

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Regulatory Committee
Date:	22 February 2017
Title:	Application for proposed development of a logistics depot comprising a workshop/office building, driver welfare building, hardstanding for vehicle parking, soft landscaping and other associated infrastructure at Land South of Fareham Waste Transfer Station, Enterprise Park, Military Road, Fareham. (Application No. P/16/1047/CC) (Site Ref: FA083)
Reference:	8070
Report From:	Head of Strategic Planning

Contact name: Katherine Snell

Tel: 01962 845938

Email: katherine.snell@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The planning application is for an extension to the Wallington Waste Recycling and Transfer Station (WRTS) for the construction and operation of a logistics facility.
- 1.2. This application is being considered by the Regulatory Committee as there has been an objection from Fareham District Council. As a result, the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment (Hampshire County Council) considers that the planning application should be considered by the Regulatory Committee.
- 1.3. Key issues raised are:
 - Landscape and visual impacts;
 - Sustainability and Climate Change; and
 - Need.
- 1.4. A committee site visit by Members took place on 31 October 2016 in advance of the proposal being considered by the Regulatory Committee.
- 1.5. The proposed development is not an Environmental Impact Assessment development under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2011](#).
- 1.6. Whilst Fareham Borough Council do not consider that the proposal complies with the [Fareham Borough Local Plan - Part 1 and 2](#), it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the adopted relevant policies of the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) as the site is in an acceptable location and is an extension to an operational waste site. The development

of the logistics facility and the consequential improvements in the performance of the adjacent WRTS facility would result in significant benefits in terms of the sustainable management of waste, meeting waste capacity targets for recycled aggregate and a reduction in greenhouse gases, helping to minimise the causes of climate change which would outweigh the minimal visual impact which may be associated with the proposal. It is acknowledged that there is some visual impact associated with the proposal but this is not considered significant due to the surrounding land uses, neighbouring industrial features and the natural screening which is already in place. The proposal will not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts as the odour, noise and emission levels will be acceptable. The nature of the development would not give rise to an adverse impact on the protected species or local ecological designations. The proposal is acceptable in highway terms as there is no increase in traffic and there is no significant flood risk or surface water increase as a result of the proposal. The loss of the agricultural land is considered to be acceptable as it is not significant.

- 1.7. That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions listed in integral Appendix B.

2. The Site

- 2.1. The proposed development is 0.4 kilometres (km) east of Wallington village, to the north-east of Fareham. The application site is located to the edge of the Fort Wallington Industrial Estate and adjacent to the existing Wallington Waste Recycling and Transfer Station (WRTS) facility. The main operations at the WRTS comprise a
 - material recycling facility;
 - waste recycling / bulking and transfer facility; and a
 - wood chipping operation.
- 2.2. The applicant (SUEZ) currently holds an operating licence for this adjacent WRTS facility for a fleet of 40 waste collection vehicles. These are currently parked at the adjacent WRTS facility for over-night storage.
- 2.3. The application site occupies 1.06 hectares (ha) and the proposal is considered to be a new development. The site is regarded as a greenfield site as the land site has not been previously developed. The site is currently used as a paddock for a few horses and is Grade 2 best and most versatile agricultural land. There are trees and hedgerows providing a screen along the perimeter of the site. The northern boundary is formed by a planted earth bund associated with the adjacent WRTS facility. The site slopes from its north western corner at circa 33.5 metres AOD to its south eastern corner at circa 27.5 metres AOD, resulting in a difference of 6 metres. The WRTS building has a roof height of approximately 10.25 metres above ground level. The WRTS access runs to the west of the site boundary (again separated by the planted bund), onto Standard Way. The M27 motorway runs to the north of the WRTS, with Junction 11 immediately to the north-east.

