

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Date of Decision:	26 September 2011
Decision Maker:	County Council
Date of Decision:	13 October 2011
Title:	Draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan
Reference:	2756
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

Contact name: Adrian Flavell

Tel: 01962 846730

Email: adrian.flavell@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to present the key elements of the draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan attached to this report, which aims to protect Hampshire's environment, maintain its communities and support the economy by delivering sustainable minerals and waste development in Hampshire to 2030, by

- a) entirely replacing policies from the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy; and
- b) identifying the strategic sites necessary to deliver the plan objectives.

1.2 It is proposed that approval be given to publish the plan and evidence base for comments on whether it is sound under Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

1.3 The report outlines the process undertaken to compile the plan and the associated supporting evidence base detailing the extent of public consultation and the level of participation by the stakeholders, including communities, individual residents and businesses.

1.4 This paper also explores:

- (i) the statutory requirement for Hampshire County Council as a minerals and waste planning authority to plan for the provision of the right development in the right place at the right time;
- (ii) the rationale behind the plan preparation process, the public participation opportunities provided and the progress made since the County Council decision of 25 November 2010 authorising this programme of work;
- (iii) the County Council's response to the public comments on the suggested approach and how these have been addressed;
- (iv) the key elements of the draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (dHMWP) including: the entire replacement of the Core Strategy with a more comprehensive policy framework; inclusion of strategic sites with specific development considerations that will have to be taken into account in the event an application is submitted and an Implementation Plan to assist with delivering the Plan's objectives;
- (v) the risks associated with the plan preparation process and proposed solutions; and
- (vi) the future timescales and milestones necessary to adopt the plan.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 As a minerals and waste planning authority the County Council has a statutory duty to prepare development plan documents (DPDs) for minerals and waste development. These developments include: quarries, wharves and rail depots for the import of minerals; waste infrastructure, for example recycling and waste recovery facilities, and landfills.
- 2.2 The proposed dHMWP covers the period 1 January 2011 to 31 March 2030 and will help shape Hampshire's future by protecting its environment and maintaining its communities whilst ensuring that Hampshire's economy is supported. It aims to deliver sustainable minerals and waste development in Hampshire ensuring the right development, in the right place, at the right time until 2030.
- 2.3 Officers consider that the dHMWP as drafted, is 'sound' as required by legislation, as it is based on solid evidence and prepared with substantial stakeholder involvement. Also a number of Members have been involved through an informal cross party sounding board which has guided and informed the plan preparation process.
- 2.4 The report briefly outlines the process undertaken for preparing the HMWP and considers the major concerns raised by stakeholders, including the public, about the suggested approach set out in the 'Have Your Say'

documentation. Comments are then made as to how such issues have been addressed in the dHMWP.

3. Preparing the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan

- 3.1 Preparation of the draft plan has been undertaken in partnership with the other minerals and waste planning authorities in Hampshire - Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and the South Downs National Park Authority - referred to as “the partners”.
- 3.2 Additionally, the partners have worked with Hampshire’s districts and borough councils, neighbouring authorities and organisations and other interested parties. This has ensured that strategic issues both within and outside Hampshire are taken into account in the dHMWP.
- 3.3 At its meeting on 25 November 2010 the County Council agreed to the preparation of a single comprehensive document for the planning of minerals and waste development, to be called the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. It would remove the need to prepare additional sites plans as originally intended and would entirely replace the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2007.
- 3.4 The County Council resolved to undertake a public consultation on the basis of a ‘Statement of Intention’, with the aim to “manage Hampshire’s natural resources to meet social and economic needs without jeopardising the environment for future generations”. The Statement also advocated a balanced and sustainable supply of minerals and a framework for the development of new waste infrastructure to deliver a sustainable waste management service for Hampshire, covering both public and private needs.
- 3.5 Subsequently, the consultation document “Have Your Say on Planning for Hampshire’s Minerals and Waste” (HYS) was published for public consultation from 17 February 2011 to 24 March 2011. A further focused public consultation on specific site issues was carried out during June and July 2011.
- 3.6 The consultations outlined a ‘suggested approach’ to minerals and waste development, including strategic mineral processing and landfill sites and a criteria led approach to waste management development.
- 3.7 Other options that had been identified, but on further detailed examination were then eliminated, were also published in the supporting material and background evidence base. A full list of the supporting evidence is available in Appendix 1.
- 3.8 The consultations were carried out under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. The approach to community participation is set out in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.

- 3.9 Details of the substantial public engagement undertaken are provided in Appendix 2. Public consultation has been undertaken over several years since 2007/08 and this has all been considered as part of the ongoing plan preparation process.
- 3.10 For the most recent consultation, over 3,000 responses have been received. The following sections highlight the main issues raised by the public and stakeholders, and make **comments** which clarify the approach taken to address these in the dHMWP.
- 3.11 It is important to emphasise that the responses to the suggested approach in HYS were part of the process that helped shape the draft plan. In this regard the cross party Member Sounding Board also provided valuable insight at its meetings (detailed in Appendix 3). All comments from stakeholders and the public have been taken into careful consideration and are reflected in the plan or evidence base – in some cases influencing policy and in others confirming the approach the County Council had already intended to take. It is, of course, not possible to accommodate everyone's views and wishes; a judgement has been taken based on informed assessment of all considerations to conclude a way forward in the dHMWP.
- 3.12 The numbers in parenthesis eg (No. X) refer to policy numbers in the dHMWP.

4 General Principles

- 4.1 Respondents raised concerns over the timing, length and complexity of HYS and associated documentation, and the communication methods employed to inform them.
- 4.2 **Comment** - The consultation was based on a suggested approach which aimed to highlight that many alternative options had been considered but that one approach had been identified as the most reasonable. The communications for the consultation were carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement, the County Council's adopted procedures for community engagement.
- 4.3 Over half the responses agreed with the issues and challenges facing Hampshire and the basic premise of the vision. However, there were very disparate views as to the actual focus of the vision, with particular concerns over:
- protection of the environment;
 - increased recycling and use of recycled aggregates;
 - insufficient emphasis on economic needs;
 - traffic issues; and
 - export of minerals for use outside Hampshire.
- 4.4 **Comment** – The dHMWP clarifies the vision and identifies the need to judge the balance between protection of the environment, maintaining communities

and supporting the economy. It also states that these overarching aims are not mutually exclusive in that multiple elements may be achieved. In this respect, the dHMWP and the framework set out by its constituent policies should be read as a whole.

- 4.5 Moreover, emphasis is given as to how a balance between the different policies respectively supporting environment, communities and economy will have to be made on a case by case basis when the authorities take planning decisions.
- 4.6 As part of the 'Open for Business' agenda the dHMWP recognises the need to support Hampshire's economy and advocates a hierarchy whereby aggregate recycling is a priority. Also the dHMWP explains that although overall it is a net importer, Hampshire has a role in providing minerals to other areas.
- 4.7 Traffic is a significant element for minerals and waste development. The dHMWP and its evidence base articulate the issues and methods by which its impacts on the environment through greenhouse gas emissions and communities due to congestion and pollution may be mitigated.

