

### **B10.2.4.17 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK RESULTING IN NO CHANGES TO SMP POLICY AND / OR DOCUMENTATION – NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL**

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Royal Lymington Yacht Club</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Comment received</b>		<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>			
Very High Level, good starter for ten. Not much information about governance of the next 2 phases.		Many thanks for your comments. The information for the implementation of the SMP policies will be determined and detailed in subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, where relevant and appropriate. This issue has been included within the Action Plan.			
<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Private Individual</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Comment received</b>		<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>			
I think it is important to protect the New Forest and the coastline including Southampton Water (Dibden Bay) and the Solent coast.		Many thanks for your comments.			
<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Fawley Parish Council</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Comment received</b>		<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>			
The ski zone at Redbridge is becoming overcrowded with fast boats. We need another area like off Shore Rd, Hythe. Dibden Bay is not suitable for development. Leisure use of the Solent is increasing but the number of slipways (surfaces) has dramatically reduced, causing unsuitable areas to be used and crowding on the		The SMP recognises the importance of recreational open space and slipway and coastal access. The provision of such access points will need to be integrated within subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, which will determine how to implement the recommended coastal flood and erosion risk management policies.			

one in use. Slipways provide something for visitors to watch as well as a launching point. With the volume of boats crowded together dangerous occurrences are frequent.	This issue has been included within the Action Plan. Specific details on coastal access will be addressed through the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.
--	---

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	16
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
Supporting literature helpful. Displays were good, comments clear. Would like to have seen some advertisements posters, where were they? There were many officials there with badges...but I would have welcomed a Q/A session, timed perhaps for 6.00pm so knowledgeable, local, indigenous people could raise issues that the "man on the street" is not aware of. This is the best way of getting to grips with the real problems and making the work accountable, but perhaps when it comes to the bottom-line you don't want in-depth questioning, so the replies can be heard by all.			Thank you for your positive comments regarding the public exhibition. We are sorry you did not see one of our advertisements for the exhibition. In total 90 advertisement posters for the New Forest exhibition were placed throughout the council's district. The locations included 9 libraries, 37 parish and town councils, 7 council information centres, 5 council leisure centres, 15 post offices, and 3 sailing clubs. The press also advertised the exhibitions in the Daily Echo and the Lymington Times and on BBC Radio Solent. The poster was also available to view and download on the North Solent SMP and the New Forest District Council website. The exhibitions were designed to encourage honest and frank discussions in full public view to assist in making informed decisions about coastal management issues. All of the comments raised will be responded to in this consultation report to make sure the process is transparent.		

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	39
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
On behalf of our client, we are not sure how much environmental monitoring the EA has conducted to date. From the advice we have received the proposed 2 year trial period will result in ecological change to the existing Lymington River and these ecological changes may indeed be irreversible, at least within reasonable timescales. In			Thank you for your comments regarding environmental monitoring of the Lymington River. The 'Regulated Tidal Exchange' at the Lymington reedbeds is in connection with the proposals for modifications to the design and operation of the tidal sluice gates for the Lymington Reedbed Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) site, which is		

<p>this context, it would be best practice to undertake a phase 1 ecological assessment of the area likely to be affected and dependant on the results of this initial assessment to undertake a phase 2 protected species survey. A full assessment of the presence or potential presence of protected species is a legal requirement and where there is a likelihood of harm or disturbance to a protected species a detailed mitigation strategy should be devised in order to maintain species at a favourable conservation status. It appears at present there is no up-to-date ecological assessment for the Lymington River and therefore the likely effects on protected habitats and species cannot be gauged.</p>	<p>deteriorating. To help restore the site, the Environment Agency, Natural England and the Hampshire &amp; Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust are implementing the recommendations of a Water Level Management Plan for the SSSI. One of three existing tidal flaps (designed to exclude seawater from the upper estuary) will be replaced with a self-regulating tidal gate, as part of a two-year reversible trial. The two year trial, anticipated to commence in Spring 2010, will be accompanied by monitoring that will aim to record any changes to the habitat over the two years. This data will allow the partners to maximise the overall environmental benefits of the plan by making any adjustments to the gate opening frequency and will be evaluated to inform any long-term decision on the management of the site.</p> <p>For all questions about this water level management plan, please contact Helen Clayton, Environment Agency, tel. 01794 832759 <a href="mailto:helen.clayton@environment-agency.gov.uk">helen.clayton@environment-agency.gov.uk</a> or James Walton, Environment Agency, 01794 832721, <a href="mailto:james.walton@environment-agency.gov.uk">james.walton@environment-agency.gov.uk</a></p>
---	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Lymington & Pennington Town Council	Response No	42
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
Any attenuation around Hurst Spit could affect the tidal regime around Isle of Wight.			Thank you for your consultation response.		