- 2.4. In the wider context, the areas to the south and west of the Site are predominantly flat, low-lying and heavily urbanised, forming part of the South Hampshire conurbation. To the north and east, more rural influences predominate north of the motorway, and the land rises in elevation to the north-east onto Portsdown Hill.
- 2.5. The site overlies a major aquifer (Portsdown Chalk) and within a Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) for the Maindell Public Water Supply Borehole.
- 2.6. Wallington Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is 430 metres to the north-west and Wallington Way SSSI is 530 metres to the south-west of the site. Habitats within the proposed development area were assessed as being of value to wildlife within the immediate vicinity, with potential to support discrete numbers of widespread breeding birds. The site also provides potential for foraging/commuting bats.
- 2.7. The site can be accessed from Standard Way, which runs through the Enterprise Park up to the site, or via Pinks Hill. The purpose made junction from the junction layout provides a minimum of 2.4 metres by 75 metres sightlines in both directions from both site exit lanes, representing a standard of provision suitable for side road access to a road operating at 40mph, including for regular Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) (defined as vehicles over 3.5 tonne un-laden) traffic levels. The immediate sections of Standard Way operate under national speed limit controls.
- 2.8. The distances to the nearest residential properties and the Wallington Conservation Area is 300 metres south-west from the application boundary of the site. Fort Wallington (Grade II Listed Building) is located 180 metres to the west from application boundary.
- 2.9. A Public Right of Way (PROW) footpath (Paradise Lane) is 150 metres from the site to the south-east.
- 2.10. The site is located on the [Strategic Road Network](#) as the Junction 11 of the M27 is 100 metres to the east of the site and accessed by the A27 or more directly via Pinks Hill.

3. Planning History

- 3.1 There is no planning history of the site but there is relevant planning history for the adjacent WRTS (FA064) which is as follows:

Application no.	Location	Proposal	Decision	Date issued
P/14/1095/CC	Sita UK Ltd, Enterprise Park	Variation of condition 6 and 7 of PP P/13/0320/CC	Granted	02/02/2015
P/13/0763/CC	Sita UK Ltd, Enterprise Park	Erection of a canopy for the storage of wood chippings	Granted	04/10/2013
P/13/0320/CC	Sita UK	Variation of	Granted	31/05/2013

	Ltd, Enterprise Park	condition 7 of PP P/12/0611		
P/12/0611/CC	Sita UK Ltd, Enterprise Park	Variation of condition 3 and 4 of PP P/98/0376/CC	Granted	23/10/2012
P/05/0809/CC	Wallington waste recycling centre	Construction of permanent mess, toilet and security facilities	Granted	19/07/2005
P/05/0813/CC	Wallington Depot	Extension to canopy at rear of MRF Building, relocated push wall resubmission for lapsed approval for canopy	Granted	08/08/2005
P/04/0730/CC	Wallington Waste Recycling Centre	Temporary retention of existing portacabins	Granted	25/06/2004
P/03/0299/CC	Wallington Recycling Centre	Erection of canopy on northern elevation of recycling building to cover the inerts discharge	Granted	10/04/2003
P/03/0298/CC	Wallington Recycling Centre	Temporary retention of existing portacabins	Granted	10/04/2003
P/03/0173/CC	Wallington Depot	Extension to southern elevation of recycling centre to house a HGV workshop	Granted	14/04/2003
P/02/0353/CC	Wallington Depot	Permanent mess, toilet and security facilities	Granted	30/04/2002
P/01/1296/CC	Wallington Depot	Temporary siting of portacabins for mess and toilet facilities	Granted	07/12/2001

P/00/0952/CC	Wallington Depot	Siting of portacabins for mess and toilet facilities	Refused	06/12/2000
P/00/0841/MW	Wallington Depot	Temporary siting and operation of a concrete crusher	Withdrawn	01/08/2000
P/98/0376/CC	Wallington Depot	Redevelopment to provide integrated waste recycling and transfer facility with offices and parking	Granted	03/12/1998
P/96/1210/MW	Wallington Depot	Change of use to Waste Recycling Facility	Refused	31/01/1997
P/95/1274/CC	Wallington Depot	Change of use to Waste Recycling Facility	Appeal for non determination	28/05/1996