5. Protection of the Environment and Maintaining Communities

- 5.1 The concept of protecting Hampshire and its neighbours' environment was broadly supported by consultees. However views differed as to the level of protection afforded, with residents wanting more and businesses less.
- 5.2 Responses indicated a lack of support for development in the countryside and that brownfield land be used where possible.
- 5.3 Protection of designated sites and landscapes was mostly supported although concern was raised over additional burdens for developers.
- 5.4 Responses to HYS generally supported the suggested approach to communities with positive comments on ensuring waste is managed close to its source, that all opportunities for rail or sea transport of materials be explored and expanded and that development should meet the highest design and operational standards. There was some concern that there are no recommended 'buffer zones' between minerals and waste development and nearby housing.
- 5.5 Community benefits through developer contributions gave rise to numerous disparate comments although the principle of some mechanism being used to provide benefits to local communities who bear the burden of unpopular development was supported overall.
- 5.6 **Comment** – The protection of Hampshire's environment is absolutely critical to the dHMWP as it sets the terms by which the local minerals and waste industry should operate. Accordingly, the dHMWP incorporates policies that: outline the response to climate change (No.1), and avoid or mitigate effects

on habitats (No. 2), landscape (No. 3) including the special purposes of the National Parks, countryside (No.4), greenbelt (No. 5), heritage (No. 6) and soils (No. 7). Particular emphasis is given to restoration (No. 8) as this presents opportunities to achieve environmental and community objectives that might not otherwise be available.

- 5.7 The dHMWP highlights the protection of landscape in particular the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding National Beauty (AONBs) (No. 3), the countryside (No. 4) and South West Hampshire Greenbelt (No. 5). Development in these areas is only allowed in exceptional circumstances and in the Parks and AONBs in very exceptional circumstances. However, as it is mostly in the countryside where accessible mineral deposits that have not been sterilised by urban development exist, therefore mineral extraction and associated development is an exception. There are other exceptions; for example certain waste facilities like anaerobic digestion or open windrow composting which are better situated in remote and/or rural locations. Nevertheless, any future development in the countryside, if permitted, will be accompanied by strong mitigation measures and restoration requirements.
- 5.8 The issues of amenity and health and safety are always a concern for residents and this is also covered (No. 9). On the matter of 'buffer zones' around development, the dHMWP explains that a 50 metres buffer would be applied generally with a greater buffer of 250 metres for rural developments or landfill, flexibly applied to meet the requirements of each particular site. In some circumstances less is required, while in other cases, particularly when dealing with landfill or open windrow composting, a significantly larger buffer zone would be justified.
- 5.9 Policy for protection against flooding and impacts of traffic (Nos. 10 and 11) is also included. Special reference is made to supporting the concept of sensitive and high quality design (No. 12) in the dHMWP; this is important given the success Hampshire has had with the development of exemplary waste infrastructure, such as the Marchwood and Chineham energy recovery facilities. It should not be forgotten that a number of Hampshire mineral sites have received restoration awards and have been noted for their conservation and habitat value.
- 5.10 The dHMWP strengthens opportunities for community involvement. It provides for attachment of conditions and legal agreements to development proposals in order to mitigate impacts (No. 13). Bilateral agreements between mineral and waste developers and local communities that realise local benefits are encouraged (No. 14).

6. Supporting the Economy

- 6.1 The HYS consultation documents considered how minerals and waste development can support Hampshire's economy, and suggested policies and proposals for the safeguarding of mineral resource and minerals and waste

infrastructure; minerals - especially aggregates; waste development, and mineral sites and landfill.

7 Safeguarding

- 7.1 There was general support that resources should be safeguarded and likewise existing capacity. There was an appreciation that the soft sand at Whitehill-Bordon was an important resource. However, others had concerns that safeguarding might prejudice the development of the Eco-town. Others thought Whitehill-Bordon should be specifically identified as a soft sand site.
- 7.2 There were some representations indicating that existing wharf capacity may not be sufficient in the longer term.
- 7.3 **Comment** – Safeguarding of resources and infrastructure is a national policy priority. It is proposed that sand and gravel and brick making clay resources should be safeguarded (No. 15). It is identified as a Mineral Safeguarding Area illustrated on the Proposals Map that will be published alongside the dHMWP.
- 7.4 The soft sand resources in the Whitehill-Bordon area are specifically identified in the light of the Eco-town development (No. 15). The Delivery Board for the Eco Town need to consider how, if practicable, some if not all the mineral deposit (strategically important soft sand) can be extracted in advance of other developments.
- 7.5 In a similar manner it is proposed that mineral infrastructure, such as aggregate recycling facilities, wharfs and rail depots (No. 16) should be safeguarded especially as some of these facilities are under pressure for redevelopment but play a vital role in the supply of aggregates. They are also important in ensuring certain wastes, like metals, are transported to customers by other means than road.
- 7.6 A particular issue that has to be addressed is the safeguarding of potential wharf and rail development to address long term needs – beyond the life of the dHMWP. It has to be recognised that the pattern of development advocated for the dHMWP may not be sustainable in the long term. There are constraints on mineral resources and infrastructure currently relied on may not be available. Accordingly, the dHMWP (No. 34) proposes that land covered by the Port of Southampton Master Plan, or currently military installations - if they are released from MoD use – should be safeguarded for possible minerals and waste development as part of any development that may emerge. This does not presume such land should be developed but that in any decision making in the future, minerals and waste planning requirements must be taken into consideration.

8. Minerals

- 8.1 Consultation responses gave overall support for maintaining aggregate supply. However alternatives to local sand and gravel extraction were

strongly supported, including the provision of recycling infrastructure and maintaining capacity for imports through wharves and depots.