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Milford on Sea Parish Council</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
<p>Policy unit 5F01: Hurst Spit. In general the parish council support the proposals for Hurst spit to Hold the Line. The parish council wish to see life and property along this part of the coastline protected.</p> <p>Policy unit 5C22: Lymington Yacht Haven to Saltgrass Lane. The parish council support the proposal for HTL.</p> <p>Concern is expressed with regards to the protection of the former landfill site at Efford site to ensure that flooding of this area does not lead to serious land contamination.</p> <p>The council would welcome further details of the potential opportunity for localised habitat creation at Saltgrass Lane and Avon Water.</p> <p>It is noted that rights of private landowners to maintain their defences.</p>			<p>Thank you for your consultation response and support of proposed policies. The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends coastal defence policy. Further detail on the expected levels of maintenance and improvement work required and potential opportunities for inter-tidal habitat creation will be included in subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, which will look at how to implement the recommended policies. Potential localised managed realignment of defences and construction of additional secondary defences could only be implemented pending further more detailed studies and consultation with landowners and stakeholders. These issues and the need for detailed investigations to determine the potential contamination risks and long-term management of the former landfill sites landward of the Lymington to Keyhaven seawall, have been identified in the Action Plan.</p>		

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Private Individual</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
<p>5C21 + 5C22 This area is vital to Hold The Line. Highly populated and a big leisure area. If this was to be let go the whole economy of the area would collapse. As well as this it is a vital ecological area with huge numbers of birds using the marshes, especially the migratory winter birds. It is an area where people and wildlife seem to have found a way to happily coexist. Long may this continue. 5F01 If Hurst Spit were to be let go the damage to the rest of the Solent would be incalculable.</p>			<p>Many thanks for your consultation feedback.</p>		

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	105
<b>Comment received</b>		<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>			
<p>5C14 Redbridge to Calshot Spit I believe that the strategy for the section from Marchwood Military Port to Hythe Marina is 'to hold the line'. Recently, the shoreline between these two points has collapsed at the Marina end. Will you be repairing it? Is there any hope of the path along this shoreline being designated as a right of way and incorporated in the Solent Way?</p>		<p>Thank you for your comments. The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends broad-scale coastal flood and erosion risk management policy that will result in the economically, socially and environmentally sustainable management of the shoreline. Once the SMP has been adopted by the Local Authorities and the Environment Agency and has been approved by Defra, Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes will commence where necessary, which will determine how to implement the recommended policies. The frontage between Redbridge and Calshot is largely privately owned and therefore no public flood and coastal grant funding would be available to privately owned defences. The frontage between Marchwood and Hythe is privately owned and there are no rights of way along the shoreline, the issues of access and rights of way were clarified during the Dibden Bay Inquiry. For the relatively short lengths where defences could be eligible for flood and coastal grant aid funding, a recommended Hold the Line policy does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works.</p>			

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	West Solent Oysterman's Action Group	Response No	110
<b>Comment received</b>		<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>			
<p>Have you seen Hanson Aggregate Application: West of Needle (area 409) Environmental Assessment Scoping report by METOC document number 1862. If this application is granted you can forget North Solent Shoreline Management Plan. If this is allowed the coastline will be destroyed because Hurst Spit will be destroyed and all the coast from Lepe to Milford on Sea will be hit by very large waves and you can</p>		<p>Many thanks for your consultation response. The issue of nearshore dredging and potential implications on coastal processes and shorelines have been considered in the development of the SMP. The Local Authority are full aware of the aggregate application you refer to and have been consulted on the Environmental Assessment Scoping Report. The application has not progressed any further through the</p>			

