

# Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy – Examination in Public

## Matter 10 –Environmental Issues

Statement on behalf of  
New Forest Energy (720405)

Prepared by Jackson Planning (521508)

August 2013

Matter 10- Environment

1. This statement is made jointly on behalf of New Forest Energy (NFE) and Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (MEM) in response to the questions 5 and 6 on **Matter 10** to augment representations and evidence provided in previous statements. New Forest Energy are a local renewable energy company developing a number of renewable energy technologies on land within the Meyrick Estate. Representations were made at the pre submission CS and proposed modifications stage.

**Question 5 - Do Policies ME4 and ME5 set local requirements in a way which is consistent with paragraph 95 of the NPPF?**

2. The response to these policies was made by MEM and the response to the modifications was made by NFE.
3. Policy ME5 is not sound as it has failed to reflect national targets and therefore is not consistent with national policy as previously set out in the representations to this plan.
4. A suggested modification to the policy below would allow it to reflect current government targets and therefore meet national policy as set out in NPPF paragraph 95 which requires local planning authorities to adopt nationally described standards.

**Question 6 - Is Policy ME8 consistent with ME1 with regard to impacts on biodiversity and ecological impact?**

5. NFE and MEM are pleased to see the introduction of policy ME8, which was requested in pre-submission representations. This additional policy is consistent with NPPF paragraph 93, which places emphasis on support for renewable energy development, as it is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainability.
6. Renewable energy development proposals must have regard to the locational and environmental limitations, however there are specific locational factors related to access to

the electricity generation grid that may limit locational choice. This is why it is necessary to caveat the policy with safeguards for biodiversity with the second bullet point to allow development in some circumstances when there are imperative interests of overriding public interest. This is part of the necessary derogation tests that applies to development likely to affect a protected species or habitats so it is appropriate here. It is possible that policy ME1 should include the bullet point two rather than remove it from policy ME8 to create a consistent policy framework.

**What modifications are required so the plan can be found sound?**

7. Policy ME4 should remove the list of the range of measures and the reference to Code for Sustainable Homes, which is to be revised following consultation. The policy should refer to development consistent with Building Regulation requirements on thermal and energy use requirements consistent with nationally applicable standards for carbon reduction.
  
8. Policy ME5 needs to remove the second paragraph and replace it with:

“ Total renewable energy use within these types of development will be consistent with national government standards”
  
9. In addition the last sentence of the policy will only be effective if the on-site renewable energy projects to be provided are identified in the Regulation 123 list for which CIL can be charged. This further supports the concept for the new neighbourhoods to be CIL free zones to allow the application of s106 contributions for renewable energy on a site basis.