

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Decision Report**

Decision Maker:	Regulatory Committee
Date:	23 October 2013
Title:	The construction and operation of a materials recycling facility and transfer station for construction, demolition and excavation waste, including the importation of inert fill to for an engineered based and localised road improvements to the A339 and site access at Kingsclere Quarry, Wolverton, Hampshire RG26 5SX (Application No: BDB/75928) (Site Ref: BA055)
Reference:	5287
Report From:	Head of County Planning

Contact name: Julia Davey

Tel: 01962 846732 **Email:** julia.davey@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. This report considers an application for the construction and operation of a materials recycling facility and transfer station for construction, demolition and excavation waste, including the importation of inert fill to for an engineered based and localised road improvements to the A339 and site access at Kingsclere Quarry, Wolverton.
- 1.2. The key issues raised by the proposal are:
- (a) compliance with planning policy and need;
 - (b) highway safety impacts;
 - (c) amenity impacts - noise, dust and lighting;
 - (d) nature conservation impacts;
 - (e) landscape and impact upon character of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
 - (f) pollution and land contamination and flood risk;
 - (g) cultural heritage.

- 1.3. The proposed development is located within the countryside, within the North Wessex Downs AONB, and adjacent to the A339 a strategic lorry route.
- 1.4. It is considered that the proposal is sustainable waste development (Policy 1) will use recycled aggregate and be located near local markets also to help reduce transport emissions as advocated within Paragraph 4.5 of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan (MWDP). It is considered the proposal, from the information provided to date, is unlikely to have any significant impact on protected species (Policy 3). In terms of Waste Location Policy 29 of the MWDP (2013) it is considered the proposal complies with this policy because a strategic need in this part of the Hampshire area has been formally identified as part of the MWDF background research and the site has been assessed as being potentially suitable for waste uses as part of this study. It is also adjacent to, and accessed from, the A339 a strategic lorry route.
- 1.5. It is considered that the proposed development within a disused quarry would not significantly detract from the natural beauty, distinctive character and remote and tranquil nature of the North Wessex Downs AONB (Policy 4) because of its peripheral location next to and near the A339, and would reflect and enhance the character of the AONB through additional landscaping and biodiversity secured through the scheme (Policy 3) and by way of planning conditions. The site is also not within an open landscape as it is already partly screened by woodland, scrub and bunds and indeed the inner workings of the actual quarry itself cannot be observed from any public viewpoint.
- 1.6. It is considered the operation of the plant would be unlikely to have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of local residents or users of the locality or give rise to significant pollution impacts (Policy 10) nor is it considered likely to have any significant adverse flood risk or drainage impacts (Policy 11).
- 1.7. The highway safety impacts have been assessed as being acceptable subject to conditions and a lorry routing agreement preventing the use of HGVs from the site on certain rural roads (Policy 12). The proposal offers a sustainable waste management option (Policy 25) which helps achieve necessary waste management capacity (Policy 27).
- 1.8. The assessment of this application has taken place against relevant policy in line with government guidance and legislation and taking into account all material considerations, and holistic consideration of the relevant DPD. As such, taking all matters into account, including all representations and consultee responses received to date, the recommendation is one of approval subject to appropriate mitigation as documented in the submission and subject to necessary planning conditions and a lorry routing agreement, because on balance it is considered the proposal complies with the relevant key policies in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (MWDP) (2013).

2. Planning History

- 2.1. Wolverton Chalk Pit was originally subject of a planning permission to extract chalk for the direct application to agricultural land on 14 March 1954 (MBDBKWR1062). A second application for the extraction of agricultural lime and retention of existing buildings was granted on 29 October 1981 (BDB 11594/CM). This 1981 permission permitted the extension of the quarry and its restoration at the lower level to agriculture or forestry. Both of these permissions were subject to the Review of Mineral Planning Permissions under the Environment Act 1995.
- 2.2. Under the Environment Act 1995 the operators of any mineral permission granted prior to April 1969 were required to submit an application for determination of new conditions by 1 June 1997. This Act introduced new requirements for the initial review and periodic updating of old mineral planning permissions.
- 2.3. The Mineral Review Permission (ROMP) for the site was granted on 5 August 1997 (BDB041487) and was subject to a minor variation to include low level restoration to agriculture granted on 10 February 1998 (BDB 042550).
- 2.4. It is understood the site ceased the extraction of chalk in 2008. The reserves at the time of the ROMP permission in 1997 were estimated at 200,000 tonnes accessed off the northern side of the A339.

3. The Site

- 3.1. The site has an area of approximately 3.8 hectares, and is about 10 kilometres north-west of Basingstoke and approximately two kilometres south-east of Kingsclere. Newbury lies approximately three kilometres to the north-west. A belt of mature trees on a high bank run along the boundary with the A339, and Coneygrove Copse adjoins the site in the north and west. This copse comprises ancient and semi-ancient woodland and is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The nearest residential property is the Pump House which is situated on the A339 approximately 280 metres to the north-west of the site. Wolverton Barn lies approximately 315 metres to the north of the Site and represents the closest point within the small hamlet of Wolverton. There are no public rights of way within the vicinity of the site which give views into the base of the quarry. The site lies within the North Wessex Downs AONB. The site is accessed from the A339 via the existing site quarry access. The red line to the application includes that section of the A339 nearest the site and highway land currently vegetated with shrubs and trees to the west of the A339. This land is included because the applicant is proposing changes to the layout of the A339 and the access in the immediate vicinity of the site.

4. Proposal

- 4.1. The proposal would involve the importation of 24,000 cu metres of inert waste to form a level base at 114 metres above ordnance datum (AOD) within the quarry at between 7-19 metres below surrounding ground levels. This reflects the variation in surrounding ground levels, which are generally lower in the north-west (121 metres AOD) and higher in the south east (133 metres AOD). This would provide the base on which to develop and would take about three months to construct. The proposed Materials Recycling and Transfer Loading Station would then be developed, taking a further four to six months.
- 4.2. The proposed Materials Recycling and Transfer Loading Station comprises the importation, sorting and screening of inert, construction and demolition waste and the subsequent bulking and export of recyclate and residual waste for landfill. Materials to be imported would comprise construction and demolition wastes (predominantly concrete, bricks, metals and soils), paper and cardboard, green garden and park waste and a small quantity of vehicle tyres.
- 4.3. It is estimated that the site would receive 100,000 tonnes of waste per annum, of which between 80-85% of the material would be recycled. The remaining 15-20% would be exported from the site for landfilling.
- 4.4. The operations on-site would comprise the segregation of materials upon receipt at the site to determine appropriate treatment, picking of the waste stream to remove materials for recycling, including wood, paper and metals, and the sorting of materials for disposal, concrete crushing, screening of soils, and tyre shearing.
- 4.5. A number of buildings and permanent structures would be required comprising: weighbridge, site office and mess facilities, storage bays for segregated waste, bays for tyre storage and shearing, a quarantine compound and a general purpose process and storage shed. The main buildings and plant will all be located within the north western half of the site and will be constructed on a concrete hard standing. The process and storage shed would be a three sided building constructed of steel and profile steel sheeting coloured "Meadowland Green". The building would be located against the north face of the quarry and measure 45 x 23.5 metres, and attaining a maximum height at the ridge of 9.7 metres. The only other building would comprise a single storey office and mess room, measuring 12 x 5 metres with pitched roof to a maximum height of five metres. It would be constructed of rendered block work with a slate roof. Car parking would be provided adjacent to the site office (seven spaces) for staff and visitors. All existing buildings would be demolished and removed from site. Other plant and equipment used on site would comprise a soil screener; concrete crusher; trommel screen; picking belt; loading shovel and a hydraulic excavator.

- 4.6. Foul drainage from the on-site welfare facilities will drain to a package treatment plant (PTP) which will be located adjacent to the proposed office building and associated site welfare facilities.
- 4.7. The proposed Hours of Operation would be between 0730 and 1800 on weekdays and between 0730 and 1300 on Saturdays. Essential maintenance may be carried out on Saturday afternoons until 1700. No operations would take place on Sundays or on Bank Holidays.
- 4.8. Access to the site would be via the existing quarry access directly onto the A339. The site access would be improved to comply with highway legislation regarding visibility and so is appropriately designed to take the proposed HGV traffic. There would also be widening of the A339 with the provision of a right hand turn lane into the site for traffic entering from the south. With regards to traffic entering from the north, that section of the A339 climbing uphill from the north which is currently two lane, would be altered such that it is single lane up to the site entrance. This is so that slow moving vehicles will not be permitted to overtake until they are past the site access. The reasoning behind this is one of highway safety in that currently with the two lanes uphill, smaller vehicles can be hidden from view behind lorries (on the inside lane) so that if an HGV were turning north and thus right out of the site it could be crossing the A339 when a 'hidden' vehicle suddenly pulls out from behind a slow moving lorry on the inside lane.
- 4.9. The proposals would generate between 28 and 56 lorry movements per day (14 to 28 loads) for importing material to raise the levels to create the platform within the quarry. Once operational the Materials Recycling and Transfer Loading Station would generate about 100 lorry movements (eight wheel tipper lorries and skip lorries) per day and about 26 car/van movements per day.
- 4.10. The proposal is an EIA Development under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 and an environmental statement has been submitted. The Environmental Assessment concluded that subject to appropriate mitigation the development would be unlikely to cause any significant environmental impacts to the surrounding area subject of the EIA. Topic areas included:
 - (a) land use, ground conditions and contaminant risk;
 - (b) water resources and flood risk;
 - (c) ecology and nature conservation;
 - (d) landscape and visual impact assessment;
 - (e) transport;
 - (f) air quality;
 - (g) noise;
 - (h) socio economic and community impacts; and
 - (i) cultural heritage.

5. Site Visit

- 5.1. Members of the Regulatory Committee visited the site in May 2013. Members viewed the site and its surroundings. Members were familiarised with the proposed levelling to take place within the quarry, the nature of the operations, haul route, plant, machinery and buildings. They also observed the site access and the proposed visibility splays, trees and vegetation to be removed, and associated highway/access alterations to the highway. At the time of the site visit the applicant was proposing that lorries were to turn left only out of the site. It is now proposed that HGVs turn left and right out of the site

6. Development Plan

- 6.1. **Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2007:** Policy S4 (Recycling and Composting), Policy S5 (Capacity Requirements for Recycling, Composting and Recovery and Treatment), Policy DC8 (Pollution, Health, Quality of Life and Amenity), Policy DC13 (Waste Management and Recycling), Policy DC6 (Highways).
- 6.2. **Mineral and Waste Plan** approved for adoption by the County Council on 19 September 2013.

Policy 1: Sustainable minerals and waste development
Policy 2: Climate change - mitigation and adaptation
Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species
Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape
Policy 5: Protection of the countryside
Policy 9: Restoration of quarries and waste developments
Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity
Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention
Policy 12: Managing traffic
Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development
Policy 16: Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure
Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development
Policy 23: Chalk development
Policy 25: Sustainable waste management
Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development
Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management

- 6.3. **Basingstoke and Deane - Adopted Local Plan 1996 – 2011** (saved policies): Policy E1 (Development Control), Policy E6 (Landscape Character), Policy EC6 (Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside), Policy A1 (Car Parking), Policy A5 (Renewable Energy).
- 6.4. **National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)** is a material consideration. In assessing and determining development proposals, local

planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

With regards also to development in AONB and Countryside the NPPF refers including:

Paragraph 115 that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.”

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF - “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

Paragraph 123 of the NPPF also states that planning policies and decision should: “identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

6.5. Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (PPS10).

Note: In March 2012 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) superseded the existing national policy statements upon its publication. The NPPF however, does not contain specific waste policies, as national waste planning policy will be published as part of the National Waste Management. Until that time PPS10 will remain applicable.