3.2 The main operations at the existing WRTS comprise of a material recycling facility, a waste recycling / bulking and transfer facility and a wood chipping operation. Since 2001 the site has undergone a number of minor changes. In its current form the WRTS facility comprises:

- A main recycling and transfer station building – the building is used for the receipt of waste which is then either bulked up and then to landfill or the subject of mechanical treatment and hand picking to separate recyclable material and produce a Refused Derived Fuel (RDF);
- A wood shredding / chipping facility – located on the external hardstanding area along the eastern boundary of the site. Includes plant and equipment (shredder, screen and wheeled excavator) and storage areas;
- Site offices / staff welfare facilities and staff / visitor parking – located to the immediate south of the main building;
- Vehicle Fleet Parking – Located along the northern boundary of the site;
- Baled RDF storage – to the south of the main recycling and transfer station building;
- Skip and Bin storage – along the southern boundary of the site;
- Weighbridge and associated office at the site entrance; and

- Vehicle circulation – to all sides of the main recycling and transfer station building.
- 3.3 The WRTS is identified in the adopted [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) as a safeguarded site for commercial and industrial waste transfer.
- 3.4 Condition 23 to the updated (14 November 2014) planning consent ([P/14/1095/CC](#)) for the adjacent WRTS facility identifies the following HGV routing restrictions: 'HGV entry access to the WRTS facility to be taken from Standard Way from the north only, with no access allowed from Pinks Hill to the south. HGV exit to be taken via Pinks Hill between the hours of 08:00 and 06:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00-12:30 on Saturday. At all other times HGV access is only permitted via Standard Way.'
- 3.5 The adjacent WRTS facility currently generates a range of daily vehicle movements, as summarised below:

HGV trips associated with the

- delivery of waste to the site;
- the collection of processed materials;
- movements to / from Southampton workshop facility for regular vehicle maintenance; and
- Staff car / van movements associated with adjacent WRTS facility operatives / SUEZ office staff / vehicle fleet drivers.

4. The Proposal

- 4.1. The proposal is for an extension to the Wallington Waste Recycling and Transfer Station (WRTS) for the construction and operation of a logistic facility. The adjacent WRTS facility is operated by the applicant and benefits from planning permission to process commercial and industrial (C&I) waste. The applicant states that the operations at the adjacent WRTS facility are currently constrained by the presence of office, car parking and bin storage areas on site, which restrict the amount of space available for waste management tasks and have a knock on effect on the efficiency of operations at the site. In addition, the adjacent WRTS facility also provides a base for the overnight parking/storage of the operational fleet vehicles which carry out waste collection services that extend to Andover, New Milton, Petersfield and Chichester.
- 4.2. The applicant states that the proposal will enhance operating standards and reduce the amount of waste sent for landfill. By relocating the parking, site office / staff welfare facilities, staff and visitor parking and skip / bin storage this will significantly increase the external and internal operating space to mechanically treat the waste rather than bulk up and deliver to landfill. The proposal would enable 4 HGVs to tip/load rather than 2 and there would be 2 lanes of vehicle circulation around the WRTS, preventing time being wasted as vehicles queue. Freeing-up the space around the main building would allow for the site to carry out the baling and external storage of recyclables and RDF material prior to transhipment. In doing so, it would make floorspace available within the main building for the storage, recycling and recovery of waste. This would prevent 25,000 tonnes of recyclable /

recoverable waste being sent to the existing landfill site at Beacon Hill (circa 50 miles from the existing WRTS facility). In addition, the applicant also anticipates that they would be able to increase the volume of waste that is managed (recycled / recovered) at the site. As the facility is supplying RDF material to Energy from Waste (EfW) facilities in Europe there is also a need for the site to be able to store RDF when the EfWs are undergoing planned shut downs or industrial action.

