features and future requirements”</p> <p>Para 1.1.7, last sentence Important point.</p> <p>PARA. 1.1.8 The River Itchen SAC is another sensitive environmental feature as are other protected habitats such as ancient woodland. Add underlined text: “It is important to note that although sensitive environmental features, such as the European designated New Forest, <u>River Itchen</u> and Solent Coast, <u>and other protected habitats</u>...”</p> <p>PARA. 1.1.14 Add the underlined text to bullet point four: “Identify how GI can be used to mitigate the recreational impact of new housing development on New Forest, <u>River Itchen</u> and Solent European sites <u>and other protected habitats</u>.”</p> <p>PARA. 2.2.10 We are starting to name our gaps ‘settlement gaps’ – is PUSH wedded to the term ‘countryside gaps’ ? should we ensure consistency?</p> <p>2.3 HEADER: Add underlined text: Solent, <u>and New Forest and River Itchen</u> European Protected Sites</p> <p>CREATE 2.3.9 with following text: River Itchen Special Area of Conservation The River Itchen is a classic example of a sub-type 1 chalk river. Only England, France, Belgium and New Zealand have true chalk rivers. It is designated as a Special Area of Conservation for a number of species and habitats. The Habitat Regulations Assessment for the Eastleigh Issues and Options Consultation 2015³² identifies several impact pathways for the River Itchen that relate to the general quantum of development in the borough. Water Resources (flows), Water Quality and Air Quality are identified as the areas requiring most consideration. Though the impact of disturbance on protected habitats and species through mechanical erosion, recreational activity and noise and vibration are also of concern. The PUSH GI Strategy and associated Implementation Plan will help to address these concerns.</p> <p>32 https://my.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/180204/Eastleigh-Issues-and-Options-draft-HRA-v3-final_SF.PDF</p> <p>PARA. 3.6.4 Add underlined text to sentence one: In developing opportunities to enhance the South Hampshire Green Grid, however, the recreational impacts of new development on the <u>River Itchen SAC</u>, New Forest Natura 2000 sites and the Solent Special Protection</p>	<p>Disagree – do not feel this is necessary.</p> <p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Question to be dealt with outside of this consultation.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p>

	<p>Areas (SPA) must be fully offset and reduced where possible for existing communities.</p> <p>PARA. 4.1.1, fifth bullet point: Grassland is a priority habitat in their own right not just for reptiles. Change as follows: Ecological protection and mitigation projects (e.g. <u>improvements for priority habitats and species grassland enhancement to improve as reptile habitat</u>);</p> <p>PARA 4.1.2 Change first word of first bullet point to "Relate"</p> <p>APPENDIX 3 Add River Itchen to list of SACs</p> <p>APPENDIX 4 Add the following to the entry for EBC HRA Also Refer to HRA for Issues and Options Dec 2015 https://my.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/180204/Eastleigh-Issues-and-Options-draft-HRA-v3-final_SF.PDF An HRA for the Draft EBLP 2011-2036 will be available in the autumn of 2017.</p> <p>Add: Also refer to EBLP 2011-2036 Background Paper available in July 2017.</p> <p>Add: Also Test and Itchen River Restoration Strategy? Technical Report: http://www.therrc.co.uk/sites/default/files/files/Designated_Rivers/Test_Itchen/technical_report_issue_5_final.pdf Management Report: https://secure.toolkitfiles.co.uk/clients/23271/sitedata/files/Strategy.pdf</p>	<p>Text amended but with the suggestion from the HIWWT.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p>
<p>Eastleigh Borough Council (Deborah Salmon)</p>	<p>PARA. 1.1.6, bullet 7: Only providing access is not be encouraged on these sites It may be better to be selective with only the sites that can accommodate access being included within the network. My worry is that if the Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites are included they will be used within calculations for Natural Greenspace indicating a much higher quantity than actually exist.</p> <p>PARA. 1.1.7: This is more my understanding of GI much more generalised than the designations providing a resource for people and more common biodiversity and enabling people to enjoy healthy lifestyles and experience nature Other functions could include flood attenuation SuDS food production etc.