7. Consultations

7.1. The local Member Councillor Lovegrove objects to the application and states the following:

‘Since my election, I have been contacted by many local residents in the Baughurst & Wolverton areas of my Division; all have great concerns regarding this proposed development. As a Tadley resident of long

standing and one who has always taken a keen interest in local matters, I have been aware of this proposal for quite some time and have always had many doubts about its advisability and find myself in agreement with the concerns of particularly, the people of Wolverton & Baughurst who oppose it.

In terms of the immediate environment around the site there are concerns regarding dust, noise, possible light pollution and an adverse effect on the water table. The first three concerns will be of particular and have an immediate effect on the near neighbours of the proposed development were it to go ahead. The site is also adjacent to an AONB which needs protecting; allowing this development to go ahead would compromise its status.

I also have great concerns, concerns that we highlighted last year in a LibDem Focus leaflet, regarding the local highways. The access and egress to and from this site by large lorries is going to be very dangerous for traffic on the A339, with lorries slowly pulling out of the quarry coming up against fairly fast moving traffic; likewise as they enter the site. This I see as a problem that will be extremely difficult to solve without major and prohibitively expensive road works.

Of huge concern to Wolverton & Baughurst residents and something that will feed into roads further up into Tadley would, or could be, lorries traversing small local roads to travel between the proposed site and Stacey's Tadley yard. These roads already take a lot of local traffic, traffic that uses them as short cuts (rat runs) between the A339 and various places of work that can be accessed through Baughurst & Tadley, e.g. the AWE or Newbury. Adding to this traffic with large lorries, along these narrow country roads, will be intolerable for local residents and I predict will be an extremely dangerous position to put them in. So briefly, I oppose this planning application and I totally back local campaigners, including the Parish Council, who oppose it.

My recent objections still stand. However, bearing in mind that the applicant has constantly changed the application and one can't rule out further alterations, I would like all my previous comments and objections to be borne in mind, including comments I might have made previously about a lorry not being able to turn right on exiting the quarry.

The amendment, now put forward, is to take out the climbing lane to the north (from the Kingsclere direction) by the use of hatching and islands in the present climbing lane but to retain it to the south, beyond the exit from the quarry. To facilitate this revision, traffic travelling north/south will be severely affected; previously, drivers had an overtaking lane to use from a much lower position down the hill and consequently a much longer stretch of road to use to overtake slower moving vehicles on the inside, all this to allow quarry traffic to make the highly dubious manoeuvre (in terms of safety) of a right turn from the quarry across two lanes of traffic. By taking

out the climbing lane prior to the quarry entrance, traffic following any quarry lorry will back up but as soon as the lorry has turned into the quarry and once the following traffic has cleared the possible obstacle of a lorry waiting to turn right into the quarry from the south, drivers will then be tempted to use excessive speed to make up for the frustration of previous slow headway. They will be further tempted to use excessive speed because they will encounter more lorry traffic that has exited the quarry, moving in the Basingstoke direction; drivers will have approximately 500m to complete their overtaking manoeuvre, up-hill and towards a bend. In my opinion, this new proposal will bring added danger to all road users on this stretch of the A339, even cautious drivers getting involved in the impulsive and possibly reckless driving of the less cautious.

The previous amendment at least had the merit of acknowledging the danger of right turns from the quarry in that it proposed any such movements wouldn't be allowed. But now we are to revert to the highly dangerous, original proposition of a lorry being able to exit right towards Kingsclere, negotiating traffic coming from the north and then attempting to join traffic coming down the hill, at speed, from the south. From the south, lorry traffic entering the quarry won't have to cross two lanes of traffic now but could well have to wait a long time, in the ghost lane, to cross a very long stream of traffic now concentrated in one lane, from the north. Additionally, any lorry in the ghost lane waiting for a suitable gap in this traffic will prevent a lorry wanting to turn right and travel towards Kingsclere from exiting the quarry quickly as it will be in the way of a clear run onto the other carriageway.

It is my belief that the proposals, with or without the amendments, are not going to bring about a desirable outcome in terms of the safety of all road users. I would also question the timing of the Speed Survey that I note was carried out on the 11th April during the Easter holiday break, not a typical work day.'

- 7.2. **The adjacent Member Councillor Chapman** objects to the application on predominantly highway safety grounds. Councillor Chapman considers the fact that the access is directly onto the fast stretch of the A339 where there is dual carriageway and where the road is on a hill adds to the highway safety issue. This includes the fact that heavily loaded vehicles heading north down the hill towards the site access when required to brake have the additional weight of the load to take into consideration on the downward slope and this has caused articulated vehicles when presented with a sudden need to brake to in fact 'jack knife' across the road - to give one example. Councillor Chapman notes that the recent amendments are reducing the width of the uphill from two existing lanes to one lane up to the point of access when egressing the site uphill from the north. However, Councillor Chapman objects to the application because he considers that lorries turning right heading north out of the site have to join a fast downhill stretch of the A339 and there is no central reservation that could accommodate an HGV waiting to turn right. He acknowledges that the Highway Authority considers visibility is good enough when the lorries look

southwards from the site access however still considers that due to the speed and the fact that the southbound carriageways are down hill that it is far too dangerous if a high speed vehicle sudden appears and is not able to brake in time. Councillor Chapman refers to an articulated lorry that around four weeks ago was unable to brake in time when heading down this hill to avoid a car that was accidentally positioned on the carriageway. The braking and weight of the articulated lorry caused it to jack knife across the carriageway.

7.3. Former County Councillor for the area Marilyn Tucker states the following:

I give brief notes below as the former HCC Member for the area, and as a local resident using the A339 regularly. My concerns against this development are major and I would bring to your attention the following:-

'Representation by Wolverton residents. I strongly advise the Members of the Regulatory Committee to study carefully the papers sent in on behalf the Wolverton Village residents; they are based on both local and expert knowledge.

Highways/Safety. The A339 has a reputation for its dangers and accidents caused. It is not just dangerous within the sightlines of the application site, but includes both before and after this site. Unfortunately drivers become very frustrated travelling between Newbury and Basingstoke when held up for miles behind slower vehicles and they then take risks. This is what happens on this stretch of the A339, hence the accidents that happen there. To my knowledge, the most recent one was a van that went over, and about 2 years' ago two people were killed when travelling south from Newbury to do their Christmas shopping in Basingstoke and were hit by an overtaking vehicle. We recognise when the road is closed due to an accident as we have traffic travelling past our homes trying to find their way south. I live on the other side (the Hannington side) of the A339 and trying to come out safely, especially when trying to turn right to travel past the quarry site, is a complete nightmare. Locals know the dangers of this road and in particular this stretch. HCC's highest priority for roads is safety and this would be completely contrary to HCC's ethos.

Rural Lanes. Although the lanes between the site and Tadley (the base for Stacey's) are unsuitable for HGVs, these vehicles still travel along them now, and we foresee an increase in them should this be passed.

North Wessex Downs AONB. The emerging Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan permits "small-scale waste management facilities for local needs" i.e. throughput of up to 50,000 tonnes per annum, requiring 2 hectares or less, whereas this Kingsclere application proposes approx. 100,000 tonnes p.a. (double the tonnage) on a site, excluding land required for highway works, of 3.58 hectares.

Noise and dust and groundwater. It appears the validity of report of the applicant is questionable. The evening and night time is very quiet when the traffic is low, which is just what one would expect in an AONB – not a business of this nature. Stacey's other main material recycling site is just into the Berkshire part of Tadley but it is within earshot of my residents as a Borough Councillor in Hampshire.

Exception. There are no exceptional circumstances why this should be considered favourably.'

7.4. **Baughurst Parish Council** objects to the application on the following grounds:

Site egress – site traffic, when turning onto the A339 to the left, will, by nature of the bulk and movement of the lorries concerned, inevitably move out into the 'fast' lane of the dual carriageway to perform this manoeuvre. Given the slow speed at which the lorries will be moving at that point, having climbed uphill out of the quarry, and their positioning, my Council are concerned at the dangerous effect this will have on traffic already accelerating up the hill in anticipation of the overtaking lane ahead.

Site egress – site traffic, when turning onto the A339 to the right, will impede traffic moving swiftly downhill towards Newbury, and, as per the first bullet point above, also obstruct traffic beginning to move swiftly uphill in the overtaking lane, towards Basingstoke. My Council consider this to be an equally potentially dangerous, and possibly fatal, situation.

My Council are concerned that site traffic will use Wolverton (via Wolverton Common), Ramsdell (via Wolverton Townsend), Basingstoke (via Ramsdell) Roads and Ewhurst Lane as alternative routes to return to Stacey's Yard at Tadley. Traffic may also choose to travel through Kingsclere village. None of these routes are suitable for heavy goods traffic. They would wish to see strict enforcement of an agreed route via the road to Ashford Hill, and enforcement to ensure compliance is met at all times. 'Unsuitable for HGV' signs should be displayed at each end of all other possible routes.

The entrance to the road to Hannington lies opposite, just south of the site. My Council are concerned that drivers both entering and exiting the lane will be placed at a significant disadvantage when sitting, waiting to leave or join the A339, given the proximity to the site and the wide range necessary for the lorries to turn. This increases the risk of accident at a point just north of an accident black spot.

Significant tree loss has already occurred, and opening of the visibility splays at the junction with the A339 will create more. Given that the site falls within an Area of Outstanding National Beauty, and lies adjacent to two Grade II sites (Wolverton House Park pale, and St Catherine's Church), my Council abhors the loss of any further woodland. Removal of

trees will also increase the loss of visual amenity to passers-by of the site, and to local residents in terms of increased noise and disruption.

My Council are concerned regarding the height of the large building to the rear of the site. Although this is placed at the deepest level of the site, its size is sufficient to ensure that it will rise above the crater, creating a loss of visual amenity to local residents and passers-by.

The planning application states that interaction has taken place with the applicant and local Councils. Apart from the invitation to an applicant site meeting on 5 July 2011, no further interaction has taken place, and the statement is palpably false.

My Council are concerned at the possibility of the intrusion of additional noise to local residents generated by both the site, and increased usage of the A339 at that junction.

My Council consider that this site should be considered as a green-field, rather than a brown-field site, given the lack of production here for over 10 years, and reduced activity prior to that date.

My Council consider that a roundabout would be the most sensible option to direct traffic from the site, together with re-routing of the A339, and enclose a rough plan, outlining a possible alternative solution to the problem of traffic leaving the site against oncoming traffic.

With regards recent highway amendments a detailed response will be forthcoming but the Parish Council has the following preliminary comments:

'a) shortening the overtaking section/crawler lane for southbound traffic will make this section dangerous and encourage drivers to look for other overtaking opportunities. The shorter length of overtaking lane will dramatically increase speeds and driver risk-taking. Traffic already historically moves at great pace uphill after many miles of restrictive travelling since leaving Kingsclere.

b) Heavy goods vehicles travelling at some speed in the Newbury direction will be turning right across the oncoming Basingstoke traffic. These will sit in the middle of the road awaiting a gap to cross into the site, across a fast moving stream of Basingstoke-bound traffic. With the continuous streams of traffic at busy times drivers of HGVs will be forced to take risks, increasing the danger to all road users.'

- 7.5. **Hannington Parish Council** wishes to raise serious concerns about the proposed access to and from the Lime Quarry site and note that 'Hannington's most used vehicle exit to the outside world is a very short distance west of the Quarry on the A339.' The Parish states:

Slow moving long vehicles exiting the quarry site to the east cannot avoid interfering with eastbound traffic just as it is accelerating onto the only bit of

two lane overtaking opportunity between Newbury and Basingstoke. Those long slow moving vehicles exiting west will have to cross this accelerating traffic and then run into the path of traffic moving fast downhill on the only stretch between Basingstoke and Newbury where opposing traffic is prevented by double white lines - hence the speed of westbound traffic.