<p>forget Pennington and Lymington marshes when this happens don't say you haven't been warned.</p>	<p>regulatory process as Hanson are awaiting further monitoring and assessment work to be completed. Further consultation will be required before any decision is made with regard to this dredging licence application. No dredging has taken place in this area to date. Coastal flood and erosion risk management are the primary concerns of the SMP and the most economically, socially and environmentally sustainable defence policies have been proposed.</p>
---	---

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Boldre Parish Council	Response No	114
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>I am vice chair of Boldre Parish Council representing South Baddesley Ward responsible for this area and have cleared these comments with the Chairman of the Council : Where properties fall into the "no active intervention" shoreline, privately created defences could adversely affect neighbouring shoreline properties. Planning permission would prevent disputes. The proposed national coastal footpath should not pass through ground likely to become eroded through rising sea level on the "no active intervention" shoreline. Boldre Parish Council wish to be consulted on any proposal covering this area.</p>			<p>Many thanks for your response. The SMP is one material consideration that planners refer to when forming planning decisions. Planning applications from private owners with regard to new or improvements to coastal and flood defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not determined solely on the SMP coastal defence policy, along with the relevant consents and permissions as is currently the case. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies of HTL and NAI do not conflict or remove these rights. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners. The SMP recognises the importance of coastal access and the natural environment, both of which have been considered during the objective-led policy appraisal process. Coastal flood and erosion risk management are the primary concerns of the SMP and the most economically, socially and environmentally</p>		

	<p>sustainable defence policies have been proposed. The provision and rerouting of coastal access in response to coastal and climate change will need to be integrated within subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, which will determine how to implement the recommended coastal flood and erosion risk management policies. This issue has been included within the Action Plan. Specific details on coastal access will be addressed through the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.</p>
--	---

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individuals	Response No	118
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>Generally. The plan relies on too many assumptions. The consequences of the plan, intended and unintended, could lead to the total destruction of some of the most desirable property in the country. This should not be allowed to happen except in the most pressing circumstances and accordingly we believe that the definition " Hold The Line" should be assigned to the entire length of coast between Lymington and Calshot for all three epochs. Any other classification is meaningless as the treatment of any one tranche affects all these tranches either side and innocent landowners behind. Specifically. 50 years hence Park Shore to Salterns Hill- No Active Intervention. If the defences are breached as park Shore the houses along Thorns beach, including Little Marsh will be lost.</p>			<p>Thank you for your comments. The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends broad-scale policies of intent for coastal flood and erosion risk management. Future development in the coastal zone will use the SMP as a guide to assist planning decisions and to ensure spatial development takes place in an appropriate, sustainable way, that aims to meet functional, social, economic and environmental objectives. However, the SMP policies do not guarantee or secure central government funding. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies of HTL and NAI do not conflict or remove these rights. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. Planning applications for additional defences or improvements to existing defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not solely dependant on the coastal defence policy in place i.e. a Hold the Line coastal defence policy does not guarantee planning permission and</p>		

	<p>neither does a No Active Intervention policy negate planning permission. Where applicable, it is stated that no public funding would be available for the maintenance of privately owned defences even if they are frontages where HTL has been identified to manage the flood risk. This has been stated throughout the draft SMP documents, however to further highlight this funding situation a further section regarding funding and privately owned defences has been included in the Draft SMP document. Further detail on the expected levels of maintenance and improvement work required to defences and sources and likelihood of funding will need to be included in subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, which will look at how to implement the final SMP policies. These issues have been included within the SMP Action Plan. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.</p>
--	--

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Norman Court and Sowley Farms Ltd</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
<p>We would like the coastline between Lymington River and Calshot to be treated as one area and not the size proposed. The unit should be designated Hold The Line ensuring each landowner the right to defend this coastline at his expense as has been practiced over the past centuries. The designation should apply over all 3 epochs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Future development in the coastal zone will use the SMP as a guide to assist planning decisions and to ensure spatial development takes place in an appropriate, sustainable way, that aims to meet functional, social, economic and environmental objectives. However, the SMP policies do not guarantee or secure central government funding. Planning applications for additional defences or improvements to existing</p>				