- 8.2 The level of supply of aggregates, 'the apportionment' – based on average sales for the last 10 years instead of an apportionment based on national and regional forecasts - received cautious support, particularly from the aggregates industry. The latter had concerns about the general impacts on aggregate supply in the regional context. New sales figures for 2010 revise the 10 year sales average to 1.56 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) – lower than that suggested in the consultation documentation (No. 17).
- 8.3 There was support for the suggested approach to other minerals including chalk, oil and gas. However some significant issues were noted for the clay areas identified and these are highlighted below.
- 8.4 **Comment** – The dHMWP recognises the responsibility placed on Hampshire by the Government to maintain minerals supply, and in particular that Hampshire should be contributing to a variety of sources of aggregate. Accordingly capacities (No. 17) and infrastructure for recycled aggregates (No. 18) and alternative supplies from wharves and rail depots (No. 19) are proposed to ensure that the contribution from these sources can, if market conditions are right, provide a greater proportion of the overall supply. In the medium to longer term this will reduce pressure on the need to release land for local sand and gravel extraction in the event the demand for aggregates increases.
- 8.5 On the other hand there is still a continuing need for making provision for local sand and gravel extraction (No. 20). Hampshire is obligated under national policy to provide for a 'steady and adequate' supply of aggregate, and that includes local land-won extraction at a proportionate scale. It also has to be recognised that some aggregates, especially soft sand and some specialist sharp sand and gravel, cannot be substituted by alternative supplies.
- 8.6 The consultation document, HYS, advocated a simpler, more transparent rate of supply be calculated by averaging the long term 10 years sales figures. This is justified on the basis that the 'Guidelines' issued by Government and taken into account in connection with the review of regional policy are based on economic assumptions that are untenable. Accordingly HYS proposed an apportionment of 1.7 mtpa of sand and gravel until 2030. This amounts to a suggested requirement of 34mt in total.
- 8.7 However, the latest sales information (2010) included in the dHMWP, revises the 10 year average sales to 1.56mtpa, a total requirement of 30.03mt. This requirement is shared between existing reserves and sites proposed in the dHMWP and the effect of these is illustrated below/overleaf.

	Sharp sand and gravel (mt)	Soft sand (mt)	Total (mt)
Apportionment	1.28 mtpa	0.28 mtpa	1.56mtpa
Sand & gravel requirement (Apportionment X Plan period [19.25 yrs])	24.64	5.39	30.03
Reserve (2010)	12.22	2.22	14.44
Sites in Plan	9.30	4.03	13.33
Total	21.52	6.25	27.77
Variance	-3.12	+0.86	-2.26

8.8 It should be noted that even with a much reduced 'apportionment' for sand and gravel there is still a shortfall in supply from local extraction sites. However, past history indicates that this sort of shortfall can be covered by 'windfall' sites, for example extraction associated with agricultural reservoirs. Accordingly, a contingency is incorporated (No. 17) to deal with additional proposals that will have to meet demanding criteria including being of equal merit to sites in the dHMWP.

8.9 In addition to the 'apportionment' for local land-won sand and gravel, the dHMWP also supports development and appropriate extensions at recycling and aggregate import sites (Nos. 18 & 19) that deliver alternative supplies of sand and gravel. To some degree the limitations on the use of alternative materials is more to do with market circumstances and plant capacity, rather than the size of the site and its location. Nevertheless, there is a shortage of rail depot capacity in the north of Hampshire and two sites are proposed – Basingstoke and Micheldever Station.

8.10 Other minerals are also important considerations in Hampshire and are dealt with as follows:

- local production of brick making clay to support Hampshire's brickworks is identified (No. 21);
- small scale operations for chalk extraction for agricultural and industrial use are supported (No. 22); and
- oil and gas exploration, appraisal and potential production are supported where the need for development is demonstrated within constraints (No. 23).

9. Waste

9.1 The responses to HYS were generally supportive of the suggested approach, namely:

- apply the national waste hierarchy to waste planning decisions, prioritising waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery over disposal to landfill;
- achieve as close to ‘zero waste’ as possible in the long term;
- generate energy from waste where recycling is not a practicable option; and
- identify sites by spatial policies and criteria.

9.2 However concern was raised about the suggested provision for future landfill in that it contradicts the concept of Hampshire pursuing zero waste. Moreover concern was raised about the suggested individual landfill proposals.

9.3 **Comment** – The dHMWP encourages the management of waste further up the ‘waste hierarchy’. Major elements in the realisation of achieving ‘Zero Waste’ are outside the remit of waste planning. Despite this, the Plan makes provision for the relevant infrastructure that supports waste prevention and significantly improves reuse, recycling and recovery in order to achieve maximum efficiency in resource use and as close to zero waste to landfill as possible, in accordance with the waste hierarchy (No. 24).

9.4 In practical terms, and certainly for the period to 2030, progressing towards zero waste to landfill is the objective approved in this plan. Evidence shows that waste trends, landfill tax and other national policies for waste management are likely to have a continuing effect of minimising the amount of waste going to landfill. The aim of as close to zero waste to landfill (zero untreated waste to landfill is a viable alternative) is therefore sound, but some allowance has to be made for wastes that cannot practicably be treated in other ways and for residues from other waste processes. It is therefore appropriate to plan for a scenario of up to 5% of non-hazardous waste to landfill by 2020. Currently, about 20% of Hampshire’s non-hazardous waste goes to landfill.

9.5 The implication of diverting more waste from landfill is that some additional facilities are required for the recycling and recovery of waste and materials. In general it is expected that such facilities can be accommodated by safeguarding existing capacity (No. 25) and proposals at existing sites (No. 26). The additional capacity needed for recycling and recovery of waste is 600,000 tonnes per annum. Assuming Hampshire accommodates all its diminishing landfill requirement – currently some commercial and industrial waste is exported to other areas – 1.1 million tonnes of capacity is required (No. 26).

- 9.6 Apart from the development of existing sites the capacity will be delivered through facilities for energy generation from waste (No. 27) and new facilities (No. 28), the dHMWP expects that waste development should be on existing industrial land or other previously developed sites. These are identified through spatial criteria and appropriate controls to prevent environmental and community impacts. However, it is accepted that there may be special circumstances when the use of 'greenfield' land for certain waste uses may be justified. Even so, special mitigation will be required to justify this (No. 4).
- 9.7 A significant part of the waste stream arises from the construction industry and the dHMWP addresses the reuse and recovery of material from this source (No. 29) and also how the residues should be managed (No. 31).
- 9.8 Hampshire needs to play its part in providing a range of facilities for specialist waste types, although some of this relates to wastewater treatment (No. 30), other wastes require facilities that are located on a regional or sub regional basis to meet market needs. Existing facilities in Hampshire have an important role and, given the emerging national policy on specialist waste provision, the dHMWP has policy (No. 33) that can deal with requirements for materials like fly ash and batteries.
- 9.9 With regard to landfill there is remaining capacity at sites with existing planning permission: at Blue Haze, near Verwood; Squabb Wood, near Romsey and Pound Bottom, near Redlynch. These may not provide sufficient long-term capacity so it is considered additional capacity would be provided at:
- Squabb Wood and
 - Purple Haze (but only as a **reserve site** if required).

However, a policy (No. 32) is proposed as contingency that sets out strict criteria for environmental and community protection in the event landfill proposals are submitted to address a future need that is currently unforeseen. Land raise proposals would be unacceptable under this proposed policy.

- 9.10 It is anticipated that virtually all landfill capacity will be provided by the private sector and other than the residual landfill capacity, most proposals will be small to medium scale – up to 50,000 tonnes per annum. However, the dHMWP (No. 27) is drafted to address any scale of development.

10. Minerals sites and landfill

- 10.1 HYS suggested a number of sites and a large number of comments relate to these. A fuller list of the site responses received to the HYS consultation can be found in Appendix 4. Each of these are discussed below.