- 4.3. The proposed vehicle workshop would replace the existing SUEZ facility, which is currently located on Empress Road in Southampton. The new facility would improve the operation of the adjacent WRTS facility and the management of the Company's HGV fleet.
- 4.4. The new accommodation would provide an improved working environment as it would be located away from the operational waste management operations & vehicle movements. No additional staff would be accommodated within the new office facility.
- 4.5. The development would comprise of:
 - workshop;
 - office building;
 - driver welfare building;
 - vehicle wash;
 - hardstanding for 40 HGV and 60 light vehicle parking;
 - skip storage;
 - fuel tank;
 - Covered storage for 16 cycles;
 - new vehicle junction;
 - 2-way pedestrian access through northern bunded boundary;
 - 2.1 metre high weldmesh boundary fencing finished in green;
 - earth works and ground re-modelling; and
 - boundary landscaping.
- 4.6 The application includes the creation of a development platform to provide a level base. It would require the construction of a retaining wall along the eastern and part of the northern boundaries of the site. This would allow a development platform for the construction of the office / workshop building and a gentler slope across the remainder of the development site. A barrier extending up to 1.1 metre in height would be installed on top of the retaining wall to the east of the site. To achieve these earth works, the cut volume is 2,550m³ and the fill 2,925m³.
- 4.7 A [proposed drainage strategy](#) has been prepared. It is proposed that a new foul water sewers will connect into the existing public sewer in Standard Way and that surface water sewers for the development will discharge into the Public Sewer, at the green field run off rate (5 litres/second). The surface water flows will be restricted to match the green field run off and designed for a 1 in 100 year storm event plus 30% climate change, as required by the Environment Agency. The workshop building would include guttering and down pipes which would collect water from the roof. Areas of concrete hardstanding and stone asphalt would incorporate slight gradients which

would direct surface water to the drainage network. Foul water generated from the vehicle wash and welfare facilities in the office and drivers unit would be collected by a separate drainage network. However, both networks would discharge to an existing manhole located to the east of the site.

- 4.8 The joint office, vehicle workshop and car parking for staff and drivers would occupy the north of the site, with more car parking to the west. The overall dimensions of the [building](#) would be 35 metres long by 25 metres wide. The pitched roof of the building would extend to a central ridge height of 10.65 metres (eave height of 9 metres). The integrated office frontage would be on the western elevation and the main workshop frontage would be on the eastern elevation. The building would be constructed from a standard steel portal frame which is over clad with metal cladding finished in a mixture of Merlin Grey (RAL180 40 05) and Goosewing Grey (RAL7038). The roof would be constructed from metal cladding finished in Sargasso (RAL5003) and would include translucent panels to allow natural illumination. It would also be supported by appropriate guttering and downpipes finished in Goosewing Grey (RAL7038). The building would include 3 roller shutter doors on the eastern elevation to allow access to the workshop. These doors would comprise 5 metres wide x 6 metres high sectional overhead steel framed and faced roller shutter doors finished in Sargasso (RAL5003).
- 4.9 In the north west of the site, a driver welfare building would be located adjacent to the driver and office staff parking areas and adjacent to the area set aside for lorry parking. The dimensions of the building would be 9.2 metres long by 2.5 metres wide and it would extend to a height of 2.8 metres (flat roof). It would comprise a prefabricated portakabin type structure finished in Goosewing Grey (RAL7038) Textured Finish. The building includes a single glazed window on each gable end and two glazed windows and single solid personal door (finished in Goosewing Grey (RAL7038)) on the front and rear elevations.
- 4.10 The vehicle washdown would be placed in the north-east corner. There is no storage or handling of waste materials proposed at the logistics facility. All such operations would continue to be carried out at the adjacent WRTS facility.
- 4.11 The storage areas as shown on the proposed site plan have been designed to ensure all of the below fit into the proposed storage areas:
- 12 x roro containers;
 - 20 x skips (can be stacked);
 - 18 x fel bins; and
 - 140 euro bins.
- 4.12 The facility would be secured on all sides by new 2.1 metre high weldmesh fencing finished in green (colour to be determined by condition 14). Matching 2.1 metres high double leaf weldmesh security gates would be provided at the main site entrance (slightly set back from the junction and opening inwards). A personnel gate is proposed to be constructed between the existing and proposed sites.