</p> <p>PARA 1.1.14, bullet 4: Why are these sites selected is it due to them already having strategies. The Itchen Navigation part of the River Itchen SAC is being impacted so badly by recreational pressure from Southampton and Eastleigh it is falling to pieces. I am sure this is the case on many other sites.</p> <p>PARA. 1.1.14, diagram: What about alleviating fragmentation of natural habitats.</p> <p>PARA 1.2.2 Generally GI should be focused within or adjacent to urban areas or new development. There is also a role for</p>	<p>Point taken – but this is also about enhancing the GI network and it is explicitly stated that access/recreation may not be conducive to sensitive sites. This list was approved by the GI Steering Group as a whole.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>River Itchen added.</p> <p>Implicit in 'Protect and enhance the natural environment'.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>GI to establish large habitat corridors within the countryside, connecting fragmented habitats. The strategic scale of the corridors will dissipate impact on the natural habitats spreading recreational pressure over a much wider area.</p> <p>PARA 1.2.10 Why is this relevant?</p> <p>Change 'four' in last sentence to 'five'.</p> <p>PARA 1.2.12 & 1.2.16 ...<u>naturalised</u> sustainable drainage systems...</p> <p>PARA 2.3.1 Great however the Solent Complex is designated for other habitats and invertebrate species. People have become so focused on the bird life and the SRMP that there is a high danger that the protection of the important coastal habitats and invertebrate species will be forgotten. This could lead to deterioration in the important SACs and Ramsar sites within the complex.</p> <p>PARA 3.1.2 mention the important rivers the Meon Test Itchen Hamble etc.</p> <p>PARA 3.4.1 This is all good but is only what already exists. The only exception is the ecological network devised to protect biodiversity.</p> <p>PARA 3.6.2 When will this be published? The GI implementation strategy is the most important part of this document. Without it GI new cannot be delivered.</p> <p>PARA 3.6.3, bullet 5: Is this really achievable within the existing urban areas</p> <p>PARA 3.6.4 Again although important there are other sites which have in combination recreational impacts. Of particular note in the Eastleigh area is the Itchen Navigation which serves both Eastleigh and Southampton, with significant damage to the canal integrity as a result. I am sure other LAs have other examples. Just because there are bespoke strategies for these two areas it does not mean they are any more important than the rest of the network</p> <p>PARA 4.1.1, bullet 5: This seems a strange example to use and I guess came from the need to preserve the rare reptiles within the New Forest. However this is not an example that is relevant across the PUSH area. If grassland is being referenced it surely should be the promotion of species rich grassland that has a value in its own right and can attract a number of fauna species</p> <p>APPENDIX 3 Add Lakeside Country Park</p>	<p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>No change – it is four.</p> <p>The term SuDS represents the naturalised element.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Opportunities mapping will be provided in the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Not for this consultation.</p> <p>If planned properly.</p> <p>River Itchen SAC added.</p> <p>Example came from the earlier GI Steering Group. It has now been changed.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p>
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	<u>General Comments:</u>	

<p>(Dave Rumble)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We welcome the document's scope and strategic focus and acknowledge that it provides the framework for a more detailed GI Implementation Plan which we would be very interested in commenting on and, through the Steering Group, helping to shape. We welcome the information in Section 4 on delivery as the previously adopted Plan, in the Wildlife Trust's opinion, gave insufficient coverage of how the projects will be resourced and delivered. The Strategy should set out the need to match opportunities funding sources in the GI Implementation Plan. South Hampshire Green Grid vs. Green Infrastructure – in some places these terms are used interchangeably. More consistency / clarity would be helpful. Would it be possible to map the Green Grid? <p><u>Specific Comments:</u></p> <p>1.1.8: Suggest "There is, therefore, a need for new GI and the enhancement of existing GI to <u>offset</u> the recreational impacts associated with growth and development on environmentally sensitive areas by providing..."