Basingstoke Sidings

10.2 Consultation responses suggest that there is support for this site, however concerns have been raised over potential impacts on a nearby conservation area.

Comment - This site along with Micheldever has the potential for supplementing the aggregate supply for north Hampshire. However, its development should take account of:

- protection of amenity of local businesses and residents;
- access improvements; and
- protection of water resources.

Micheldever Station

10.3 Consultation responses raised concerns that the site would have impacts on new residential development at Micheldever.

Comment - This site could be used to help transport minerals. Its development should address:

- screening and operational measures to satisfactorily reduce impacts on nearby homes;
- protection of local designations;
- protection of water resources; and
- transport impacts.

Bleak Hill Quarry Extension, Harbridge

10.4 Consultation responses highlighted concerns over traffic impacts, visibility and cumulative impacts in relation to mineral operations in the locality.

Comment - This site would contribute 0.5mt of sharp sand and gravel from west Hampshire. It would be restored with inert fill to agriculture with nature conservation elements and public access. As an extension it should not cause additional site traffic. Development should address:

- screening to reduce visual impact;
- cumulative impact with other operations; and
- local habitat.

Bramshill Quarry Extension, (Yateley Heath Wood)

- 10.5 Responses indicated that the northern portion of the site has recently been subject to a management agreement for nature conservation under a stewardship scheme. The proximity to the caravan park and potential impacts on its residents was highlighted in addition to concerns over joint access. Potential detrimental effects to the nearby European Site (Special Protection Area) were also suggested.

Comment - This site could contribute 1.0mt of sharp sand and gravel from north Hampshire with restoration to forestry and heathland. However, the northern portion of the site is effectively sterilised. The remaining southern part of the site is still viable, taking the likely working area away from the caravan park. Development should consider:

- residential impact;
- protection of habitat;
- cumulative impact;
- access; and
- visual impact.

Cutty Brow, Longparish

- 10.6 Responses highlighted concerns over visual impact on local residents, access and traffic issues, potential impacts on nearby habitat adjacent protected areas and heritage assets and the desire for the local community to be actively involved in any development.

Comment - The site would supply 1mt of sharp sand and gravel with restoration to agriculture. Development would need to address:

- access and traffic; and
- screening for visual impact.

Forest Lodge Farm, Hythe

- 10.7 Responses highlighted concerns over potential impacts on the amenity of nearby homes and concerns over traffic impacts. Also, issues about effects on the nearby European Site and the New Forest National Park.

Comment - The site would contribute 0.17mt of sand and gravel and 0.4 mt of soft sand supply from south Hampshire. Restoration would be to grazing with habitat features that may require some inert fill. Development would need to address:

- amenity impacts on nearby residents;

- traffic; and
- impacts on the European site and National Park.

Hamble Airfield, Hamble

10.8 Significant concerns have been raised through the consultation process particularly in relation to:

- traffic on Hamble lane;
- potential health, amenity, safety and pollution impacts on nearby residents, schools and businesses;
- safety of local school children and any site related traffic; and
- potential impact on nearby European sites.

Comment - This site would supply 1.25 mt of sharp sand and gravel from south Hampshire, and in particular the strategic housing requirements at, for example, Eastleigh and Fareham. It would be restored for local community amenity use, recreation, grazing and woodland with wildlife features. Development would need to address:

- traffic and congestion on Hamble Lane to ensure there is safe access, provision made for more vulnerable highway users and impacts on peak flows, particularly regarding the schools, are managed;
- measures, including screening, 'buffer zones' and site management to ensure amenity, health and pollution impacts are controlled within appropriate standards; and
- effective mitigation to ensure the protection of the nearby European site.

Mortimer Quarry Extension, Mortimer

10.9 Consultation responses raised concerns over potential impacts on local habitats, the potential for increased traffic in a rural area and the sequencing relating to the existing site.

Comment - The site would contribute 2.4mt to aggregate supply in north Hampshire. It would be restored to commercial forestry with public access and heathland habitat. It would be an extension to the existing site and there should be no net increase in site traffic. Development should address:

- a conveyor link to the current processing; and
- protection of landscape, water resources, biodiversity and heritage would need to be undertaken.

Purple Haze, Ringwood Forest

10.10 A significant number of responses were received regarding this site, with concerns including (but not limited to):

- potential impacts on the Ebblake Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and especially the Dorset Heathlands SPA;
- the potential impacts on the amenity of both local residents and visitors to Moors Valley Country Park;
- potential health, safety, pollution and amenity impacts of potential landfill operations;
- additional traffic on the B3081;
- the water main through the site; and
- cumulative impact on the locality with other operations.

Comment - The site would contribute by 2030 about 0.75mt of sharp sand and gravel and 4mt of soft sand from west Hampshire. The site would be progressively restored to forestry and heathland habitat with public access. The site would be a **reserve site for non-hazardous landfill** and in the event it is not required for this purpose, restoration would require inert fill. Development of the site would need to address:

- hydro-geological issues relating to the nearby Ebblake Bog SSSI that would include not extracting mineral from the northern portion of the site. NB. This would effectively move extraction further away from Verwood;
- visual impact on the users of the B3081 and the Moors Valley Country Park by screening;
- protection or re-routeing of utilities;
- amenity of the Moors Valley Country Park;
- maintenance of local recreational access;
- protection measures for the nearby Dorset Heathlands SPA; and
- traffic and congestion on the B3081 to ensure there is safe access, provision made for more vulnerable highway users and impacts on peak flows managed.

Roeshot, Christchurch

- 10.11 Responses indicated concerns over traffic impacts, especially on the New Forest National Park, potential amenity impacts on local residents and possible displacement of local users to adjacent Dorset Heath and New Forest protected areas.

Comment - This site is included in the plan as a supply of sharp sand and gravel from west Hampshire of approximately 3mt. Restoration to agriculture, public access and nature conservation elements linked to the New Forest National Park. Development would have to address:

- access onto the A35 and traffic impacts;
- impact on the setting of the New Forest National Park;
- maintenance of recreational access; and
- protection of water resources.

Michelmersh Brickworks

- 10.12 Consultation responses highlighted concerns over the proximity of clay resources to houses and the visual and other amenity impacts of clay working on residents and the village overall. Particular concern was raised about extraction on the land to the north-east, east and south of the brickworks.

Comment - This site would secure a supply of clay for Michelmersh Brickworks for most of the plan period . The land to the north-east of the brickworks known as the 'Old Schoolhouse Field' would be excluded. Likewise land to the east and south would be excluded. Restoration would be to a combination of agriculture, nature conservation and local amenity uses. Development would need to address:

- restricting use of the clay to the brickworks and;
- managing operations to minimise impacts on amenity

Selborne Brickworks

- 10.13 Concerns were raised over this site about how it would adversely affect the South Downs National Park and the amenity and environment of nearby homes.