- 4.13 External lighting of the wider site would be provided to function only during operational hours when natural illumination falls below safe working levels. All new lighting would be designed and directed so that light spillage beyond the site boundary is minimised. It is proposed to affix Philips Cosmopolis Lamps (or similar) to the office / workshop building and to the vehicle wash down structure (ref: [WE04116 C Rev B](#)). Furthermore, it is proposed to install the aforementioned lamps (or similar) on 8 metre high monopoles in various positions across the site (as shown on [Proposed site plan 101 Rev C](#)). In addition, it is anticipated that a network of CCTV cameras would be installed across the application site.
- 4.14 The proposed development is supported by a landscaping scheme [1822-01-01 Rev A](#). This would include the provision of new grassland, new hedgerows and specimen tree planting. The proposal has also been designed limit its impact on the existing peripheral vegetation, the only noticeable areas of existing vegetation that would be lost would be through the construction of the site vehicular access and the pedestrian access to the adjacent WRTS facility.
- 4.15 In response to the potential for breeding birds and bats in the area, ecological mitigation measures including incorporating a bat friendly lighting strategy and a precautionary approach in respect to breeding birds are part of the proposals as identified in the [Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey \(September 2016\)](#).
- 4.16 Parking for the WRTS vehicles would be to the south. Vehicle access to and from the application site would be via a new high standard metalled road in connection with the adjacent WRTS facility access road, close to its connection with Standard Way. This enables safe two-way access between the site and the adjacent WRTS facility without the need to access the public highway network.
- 4.17 The applicant proposes that the hours of operations are 04.30-22.00 hours Monday to Sunday, including recognised Bank Holidays.
- 4.18 The proposals would not generate a material level of additional traffic movements as they replace facilities already based at the adjacent WRTS facility. The fleet collection vehicles will leave the facility in the morning, they will then on average return to the WRTS site once during the day to tip and then tip at the WRTS at the end of the day. After the tip they will park up. Therefore there will be 80 movements from the proposed site.
- 4.19 The applicant proposes to abide by the same traffic restrictions as the adjacent WRTS (as detailed above in Section 3). The key predicted changes in operational waste collection fleet and associated staff / visitor traffic volumes as a consequence of the application scheme are as follows:
- Waste Collection Fleet Traffic: Small overall reduction in daytime HGV volumes associated with the future opportunity to carry out the maintenance of existing fleet vehicles on-site, rather than require a trip to the current workshop based in Southampton; and

- Car / Van Traffic: 6 additional car / light van arrival / departure movements associated with new staff relocated to the new vehicle maintenance workshop from the Southampton site.
- 4.20 The detailed calculation of the predicted HGV movements and evaluation of the local road network is provided in the [Transport Statement](#) provided with the planning application.
- 4.21 Screening under the [Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations \(2011\)](#) has been carried out on the proposed development as supplied. The development is Schedule 2 development and could be classified as within Category 11, (b) and 10 (b) and exceeds the size threshold. However, whilst being identified under the Regulations, it is not deemed an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development requiring an Environmental Statement as there will not be any significant environmental impacts as defined by the EIA Regulations 2011.

5. Development Plan

- 5.1. The following plans and associated policies are considered to be relevant to the proposal:

[National Planning Policy Framework \(2012\)](#) (NPPF)

- 5.2. The following paragraphs are relevant to this proposal:

- Paragraph 11 (Determination in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise);
- Paragraph 14 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development);
- Paragraph 30 (Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion);
- Paragraph 94 (Obligation on local planning authorities to take actions to mitigate climate change); and
- Paragraph 112 (Economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land)

[National Waste Planning Practice Guidance](#) (NWPPG) (last updated 15/04/2015)

- 5.3. The following paragraph is relevant to the proposal:

- Paragraph 050: (Planning and environmental regulation).

[Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) (HMWP)

- 5.4. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development);
- Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation);
- Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species);
- Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets);
- Policy 8 (Protection of soils);
- 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 25 (Sustainable waste management);
- Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure);
- Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development);
- Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management); and
- Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development).