	<p>defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not solely dependant on the coastal defence policy in place i.e. a Hold the Line coastal defence policy does not guarantee planning permission and neither does a No Active Intervention policy negate planning permission. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The proposed harbour breakwaters and implications of continued saltmarsh loss have been considered during the development of the SMP and predictions of changes in shoreline position and coastal processes. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.</p>
--	--

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Private Individual</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
<p>5C20 Sowley to Elmer’s Court                      1. "Hold the Line" is a more appropriate policy option rather than "No Active Intervention", especially as both 5C19 &amp; 5C21 are "Hold the Line". The total coastline between the Lymington River and Calshot should be treated as one policy unit, "Hold the Line", as each</p>			<p>Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information</p>		

<p>landowner's interests are aligned. If this is unacceptable, 5C20 should be re-designated with the Pylewell Park coastline remaining as "No Active Intervention", whilst the coastline to its East is added to 5C19 and the coastline to its West being added to 5C21. In particular this would ensure that the Lymington River Estuary would all be part of one policy option. 2. Each landowner should have the right to defend his coastline at his own expense, as has been the practice over centuries. This defence should not only be on the coastline, but also on the sides of his property to provide protection if his neighbour does not adequately protect his property. 3. The same designation should apply over all three epoch i.e. 100 years. 4. There should be a presumption that planning permission should be granted for all defence works undertaken by landowners, provided there is no damage to the environment. Having "No Active Intervention" as a policy option is likely to have a major psychological influence on planning and other decisions, such as any made by, e.g. Natural England, New Forest National Park Authority or the Lymington Harbour Commissioners. 5. There are two additional man-made factors which will influence the SMP in respect of the Lymington River Estuary and these have not been taken into account:- 5.1 There is a new breakwater being erected by the Lymington Harbour Commissioners commencing in Spring 2010. This project extends over 20/5 years and in its partially built stages will generate different environmental and erosion influences. 5.2 The damage by the new Ferries that have been illegally introduced to the Lymington River by Wightlink in early 2009. It is important that both these factors are scientifically evaluated due to any adverse effect they may cause before any final judgement is made on the appropriate policy option for 5C20. 6. The designations of the New Forest National Park Authority land on the East bank of the Lymington River, i.e. SSSI, SPA, SAC, AONB etc, should be preserved, rather than allowing it to disappear through a "No Active Intervention" policy.</p>	<p>and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Future development in the coastal zone will use the SMP as a guide to assist planning decisions and to ensure spatial development takes place in an appropriate, sustainable way, that aims to meet functional, social, economic and environmental objectives. However, the SMP policies do not guarantee or secure central government funding. Whichever policy is recommended, private defence owners have the right to maintain their defences. Planning applications for additional defences or improvements to existing defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not solely dependant on the coastal defence policy in place i.e. a Hold the Line coastal defence policy does not guarantee planning permission and neither does a No Active Intervention policy negate planning permission. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The proposed harbour breakwaters and implications of continued saltmarsh loss have been considered during the development of the SMP and predictions of changes in shoreline position and coastal processes. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended.</p>
--	--

Further to our submission on the NSSMP consultation we attach aerial photographs illustrating erosion in front of our boundary which has occurred between 2008 and 2009. We feel this is due to both natural and man-made causes as it is at this point in the river where the Wightlink ferries begin to turn to negotiate the bend in the river, and where significant thruster effects and drawdown impact on the foreshore. This makes it particularly important for us to be able to maintain our riverbank defences in the face of such an accelerating level of erosion, and we would be grateful if this could be attached to our consultation response. (PHOTOS ON I DRIVE IN CASE FOLDER)	
---	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	136
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
No Comments			Thank you for your consultation feedback form.		