</p> <p>1.1.9 & 1.1.10: Suggest also stating that new settlements should incorporate genuinely new GI rather than increasing the burden on existing GI and sensitive sites this applies at strategic and local site level. Appropriate metrics should be applied to evidence this.</p> <p>1.2.10 Have the four strategic sites been acquired? I thought one of the four was Manor House farm?</p> <p>2.3: It would be helpful to have a summary of the extent to which the soundness of Local Plans in the PUSH area – in terms of Habitats Regulations compliance –depend on this document as was been the case with the 2010 Strategy (see also 1.1.5, 1.1.7, 1.1.11, Appendix 4).</p> <p>2.3.1 There is no reference to the proposed new SPA for the three tern species.</p> <p>2.3.4: As well as SANG-type GI SRMP is looking to provide a network of refuges for disturbed / displaced birds.</p> <p>2.3.6: Would be helpful to include the term "in-combination" here. Given the likely departure from Europe, should we also be referencing nationally protected sites here?</p> <p>3.3: Point 5 - Suggest "Protect and enhance biodiversity, providing mitigation for the impact of development taking place within the sub-region and in-combination with that taking place adjacent to it". Point 8 - Suggest "Where appropriate, maximise multifunctionality of new and existing GI."</p> <p>4.1.1: Point 5 - Suggest: "Ecological protection and mitigation projects (e.g. creation of undisturbed refuge habitat for coastal birds);</p> <p>4.1.2:</p>	<p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>As in response to other commenters, further layering could be done to create a green grid map and words to this effect have been included in the draft strategy for Joint Committee.</p> <p>Agreed – word changed.</p> <p>Agreed text amended.</p> <p>The SRMP project coordinator has no contention with this wording but this point will be confirmed before publication.</p> <p>To be resolved at a later date.</p> <p>Noted – name added to section sub-title.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – 'in-combination' added. Not felt that adding 'national' is necessary.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p>
----------------------	---	---

	<p>Point 3 - The drivers outlined in the document create a mandate to do more than (merely) mitigate impacts on biodiversity. Suggest additional bullet point: "Provide opportunities to secure net gain for biodiversity e.g. in the form of well managed priority habitats forming ecological networks"</p> <p>4.6.1/4.6.5: Delighted to see differentiation between capital AND revenue funding for GI delivery.</p> <p>4.6.4: Suggest: "Further details of potential GI funding will be set out in the PUSH GI Implementation Plan, matching sources of funding to projects where feasible."</p> <p>Appendix 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solent Waders and Brent Geese Strategy 2010 is currently undergoing revision and update. • Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Nature Partnership (LNP) is currently focusing developing and disseminating the Ecological Network map mentioned elsewhere. • Under Coastal Projects mention EA's Regional Habitat Creation Programme 	<p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Noted – text amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed – text added.</p>
--	--	---

PUSH Planning Officers Group		
Authority (Officer)	Comment	Response
<p>Test Valley Borough Council (David Bibby)</p>	<p>GENERAL There may be opportunities for reducing repetition in some places.</p> <p>SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION PARA.1.1.3 Would it be appropriate to say here (and in a few other places too) that the GI strategy has informed the PUSH Spatial Position Statement (SPS) when the Joint Committee are being asked to approve it some time after the SPS? Would the alternative phrase of 'prepared alongside' or similar wording be preferable?</p> <p>PARA.1.1.10 (see also 3.6.3 5th Bullet and 4.1.2 8th Bullet) Clarification is needed as to whether ANGSt is being used for indicative purposes/benchmarking or it is actually being applied as a standard which we are expecting to achieve? It is unlikely that retrofitting GI in urban regeneration schemes will address the ANGSt deficits.</p> <p>PARA.1.2.10 Our understanding is that at present for the Solent SRMP, only two of the bids have been agreed, and the other two are due to be considered at the Solent LEP Board in March.