Hannington Parish Council urges that this application only be approved if the Highways Department are satisfied with the safety of the scheme for vehicle access to the Quarry and for the exit from Hannington onto the A339. It outlines the following concerns:

HGV movement through Hannington - We understand that Stacey's have expressed a willingness to enter into a legal agreement with Hampshire County Council by way of a section 106 to not pass through local villages. We would be very grateful for assurance that this condition will be put in place and specifically include Hannington and the village roads leading to and from the hamlets of White Lane, North Oakley and Ibworth.

Safety of new road junction - We request that specific consideration be given to the impact on those accessing the A339 from Hannington with the new road layout. We would like to be certain that the Highways Authority gives due consideration to the safety of the proposed new road junction, particularly with HGV vehicles turning out of the site towards Newbury, the impact on traffic flow and the adequacy of vehicle site lines. We recognise that those living close to the site have a number of other concerns about the proposed development, however we consider that it is only the above traffic/ safety issues that directly impact on our village and its residents.

- 7.6. **Kingsclere Parish Council** objects to the application on the grounds that the site traffic, when turning on to the A339 to the right, will impede traffic moving swiftly downhill towards Newbury, and, as per the first point above, also obstruct traffic beginning to move swiftly uphill in the overtaking lane, towards Basingstoke. My Council considers this to be an equally potentially dangerous, and possibly fatal, situation. My Council are concerned that traffic might choose to travel through Kingsclere village where roads are not suitable for heavy goods traffic.
- 7.7. **Tadley Town Council** raises concern regarding the amount of extra HGV traffic generated to and from Staceys at Tadley as there does not appear to be overnight parking at the site. Also about the right turn being reinstated.
- 7.8. **Ashford Hill with Headley Parish Council** objects to the whole scheme.
- 7.9. **Wootton St. Lawrence Parish Council** are objecting on the grounds that this development will have a serious impact on its local roads due to the inevitable increase in HGV traffic. The amendments have been noted but still nowhere does it state that lorries using this site should not be permitted to use as short cuts the "C" and "U" lanes that run through our villages. The Parish strongly request that the lorries are made to use the main roads and NOT be allowed to use the "C" and "U" lanes, especially through Ramsdell

and Monk Sherborne as a short cut to the A340. Councillors feel most strongly that these lanes are not a viable route for the vehicles that will be using the proposed development should it be approved.

Inappropriate location - This is a Greenfield site (HCC Screening opinion SCR/2009/0236) with agricultural covenants in the North Wessex Downs AONB. The site was, we believe a SSSI and the HCC Screening opinion says that "the development will have a significant environmental impact in a sensitive area."

Not Sustainable - The demand for additional capacity this class of recycling has not been quantified. Capacity for this class of recycling already exists at the applicant's Tadley facility which has significant space for expansion. All Hampshire recycling would be from the Basingstoke direction. From Basingstoke, the distance to Tadley or Kingsclere is almost identical. The site is only 2.5 hectares and with provision for operational buildings and space for vehicles very little area remains for receipt, processing, storage and despatch. If the application is not commercially viable and sustainable, it should be refused.

A339 dangerous road - The A339 is one of the most dangerous roads in Hampshire. This section has had many accidents and fatalities. We do not believe that right turns into, or out of the site can be made safe without a roundabout. There is no finite maximum number of lorries per day defined within the application. It only states an ESTIMATE based on the AVERAGE number of vehicles at the Tadley site. There is no comparison of the capacities of the sites and no definition of whether the average includes non working days. A maximum number of daily transits needs to be defined and enforced.

Uncontrolled traffic on local lanes - Because the site is so small, all lorries are based at the applicants existing site in Tadley. The proposed route between sites includes 2 junctions with high accident rates (B3051/A339, and B3051/ Brompton Lane). Consultation with Councils in West Berkshire has not been recorded. HCC have stated that they do not have the resource to monitor traffic deviating from any agreed routes nor the power to enforce compliance. Without a robust and reliable traffic plan, enforced by an authority with sufficient resource, the application should be rejected.

Light pollution - The site asks to operate during hours of darkness and so operational lights are requested. The height of the lighting towers is not defined. At the Tadley site 15 metre high lights are required. These would be above the edge of the quarry. During winter months, without leaves on the deciduous trees in Coneygrove Copse, significant light pollution would impact a number of houses including listed buildings. Light pollution is contrary to the policies of North Wessex Downs AONB. The application also asks for security lighting. The inclusion of 24 hour motion activated security lighting is also inappropriate in the AONB. No external lighting should be permitted.

Dust pollution - There is no proposal to minimise dust pollution by design. Recent information from a local Meteorologist suggests that the opening of the sight lines to the A339 will cause more dust pollution. The prevailing wind is from the A339 side of the site, the quarry will act as a funnel and push dust upwards. All neighbouring properties are downwind of the site. Appropriate dust control by design should be included.

Noise pollution - We believe the trials done by contractors to the applicants may not have accounted for a number of significant variables. This is a rural area with no industrial noise. Independent assessment of existing noise levels and of noise should be conducted by HCC and the results made available.

Public Consultation needed - There has been no public consultation by HCC or the applicant. Many details are unclear. Full public consultation should be undertaken, and informed responses evaluated, before this application is considered by committee. Complete discussions with West Berkshire County Council on their minerals and recycling policies and the proposed lorry routes should be made public. Have HCC or the EA checked on the Tadley operation of the applicant to see if there has been any complaints about noise, dust or light pollution? Full Public Consultation will enable an informed decision to be made in a transparent way that will engage with the many local communities who will be affected by this application .

- 7.10. **Greenham Parish Council** objects to the application. It notes that this is the only area on the journey from Newbury to Basingstoke where it is totally safe to overtake given the second lane. Drivers are frustrated at the slow moving traffic on the 12 miles of road between Newbury and Basingstoke and they accelerate up this hill to overtake. They will now meet HGVs pulling out to turn left to Basingstoke or crossing the road to turn right to Newbury. There will no doubt now be a restriction on overtaking and in GPC's view this is an accident waiting to happen. GPC can see no sound reason why the A339 should be compromised to the detriment of so many users for one development. The overtaking zone is well measured and allows for a reasonable amount of traffic to increase speed and pass slow traffic safely. If the overtaking zone is any shorter it will seriously compromise this important stretch. The urgency with which drivers would now approach the shortened overtaking area will inevitably reduce safety. The A339 is a dangerous road with unfortunately fairly regular crashes and a number of fatalities due to driver impatience. Compromising the only safe haven to overtake will be a backward step for road safety.

According to the report it is envisaged that there will be 100 lorry movements a day. However this is not a 24/7 operation so this traffic will be compressed into the operational time of 0700 to 1800 which is the busiest time for the A339. This does not include the numerous ancillary movements by all sorts of vehicles. The residents of Hannington already have to wait to

either turn right or left and 2 collisions have occurred in the last 2 months. There is no indication of the route vehicles will take once off the A339. Lorries will take the most direct route as indicated by their SatNav making inevitable the use of small country lanes and roads. A bulking centre in a major conurbation such as Basingstoke or Newbury makes sense as roads are designed to move traffic from villages to these main towns. This proposal will lead to the use of a road network where movement between villages is generally poor. For some time now Kingsclere and surrounding villages have been experiencing problems with traffic, and in particular large commercial vehicles using villages as a rat run. Although the villages are well signposted as having roads that are unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles, residents are regularly subjected to congestion along Swan Street Kingsclere which is used by lorries to access the A34 via Whitchurch. Ecchinswell is also recorded as a rat run from the A339 to Kingsclere and is an attractive route then to the quarry. We have increased traffic on the B3051 as AWE has expanded.

In GPC's view the proposal will greatly impede both the throughput of traffic and the ability to pass large vehicles. This is the only part of the road from the Tesco roundabout in Newbury to the roundabout serving the housing at the old hospital entrance in Basingstoke where it is safe to overtake. The use of this location is directly contrary to the Hants CC policy, which requires that: *Large-scale strategic waste development will be located in or close to major areas of development.* The policy goes on to say that: *Minerals and waste development are major generators of heavy goods traffic but this often raises road capacity and amenity issues. Highways issues, including where appropriate cross-border issues, will be considered during the evaluation of all potential sites for inclusion in the Hampshire Mineral or Waste Management Plans. Sites with unacceptable highways impacts will not be brought forward in these plans.*

- 7.11. **Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council** raises objection on following grounds: Under Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 it is a requirement for a development to not result in inappropriate traffic generation or compromise highway safety and provide safe and convenient access for all potential users. Given the reported concerns of Hampshire County Council Highways; the existing operation of the A339; the nature of the existing and proposed access/egress; the nature of the vehicles attending the site; and the operational hours of the proposed development, the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011, the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (PPS10).
- 7.12. **West Berkshire Council** raises no objections to the proposed development commenting that with regard to this proposal, the A339 is designated as a "District access route to key destinations" and is the most suitable route for HGV traffic to access the Newbury area. As well as the A339 traffic, it is noted that there will be some movement between the Tadley and

Kingsclere sites, which will be likely to use the B3051 past Brimpton Common. This route is not included part of the Council's Freight Route Network. No highways objections raised as the projected increase in traffic north of the site towards West Berkshire is less than 1%.

- 7.13. **The Highway Authority** - after very detailed and cautious consideration of information submitted to date raises no objection to the application subject to conditions and a section 106 lorry routing agreement.

Construction phase - The proposals include the partial infilling of the disused quarry. This is estimated to require 24,000m³ of inert spoil and require 24-36 HGV trips per day over a period of three months. As this level of movements is below that forecast for the main use of the site, any plans which may be approved for the main application will be suitable to facilitate construction traffic during this phase of the operation. There will however need to be careful consideration to the management of traffic during this construction phase to protect the safety of highway users, including suitable conditions to ensure any mud or debris is not transferred to the public highway.

Lorry Routing - The distribution of HGV traffic from the site is expected to be 30% travelling to/from the north and 70% travelling to/from the south. While the applicant uses a site in Tadley for stationing fleet vehicles overnight, it is not anticipated that HGVs will routinely travel directly between Tadley and the proposed site but will be travelling via other sites to pick up/drop off recycling material before arriving at the transport loading station. In spite of this, however, there are several routes to the north of the site that are considered unsuitable for HGVs (including Crabbs Hill and Ramsdell Road) due to very narrow road widths and limited forward visibility. As such a traffic routing plan will need to be submitted to, and approved by, the County Council prior to occupation of the site to ensure that HGVs accessing the site are not using inappropriate routes. The submission of this plan along with its implementation should be included as a condition of the planning permission should this be granted.

Access Arrangements - Previous highways response noted that the access arrangements were subject to a preliminary design check in order to determine their suitability. The previous access arrangements as detailed in drawing no. 09-044/GA/200 Rev K did not achieve preliminary design approval primarily due to safety concerns regarding the potential masking of overtaking vehicles using the climbing lane to the north of the access by slower vehicles in the nearside lane. This was considered a particular issue for HGVs exiting the site and turning right as this masking effect would reduce the overall level of visibility to the north and a vehicle may attempt a right turn manoeuvre unaware of a faster vehicle approaching.

As such the previous access arrangements did include a central island to discourage any right turning traffic from the site, although it was considered that the alignment of the island was not severe enough to achieve this.

The design check report also noted, however, that even if right turns were successfully discouraged, there were concerns regarding the potential for HGVs wishing to travel north undertaking unsafe u-turn manoeuvres as the nearest appropriate junction for undertaking such a manoeuvre is located approximately 7.5 kilometres to the south of the site.