Comment - The site comprises a recently lapsed planning permission for clay extraction and would supply clay for Selborne Brickworks for over 20 years. Restoration would require inert fill and would be for agriculture with habitat features. Development would need to address:

- restricting use of clay to the brickworks;

- limiting access for inert fill to the site via the haul road over the neighbouring Chapel Farm;
- protection of the South Downs National Park;
- local water features and water resources; and
- residential amenity.

Squabb Wood Landfill Extension, Shootash

10.14 Concerns were raised over the uncertainty of the height of potential surcharging at the site. Also that adequate screening should be provided to reduce any visual impact of the site.

Comment - The site would provide 0.4mt of landfill capacity as a lateral extension to the existing operation. This capacity with that already permitted should be sufficient for the HMWP. Development would need to address:

- screening of the site;
- limiting the surcharging of permitted levels to that needed to grade into the landform on the extension; and
- maintenance of landscape character.

Blue Haze Landfill Extension, Ringwood Forest

10.15 Concerns were raised about increasing the life of this site because of traffic and odour. The current operator considers that any extension would represent a significant engineering challenge without creating steep slopes.

Comment - The extension would create an unacceptable landform and would be difficult to deliver. The extension site is not included in the dHMWP.

11. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 11.1 The draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 25 July 2011. It aims to drastically reduce the quantity and variety of policy guidance given to planning authorities. The draft NPPF highlights that the aim of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which it defines as “ensuring that all people should be able to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life, both now and in the future”. The NPPF defines this as “planning for prosperity (an economic role), planning for people (a social role) and planning for places (an environmental role)”.
- 11.2 Although still in draft form, the NPPF has been classed as a ‘material consideration’ by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore the draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (dHMWP) must take it into account

This is not over helpful as it will not be clear in some areas what targets have to be achieved. Indeed with regard to sand and gravel apportionments and accommodating London's waste South East Plan objectives may still remain. However, the alternative policies proposed for the dHMWP (Nos. 17 & 27) are based on robust evidence and represent a strong case for 'departing' from what will be old regional targets.

- 11.3 However, it is apparent that the Government intends that the NPPF will be the 'default' planning policy in the absence of an up to date plan. This is a major issue, as the Government's view about sustainable development is in favour of economic growth and, laudable as this aim is, given current circumstances it is not necessarily what should prevail in all cases. The principal defence therefore to ensure local priorities can be given weight especially when addressing speculative minerals and waste development is to have a Plan in place. This emphasises the need to progress the dHMWP as quickly as possible.

12. Next steps

- 12.1 If, following a recommendation from the Cabinet, the dHMWP is approved by Council and its partners, the draft will then be published in November 2011 for public comment on its soundness; whether it has been positively prepared, is effective, justifiable and in conformity with national policy.
- 12.2 Any comments received will then be collated and, together with the plan and evidence base, will be submitted to the Secretary of State in the early spring of 2012 for scrutiny by an independent planning inspector at a Public Examination. In the run up to, and during the Examination hearing, the Inspector may wish to resolve minor issues of dispute, or seek further clarification from the Planning authorities on particular issues which are felt to potentially impact on the 'soundness' of the Plan. In order to ensure that any such minor issues can be dealt with expeditiously, it is proposed that authority is delegated to the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment to respond, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport.
- 12.3 The Inspector will report after the Public Examination whether the HMWP is 'sound'. Following this the Council and its partners will decide whether or not to adopt the plan.
- 12.4 It is appropriate to bring to Members' attention the main risks to achieving this timetable:
- (i) The Localism Bill proposes to revoke the South East Plan. It would be unwise to submit the HMWP to the Secretary of State before this happens as it is not in conformity with the SE Plan. It is anticipated that the Localism Bill will be enacted before the end of the year and the South East Plan will be revoked simultaneously. This will be well before the anticipated date for submission of the HMWP to the Secretary of State.

However, in the event there is a delay in the completion of the Bill or revocation of the South East Plan the submission of the HMWP will have to be delayed accordingly. In the event there is a delay, this will be reported to Council, with advice on an alternative timetable

- (ii) It has been the practice of Inspectors in recent public examinations to ask planning authorities to do additional work with regard to their Plans to make them 'sound'. These are often minor points and can be addressed within the principles of the delegation recommended. It is not anticipated that any major issues will arise with the HMWP. If an unforeseen issue does emerge that may require a Council decision, the timetable for the Plan adoption will be reviewed accordingly.

13. Recommendation

That the Cabinet recommends to the County Council:

- (i) That the draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan attached to this report be approved by County Council at its meeting on 13 October 2011 for publication; consultation on its soundness; and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulations 27-30 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.
- (ii) That the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport, be authorised to finalise the text, plans and diagrams of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and supporting documents, provided that these do not materially change the direction, shape and emphasis of the Plan, and do not raise new issues.
- (iii) That, during the pre-submission period to the Secretary of State and during the public examination itself, the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment be authorised, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport, to make minor changes to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan to respond to consultation comments, legislative and national policy changes, provided that these do not materially change the direction, shape and emphasis of the document, and do not raise new issues.

Rpt/2756/AF

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Corporate Strategy**

Hampshire safer and more secure for all:	no
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Maximising well-being:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:		
<u>Title</u> Planning for future Minerals and Waste Development in Hampshire	<u>Reference</u> 1964	<u>Date</u> 25/11/2010
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives		
<u>Title</u> Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations		<u>Date</u> 2008
Draft National Planning Policy Framework		25 July 2011
Localism Bill		2010
Minerals Policy Statement 1		2006

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 1.1 The principles of the Plan, whose primary purpose is to protect the environment and maintain communities whilst supporting economic growth, have been assessed and this iterative process has influenced the plan-making.
- 1.2 It is concluded that the Plan itself is unlikely to have a significant negative effect on any residents in Hampshire and nearby areas, as this is considered through the plan making process through the use of Sustainability Appraisal in particular.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1 No impact.

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

Sustainable use of minerals and management of wastes contributes to reducing the carbon footprint of the county.

- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

The proposals contained within the Plan will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal to ensure that they contribute to adaption and mitigation of climate change.