</p> <p>PARA.1.2.11 The phrase regarding 'localised flooding due to superfluous levels of surface water' may be better expressed.</p> <p>PARA.1.2.21 This refers to the LNP providing a 'green grid' and ecological network for PUSH. Is this now available, as we understand it was due to be launched in February/March? It would also be useful to know if it's being presented as something which PUSH has signed up to, and how it relates to the Green Halo concept.</p>	<p>Agreed – following Joint Committee, any remaining unnecessary repetition will be removed.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Agreed – text added to clarify that it is indicative.</p> <p>The SRMP Project Coordinator has confirmed that four projects will be funded. This will be confirmed prior to publication of this strategy.</p> <p>Agreed – word superfluous (from an earlier draft) has been removed.</p> <p>Agreed – however, there is a question as to whether this mapping will be available to PUSH. Joint Committee will have the opportunity to say whether it wants its inclusion.</p>

	<p>SECTION 2 DRIVERS FOR A PUSH STRATEGIC GI APPROACH SECTION 2.3 The sub-title of the section should be amended to ensure reference is also made to the Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Chichester Harbour & Langstone Harbour SPA (which also form part of the Solent European sites).</p> <p>PARA.2.3.7 The final sentence should only be included if there is evidence which would back this up.</p> <p>PARA2.3.8 With regard to the reference to 'an appropriate mitigation strategy needs to be developed', Natural England have stated their acceptance of a individual local authority by local authority approach. The package which is described is what New Forest DC is doing, but not what Test Valley are doing.</p> <p>PARA.2.4.2 We are not certain, but do not believe that the South Downs NPA is involved in the SRMP.</p> <p>SECTION 3 A GI STRATEGY FOR SOUTH HAMPSHIRE PARA.3.4.4 AND APPENDIX 2 FIGURE 5 Minor technical point, but Ramsar sites aren't European sites/Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>PARA.3.5.1 Although reference is made to the green grid as being 'as shown on one or more maps in Appendix 2' the document is unfortunately not clearly showing what the green grid comprises.</p> <p>PARA.3.5.2 The composition of the green grid (as detailed in Appendices 2 and 3) makes it challenging to use as a decision making tool as suggested in the paragraph.</p> <p>PARA.3.6.3 5th Bullet (see comment on Para.1.1.10 and 4.1.2 8th Bullet)</p> <p>PARA.3.6.4 Whilst they may be the most important strategically, are Solent and the New Forest the only designations which need to be considered? We are not aware that New Forest NPA are co-ordinating any initiatives linked to mitigation, as they are not formally part of PUSH, so is the reference with regard to the Green Halo idea?</p> <p>SECTION 4 DELIVERING THE GI STRATEGY PARA.4.1.2 8th Bullet (see comment on Para.1.1.10 and 3.6.3 5th Bullet) PARA.4.3.3 see comment on Para.1.2.21</p> <p>APPENDIX 1 PUSH GI PARTNERSHIP No comments</p> <p>APPENDIX 2 SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FIGURE 11 The key 'strategic Accessible Natural Greenspace' is somewhat misleading as the extent of public access to these designations varies and in some cases the issue of increased access may be in conflict with their nature conservation interest. The sites may be managed primarily for nature conservation, rather than access and as such are not formally SANGS. The map seems to include: HWT reserves, LNRs, Forestry Commission land,</p>	<p>Agreed – text added.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – text amended.</p> <p>Noted – text amended to clarify.</p> <p>Noted – maps may be layered to better show the 'Green Grid'. An 'author's note' added to inform Joint Committee of this.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed and text amended.</p> <p>New Forest Green Halo referenced in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Agreed – text amended. See response to para 1.2.21 comment, above.</p> <p>Agreed – Key label will be changed on final map.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>country parks etc. which don't necessarily have any relationship with SANGS.</p> <p>FIGURE 12 This is labelled as potential river restoration locations, but the map seems to show the extent of the river network as a whole.