In order to address these concerns the access proposals for the site have now been amended and it is now proposed to allow both left and right turning traffic out of the site and also to move the start of the existing climbing lane to the access point. This removes the potential for any masking of overtaking vehicles and therefore improves visibility for vehicles exiting the site (which was the principal safety concern with the original proposals).

As well as removing the likelihood of u-turning along the A339, this arrangement also improves the right turn manoeuvre for HGVs as it reduces the number of lanes vehicles have to cross. The design of the access also provides sufficient visibility (based on recorded speeds on the A339 in the vicinity of the site) for right turning vehicles to complete the manoeuvre safely without impacting on northbound traffic on the A339.

By moving the start of the climbing lane 160 metres south this does reduce its overall length from 760 metres to 600 metres. Consideration was given to extending the climbing lane further south to mitigate this reduction however the end of the climbing lane had been moved back to its existing location due to a poor accident record which included a fatality. The reduced length of 600 metres is also in line with national standards for the length of a climbing lane as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and is sufficient to allow suitable overtaking facilities.

As requested in the two previous highways responses to this application, the most recent access arrangement proposals (as set out in drawing no. 09/044/GA/200 Rev L) were subject to a preliminary design check as undertaken by County Council engineers under its Section 278 Design Check processes. The proposals have been considered against all of the relevant highway standards, particularly those detailed in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), and have achieved an approval. In particular, the visibility splay requirements for the access have been shown to meet the necessary design standards for the speed of the road, and considering the measured speeds on the A339 at this location.

As part of this process an independent road safety audit was undertaken. Whilst noting some design considerations, the Safety Audit did not raise any significant safety concerns with the proposals. All matters raised in the audit can be satisfactorily addressed through the detailed design process. The preliminary design check has therefore been approved.

Summary - The A339 in this location is a busy road which carries periods of heavy traffic at high speeds. It has therefore been necessary to take a

cautious approach to considering the adequacy of the proposed access onto this road. However, following the latest submission and the completion of a Preliminary Design Check (which included a Road Safety Audit) it has been demonstrated that the access arrangements are acceptable in relation to both the safety and operation of the local highway network and that the proposed access works meet the necessary design standards. It is considered therefore that the proposal complies with Policy DC6.

- 7.14. **Environment Agency** has no objection in principle to the proposal subject to conditions being attached to any planning permission granted addressing land contamination; surface water disposal, and landscape management. With regards Flood Risk the Agency adds that the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has demonstrated that a suitable surface water drainage scheme will be constructed to ensure there will be no increase in the risk of surface water flooding on and off site.
- 7.15. **Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO)** – raises no objection to the proposal. The EHO adds that the applicant's noise assessment very much represents a worst case scenario, and when this is compared to the existing noise climate according to the relevant methods, EHO is satisfied that impact arising from noise is not an issue that it would have concerns about. The operation of site will be regulated by an Environmental Permit issued by the Environment Agency. In such circumstances, there is unlikely to be a noise impact to residents, and we consider that the prediction data is broadly compliant with our guidance to developers, we have no reason to oppose the proposal. Conditions are recommended to ensure that the applicant implements and adheres to all mitigations measures proposed in Section 10 of the Environmental Statement to safeguard air quality and odour disturbances.
- 7.16. **Natural England** raises no objection in principle to the proposal. Commenting that this proposal does not appear to affect any other statutorily protected sites and is broadly satisfied that the mitigation proposals, if implemented, are sufficient to avoid adverse impacts on the local population of Bats and therefore avoid affecting favourable conservation status.
- 7.17. **North Wessex Downs (NWD) AONB** objects to the proposal. There is no planning policy support from National, Regional or Local planning policy that would support a use of the scale proposed and level of activity it would bring, within this nationally protected AONB. The reasons given for the proposed location in the application appear to be operational reasons from the applicant and not the "exceptional circumstances" required by the NPPF. If the County Council still consider there is a need for a strategic waste recycling facility then a suitable location outside the AONB, preferably within or adjacent to a principle urban area like Basingstoke should be considered. The development will have a negative and urbanising influence on this part of the AONB and will not conserve or

enhance the area and would be contrary to the aims of the NWD AONB Management Plan.

Under Section 85 of the CRoW Act 2000 there is a legal duty for all relevant authorities to “have regard to” the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB in exercising or performing any functions affecting land in their area.

The NPPF, although not containing any specific waste policies, still advises in respect of AONBs at Paragraph 115 that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.” Paragraph 116 of the NPPF goes on to state that “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- (a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- (b) the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- (c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

Paragraph 123 of the NPPF also states that planning policies and decision should: “identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.” The NWD AONB is already an area characterised as “a place with a sense of remoteness and tranquillity” and “a place where the highest environmental quality is seen as a key economic driver and where all economic activity is in harmony with maintenance of the landscape” (NWD AONB Management Plan p15). The application, being located so close to non-AONB locations, does not explain why this use has to be located within this protected landscape. The proposal to initially import 24,000 cubic metres of inert spoil and then process 100,000 tonnes a year of waste resulting from the construction/demolition industry will source the majority of this material from outside the AONB. As such have sites been fully considered outside the AONB and closer to the major urban areas, the most likely source of waste in the first place? The exportation of waste from outside AONBs into AONBs for processing, only to then export the majority of this processed waste back to non AONB locations runs contrary to the primary purpose of AONB designation to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area.

It is also considered the likely 100 HGV movements per day associated with this use will not conserve or enhance the character and qualities of the AONB, specifically in relation to tranquillity. In terms of landscape impact the application accepts that the carriageway widening, loss of roadside trees, visibility splays, increased road signage will all have a negative and urbanising influence on this part of the AONB. This development will therefore not conserve or enhance the area and would be contrary to the aims of the NWD AONB Management Plan so planning permission should be refused.

The Council, in preparing their report and recommendation, are requested to take into consideration the outcome of the High Court decision from within the Surrey Hills AONB. Where Mr Justice Haddon-Cave made a number of specific references as to the interpretation of Paragraph 116 of the NPPF that are relevant to this case (attached to this report). .

8. Representations

- 8.1. **Borough Councillor Graham Round** (also Baughurst Parish Councillor) strongly objects to the proposal. The latest amendment shortens the overtaking section/crawler lane for southbound traffic. A shorter section for drivers to overtake will make this current black spot even more dangerous and encourage drivers to look for other overtaking opportunities. Heavy goods vehicles travelling in the Newbury direction are turning right across the oncoming Basingstoke traffic. These trucks will sit in the middle of the road awaiting a gap to cross into the site. With the continuous streams of traffic at busy times drivers of HGVs will be forced to take risks. The applicant is still proposing a s106 Agreement in an attempt to prevent trucks from diverting along Baughurst's country lanes. I do not believe a 106 Agreement of the type suggested will protect residents from the blight of these trucks trying to divert off the busy routes. A traffic regulation order to ban vehicles over 7 tons from using the lanes as a through-route.

The application site is located in the open countryside and within a protected area of outstanding natural beauty, the North Wessex Downs AONB. The residents of Wolverton within the parish of Baughurst currently enjoy the beauty, peace and tranquillity of this countryside location. It is accepted that the A339 produces a level of background noise but the introduction of a process plant within the open countryside will generate an unacceptable industrial noise nuisance to residents and users of the countryside.

The development of a large industrial process at the old quarry will bring misery, not only to those residents living close by the quarry but to the residents of the whole parish of Baughurst and surrounding area. The proposed use of the old quarry can in no way be compared with the quarry's previous use of providing chalk to local farms.

Residents are only too aware of the many times that the A339 is closed because of accidents in this location and traffic is diverted through the rural lanes. Accident data available to the applicant is weak when compared to reality on the ground. The site is located at an accident black spot.

- Objection raised by Andrew Lord, Planning Adviser for the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which clearly sets out why this application is not supported by local and national planning policy, together with reference to specific appeal decision to support his reasons for objection.
- Investigations and report by Paul Basham Associates which clearly confirm residents' concerns that the proposed development will make a current dangerous stretch of road even more dangerous, even lethal!

Whilst the report raises the concerns of routing of the applicant's own vehicles between the application site and their existing Tadley operation, we would ask Planning Officers to also consider the impact of third party operated trucks attending the site. It will be impossible for the applicant to ensure that third-party operated trucks do not choose to leave the local 'A' roads and divert/shortcut through the web of local lanes within Baughurst Parish and the surrounding villages. There is no doubt the proposed operation of the site will generate high levels of inappropriate traffic in the form of heavy goods vehicles throughout the network of rural 'C' classified roads. HCC Highways department already struggles to maintain the rural verges throughout the parish, the additional impact of these heavy vehicles will destroy the rural character of the parish.

Paul Basham Associates report highlights the dangers of Stopping Sight Distances (SSD).

Investigations and report by 24 Acoustics Ltd questions the accuracy of the data presented by Applicant's Consultants, Golders Associates and concludes that noise generated from the plant exceeds acceptable levels and there is the potential for significant loss of amenity to residents of nearby residential properties.

The applicants have not properly considered and addressed the harm caused to the countryside location and nearby residential dwellings from dust, especially airborne concrete dust and light pollution.

Residents are concerned that the applicant has not carried out a public awareness campaign or proper public consultation.

Residents have carried out their own awareness campaign to ensure that people who will be affected by the proposal are made aware of the application; this has resulted in the formation of a residents group who oppose the application, a web site and petition.

8.2. **District Councillor Bound** objects to the application.

8.3. **Borough Councillor Cathy Osselton** objects to the application:

“We are writing on behalf of our constituents, residents of the Kingsclere Ward to object to the Planning application BDB/75928 for the proposal of a Materials Recycling and Transfer Loading Station at the Kingsclere Quarry Wolverton (known as the Lime Quarry).

The A339 between Newbury and Basingstoke is the most dangerous road in the south of England according to the Automobile Association in 2001 when conducting a survey of roads in Britain. We are sure that this statement is true today yet the villagers of the area have to endure more and more traffic on this road which impacts on the safety of local drivers. This road, when de-trunked, continued to be an exceptionally busy road forming a principal route linking the A34 and M4 to the M3 and routes east to London and the South Coast. Much of the HGV traffic originates either in the Midlands or in European countries where it travels to England via South Coast Ports. There are few places on the A339 that are suitable for overtaking hence the road is frequently congested, particularly at peak times. The Kingsclere Bypass was opened in 1983 and removed serious bottleneck from the A339 but in the intervening year's permitted demographic change has removed much of its benefit and we are back to square one.

The A339 in many parts is very narrow, confined between hedges with minimal verges and has many bends with restricted visibility. One such bend is approached as you leave Kingsclere and is at the bottom of the hill prior to the access to the quarry. In their application RMPL state that the development will cause only a very small addition to the level of traffic already using this road and will not therefore adversely affect existing road users or communities located along the route. This statement we strongly refute. Observations on the ground show that the local network is already seriously impacted by traffic, there are so many planning applications permitted but not yet built in the area. The plans have not taken into account our close proximity to the Berkshire Borders and that there are 1,500 houses currently being built at Newbury race course and 2,000 houses to be built at Sandleford which most definitely will impact on the A339 towards Basingstoke and the B400 to Newtown. No mention has been made of the increase in the Sainsbury Depot at Houndsmill with added lorries on the A339 and the guaranteed increase of traffic from Greenham Park. What are the latest figures of traffic movement on this road no mention in the applicant's literature.

When working on the Cross Boarder Group and Joint Action Group, Hampshire County Council conceded in 2008 that some 23% increase in cars and 28% in HGV is already committed within West Berkshire to the south of Newbury on the A339. To permit an increase over 10% of cars and greater than that of HGV is deemed to be unacceptable. Projections for

NGP to 2008 were already exceeded by 30% or more by 2005 and then only 30% of the Greenham Park had been built out. Are we looking at the numbers now in 2013? We are sure that the A339 is carrying far too much traffic as an A road and the last thing the villagers wish to see is an extra 100+ lorries trying to access it daily.