HMWP Supporting evidence

1. Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire - Specialist Waste Facilities Paper
2. Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire - Waste Data Summary Report
3. Assessment of Sites and Areas for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire (draft report)
4. Draft Hampshire Minerals Plan Traffic Assessment Pt 1
5. Draft Hampshire Minerals Plan Traffic Assessment Pt 2
6. Draft Hampshire Minerals Plan Traffic Assessment Pt 3
7. HMWP Minerals proposal addendum - clay July 2011
8. Hamble Airfield - Traffic and Access Study
9. Hamble Lane Traffic Map AM Peak
10. Hamble Lane Traffic Map Off Peak
11. Hamble Lane Traffic Map PM Peak
12. Hampshire Mineral Proposal Suitability Study
13. Have Your Say on Planning for Hampshire's Mineral and Waste – Summary of responses
14. Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Scoping September 2010
15. Joint Baseline Report September 2010
16. Landfill Surcharging and Land raising in Hampshire (v2)
17. Minerals in Hampshire - Background Study

18. Planning for Waste Management Uses in Hampshire - A Review of Air Quality Trends and Planning Considerations
19. Strategic Transport Assessment
20. Supporting Documents - Errata Sheet
21. Sustainability Appraisal - Interim Report on Policy Options
22. Sustainability Appraisal - Interim Report on Sites
23. The Suitability of Industrial Areas for Waste management Uses in Hampshire
24. Topic Paper Wharves & Depots - The Hampshire Context (2011 update)
25. Wharves and Depots Needs Assessment - Update (2011)
26. HMWP HYS Consultation Responses Summary Report Final
27. HMWP Report of Stakeholder Event 16 May 2011
28. HYS Fareham - Summary of comments from exhibition 11 March 2011
29. HYS Fleet - Summary of comments from exhibition 4 March 2011
30. HYS Fordingbridge - Summary of comments from exhibition 2 March 2011
31. HYS Hamble - Summary of comments from Eastleigh Council meeting 22 February 2011
32. HYS New Milton - Summary of comments from meeting 23 February 2011
33. HYS Romsey - Summary of comments from exhibition 9 March 2011
34. HYS Whitehill Bordon - Summary of comments from meeting 15 March 2011
35. Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Frequently Asked Questions

Community participation

- The approach to public participation in plan making in Hampshire is set out in the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- The County Council agreed the communication and engagement programme, for the preparation of the plan, which accords with the SCI, at its meeting in November 2010.
- As part of this programme a cross-party group of County Councillors was convened and then met on a regular informal basis to provide guidance on the preparation of the plan and opportunities for community engagement.
- This group provided feedback on the draft suggested approach, the key elements of the plan including sites and the development management control criteria. The County Councillors included in this group and a summary/ list of the meetings undertaken can be found in Appendix 3.
- A variety of methods were employed to inform residents of the ongoing plan making activities before, during and after the consultation. These included newsletters, emails and press releases.
- Additionally, several regional and site specific events were held to provide an opportunity for local residents to meet officers, find out more about the suggested approach and leave their comments. A list of the public events is included below.

Public events undertaken

Four exhibitions were organised, from 4pm to 8pm on the following dates:

02/03/2011 - Fordingbridge (Fordingbridge Town Hall)

04/03/2011 - Fleet (Harlington Centre)

09/03/2011 - Romsey (Crosfield Hall)

11/03/2011 - Fareham (Fernehall Hall)

One local meeting was organised:

15/03/2011 - Bordon (Forest Community Centre) 6pm-8pm

Three local meetings were attended, based on invitations from local organisations:

21/02/2011 – Hamble, meeting with Parish and District representatives organised by Eastleigh Borough Council

22/02/2011 – Hamble, public meeting organised by Eastleigh Borough Council

23/02/2011 – New Milton, public meeting organised by New Milton Town Council

After the consultation period ended:

16/05/2011 – “Supplying tomorrow’s resources” Stakeholder event (Ashburton Hall, Winchester)

Further three local events were organised for the Have Your Say – Additional Mineral Issues:

27/06/2011 - Kingsley (Kingsley Community Centre)

29/06/2011 - Hartley Wintney (Victoria and Appleton (V&A) Centre)

06/07/2011 - Michelmersh (Jubilee Hall)

After the Have Your Say – Additional Mineral Issues:

10/08/2011 – Verwood (Verwood Memorial Hall)

18/08/2011 – Michelmersh (Brickworks Open Evening)

Hampshire County Councillors invited to attend Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Sounding Board Meetings

Councillors

Carew, Chapman, Cooper, Dash, Davidovitz, Frankum, Gibson, Heron, Hockley, House, James, Kemp-Gee, Kendal (chair), Knight, Mans, McIntosh, Perry, Porter, Rice, Simpson, Tucker, Wheale, Woodward.

Meetings

1st Sounding Board, 07 February 2011

2nd Sounding Board, 15 February 2011

3rd Sounding Board, 14 April 2011

4th Sounding Board, 26 May 2011

5th Sounding Board, 13 June 2011

6th Sounding Board, 06 July 2011

Responses to Have Your Say on Planning for Hampshire's Minerals and Waste

- Further details available in the “Summary of Responses from the Have Your Say on Planning for Hampshire's Minerals and Waste”
- 1377 people and organisations responded to the consultation.
- The majority of these were received from residents
- Adding up all the general comments and the number of comments on each question, a total of 4797 comments were received within the consultation timeframe
- Over 3,500 responses were received after the consultation closed on 24 March, mostly from residents commenting on the suggested site at Purple Haze, Ringwood Forest
- Site responses – issues and numbers:
- Basingstoke Sidings, Basingstoke (Aggregate rail depot)

Responses – 33 out of 55 (60%) responses to the relevant question agree with safeguarding a new rail depot site at Basingstoke

Issues –

- More smaller sites may be needed to avoid road transport
- Potential for importing crushed rock should be explored
- Basingstoke sidings may impact on nearby conservation area
- Bleak Hill III Extension (Sharp sand and gravel)

Responses – 7 respondents opposing Bleak Hill, and 5 that felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

- Quality of life for nearby residents
- Potential traffic impacts (including on road safety, structural integrity of nearby properties and the Avon valley)
- Potential impacts on nearby designated areas and heathland (eg through changes to groundwater levels)
- Potential for cumulative impacts with other nearby developments, particularly on Ringwood Forest
- Need to consider restoration strategically across Ringwood Forest
- Need for screening the site so that it is not visible from the road
- Concern regarding the availability of inert fill for restoration, as this material could also be used for aggregate recycling
- Concern over risk of bird strike should the site be used for landfilling of food waste

- No connection of the site by rail
- Blue Haze Landfill, Ringwood (Additional landfill void)
 - Responses – 11 respondents opposing Blue Haze, and 5 that felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational
 - Issues –
 - Due to the proximity of the site to the suggested Purple Haze site, similar concerns apply. Please see the responses given to Purple Haze for further details.
 - The key issues raised specifically regarding Blue Haze were:
 - Concern that the current height of the site would be increased
 - Continuing need for bird exclusion measures as long as food waste is received
- Bordon Whitehill (Specific safeguarding - Soft sand)
 - Responses – 27 out of 39 (69%) responses to the relevant question agree with a specific safeguarding of soft sand reserves at Whitehill-Bordon
 - Issues –
 - Support for extracting resources regardless of development pressures
 - Support for extracting resources only for needs of eco-town
 - Should balance mineral need with development need
 - Opposition due to local SINC's and other designated areas
- Bramshill Quarry Extension (Sharp sand and gravel)
 - Responses - 28 respondents opposing Bramshill
 - Issues –
 - Distance between the suggested extension and the existing site and how material would be transported between the two
 - Potential impact on designated areas (eg SPA, SSSI and AONB) and biodiversity
 - Need to ensure there are no likely significant effects on the conservation objectives of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA
 - Potential impacts on local hydrology (eg effects on drainage, water table and flooding)
 - Potential impact on local watercourses (eg through run-off)
 - Potential impacts on residents (eg through proximity, reduction of recreation facilities, loss of noise barrier)
 - Potential visual and landscape impacts
 - Potential loss of equine and farming facilities

- Concerns about the insufficient level of consultation with local residents

Comments on the suggested replacement for this extension (Yateley Heath Wood, also an extension at Bramshill) were received through the second consultation, Have Your Say – Additional Mineral issues.

