

Nutrient Neutral Development – OPS Board Challenge Session

Questions/Comments from the Board

1. Concern that the Position Statement has made building on green field sites the default position.
2. Has the council received any response to the lobbying letters that have been sent to Government?
3. Have any cases of a development refused due to the applicant not being able to demonstrate nutrient neutrality been considered by the Planning Inspectorate? If so, what was the outcome?
4. Could HBC's housing targets be reduced due to the issue?
5. Is nutrient neutrality based upon the current or historic use of the land – eg, farmland that hasn't been farmed for many years. If current use, how can a development be neutral when judged against a site that has no detrimental nutrient impact?
6. How long will the Position Statement be in effect for?
7. What is Natural England's advice in respect of developing brownfield sites?
8. In percentage terms, how much of HBC's five-year land supply brownfield and how much is greenfield?
9. In respect of mitigation, is the criteria listed in point 40 on page 7 of the Position Statement the complete list to be met in order for a development to be considered nutrient neutral?
10. What opinion does PfSH have on HBC's Position Statement?
11. Have any other authorities adopted a similar position statement?
12. What are other local councils, such as Portsmouth and Fareham doing to permit development?
13. Page 11, point 67 of the Position Statement makes reference to HBC part funding the delivery of development. Could this be explained further, such as the circumstances where this might happen?
14. When is it anticipated that the next step, the Management Plan will be written/adopted?