This is the only area on the journey from Newbury to Basingstoke where it is totally safe to overtake given the second lane. Drivers are frustrated at the slow 12 miles of road between the two towns and accelerate up this hill to overtake. They will now meet HGV's pulling out to turn left to Basingstoke or crossing the road to turn right to Newbury an accident waiting to happen. Doubtless there will be a design which will restrict the road from the bend to this point which will totally compromise this overtaking zone. Why should the A339 be compromised to the detriment of so many users for one development? This hardly makes economic sense for the through traffic. The overtaking zone is well measured and allows for a reasonable amount of traffic to increase speed and pass slow traffic safely. If the overtaking zone is shorter it will seriously endanger this important stretch. The urgency which drivers will now approach the overtaking area will reduce safety as they will be anticipating when they can move into the overtaking lane.

According to the report it is envisaged that there will be 100 lorry movements a day which in reality will be equivalent to 200 movements altogether (i.e. 100 in and 100 out). However this is not a 24/7 operation so this traffic will be compressed into the operational time between 07.00 to 18.00 which is the busiest time for the A339. What of the numerous ancillary movements by all sorts of vehicles.

The residents of Hannington have to wait to either turn right or left onto the A339 and 2 collisions have already occurred in the last 2 months. I do not think that their proposed new road lay out is safe, in fact I think it is extremely dangerous.

What route will these lorries take once off the A339? We have to regard this application as a hub for bulking of waste as it moves up the hierarchy. We therefore have to consider a radius drawn round this site where it is cost effective and efficient bringing waste for bulking. Lorries will take the most direct route as indicated by their satnav so you only have to look at a map with this radius on it to appreciate the inevitable use of small country lanes and roads. A bulking centre in a major conurbation such as Basingstoke or Newbury makes sense as roads are designed to move traffic from villages to these main towns. This proposal inevitably will use a road network where movement between villages is generally poor.

For some time now Kingsclere and surrounding villages have been experiencing problems with traffic, and in particular lorries and large commercial vehicles using villages as a "rat run". Although the villages are well signposted as having roads that are unsuitable for heavy goods

vehicles, residents are regularly subjected to congestion along Swan Street Kingsclere which is used by lorries to access Overton or the A34 via Whitchurch. Ecchinswell is also recorded as a rat run from the A339 to Kingsclere and then to the quarry? We have increased traffic on the B3051 as AWE has expanded, again access to Tadley. I am not convinced that these routes will not be used by this company. Where, locally is the waste material coming from and where is it going to? We are not a hub for such a business. I would like a robust investigation as to why this material waste cannot be processed elsewhere and the site has to be in an attractive rural area on an already dangerous road.

We note that all lorries will end their full run in Tadley at the end of the working day and no empty lorries will leave the quarry to go back to the Tadley depot. We are not convinced that this will be the case and how will it be monitored?

The Lime Quarry we note on the map shows that most of its equipment will be sited parallel to Ramsdell Road not on the other side (another rat run to Tadley.) I dispute that residents will not hear the noise at 300m away and being slightly high, the potential for noise is great.

On the 5 December 2011 we instigated a meeting with Hampshire County Council because of the increasing use of villages as rat runs off the A339 and also the increasing amount of HGVs, lorries and cars on the A399 compared with 2010. Cllr D Sherlock Kingsclere ward, Cllr K Chapman, HCC, Mr A Greayer resident of Kingsclere and Mr Peter Goff Chairman of the Parish Council and myself attended. The meeting was chaired by Mr Stuart Jarvis, Director of Economy, Transport and Environment and his deputy. A full and frank discussion took place on how West Berkshire's Transport Plan 2006/07 had had an impact on the A339 and surrounding villages. At the end of the meeting Hampshire County Council Highways Department promised to review traffic problems around Kingsclere and surrounding areas in fact the triangle area including Burghclere, Ecchinswell, Kingsclere and Burghclere following completion of the bridge work at Headley. We believe from Cllr Chapman that this promise is about to be honoured.

If this is the case then we think the application should be held in abeyance or preferably refused until we have a proper update on the traffic situation in light of present and future demographic changes.

As far as waste is concerned this location is contrary to policy guidance which says:

Large-scale strategic waste development will be located in or close to major areas of development

- The importance of existing social and economic investment, the preservation of the natural and historic heritage, and the loyalties of

people to their local communities and countryside must all be respected?

- Minerals and waste development are major generators of heavy goods traffic but this often raises road capacity and amenity issues
- The Hampshire Local Transport Plan will include proposals for a Hampshire-wide Strategic Road Network and will also show other routes historically used for the transport of minerals and waste.
- These routes differ from the Hampshire Lorry Route Network shown on the adopted Proposals Map.
- Highways issues, including where appropriate cross-border issues, will be considered during the evaluation of all potential sites for inclusion in the Hampshire Mineral or Waste Management Plans.
- Sites with unacceptable highways impacts will not be brought forward in these plans.
- The Environment Agency's policies on landfill design and location effectively prohibit landfill on major aquifers. Approximately 54% of Hampshire is classified as a major aquifer.
- Given this, delivery of new non-hazardous landfill in Hampshire will be difficult, and when you consider settlements and environmental designations, options are severely limited.

We reiterate that we think the application should be held in abeyance or preferably refused until we have a proper update on the traffic situation in light of present and future demographic change.”

- 8.4. **The Baughurst Society** objects to the application. The Society has a membership which includes a significant proportion of the households in rural Baughurst and it adds:

The site is in open countryside within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the proposed application will cause noise, dust and light pollution which is contrary to the stated objectives of the AONB. The site is located on a section of the A339 which has a long history of road traffic accidents and fatalities. The proposed access would make this section more dangerous.

Traffic planning for lorries going to the main sources on building sites to the East (including the lorry base at Tadley) such as Reading or Bracknell and to the West such as Andover, is very poorly served. The shortest routes are over lanes and through Kingsclere or Ashford Hill, most of which are already signed as unsuitable for HGV. Mandatory protection for these

routes must be included if the application is considered. Some of the proposed traffic movements are in smaller lorries with skips. It is vital that this traffic is not allowed to use inadequate local lanes either.

Within close proximity of the site are over a dozen homes and the community facility of Wolverton village hall as well as listed buildings. This is a quiet and tranquil area. We do not consider that sufficient consultation has been done with these people who would be badly affected by the noise, dust and light pollution. Consideration should be given to completely enclosing the facility within the rim of the quarry, and purchase of a suitable tree and shrub screening belt between the quarry and the affected properties so it can be sustained in perpetuity. Local consultation has not taken place.

The accident report only covers the period up to March 2013. Since that time there have been at least 2 major accidents on this stretch of road that have caused road closures. Loss of the overtaking capacity of the 3 lane section will increase driver frustration and consequential reckless acts resulting in accidents. Just a few hundred metres from the site entrance the road sign for Hannington is still lying partially destroyed at the side of the road with parts of damaged vehicle by it. There are Covenants on the site preventing commercial use. Issues of groundwater contamination were part of the reason for stopping operation of the pit. The Parish understands that backfill with chalk was required. The revised traffic access does not reduce the danger for traffic on the A339 70% of the lorry movements are to and from Basingstoke. Lorries exiting the site will cross the path of lorries waiting to enter the site. A roundabout and a revised access position is essential

8.5. **Council for the Protection of Rural England (North Hampshire Branch)** objects to the application on the following grounds:

Traffic - The applicant estimates that there will be 120 lorry movements per day, on average. These trips will presumably mainly be made on the A339 road. This road is already carrying traffic in excess of its designed capacity and is accident-prone. The addition of so many more lorry trips will make the situation far worse. However, some of the lorry movements may be by way of the local lanes. In particular, we understand the lorries will be parked by night at the applicant's premises at Pamber Heath and that there will be daily transits between the two sites. The trip between Pamber Heath and the chalk pit will either be by the narrow lanes through villages such as Wolverton, Browninghill Green and Baughurst or by the B.3051 through Ashford Hill. These roads are not suitable for multiple lorry movements, which will be a considerable nuisance to village residents and normal road users.

Landscape - The proposed site is within the North Wessex Downs AONB. As has been pointed out to you by the Planning Adviser to the AONB in his submission, which we fully support, the NPPF at para. 116 requires that planning permission should be refused for major developments in, inter

alia, AONBs except in exceptional circumstances. NPPF contains other references to the need to protect AONBs from unnecessary development.

Whilst operations in the chalk pit may not be obtrusive, there will be necessary development of the access, such as carriageway widening, visibility splays, road signage and loss of roadside trees which will spoil the countryside.

Tranquillity - The crushing plant will produce noise, light and dust pollution which will affect nearby residents. The consequent loss of tranquillity, when added to the extra traffic in rural lanes, will have a seriously adverse effect on the neighbourhood.

Above all, we would stress that this is a greenfield site within the North Wessex Downs AONB and we submit that there must be more suitable sites on brownfield land nearer towns.

- 8.6. Individual letters of objection have been received from 92 individuals with some individuals/families writing in several times (total letters of objection being 129).
- 8.7. The key reasons for these objections to the proposal can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) highway safety - location of access; speed of traffic on highway; gradient of road; accident record; visibility; rat running through rural lanes; enforcement of a section 106 routing agreement;
 - (b) no need for the facility;
 - (c) contrary to Hampshire County Council DPD locational policy and NPPF;
 - (d) adverse impact on character of NWD AONB;
 - (e) amenity impacts - noise, dust, lighting to local residents;
 - (f) potential pollution;
 - (g) land ownership/covenants on the site preventing commercial use;
 - (h) groundwater contamination were part of the reason for stopping operation of the pit and was understood that backfill with chalk was required;
 - (i) highway alignment drawings too complex to understand;
 - (j) flood risk;
 - (k) wells in vicinity.
- 8.8. One letter of support has also been received to the application on the basis that the applicant Staceys is a long standing local firm and has been a good local employer for many years and that whilst the supporter has no personal interest in the application or to the applicant he adds that subject to the Highway Authority having no objections to the application then support for the development is given.

8.9. Online petition set up by a local action group entitled 'AGAINST THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF KINGSCLERE QUARRY' can be found on line via the following link: <http://www.a339kingsclerequarry.co.uk/>

8.10. It states the major concerns of the Action Group are:

- (a) the creation of an industrial site within the North Wessex AONB;
- (b) increased danger on the A339 created by lorries entering and exiting the quarry;
- (c) small country lanes being used as rat runs by lorries;
- (d) pollution from noise, dust and light.

As on 8 October 2013 there were 771 signatories to the petition.

8.11. Hampshire County Council has attended a Baughurst Parish Council meeting and a full Parish Council meeting, which the applicant also attended and where approximately 80 local people were present in addition to the Parish Council members. Hampshire County Council have also coordinated a site meeting with the applicant and all local parishes led recently by the applicant on site.

9. **Commentary**

9.1. The application site is the chalk quarry at Wolverton within the NWD AONB. The planning permission for the quarry allows for the extraction of chalk until 21 February 2042 with restoration to amenity woodland and agriculture. Consequently the site is not a brown field site.