- Commercial or military port land in Southampton or Portsmouth

Responses – 41 out of 59 (69%) of the responses to the relevant question agreed with the suggested approach to meeting the need for new capacity at wharves

Issues –

 - Concern over potential impacts of wharf construction, operation and transport
 - Need to consider regeneration opportunities, including coastal use for recreation
 - Questions over what constitutes a sustainable extension and whether expansions are needed
 - Cutty Brow, Longparish (Sharp sand and gravel)

Responses – 3 respondents opposing Cutty Brow, and 3 that had no objections or that felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

 - Potential problems with traffic and access issues
 - Need to screen the developments
 - Potential cumulative impacts with the nearby waste developments
 - Potential impacts on an important ecological corridor (the former railway line), adjacent SINC and River Test SSSI
 - Suggestion for the use of an adequate buffer to nearby residences
 - Suggestion for the local community to be compensated for disruption and loss of tranquillity
 - Suggestion for restoration to be to amenity use, not agriculture
 - Forest Lodge Farm (Soft sand with some sharp sand and gravel)

Responses - 10 respondents opposing Forest Lodge Farm, and 2 that supported the site or that felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

 - Potential impacts on the nearby New Forest National Park and numerous other designations (Ramsar, SPA, SAC and SSSI sites), particularly because of potential hydrological connectivity

- Concern over impacts of dust from mineral extraction on adjacent CHP₁₅ plant
- Concern over noise, dust, odour and potential disturbance of properties in very close proximity to site
- Potential impacts on traffic congestion and road safety, particularly near the proposed entrance opposite the Netley View Housing Estate
- Loss of an environmental buffer between industrial and residential areas and back-up grazing land
- Suggestion to restore the site as playing pitches
- Potential to contribute to wider green infrastructure and amenity opportunities in the area, particularly in relation to the New Forest National Park
- Hamble Airfield (Sharp sand and gravel)

N.B. - As many of the issues raised are common concerns for residents regarding any suggested new or extensions of mineral or waste sites and as a significant number of responses were Hamble, the various issues raised regarding Hamble have been highlighted in as much detail as possible and can be used as a guideline to the issues that should be considered regarding any minerals or waste site.

Responses – 1058 respondents opposing Hamble, and 7 that supported it or felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

Hamble residents often felt that **communication** regarding the consultation and suggested approach had been poor, including such issues as:

- Community views ignored
- Residents not informed of the consultation or local events
- Insufficient number of local events
- Insufficient time to respond to the consultation and other documents
- Large amounts of documents
- Most documents only available online

A considerable amount of concerns were raised regarding the access to the site and the **transport impacts** on:

- Increased traffic and congestion
- Cumulative impacts on traffic from schools, health facilities and the local supermarket
- Emissions and air pollution from increased traffic levels

- Cumulative impacts on air pollution from pollution levels that already exceed legal limits
 - Access for emergency vehicles
 - Emergency access to the BP fuel terminal
 - Damage to roads
 - Mud on roads
 - Road safety (particularly dangers to pedestrians, cyclists and children)
 - Ability of Hamble Halt railway bridge to take the additional strain
 - Cumulative impacts on traffic from the Woolston development
- Concerns regarding the accuracy and up to date nature of traffic assessments.

Some concerns related to **health, safety and pollution**:

- Risk of flooding and run-off
- Water pollution and other impacts on nearby watercourses (eg Hamble River) and the marine environment
- Cumulative effect with effluent from Fawley refinery
- An oil pipe runs under the site
- Dust and air pollution (including the effect of local winds orienting the dust towards the schools)
- Noise
- Other health impacts
- Subsidence
- Vibration
- Unexploded bombs from the war
- Light pollution
- Previously landfilled and contaminated land

Other concerns related to **protection of the environment, amenity and quality of life**, including concerns regarding

- Proximity to vulnerable targets (eg residents, school, health centre, police training college, recreation areas)
- Loss of historic or archaeologically significant sites and spoiling the historic village
- Adjacent/near sites of local, national and international importance (eg RAMSAR, SPA, SAC, SSSI, Country Park)
- Loss of biodiversity and habitats (eg for sand lizards, adders, grass snakes, common lizards, slowworms, owls, skylarks, buzzards, kestrels, rabbits, deer, foxes, long tailed tits, field mice)

Loss of trees that should be preserved

- In and near AQMA₁₄ and AQMA Strategic Gap
- Loss of a greenfield site, of a strategic gap and of green and open space
- Loss of a recreation area (eg footpaths and playing fields, opportunities for walking, jogging, dog walking, horse care and riding, cycling)
- Damage to other recreation activities in the area (eg sailing, yachting and holiday pursuits)
- Damage to local economy (eg due to effects of traffic issues, on painting and varnishing of yachts, on the River Hamble, on access to boats, on the tranquillity of the village, etc.)
- Cumulative impacts with existing industry
- Damage to houses (eg to foundations)
- Reduction in house values
- Effects on the upcoming Olympics
- Within an airport exclusion zone, leading to bird-strike issues
- Landscape and visual impacts

Questions regarding the selection process of sites, with **other sources** of sand and gravel were suggested including increased use of:

- Recycled aggregates
- Marine dredged aggregates, including dredging from the Solent
- Imported aggregates that could be landed at the ports
- Ensuring that priority is given to using aggregates locally as both marine and won aggregates end up being exported to the rest of the country and abroad
- Aggregates extracted from the shingles bank

There were particular concerns regarding the **restoration** of the site and the possible uses after restoration, particularly regarding:

- Classification of the site as brownfield land after extraction has taken place
- Use of the site for housing development
- Use of the site for landfill
- Nature of the materials that would be used for restoration
- Leaving the site as pits full of water
- Need to consider any regional and local plans for the area, eg the Hampshire County Structure Plan, the Eastleigh Local Plan Review, but particularly the Local Parish Plan (2008) for Hamble in which the airfield

is designated for recreational area to provide an open space for the area and act as an incentive to the tourist industry

There were a few comments suggesting **conditions to be met** before Hamble is extracted or in support of Hamble:

- Need to consider the countryside Access Plan for the Solent
- Need for the base of the site to remain above the water table, so that the site can be developed for non-mineral uses
- Suggestion to consider rail or water access for the site, conveyors or a bypass
- Opportunity to create jobs and help businesses
- Suggestion to provide free car parking or park and ride service to alleviate congestion
- Need to work with the developer and the community to agree an acceptable development brief for the site
- Need to improve Hamble Lane, Portsmouth Road and the access to the site
- Suggestion to restore to grazing, nature conservation, open space, lakes, wildlife uses or recreational uses
- Suggestion for compensation
- Good use of brownfield land
- Micheldever Station, Micheldever (Aggregate rail depot)

Responses – 41 out of 55 (75%) responses to the relevant question agree with safeguarding a new rail depot site at Micheldever

Issues –

- More smaller sites may be needed to avoid road transport
- Potential for importing crushed rock should be explored
- Concern over impact on Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 and nature conservation areas in Micheldever
- New residential developments in Micheldever prevent use as rail depot
- Michelmersh Area of Search (Brick-making clay)

Responses – 18 responses agreed with both Michelmersh and Selborne, 11 opposed Michelmersh

Issues –

There were some specific comments on the boundaries, including suggestions for alteration of certain segments by landowners and operators

Other comments included concerns regarding:

- Traffic and road impacts, particularly regarding nearby village and rural lanes
- Noise and dust impacts
- Potential impacts on designated areas (eg the Mottisfont Bats SSSI^s near Michelmersh)
- Potential impacts on sewers, water mains and a high pressure underground gas pipeline at Michelmersh
- Potential impacts on nearby properties and residents
- Landscape impacts and visual intrusion
- Impacts on Michelmersh as it is designated an Important Open Area in the Local Plan
- Potential for landslip

Further comments were also received through the second consultation, Have Your Say – Additional Mineral issues.

- Mortimer Quarry Extension (Sharp sand and gravel)

Responses - there were 6 respondents opposing Mortimer and 1 that felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

- Potential loss of SINC habitat
- Potential increase in traffic in a rural area
- Need for extraction to be completed at the existing quarry first
- Concern that the existing quarry has not been appropriately restored
- Status of the site as a current planning application

- Purple Haze, Ringwood (Soft sand, sharp sand and gravel and landfill)

Responses - 16 respondents opposing Purple Haze, 1 that supported it and 5 further respondents that opposed it as a landfill

Issues –

- Nearby residents
- Moors Valley Country Park (including direct impacts on the Park, as well as indirect effects to local economy and nearby designated areas from the displacement of current visitors)
- Loss of informal recreational land
- Dorset Heathland SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites and nearby SSSIs
- Habitats and biodiversity (eg nightjars, sand lizards, smooth snakes, slow worms, grass snakes, adders, deer, rabbits and squirrels)

- Quality of the heathland after restoration
 - Quality and speed of restoration due to the potential unavailability of non-hazardous waste
 - Need for careful design of public access to protect the biodiversity interest of the site after restoration
 - Flooding
 - Groundwater and hydrology, which might impact nearby watercourses, including Moors River System SSSI and Ebblake Bog SSSI
 - Recently installed water pipe running through the area
 - Need to consider the site strategically as part of the Ringwood Forest
 - Concentration of extraction activities in this area compared to the rest of Hampshire
 - Traffic (eg on the B3081 and A35), road safety and road wear, including cumulative impacts of traffic from other sites in the area and proposed residential and commercial developments
 - Need for road haulage as the site has no connection by rail and is remote from the larger waste producing settlements of Hampshire
 - Access, particularly as the identified access point to the site is also used as access to the Country Park
 - Need for HGVs to avoid Verwood
 - Landscape, particularly impacts on the enclosed and nearby tumuli
 - Tranquillity
 - Four Scheduled Ancient Monuments
 - Vibration, dust and noise pollution
 - Odour (as already present from the existing, nearby landfill)
 - Levels of rubbish strewn across the road
 - Airport safeguarding zone if food waste is landfilled
 - Plans outlined in local plans, such as the East Dorset Core Strategy, Local Transport Plan and Heathlands Joint Development Plan Document (eg to develop the area, restore more heathland and establish a cycle route in the area)
- Concerns over insufficient communication across the border
 Concern on the reliance for most of Hampshire's soft sand provision on one site in the far west of the county
- Roeshot Hill (Sharp sand and gravel)
- Responses - there were 15 respondents opposing Roeshot and 3 that felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

- Potential to contribute to wider green infrastructure in the area
- Potential traffic impacts, particularly on the New Forest National Park
- Potential dislocation of local traffic to other roads (eg through Bransgore, passing near the local school)
- Need to consider a rail link to avoid traffic impacts
- Potential impacts on the water table and hydrology, which could cause subsidence of nearby properties or impact on the adjoining Burton Common SSSI
- Potential for water pollution that could spread into Poole and Christchurch Bay
- Potential impacts on the woodland burial ground
- Potential impacts on the nearby urban area
- Potential impacts on the neighbouring county of Dorset
- Potential cumulative impacts (such as with the potential housing development south of the railway or with aggregate proposals in Dorset)
- Potential displacement of visitors from Dorset Heaths and New Forest National Park
- Concern regarding noise and dust
- Concern that after extraction the site would be used as landfill and would have negative impacts associated with landfills
- Concern that the limitations on the site (shallow deposits, high groundwater level and proximity to the Dorset market) mean it will make a minimal contribution to Hampshire's need for minerals
- Selborne Area of Search (Brick-making clay)

Responses – 18 responses agreed with both Michelmersh and Selborne, 3 opposed Selborne

Issues –

There were some specific comments on the boundaries, including suggestions for alteration of certain segments by landowners and operators

Other comments included concerns regarding:

- Traffic and road impacts, particularly regarding nearby village and rural lanes
- Noise and dust impacts
- Potential impacts on designated areas
- Potential impacts on nearby properties and residents

- Landscape impacts and visual intrusion
- Potential for landslip

It was suggested that restoration to agriculture could still further the BAP¹⁰ through ponds, field margins, species-rich hedgerows, etc

Further comments were also received through the second consultation, Have Your Say – Additional Mineral issues

- Squabb Wood Landfill, Romsey (Additional landfill void)

Responses – 7 respondents opposing Squabb Wood and 6 that did not object or felt certain issues needed to be considered before it becomes operational

Issues –

- Potential impacts on the community (particularly odour, air pollution and traffic impacts)
- Concerns about prolonging the impacts felt by the community for indeterminate periods of time
- Potential impacts on the environment (including nearby SAC, SSSI and SINC)
- Concern that planning conditions will be unable to protect the community
- Concern regarding what the site will be restored to
- Potential impacts on habitats of value for foraging bats
- Potential to cause a gull hazard if putrescible waste is landfilled
- The perceived limited ability of the Environment Agency to control impacts
- The unrecognised potential to provide even further capacity
- Safety and carbon efficiency of burning gas
- Potential cumulative impacts with the extraction site at Roke Manor