Fareham Borough Local Plan - Part 1: The Adopted Core Strategy (2011)

(FBLPpt1)

5.5 The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- Policy CS6: (The Development Strategy); and
- Policy CS14: (Development Outside Settlements).

Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites & Policies (FBLPpt2)

5.6 The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- DSP9: (Economic Development Outside of the Defined Urban Settlement Boundaries).

6. Consultations

6.1. **County Councillor Latham:** Has no comment.

6.2. **County Councillor Matthews:** Has been notified of the proposal.

6.3. **Fareham Borough Council:** Has raised objection due to the site being located beyond the defined settlement boundary (Policy DSP9 and CS14) and resulting in landscape harm that is not outweighed by the merits of the proposal. As you are aware, the original proposal set out above was considered by the Planning Committee on 16 November 2016. Members resolved to raise objection to the application because the limited landscaping works proposed will not mitigate against the substantial visual harm caused by the changes to the site levels, the height and size of the proposed office/workshop building, and the extensive hard surfacing and associated parking of lorries and vehicles, on this elevated countryside site.

6.4. Having considered the revised landscape details it is not considered they overcome Members concerns. Members were quite clear at the meeting; they felt that the perimeter landscaping should reflect that of the adjacent site, including bunding.

6.5. In the event that Hampshire County Council was minded to grant planning permission, it is recommended that the suggested planning conditions included within Fareham Borough Council's response dated 16 November 2016 are imposed.

6.6. **Fareham Borough Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO):** Was notified.

- 6.7. **Natural England:** Has no objection.
- 6.8. **Environment Agency:** Has no objection subject to conditions to protect the aquifer and drinking water source.
- 6.9. **Local Highway Authority:** Has no objection subject to conditions. In the Highway Authority's previous response, information was requested on likely movements of HGVs and cars / vans and how any potential conflict between, for example, HGVs crossing the access road to enter the proposed site directly from Standard Way and HGVs leaving the WRTS travelling towards the junction with Standard way will be managed. It was also requested that the applicant demonstrate that the proposed access arrangements will not lead to queueing of HGVs on to the public highway as they give way to HGVs travelling along the current access road. The following information has been provided by the applicant:
- The fleet vehicles leave the current site between 04:30 – 05:00 in the morning and will leave at the same time at the proposed new facility;
 - The fleet vehicles will turn left out of the proposed facility to the end of the access road and join the public highway;
 - The proposed site would have suitable stop signs and signs to give way to oncoming vehicles on the access road;
 - The fleet will return 2-3 times during the day and tip at the existing WTS using the weighbridge. On the last tip of the day the fleet vehicles would exit the WTS and then turn left into the proposed logistics facility;
 - The fleet vehicles will not at any point during the day turn right into the new proposed logistics facility at the top of the access road. Ensuring there would be no conflict between vehicles nor queueing on the public highway as a result of the proposed development;
 - The only vehicles which would turn right into the proposed logistics facility during the day will be the staff cars and appropriate warning signs will be installed.

The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed movement of vehicles and signage arrangements will minimise the potential for conflict with the new arrangements.

Construction Traffic Management

As stated in the Highway Authority's previous response, detailed information has not been provided on the construction phase of the development and a Construction Traffic Management Plan should be provided prior to work starting.

Recommendation

From a review of the information contained in the application the Highway Authority satisfied that this proposal will not have a severe impact on the highway. I therefore raise no highways objections to this application subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to the submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan prior to the development commencing.

- 6.10. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** Has no objection.
- 6.11. **HCC Planning Policy:** Confirmed which policies are most relevant in the HMWP (2013).

- 6.12. **County Archaeologist:** Has no objection subject to condition.
- 6.13. **County Landscape:** Architect has no objection subject to landscape condition.
- 6.14. **HCC Public Health:** Was notified of the proposal.
- 6.15. **Defence Infrastructure Organisation:** Has no objection.