9.2. The key planning issues raised by the proposal are:

- (a) compliance with planning policy;
- (b) highway safety impacts;
- (c) amenity impacts - noise, dust and lighting;
- (d) nature conservation impacts;
- (e) landscape and impact upon character of AONB impacts;
- (f) pollution; flood risk; and land contamination
- (h) cultural heritage

9.3. The key development plans for the purposes of determining this application are the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2007 and the new Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (July 2013) approved for adoption by the County Council on 19 September 2013. Other key relevant DPD

includes the Basingstoke and Deane DPD. Relevant government Guidance is the National Planning Policy framework which is material consideration in the determination of this planning application and PPS10 Waste policy. '

9.4. Policy 29 of the MWDP (2013) only supports waste development outside of previously developed land and industrial sites where it is demonstrated that the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed and, a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified. The site access is onto the A339 which is part of the Hampshire Strategic Road network. Para. 6.188 states that because activities such as the more open construction, demolition and recycling sites can create noise they are not easily assimilated in built up areas and 'Sites within countryside locations are often more suitable for these types of activities 'but -in accordance with other polices in the MWDP' activities involving open areas will only be supported if they do not have adverse environmental impacts and noise and emissions are controlled by effective enclosure and other techniques. With regards the issue of 'special need' referred to in Policy 29 there has been much debate within government and the planning inspectorate through appeal decisions as to what 'need' means in terms of policy. With regards this application and the reference to special need in Policy 29, Hampshire County Council is looking at the need to site a facility in a location where there is a strategic need in the wider public interest in terms of waste infrastructure. The Hampshire Aggregate Need Assessment supports the fact that there is a gap for a strategic aggregate recycling facility (one that handles over 50,000 tpa) in the north of the County which includes the area subject of the application site. Para.6.19 of the MWDP (2013) adds there may be 'exceptional circumstances where both enclosed and open air facilities can be justified on sites outside main urban areas. Facilities may require a more rural location because this is closer to the source of waste being treated.' To conclude it is considered on balance that this proposal falls under 'development in other locations' part of Policy 29 and it complies with this policy in principle in that it can be demonstrated that the site:

- (a) would have good transport connections (via the strategic road network – A339) for reaching sources of waste and markets for recovered material;
- (b) a special need for the location could can be justified in that it provides a new strategic aggregate recycling site(that which handles over 50,000 tpa) where currently there is a gap of provision in this location;
- (c) the site is suitable in that it has already been identified as having potential to provide new capacity in the evidence base for the HMWP (ref: HMWP130 Assessment of Sites and Areas for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire).

Nevertheless, the plan has to be taken holistically as a whole with all key issues raised assessed against relevant policies. Accordingly it is not enough just to comply with one waste policy, the development needs to be weighed against all other relevant key policies in the plan to assess any or

the degree of environmental impact. The other key policy areas are outlined and evaluated below.

- 9.5. Highway safety is the most sensitive issue raised by this application as reflected in the letters of objection.
- 9.6. The application was submitted last year with a proposal to turn left and right out of the site. Following comments from the Highway Authority the applicant submitted an amended highway scheme which proposed banning right turns out of the site through signage and the inclusion of a traffic island. This raised concerns as it would require traffic wishing to travel north to travel southwards for several miles towards Basingstoke before a safe U-turn could be undertaken.
- 9.7. In addition to these concerns it was observed that lorries climbing on the inside lane of the dual carriageway heading south up the hill towards the site access occasionally blocked the view of any smaller vehicle trying to overtake in the outside lane. This created a highway safety issue if HGVs from the site were to turn right out of the site heading north and potentially come across a vehicle overtaking in the outside lane.
- 9.8. The applicant submitted a further amended highway scheme, which is the current proposal. This involves vehicles being able to turn left and right out of the site. However it proposes removing the climbing lane north of the access, which prevents overtaking before vehicles reach the site access when heading south. The proposal then shows that once past the site access the climbing lane arrangement will continue as existing. A right hand turn lane is also proposed for traffic turning right into the site, when traveling north towards it down the hill from the Basingstoke direction.
- 9.9. Members can see from the report and the online petition that there is significant local objection to the proposal on highway safety grounds. The local residents and local Members consider the proposal is an 'accident waiting to happen'. Three key concerns relate to the speed of traffic, including the fact that the A339 slopes downhill to the site so that if a large vehicle with heavy load is forced to stop it will take longer to brake and if an articulated vehicle could jack-knife, the fact that the site accesses the A339 in the middle of a hill and how is any lorry routing agreement preventing traffic from using small rural lanes going to be enforced, especially for third parties.
- 9.10. The Highway Authority has been made aware of all these issues and has undertaken a safety audit and full analysis and assessment against current design standards. The conclusion is that the design of the access and the road improvements together with increased visibility (the length of which is based on surveys of vehicle speeds at this location) means the access design complies with relevant highway design standards and no objection therefore can be raised on highway safety grounds.

- 9.11. Amenity Impacts - noise, dust and lighting - objections have been received to the impact by way of noise, dust and lighting on nearby residents and objections by the NWD AONB and others to the impact on the tranquillity and character of the AONB.
- 9.12. The site is not close to the nearest residential properties which are sited 255 metres north north-west (garden 230 metres north north-west) on same side of the A339; 300 metres north-east (garden 240 metres north-east) on same side of A339 and 250 metres west (garden 220 metres west) on other side of A339. There is a bridleway 400 metres to the east.
- 9.13. The development is located within an old quarry but concerns are raised that part of the roof of the main building will rise in one of two places above the top of the quarry edge. The cross- section drawings attached to this report (Figure 3.5 Rev A) show that it is to the north-west that approximately four metres of the northern elevation of the main building will rise above the base of the quarry. However this section of the quarry is separated from views from properties beyond by the wooded copse. Accordingly it is not considered there will be any public view of this section of the buildings. The eastern corner of the quarry is higher than the roof of the building so will not be visible at distance from the bridleway (400 metres away) nor from the nearest residential properties. It is also noted that there is a woodland edge alongside the bridleway separating it from the open fields and the site. There are some existing trees and vegetation on the eastern edge of the quarry and it is recommended that existing planting is strengthened along the upper edge of the quarry along with planting already proposed.
- 9.14. The applicant has submitted an outline lighting scheme to ensure that any necessary lighting for health and safety purposes during operation of the site is at lower level. This can be secured by condition to ensure that light pollution is unlikely. It is noted that the nearest public viewpoint is a public bridleway some 400 metres to the east of the site and that the hours of working are standard for developments of this type in that it is a 5 .5 day week with no operations on Saturday afternoon or Sundays. Only essential maintenance work will be carried out on Saturday afternoons if necessary.
- 9.15. It is noted that the Environmental Health Officer raises no objection and it is considered that the proposal subject to proposed mitigation and appropriate planning conditions would be unlikely to have any significant noise, dust or lighting impact upon the amenity of the local residents, or on the tranquillity of the area.
- 9.16. Nature Conservation - The Environmental Statement (ES) summary document has concluded that the development is unlikely to have any significant impacts upon the ecology of the area. Both the impact of the development on the site without mitigation and with mitigation is graded as 'negligible'.

- 9.17. Natural England has noted the protected species surveys have identified that the following European protected species may be affected by this application: bats and hazel dormice and the dormice are identified in the ES as being within woodland north of the site and although bat roosts have not been identified on the site there have been some bats observed in the area.
- 9.18. The ES has concluded that no specific mitigation measures are necessary during the construction phase. In the operational phase the ES states the impact on ecology is 'negligible'- It adds the only impact that has been identified relates to the impact of artificial lighting on bats using the drainage corridor south of the site. The use of down lighting angled away from the ditch area is stated will avoid any potential effects to any bats foraging or flying in the area and other mitigation on the periphery relates to soft tree felling for example under observation on the roadside verges where necessary. It is noted Natural England state it is 'broadly satisfied that the mitigation proposals, if implemented, are sufficient to avoid adverse impacts on the local population of bats and therefore avoid affecting favourable conservation status.'
- 9.19. The applicant has proposed some mitigation including enhancement measures such as bird and bat boxes and the use of indigenous trees for additional landscape planting. Mitigation measures are proposed regarding individual species addressed in the ES to ensure no adverse impact occurs regarding nature conservation on the site.
- 9.20. Landscape and impact upon character of AONB - The boundary of the NWD AONB is attached to this report. It can be seen that the site is on the edge of the AONB adjacent to the A339 a busy strategic lorry route.
- 9.21. The NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities must give "*great weight*" to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in AONB's which have the highest state of protection. The NPPF advises that local planning authorities should refuse planning permission for major developments in designated areas except in "*exceptional circumstances*" and where they are in the "*public interest*". The proposal is a 'major development' as it is an EIA development.
- 9.22. Consideration of what amounts to "*exceptional circumstances*" and "*public interest*" as outlined in Para. 116 of the *NPPF* will include assessment of (a) the "*need*" for the development, including any national considerations, and its impact upon the local economy; (b) the opportunity for developing elsewhere, or meeting the "*need*" in some other way; and (c) any detrimental effect and the extent to which that could be moderated.
- (a) Need - Para 116 of NPPF- 'the need for the development including in terms of any national considerations and the impact of permitting it or refusing it upon the local economy

- 9.23. The North Wessex downs AONB officer has objected to the proposal and refers to a recent planning judgement - [R (oao) Cherkley Campaign Ltd -v- Mole Valley DC (Def) Longshot Cherkley Court Ltd (Int)] which relates to a golf course within an AONB – the judge stated:-

“But whichever level or type of development one is dealing with, a clear distinction is always drawn between public “need” (i.e. what is in the public planning interest), and private “demand” (i.e. what is in the developers interest by having this particular type of development). The latter is not to be equated to the former. Furthermore, the fact that a development might bring benefits to some members of the public, does not automatically mean that there is a demonstrable public “need”..... In my judgment, the word “need” in paragraph 12.71 means “required” in the interests of the public and the community as a whole, i.e. “necessary” in the public interest sense. “Need” does not simply mean “demand” or “desire” by private interests. Nor is mere proof of “viability” of such demand enough.....The Council majority failed to appreciate that fundamental distinction between : (a) that which can in its context properly be regarded as a “need” in the public interest sense, and (b) mere commercial “demand” for such facilities. It is clear that the Council majority failed to have this distinction in mind when coming to their decision.”

- 9.24. The County Council considers that a strategic need in the public interest for a recycling site in this part of Hampshire has been identified. It is considered that this proposal does satisfy the NPPF and the requirements of part (ii) of Locational waste Policy No. 29 where it states ‘ a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified.’

- a) The cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area or meeting the need for it in some other way.

The applicant is a local business already operating in the locality. The applicant has control of the quarry site and wishes to develop it for the proposed use. The site is in the control of the applicant and they have no other suitable site in the locality that could be used for such waste uses. There is a gap in this part of Hampshire for a strategic facility such as this has been identified.

- b) Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities and the extent to which that could be moderated.

The site has the advantage of the operational area being located within a disused quarry. This means that loading, unloading, processing plant and machinery that is not within the buildings are all operational at lower level than the surrounding areas. This has significant benefits in terms of protecting the environment and the amenity of local residents and the

character of the AONB from material harm and significantly minimises any potential adverse impacts. It is noted the land to the east and south is agricultural land and that 400 metres approximately to the east is a public bridleway. On balance it is not considered that the proposal subject to mitigation would have any significant detrimental effect on the environment and the landscape character of the area nor on recreation in the area. It is not considered that any new recreational opportunities can be achieved through this proposal due to the limited land in the control of the applicant, and the location of the site in context of its surroundings and existing footpaths and bridleways.

9.25. Pollution; flood risk; and land contamination - Concerns and objections have been raised by local residents as to the potential for the development to pollute the environment. However it is noted that the Environment Agency who are responsible for Environment Pollution issues of this nature, have raised no objection to the proposal subject to land contamination and drainage conditions. Accordingly it is considered the proposal accords with MWDP policy in this regard.

9.26. Cultural Heritage - The extraction of chalk will have removed any archaeological layers that might previously have existed.

10. Conclusion

10.1. The proposed development is within a quarry located within the countryside, within the NWD AONB, and adjacent to the A339, a strategic lorry route.

