

Recreational Disturbance – Round Table Session

Referring to Natural England consultation letter which provides a link to the background work by Footprint Ecology.

Extract from NE Consultation letter.....

“It is considered that a financial contribution, based on a robust and agreed methodology, directed towards measures at the designated sites e.g. via the New Forest National Park Authority’s Habitat Mitigation Scheme, is a means that will enable the Authority to deliver site specific mitigation measures on behalf of the applicant. Such an approach would provide a certain and robust means to addressing the effects of recreational disturbance via direct measures at the protected sites. Some detail on how this money will be used as part of the Scheme is advised to ensure you as competent authority can be satisfied the recreational impact from this development will be appropriately addressed and secured in perpetuity. “

Points requiring clarification

Is it just recreational disturbance – no other harm alleged from proximity of development?

How is the Natural England catchment distance arrived at ? As the crow flies ? Does it adequately take account of travel distances ? What does the survey data show about trips from Fareham ?

Taking into account the evidence put by NE and the scale and location of development, what would the likely impact of the proposed development be ?

If there are impacts in combination how can appropriate mitigation be arrived at ? How is any sum arrived at ? How will it be spent ? The UU is made out to Fareham BC, does Fareham have an appropriate scheme to direct funding to and would it provide adequate mitigation ? Shouldn’t any money, if required, go to the New Forest NP ?

In light of potential difficulties in arriving at an appropriate sum (if necessary), would a potential overpayment taking account of the “precautionary principle”, comply with the CIL regs ?