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	138
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
I request that I should be able to maintain my property from rising sea levels and that the entirety of coastline/river bank from Lymington to Calshot should be classified one area and 'hold the line'.			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Future development in the coastal zone will use the SMP as a guide to assist planning decisions and to ensure spatial development takes place in an appropriate, sustainable way, that aims to meet functional, social, economic and environmental objectives. However, the SMP		

	<p>policies do not guarantee or secure central government funding. Whichever policy is recommended, private defence owners have the right to maintain their defences. Planning applications for additional defences or improvements to existing defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not solely dependant on the coastal defence policy in place i.e. a Hold the Line coastal defence policy does not guarantee planning permission and neither does a No Active Intervention policy negate planning permission. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. The proposed harbour breakwaters and implications of continued saltmarsh loss have been considered during the development of the SMP and predictions of changes in shoreline position and coastal processes. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.</p>
--	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	North Solent Coastal Group	Response No	139
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
We consider that the whole of the coastline between Hurst Spit and Redbridge should be treated as a single unit because the interests of the coastal land owners are aligned. This coastline has been actively			Thank you for your comments. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to		

managed by the individual landowners for many years. 2. We believe that the appropriate designation for the entire coastline in this area is "Hold the Line". This is the appropriate way to ensure that each individual landowner has the right to defend his coastline at his expense as he has done in the past. 3. Notwithstanding our belief that the interests of the majority of landowners are aligned, there may be some land owners with less interest in defending their land. There appears to be no consideration in the draft SMP of situations where adjoining areas of land are subject to different landowner/DEFRA intentions, objectives or policies. For instance the owner of one piece of foreshore land may wish to "hold the line" on his land whilst the owner of the adjoining land may be prepared for "no active intervention". One possible reason for this difference may be that the former has a valuable house on the land and the latter has low value agricultural use. One possible equitable solution to such situations would be to include in the definition of "hold the line" the right to provide defences along the entire boundary of the land if it is threatened by lack of protection of adjoining land. This would, for example, allow an owner to protect his garden from flooding if an adjoining field or other property is flooded. Such right should not be subject to any need to obtain planning consent (even if there was previously no defence along the affected boundary). 4. The next point of principal is the erroneous concept that there is any logic in any landowner agreeing to a less advantageous Policy Option in the second or third Epoch than in the first Epoch. To do so would be equivalent to a freeholder of land agreeing to reduce his interest in the land to a 20 or 30 year lease in respect of a covenant of a reduced ability to defend the land. There should be an automatic assumption that the Policy is the same in the three Epochs (unless DEFRA has responsibility for the land and wishes to limit, in advance, its responsibility to defend the land).

continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. The SMP is one material consideration that planners refer to when forming planning decisions. Planning applications from private owners with regard to new or improvements to coastal and flood defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not determined solely on the SMP coastal defence policy, along with the relevant consents and permissions as is currently the case. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>John Grimes Partnership Ltd</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>Comment received</b>		<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>			
Luttrell's Tower is historically significant and there is a case for HTL rather than NAI for 5C16- see letter & photos in file.		<p>Thank you for your comments. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. The SMP is one material consideration that planners refer to when forming planning decisions. Planning applications from private owners with regard to new or improvements to coastal and flood defences will be considered on a case by case basis and not determined solely on the SMP coastal defence policy. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. It is not economically viable for public funding of defences along largely undeveloped and privately owned frontages. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.</p>			

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>North Solent Coastal Group</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
Ask that River Lymington to Calshot is treated as one unit and HTL for 100 years.			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.		

<b>Comment relates to</b>	<b>New Forest District Council</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Lymington River Association</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
5C20 Sowley to Elmer's Court: The LRA believes that this section should be designated HOLD THE LINE.5C21 Elmer's Court to Lymington Yacht Haven: The introduction of the new W class ferries has been ruled unlawful by the High Court which has also defined the			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term.		