10.2. It is considered that the proposal is sustainable waste development (Policy 1) will use recycled aggregate and be located near local markets also to help reduce transport emissions as advocated within Para. 4.5 of the MWDP. It is considered unlikely to have an impact on protected species (Policy 3). In terms of Waste Location Policy 29 of the MWDP (2013) it is considered the proposal complies with this policy because a strategic need in this part of the Hampshire area has been identified. It is also accessed from the A339 a strategic lorry route.

10.3. It is considered that the proposed development within a disused quarry would not significantly detract from the natural beauty, distinctive character and remote and tranquil nature of the NWD AONB (Policy 4), and would reflect and enhance the character of the AONB through additional landscaping and biodiversity secured through the scheme (Policy 3) and by way of planning conditions. The site is screened by woodland, scrub and bunds and the inner workings of the quarry cannot be observed from any public viewpoint.

10.4. It is considered the operation of the plant would be unlikely to have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of local residents or users of the locality or give rise to significant pollution impacts (Policy 10) nor is it

considered likely to have any significant adverse flood risk or drainage impacts (Policy 11).

- 10.5. The highway safety impacts have been assessed as being acceptable subject to conditions and a lorry routing agreement preventing the use of HGVs from the site on certain rural roads (Policy 12). The proposal offers a sustainable waste management option (Policy 25) which helps achieve necessary waste management capacity (Policy 27).
- 10.6. Taking all matters into account, including all representations and consultee responses, the recommendation is one of approval subject to necessary planning conditions and a lorry routing agreement, as on balance it is considered the proposal complies with the relevant policies in the Hampshire MWDP (2013).

11. Recommendation

- 11.1. That subject to a lorry routing agreement permission for the construction and operation of a materials recycling facility and transfer station for construction, demolition and excavation waste, including the importation of inert fill to for an engineered based and localised road improvements to the A339 and site access at Kingsclere Quarry, Wolverton, Hampshire RG26 5SX (Application No: BDB/75928) be approved subject to the conditions listed in Integral Appendix B.

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:	no
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	no
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Date</u>
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives		
<u>Title</u> NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework)		<u>Date</u>
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf		<u>March 2012</u>

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.)

Document

The construction and operation of a materials recycling facility and transfer station for construction, demolition and excavation waste, including the importation of inert fill to for an engineered based and localised road improvements to the A339 and site access at Kingsclere Quarry, Wolverton, Hampshire RG26 5SX (Application No: BDB/75928)

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/application-details.htm?id=14972>

Location

County Planning,
First Floor, EII Court West, The
Castle, Winchester SO23 8UD

CONDITIONS

Commencement

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Written notification of the date of commencement shall be sent to the Waste Planning Authority within seven days of such commencement.

Reason: To comply with Section 91(as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Working and Construction Programme

2. The development shall be constructed in accordance with a construction scheme and site waste management plan incorporating amongst other matters the details set out below, to be submitted in writing to the Waste Planning Authority for approval within six months of the date of this permission, and prior to the commencement of the development and thereafter the construction shall be implemented in accordance with this approved scheme and site waste management plan:
 - (a) programme of works including importation, raising of levels , grading of quarry side etc;
 - (b) site preparation, including provision of fencing and other security measures;
 - (c) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
 - (d) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - (e) storage of plant and materials;
 - (f) measures for keeping the highway free from mud or extraneous matter;
 - (g) for the control of dust during the construction phase including the operation of a suitable Dust Action Plan (DAP);
 - (h) measures for the protection of groundwater;
 - (i) lighting;
 - (j) waste management; and
 - (k) construction of building foundations.

Reason: To enable the Mineral Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area.

Site Layout and Surfacing Details

3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a final layout plan of the site showing the detailed layout of the site as shown on approved in outline on drawing 09-044-SK-01 REV E (12.10.11) shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority for approval in writing and thereafter implemented in accordance with that approval. The final layout plan shall include details of areas external to the proposed buildings, the location of any necessary container storage areas referred to in the application documents; screening areas, stockpile areas, crushing areas, and

vehicle manoeuvring areas; and car and HGV parking areas, so that vehicles may enter and leave the site in forward gear. The site shall be set out in accordance with the approved outline layout plan and the submitted final layout plan and the parking/turning areas shall be used and retained exclusively for their designated use at all times.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development and to ensure the efficient and safe operation of the site and in the interests of local amenities

4. Within six months of the date of this permission or prior to construction of the foundations of the approved buildings whichever is the sooner, details of surfacing materials to be used on areas external to the proposed buildings shall be submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with that approval. The site shall be surfaced in accordance with the approved details and the surfacing maintained in a good state of repair and there shall be no change to the surfacing materials unless they have been agreed in writing in advance with the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain planning control over the development and in the interests of safeguarding the environment and local amenity.

Buildings, Fencing

5. The elevations of the new waste building shall be constructed in the location and to the dimensions and materials shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the Waste Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development and in the interests of the local environment and local amenities.

6. Prior to the buildings on the site being erected, the colours and materials to be used externally on all of the buildings shall be agreed beforehand with the Waste Planning Authority in writing and thereafter implemented as agreed in accordance with such approval. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and there shall be no replacement, or changes to the materials or colours used externally on the buildings unless they have been agreed in writing in advance with the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the environment and local amenity.

Hours of Working

7. Works relating to the construction of the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to operations, shall only take place between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hours on Saturday. There shall be no piling on Saturdays, and no construction works undertaken on Sundays or bank, public or national holidays, unless otherwise agreed beforehand in writing by the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby properties during the construction period.

8. Unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by the Waste Planning Authority no heavy goods vehicles shall enter or leave the site, no external lights shall be illuminated and no plant (with the exception of the biomass plant) or machinery shall be operated, except between the following hours: 0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0800-1300 Saturday. There shall be no working on Sundays or recognised public holidays.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity.

Landscape

9. Within six months of the date of this permission and prior to the commencement of the development a biodiversity woodland management and landscape scheme, for the full periphery of the quarry site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority before the development commences and thereafter implemented in accordance with such approval.

The scheme shall include inter alia details of:

- (a) woodland planting;
- (b) management responsibilities; and
- (c) maintenance/management schedules.
- (d) regarding and planting of bunds near and alongside entrance within and near the gates.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity to ensure the site is permanently screened for the west and to increase biodiversity.

10. The scheme approved in condition 8 within the site shall be planted with local native species and to a density, specification, timescale and a maintenance programme to be agreed with the Waste Planning Authority in writing beforehand. Any trees or shrubs which, within a period of five years from the date of planting, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and to enhance the character of the AONB and biodiversity of the SINC.

Protection of Water Environment

11. No solid matter shall be deposited so that it passes or is likely to pass into any watercourse. All areas where waste is stored, handled or transferred shall be underlain by impervious hard-standing with dedicated drainage to foul sewer or sealed tank.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

12. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The bund capacity shall give 110% of the total volume for single and hydraulically linked tanks. If there is multiple tankage, the bund capacity shall be 110% of the largest tank or 25% of the total capacity of all tanks, whichever is the greatest. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses and overflow pipes shall be located within the bund. There shall be no outlet connecting the bund to any drain, sewer or watercourse or discharging onto the ground. Associated pipework shall be located above ground where possible and protected from accidental damage.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

13. No sewage or trade effluent (including vehicle wash or vehicle steam cleaning effluent) shall be discharged to any surface water drainage system. Appropriate measures should be taken during construction to protect groundwater.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

14. Prior to waste operations commencing a surface water drainage scheme to ensure the protection of groundwater shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority for approval and thereafter the site and associated operations shall be implemented in accordance with this scheme.

Reason: To protect the water environment and biodiversity of adjacent land.

Noise, Dust and Odour

15. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with all the mitigation measures proposed in Section 10 of the Environmental Statement to safeguard air quality and odour disturbances.

Reason: In the interests of amenities of nearby residents and as required by the Environmental Health Officer.

16. Prior to waste operations commencing a noise monitoring scheme shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority for approval in writing. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residents.

17. All lorries entering and exiting the site carrying waste or recovered/recyclable material shall be fully sheeted.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities by preventing spillage of material onto the public highway.

18. All practical measures shall be taken, within the waste building, and across all outside areas within the site, to ensure no dust nuisance is caused to nearby residential properties and their occupiers. These measures shall be implemented for the duration of the development. Measures shall also be undertaken during construction of the development to ensure no dust nuisance is caused to the same residents..

Reason: In the interests of local amenities.

19. Measures to control odour at the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with that approval prior to the commissioning of waste operations at the site.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities.

20. Other than vehicles involved in delivering waste and exporting waste/recovered/recyclable materials, all vehicles and mobile plant involved in the handling of waste or product operating at the site external to the waste transfer building must be fitted with, and use, a low tonal white noise type vehicle reversing alarm or switchable system and all vehicles, plant and machinery operated within the site shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' specification at all times, and shall be fitted with and use effective silencers.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities.

Lighting

21. Prior to waste operations being commenced at the site a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority in writing and thereafter implemented in accordance with such approval prior to the commencement of waste operations. The scheme shall include details of: all external lighting, including safety and security lighting; illumination from within the waste building; and measures to prevent light pollution. No floodlighting or any form of external lighting, including security lighting other than that explicitly approved under this condition, shall be installed on the site without the prior written approval of the Waste Planning Authority. Shields and appropriate fittings are to be used to prevent light from the site affecting neighbouring residents.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and to avoid strong light being directed at oncoming trains.

Highways

22. No development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the access works to create a new access to the site from the A339 (as shown in principle on drawing 09/044/GA/200 Rev L) have been completed to the written satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure safe and adequate access.

23. A log of HGVs entering and exiting the site shall be kept up to date at all times and shall be provided to the Waste Planning Authority upon request.

Reason: To assist in the monitoring of the site.

24. Full details of the vehicle cleaning measures proposed to prevent mud and spoil from vehicles leaving the site shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority for written approval prior to the commencement of the development. The approved measures shall be implemented before the development commences. Once the development has been commenced, these measures shall be used by all vehicles leaving the site and maintained in good working order for the duration of the development. No vehicle shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud and spoil being carried on to the public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

Restriction of Permitted Development Rights

25. Notwithstanding the provisions of Parts 4, 8 and 25 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order):
- (i) fixed plant or machinery, buildings, structures and erections or private ways shall not be erected, extended, installed or replaced at the site without the prior agreement of the Waste Planning Authority in writing; and
 - (ii) no telecommunications antenna shall be installed or erected without the prior agreement of the Waste Planning Authority in writing.

Reason: To protect the character of the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Storage limitations

26. There shall be no unloading, processing or storage of imported waste materials outside of the main approved waste building other than those approved on the layout plan subject of this permission.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and the landscape character of the area.

27. Any essential waste containers needed at the site should be outlined for approval of the Waste Planning Authority in writing before the development commences and shall only be stacked to a maximum height of 3.5 m above ground levels in the location to be approved upon submission. .

Reason: In the interests of local amenities.

Tonnage limit

28. No more than 100, 000 tonnes of waste per annum – of the types detailed in the approved application and EIA shall be imported to the site.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities and an Environmental Impact Assessment was undertaken on the basis that the development would import a maximum of 100,000 tonnes per year.

Land contamination

29. Prior to the commencement of development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
- (1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - all previous uses
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site;
 - (2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site;
 - (3) The site investigation results and the detailed risk assessment (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 - (4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect the groundwater from any contamination that may be present in made ground or the unsaturated zone within the Chalk from the previous activities that took place within the quarry.

30. Prior to occupation of any part of the permitted development, a verification report demonstrating completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a “long-term monitoring and maintenance plan”) for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan, and for the reporting of this to the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the groundwater from any contamination that may be present in made ground or the unsaturated zone within the Chalk from the previous activities that took place within the quarry.

31. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to dispose of surface water has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect the groundwater from any contamination.

32. Prior to the commencement of development a landscape management plan, including long- term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme shall include the following elements:

- details of the extent and type of any new planting (NB planting to be of locally native species of UK genetic provenance);
- details of the extent of existing and new areas of chalk grassland;
- details of maintenance regimes;
- details of any new habitat created on site including the proposed reed bed infiltration basin, which should be designed to maximise its ecological value;
- details of treatment of site boundaries and/or buffers around water bodies.

Reason: This condition is necessary to ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat and secure opportunities for the enhancement of the nature conservation value of the site in line with national planning policy.

Flood Risk

33. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the surface water drainage scheme outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted as part of this approved development.

Reason: To ensure there will be no increase in the risk of surface water flooding on and off site.

34. Wheelwash should be on a sealed system and final effluent tankered off site.

Reason: In the protection of groundwater.

Nature Conservation

35. Mitigation measures to prevent impacts to nature conservation and increase the biodiversity of the site shall be implemented as outlined in the approved ecological assessment comprising the approved Environmental Statement and including those measures detailed in the approved planning statement and application and shall be maintained for the duration of the development as appropriate.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation and increasing and enhancing the character of the AONB.

Advice notes to applicant

Legal Agreement- There is a requirement for a lorry routing agreement to prevent the movement of HGV's associated with the operation of the site from using unsuitable specified rural roads as short cuts when accessing and egressing the site- in the interests of highway safety.

*Annexe to Reasons for Conditions (as required by Article 31 of the
Town and Country Planning
(Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010)*

HAMPSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN (adopted 2013)

Policy 1 – Sustainable minerals and waste development

The Hampshire Authorities will take a positive approach to minerals and waste development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Minerals and waste development that accords with policies in this Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the proposal or the relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, the Hampshire Authorities will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

Any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or

Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

Policy 2 - Climate Change - mitigation and adaptation

Minerals and waste development should minimise their impact on the causes of climate change. Where applicable, minerals and waste development should reduce vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts of climate change by: being located and designed to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the more sustainable use of resources; or developing energy recovery facilities and to facilitate low carbon technologies; and avoiding areas of vulnerability to climate change and flood risk or otherwise incorporate adaptation measures

Policy 3 - Protection of habitats and species

Minerals and waste development should not have a significant adverse effect on, and where possible, should enhance, restore or create designated or important habitats and species. The following sites, habitats and species will be protected in accordance with the level of their relative importance: internationally designated sites including Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar sites, any sites identified to counteract adverse effects on internationally designated sites, and European Protected Species; nationally designated sites including Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves, nationally protected species and Ancient Woodland; local interest sites including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, and Local Nature Reserves; habitats and species of principal importance in England; habitats and species identified in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan or Hampshire Authorities' Biodiversity Action Plans.

Development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon such sites, habitats and species will only be permitted where it is judged, in proportion to their relative importance, that the merits of the development outweigh any likely environmental damage.

Appropriate mitigation and compensation measures will be required where development would cause harm to biodiversity interests.

Policy 4 - Protection of the Designated landscape

Major minerals and waste development will not be permitted in the New Forest or South Downs National Parks, or in the North Wessex Downs, the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs, and Chichester Harbour Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), except in exceptional circumstances. In this respect, consideration will be given to: the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations; the impact of permitting, or refusing the development upon the local economy; the cost and scope for meeting the need outside the designated area, or meeting the need in some other way; and whether any detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and / or recreational opportunities can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Minerals and waste development should reflect and where appropriate enhance the character of the surrounding landscape and natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the designated area.

Minerals and waste development should also be subject to a requirement that it is restored in the event it is no longer needed for minerals and waste uses.

Small-scale waste management facilities for local needs should not be precluded from the National Parks and AONBs provided that they can be accommodated without undermining the objectives of the designation.

Policy 5 – Protection of the countryside

Minerals and waste development in the open countryside, outside the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, will not be permitted unless: It is a time-limited mineral extraction or related development; or The nature of the development is related to countryside activities, meets local needs or requires a countryside or isolated location; Or the development provides a suitable reuse of previously developed land, including redundant farm or forestry buildings and their curtilages or hard standings. Where appropriate and applicable, development in the countryside will be expected to meet highest standards of design, operation and restoration. Minerals and waste development in the open countryside should be subject to a requirement that it is restored in the event it is no longer required for minerals and waste use.

Policy 9 Restoration of Quarries and waste developments

Temporary minerals and waste development should be restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with the development plan.

Restoration of minerals and waste developments should be in keeping with the character and setting of the local area, and should contribute to the delivery of local objectives for habitats, biodiversity or community use where these are consistent with the development plan.

The restoration of mineral extraction and landfill sites should be phased throughout the life of the development.

Policy 10 – Protecting public health, safety and amenity.

Minerals and waste development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. Minerals and waste development should not: Release emissions to the atmosphere, land or water (above appropriate standards); Have an unacceptable impact on human health; Cause unacceptable noise, dust, lighting, vibration or odour; Have an unacceptable visual impact; Potentially endanger aircraft from bird strike and structures; Cause an unacceptable impact on public safety safeguarding zones; Cause an unacceptable impact on: Tip and quarry slope stability; or Differential settlement of quarry backfill and landfill; or Subsidence and migration of contaminants; Cause an unacceptable impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters; Cause an unacceptable impact on public strategic infrastructure; Cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between minerals and waste developments, and between mineral, waste and other forms of development.

The potential cumulative impacts of minerals and waste development and the way they relate to existing developments must be addressed to an acceptable standard.

Policy 11 - Flood Risk and Prevention.

Minerals and waste development in areas at risk of flooding should: not result in an increased flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood-risk overall; incorporate flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures where appropriate to the character and biodiversity of the area and the specific requirements of the site; have site drainage systems designed to take account of events which exceed the normal design standard; not increase net surface water run-off; and if appropriate, incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems to manage surface water drainage, with whole-life management and maintenance arrangements.

Policy 12- Managing Traffic

Minerals and waste development should have a safe and suitable access to the highway network and where possible minimise the impact of its generated traffic through the use of alternative methods of transportation such as sea, rail, inland waterways, conveyors, pipelines and the use of reverse logistics. Furthermore, highway improvements will be required to mitigate any significant adverse effects on: highway safety; pedestrian safety; Minerals and waste development should have a safe and suitable access to the highway network and where possible minimise the impact of its generated traffic through the use of alternative methods of transportation such as sea, rail, inland waterways, conveyors, pipelines and the use of reverse logistics. Furthermore, highway improvements will be required to mitigate any significant adverse effects on: highway safety; pedestrian safety; highway capacity; and environment and amenity.

Policy 13 – High-quality design of materials and waste development

Minerals and waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape and townscape.

The design of appropriate built facilities for minerals and waste development should be of a high-quality and contribute to achieving sustainable development.

Policy 16 - Safeguarding – Minerals Infrastructure

Infrastructure that supports the supply of minerals in Hampshire is safeguarded against development that would unnecessarily sterilise the infrastructure or prejudice or jeopardise its use by creating incompatible land uses nearby.

Minerals sites with temporary permissions for minerals supply activities are safeguarded for the life of the permission.

The Hampshire Authorities will object to incompatible development unless it can be demonstrated that: the merits of the development clearly outweigh the need for safeguarding; or the infrastructure is no longer needed; or the capacity of the infrastructure can be relocated or provided elsewhere. In such instances, alternative capacity should: meet the provisions of the Plan, that this alternative capacity is deliverable; and be appropriately and sustainably located; and conform to the relevant environmental and community protection policies in this Plan; or the proposed development is part of a wider programme of reinvestment in the delivery of enhanced capacity for minerals supply.

The infrastructure safeguarded by this policy is illustrated on the Policies Map and identified on the List of safeguarded minerals and waste sites.

Policy 17 – Aggregates supply – capacity and source

An adequate and steady supply of aggregates until 2030 will be provided for Hampshire and surrounding areas from local sand and gravel sites at a rate of 1.56mtpa, of which 0.28mtpa will be soft sand.

The supply will also be augmented by safeguarding and developing infrastructure capacity so that alternative sources of aggregate could be provided at the following rates:

- 1.0mtpa of recycled and secondary aggregates; and
- 2.0mtpa of marine-won aggregates; and
- 1.0mtpa of limestone delivered by rail.

Policy 18 – recycled and secondary aggregates development

Recycled and secondary aggregate production will be supported by encouraging investment and further infrastructure to maximise the availability of alternatives to marine-won and local land-won sand and gravel extraction.

Policy 25 – Sustainable Waste Management

The long-term aim is to enable net self-sufficiency in waste movements and divert 100% of waste from landfill. All waste development should:

- a. encourage waste to be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy; and
- b. reduce the amount of residual waste currently sent to landfill; and
- c. be located near to the sources of waste, or markets for its use; and / or
- d. maximise opportunities to share infrastructure at appropriate existing mineral or waste sites.

The co-location of activities with existing operations will be supported, where appropriate, if commensurate with the operational life of the site, and where it would not result in intensification of uses that would cause unacceptable harm to the environment or communities in a local area (including access routes), or prolong any unacceptable impacts associated with the existing development.

Provision will be made for the management of non-hazardous waste arisings with an expectation of achieving by 2020 at least:

- 60% recycling; and
- 95% diversion from landfill.

Policy 27 – Capacity for waste management development

In order to reach the objectives of the Plan and to deal with arisings by 2030 of:

- 2.62mtpa of non-hazardous waste;
- 2.49mtpa of inert waste;
- 0.16mtpa of hazardous waste.

The following minimum amounts of additional waste infrastructure capacity are estimated to be required:

- 0.29mtpa of non-hazardous recycling capacity; and
- 0.39mtpa of non-hazardous recovery capacity; and
- 1.4mt of non-hazardous landfill void.

Proposals will be supported where they maintain and provide additional capacity for non-hazardous recycling and recovery through:

- a. the use of existing waste management sites; or
- b. extensions to suitable sites:
 - that are ancillary to the operation of the existing site and improve current operating standards, where applicable, or provide for the co-location of compatible waste activities; and
 - which do not result in inappropriate permanent development of a temporary facility and proposals for ancillary plant, buildings and additional developments that do not extend the timescale for completion of the development; or
- c. extension of time to current temporary planning permissions where it would not result in inappropriate development; or
- d. new sites to provide additional capacity (see Policy 29 - Locations and sites for waste management).

Policy 29 – Locations and sites for waste management

1. Development to provide recycling, recovery and/ or treatment of waste will be supported on suitable sites in the following locations:
 - i. Urban areas in north-east and south Hampshire;
 - ii. Areas along the strategic road corridors; and
 - iii. Areas of major new or planned development.
2. Any site in these locations will be considered suitable and supported where it:
 - a. is part of a suitable industrial estate; or
 - b. has permission or is allocated for general industry/ storage; or
 - c. is previously-developed land or redundant agricultural and forestry buildings, their curtilages and hardstandings or is part of an active quarry or landfill operation; or
 - d. is within or adjoins sewage treatment works and the development enables the co-treatment of sewage sludge with other wastes; and
 - e. is of a scale compatible with the setting.
3. Development in other locations will be supported where it is demonstrated that:
 - a. the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed; and
 - b. a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified.

Policy 30 - CDE waste development

Where there is a beneficial outcome from the use of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste in developments, such as the restoration of mineral workings, landfill engineering, civil engineering and other infrastructure projects, the use will be supported provided that as far as reasonably practicable all materials capable of producing high quality recycled aggregates have been removed for recycling.

Development to maximise the recovery of construction, demolition and excavation waste to produce at least 1mtpa of high quality recycled/secondary aggregates will be supported.