

Session/Issue 9:

- i) Are the policies consistent with the NPPF and/or justified by clear and robust local evidence and if not, what needs to be changed and why?
 - ii) Are the targets for renewable energy in policy CP11 appropriate, reasonable and realistic, in the light of national policy?
 - iii) Does policy CP12 strike the right balance between protecting the district's environment, landscape, biodiversity and nature conservation resources and facilitating other strategic development, such as the provision of renewable and decentralised energy?
 - iv) Is Policy CP13 reasonable, realistic and appropriate for a JCS?
 - v) Is Policy CP14 reasonable, realistic and appropriate for a JCS?
-

Question i)

We pointed out in our consultation submission that there appears to be nothing in the JCS that addresses how the Plan will bring about or encourage the reduction of carbon emissions from transport. There is clearly some definition of what the Core Strategy is about that is eluding us. Probably most of the plans and objectives of the JCS have transport carbon consequences. Why are these not discussed? Why does the local authority not feel obliged to address the District's serious contribution to climate change?

Question ii)

We note under JCS CP11 that '*30% of regulated emissions [are] to be provided off-site or through a financial contribution*'. It is not clear whether this relates to *Allowable Solutions* or is something separate. We would like to know how a contribution is assessed and how is it to be used to remove an equivalent amount of carbon emission elsewhere. Is it through some nationally approved off-setting programme? We hope that it will not be seen as a money payment (to the Council?) without it being tied specifically to carbon sequestering or other offset.

We believe that the 2016 date for all new housing to be zero-carbon is probably as challenging as it is welcome. We understand this is national regulation and, therefore, mandatory. Zero carbon in this context of course means zero carbon in its use, not in its construction. We would welcome a proactive Council commitment to reducing the embedded carbon of new construction, perhaps moving towards zero such carbon through active use of sequestered carbon in wood frame building.

It is not clear what is meant in JCS §7.10 by '*combined heat and power (CHP) and district heating/cooling networks are the most cost-effective way to meet the higher Code for Sustainable Homes levels*.' The higher code levels mentioned include Code 6 from 2016. CHP and district heating systems are not themselves normally zero carbon. This needs clarification.

Question iii)

The landscape impact of wind turbines is significant. WinFoE members probably have wide views on the degree of impact, some liking them even as aesthetically positive contributions to (some) landscape, whilst others would prefer not to see them. There is widespread agreement, however, that wind power is necessary within the context of wider environmental concerns. We would prefer that turbines had community buy-in, that if energy were primarily local to a large village say, and the village valued its contribution to its sustainability, its landscape impact would not be regarded with so much hostility as people have for massive commercial wind-farms. Many more, somewhat smaller, turbines, one to each major village might be more socially accepted than would be fewer sites of major alien wind-farms of giant machines, offering no local benefit.

We wonder whether the Council would consider creating an exemplar project to introduce a community buy-in scheme - searching out a community that would accept a turbine for its own energy purposes, involving them in discussions on size and location and monitoring the use of the system and the community's attitudes to it over a period of time.

We would generally accept that certain areas are more sensitive to the landscape impact than others. There is a lot of AONB in Hampshire, so that choices are somewhat restricted.

Generally we do not like the idea of field-sized arrays of photovoltaic sensors in green fields that could have better agricultural use. We feel that there is much scope, however, for PV devices to be more widely used in locations and on structures that already have low aesthetic content – e.g. all the tin-sheds that make up industrial parks, car parks, motorway cuttings and so on.

The wording of CP12 is unexceptionable for us, but we wait to see how it will be interpreted when practical schemes are put forward.