<p>Ferry introduction as a Plan and Project, habitat loss is taking place daily against the law what is the NSSMP going to do about this ??</p> <p>5F01 Hurst Spit: The reasons for the loss of the Hurst Spit natural replenishment through man's intervention are well documented, presumably the NSSMP will provide for re introduction of natural cycles to reduce the financial burden of continued of this vital feature of the western Solent.</p> <p>5C22 Lymington Yacht Haven to Saltgrass Lane: It is calculated there is a loss of at least 50 hectares of SSSI then Natura 2000 protected saltmarsh and mud flat due to the action of the ferry service since 1973. An offshore reef system may well provide for the conditions for re accretion of this environment if coupled with the correct management of the ferry vessels and other impacts. This must be more effective method of "holding the line" than re building the sea wall.</p>	<p>The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners. The proposed harbour breakwaters and implications of continued saltmarsh loss have been considered during the development of the SMP and predictions of changes in shoreline position and coastal processes. Other avenues are available to stakeholders and agencies with regard the operations of vessels and is beyond the scope of the SMP. Further detail on the expected levels of maintenance and improvement work required to defences and sources and likelihood of funding will be included in subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, which will look at how to implement the final SMP policies. These issues have been included within the SMP Action Plan.</p>
--	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Beaulieu Parish Council	Response No	159
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
Beaulieu Parish Council would like to see the following PU 'hold the line':- 5C17 to 5C20			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent		

	<p>protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.</p>
--	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	160
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
<p>The coastline between the Lymington River and Calshot must be treated as one unit in the SMP, and not six as proposed. This unit must be designated as "Hold the Line" to ensure each landowner has the right to defend their own coastline at own expense. This has been the practice established for a period going far back in history. This designation must apply for all three epochs i.e. 100 years. Dividing the area into different units creates very high risk of fragmenting practice which would create breaches in coastal defences which would enable sea ingress behind neighbouring land. It is essential that the prevailing system of protecting the land against erosion and rising sea levels is maintained and reinforced into the future. It is vital that landowners are left free to defend their property against erosion both for their own benefit and for the benefit of the community in preserving cherished</p>			<p>Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that</p>		

countryside.	unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.
--------------	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	164
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
5C13 Lower Test Valley: The total coastline between the Lymington river and Calshot should be treated as one unit. Each area operating in relationship to each other and for the benefit of each other.			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended.		

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	165
<b>Comment received</b>			<b>Client Steering Group Response</b>		
As respects 6 units 5c16 to 5c21 inclusive this entire shoreline should be classified hold the line through all 3 epochs, as other areas. Consistency of treatment of neighbouring areas is self-evidently necessary to avoid floodwater "getting in round the back". OUR			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term.		

<p>RIGHT AS RIPARIAN AND/OR COASTAL PROPERTY/LAND OWNERS TO CONTINUE TO DEFEND AGAINST THE SEA AT OWN EXPENSE,AS HITHERTO,MUST NOT BE DIMINISHED.I AND MY FAMILY ARE YEAR ROUND USERS OF THIS COASTLINE NOT ONLY AS RESIDENTS BUT ALSO AS DINGHY SAILORS,YACHTSMEN AND BIRDWATCHERS.</p>	<p>The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended.</p>
--	--

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	177
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>My family and I have lived at Pitts Deep since 1968 keeping the sea at bay at our own very considerable expense especially after the recent increase in bad weather. The property was originally leased from the Pylewell Estate. In 1985 we were offered the freehold and brought it. At no time during the last 40 years has Pylewell done anything to halt erosion of the seashore, which is now occurring so fast to the eastern end of my property (and their estate) that it will incur further defences on my part running inland. I understand that Pylewell is under no obligation to HTL this means that all private properties on the shore adjoining their land are at a greater risk than would be the case if they (Pylewell) were obliged to keep the sea at bay. It would be far better if the whole of the N W Solent shoreline (Calshot to Hurst Spit) was designated HTL. I have no intention of the future of my family home being dictated to by a legal nonsense that allows one landowner to put another ones home at risk in this way.</p>			<p>Thank you for your response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies of HTL and NAI do not conflict or remove these rights. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths</p>		

	of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.
--	---

Comment relates to	New Forest District Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	180
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
All Policies between 5C16-5C20 should be HTL.			Thank you for your comments and response. The SMP team acknowledge that many of the private landowners in the West Solent protect their landholding and maintain their defences at their own expense and intend to continue to maintain them over the long-term. The process for the development of the SMP sought this information and we are grateful for the responses received from landowners. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. The division of the West Solent shoreline into the separate lengths aims to reflect the differences in management and processes acting on these shorelines. The intention is that unmanaged and undefended lengths of shoreline will remain undefended. We welcome the opportunity to explore coastal planning issues with landowners and external partners.		