</p> <p>FIGURES 15, 16 and 17 Should the New Forest be identified as ANGSt, when we are trying to discourage recreational visitor pressure and provide alternatives? There is no differentiation about whether they are areas we should be encouraging people or over the extent of accessibility. Should there be a distinction between those sites which we are aware of, and those which we are signed up to and intending to use as ANGSt.</p> <p>APPENDIX 3 NAMED COMPONENTS OF THE GREEN GRID NETWORK APPENDIX 3 The rationale behind the list of components of the green grid is unclear e.g. Emer Bog SAC is not included within the list of SACs, is this because it's not big enough? Also what do 'large areas of woodland' mean in practice (under recreational areas)? The SPA and Ramsar designations are both named as 'Solent and Southampton Water' (not separately).</p> <p>APPENDIX 4 REVIEW OF RELEVANT PROGRAMMES/PLANS/STRATEGIES APPENDIX 4 What is the main purpose of the appendix as many of the documents references are not plans/programmes/strategies, but rather relevant documents/sources of information for the GI strategy. The title of the Appendix may therefore be better phrased. Page 52, Test Valley Local Plan HRA – the reference to our Core Strategy 2012 should now be 'Revised Local Plan 2016' and which has a plan period to 2029 (not 2031). Page 57 – reference is made to the Forest Park as a strategic GI project, but these aren't identified until the implementation stage, notwithstanding that the Forest Park Implementation Framework does say about alternative to the New Forest. To minimise any potential confusion could the sentence referencing it being an alternative to the New Forest be deleted. Page 59, PUSH SFRA – the current version is now the 2016 SFRA (which is on the PUSH website).</p> <p>APPENDIX 5 GLOSSARY No comments</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed – problem occurred from formatting of page – text amended.</p> <p>Noted – title amended.</p> <p>Noted – text amended.</p> <p>Noted – reference to it being an alternative to the New Forest removed.</p> <p>Noted – text amended</p>
<p>Havant Borough Council (David Hayward)</p>	<p>Overall the draft strategy is a coherent update of the previous document and brings together the evidence base on strategic green infrastructure across the sub-region. You can see how the implementation plan, setting out specific projects, will then fall under this. It would be useful to know when this is likely to be complete.</p> <p>I have a few specific comments on individual sections which I've done as tracked changes.</p> <p>In terms of general comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PUSH isn't able to hold copyright as it's a partnership rather than a specific organisation. • I'd really question the use of ANGSt standards – these are generally considered rather out of date now – these crop up a few times in the strategy. Publishing the accessibility maps is not particularly helpful where it shows significant deficits to ANGSt – it implies we should be demolishing large urban areas to create parks which is not at all deliverable. 	<p>Supporting comment.</p> <p>Agreed – footer removed (originally on earlier GI documents).</p> <p>ANGSt is used as an example. Text modified slightly to make this more apparent. ANGSt maps show where there are opportunities to design in GI as part of urban regeneration. The maps will be updated for the final version as they currently do not show many sites.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• South Hampshire is a sub-region – there shouldn't be references to the 'South Hampshire part of the PUSH sub-region'• I am sceptical as to the value of the various maps in appendix 2 and the table on p17. This more seems like a collection of the mapping that we have rather than a layering up of the green infrastructure opportunities and the green grid that we have and want to create. The commentary below describes what each map is, but there's no connection between the various maps, no connectivity and likely repetition. Instead, specific (not all) individual layers should be built up to form the green grid. If all the layers in that appendix were overlayed, that would comprise all of the sub-region. As it is though, it doesn't provide evidence of a GI deficit which is what the next section seeks to suggest.	<p>Agreed – text amended.</p> <p>Further layering of mapping would be useful, particularly to better show the green grid and further commentary linking the datasets together. Further green grid and opportunities mapping will be provided I the Implementation Plan.</p>
--	--	---