

## Principal Issues Raised and Responses Given/Changes made to the Strategy

For clarity, these have been collected into themes and where possible the main genre of respondents raising the issues has been identified.

Issue	SRMP response
<p><b>Viability and affordability issues - raised by planning consultants and public sector bodies.</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised that in some areas (particularly the Isle of Wight) the increased payment level may affect the viability and affordability of housing.</p>	<p>Concerns were raised that in some areas (particularly the Isle of Wight) the increased payment level may affect the viability and affordability of housing. The SRMP believes that setting the developer contribution level as variable depending on bedroom numbers of proposed dwellings is more sympathetic to viability and affordability issues rather than one set levy for all property sizes. Providing mitigation costs up-front should also allow developers opportunity to factor this in when purchasing land for housing and when designing schemes</p>
<p><b>When developments might require additional mitigation - raised by planning consultants.</b></p> <p>There was a call for more clarity surrounding the issue of what size or location of development might require additional mitigation measures over and above the SRMP developer' contribution level.</p>	<p>The SRMP consider that there are too many factors that influence whether additional disturbance over the 'in-combination effects' is likely. For example, existing access to intertidal and frontage - beach, sea walls, design of the scheme, type of adjacent habitats - deep mud or shingle/sand, the height of the site in relation to the intertidal level and so on Therefore even very modest housing schemes could have an impact, whilst larger schemes may have less effect depending upon their location. Thus developers are still encouraged to hold early discussions with the local planning authority on mitigation if they are proposing large schemes or developments close to the SPA boundary. <b>The rationale behind not providing matrix of trigger points where additional mitigation measures will be required has been explained within the Strategy.</b></p>
<p><b>Site Specific Project Selection - raised by various groups.</b></p> <p>The Strategy refers to funding available for site specific projects. There were calls for more information about how projects are put forward and assessed for eligibility.</p>	<p><b>Additional information relating to this process has been added to the Strategy.</b></p> <p>This includes how projects may be put forward for consideration, the criteria against which they are assessed and how the successful projects will be publically reported in future.</p>

<p><b>Ranger's costs: raised by various groups.</b></p> <p>There were several comments querying the costs of the Rangers and their level of provision.</p>	<p>The Draft Strategy didn't stress enough that the budgeted costs of the Rangers covered all their employment costs such as pension and national insurance contributions, desk space, line management and uniform. <b>This has been made clearer in the revised Strategy. More information has also been provided explaining the rationale behind retaining Rangers all year.</b></p>
<p><b>Calculations of housing figures and the breakdown of the charges between bedroom sizes: raised by planning consultants and others.</b></p> <p>Several queries were raised about the methodology surrounding how the housing figures were calculated.</p>	<p>The housing figures were taken from the PUSH Spatial Position Statement. The methodology used to fix the charging level for each sized house was based around one developed for the Thames Basin Heath mitigation scheme. It accounts for the existing occupancy of properties and the projected mix going forward based on a sample of authorities within the area. These will be reviewed every two years throughout the duration of the Strategy. <b>This is now noted in the revised Strategy.</b></p>
<p><b>Dog control issues: raised by residents and conservation groups.</b></p> <p>There were repeated suggestions of locations dogs should be excluded or their access restricted or controlled in certain areas, such as being kept on leads or only being allowed access in the summer.</p>	<p>The Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership is based around education and positive behaviour change methods, not authoritarian controls and measures. The Strategy includes the employment of a Dog Initiatives Officer to specifically work with dog owners and walkers to find ways of meeting their needs whilst also protecting the overwintering birds. This approach will be closely reviewed as part of the monitoring process and the focus of it may change over time if necessary. <b>This has been made clearer in the Strategy.</b></p>
<p><b>Are the measures proposed robust enough? - raised by residents and conservation organisations.</b></p> <p>Some respondents raised concern that the measures proposed would not be firm enough to bring about behaviour change. Saying educating people and encouraging best practice, with no recourse to enforce these behaviours wouldn't be effective in about changes.</p>	<p>The Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership is still favouring a positive behaviour change approach, without authoritarian measures being imposed. <b>It has been made clearer in the Strategy that the effectiveness of this will be closely studied as part of the monitoring work and if it is not successful in achieving its objectives then a review of other possible behaviour change tools/techniques will be undertaken.</b></p>



<p><b>Access Management Assessments - raised by several groups.</b></p> <p>It became clear that the role of this piece of work had not been fully conveyed in the Draft.</p>	<p><b>Further information clarifying the purpose of the Assess Management Assessments has been included in the Strategy.</b></p>
<p><b>Regular Reviews - raised by conservation groups.</b></p> <p>There were several suggestions made that the Strategy should be subject to regular review.</p>	<p><b>The Strategy being strengthened by a commitment to regular reviews.</b> After due consideration of the comments, the review period has been set as 5 yearly or sooner if changes in legislation or evidence necessitate.</p>
<p><b>Housing figures upon which the Strategy is based, and the duration of the Strategy - raised mainly by planning consultants.</b></p> <p>Several respondents queried both the housing figures the Strategy is based upon and the end date of the Strategy. They particularly queried the use of the PUSH SPS, as opposed to the PUSH SHMA.</p>	<p>The date set came from the PUSH Spatial Position Statement. At present, PUSH has not agreed on the amount or distribution of housing beyond that date. The financial calculations will be reviewed every second year and the Strategy itself will be reviewed every 5 years unless a change in legislation or local conditions necessitates a sooner review.</p> <p><b>A wider explanation of the rationale behind the data set used has been added to the Strategy.</b></p>
<p><b>Greater clarity in respect of how student accommodation would be dealt with - raised mainly by planning consultants.</b></p> <p>Several respondents sought further information on this matter.</p>	<p>More information and a general model for calculation have been added, but it remains a situation whereby the developer will need to agree this on a case-by-case basis with Natural England and the planning authority. Therefore, they are advised to hold early discussions on this matter.</p>