7. Representations

- 7.1. Hampshire County Council's [Statement of Community Involvement \(2014\)](#) (SCI) sets out the adopted procedure and publicity requirements associated with determining planning applications.
- 7.2. In complying with the requirements of the SCI, Hampshire County Council:
- Published a notice of the application in the [Hampshire Independent](#);
 - Placed notices of the application at the application site;
 - Consulted all statutory and non-statutory consultees in accordance with [The Town and Country Planning \(Development Management Procedure\) \(England\) Order 2015](#); and
 - Notified by letter all residential properties within 260 metres of the boundary of the site.
- 7.3. As of 7 February 2017, no representations to the proposal have been received.

8. Commentary

Policy context and principle of the development

- 8.1. The proposal is being considered by Hampshire County Council as the Waste Planning Authority because the development is regarded as waste infrastructure, extending the adjacent Waste Transfer site. The logistics depot would enable the WRTS to maximise the amount of waste that can be managed at the site (which is well below its consented capacity of 300,000 tonnes per year) and the volume of waste that can be diverted from landfill. Conditions to ensure that the site would be operated solely in conjunction with the adjacent WRTS are recommended in integral appendix B.
- 8.2. The site is identified as within an urban area and is located along the strategic road corridor as defined on the [Key Diagram](#) (see figure 6) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). On this basis, the proposal accords with Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the Plan as 'development to provide recycling, recovery and/ or treatment of waste will be supported in urban areas in south Hampshire, areas along the strategic road corridors and is of a scale compatible with the setting'.
- 8.3. Fareham Borough Council identify the site as outside the settlement boundary in the [Fareham Borough Local Plan - Part 1: The Adopted Core Strategy \(2011\)](#), and consider the site as countryside (Policy CS14)

However, for the purposes of this application, the site is not regarded as countryside as the policies of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) take precedent over the Borough Local Plan as a waste proposal is being considered. Therefore, Policies CS6 (The Development Strategy) and CS14 (Development Outside Settlements) are also not relevant to this development.

- 8.4. The adjacent site is safeguarded under Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) (safeguarded site FA64) as a Transfer Station for commercial and industrial waste, with recycling operations on site. The proposal would result in the co-location of synergistic land uses which would be complementary to the function of the existing waste activities. It is therefore concluded that the proposed site would not result in the introduction of any uses which may prejudice the existing neighbouring operations. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 26 (Safeguarding – waste infrastructure) of the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
- 8.5. Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that 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 [NPPF \(2012\)](#) (Paragraph 14 :Presumption in favour of sustainable development).

Demonstration of need and capacity for waste management/mineral resource

- 8.6. Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out the approach for the overarching sustainable waste management policy, setting out the long-term aim of enabling net self-sufficiency in waste movements and diversion of waste from landfill. It sets criteria by which all waste development are expected to meet, relating to the waste hierarchy, reducing waste to landfill, proximity to markets and maximising co-location opportunities. The policy clearly supports the co-location of activities with existing operations, where appropriate and 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 or prolong any unacceptable impacts associated with the existing development.
- 8.7. The policy also sets recycling and diversion from landfill targets for the management of non-hazardous waste arisings by 2020. This is particularly relevant to this proposal as it meets the requirements of the policy on all parts: a. encourage waste to be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy; b. reduce the amount of residual waste currently sent to landfill; c. be located near to the sources of waste, or markets for its use; and d. maximise opportunities to share infrastructure at appropriate existing mineral or waste.
- 8.8. Policy 2 (Climate change - mitigation and adaptation) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development to minimise their impact on the causes of climate change and where applicable reduce vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts of climate change. Paragraph 94 of the [NPPF](#)

(2012) places an obligation on local planning authorities to take actions to mitigate climate change in accordance with the objectives and provisions of the [Climate Change Act 2008](#). In addition, Paragraph 30 of the [NPPF \(2012\)](#) supports proposals that reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. This proposal would result in noticeable climate change benefits, as shown in a [Waste and Resources Tool for the Environment \(WRATE\) Assessment](#) of the proposal. This assessment modelled three scenarios to allow comparison of the climate change benefits associated with the current WRTS operations (Scenario 1), the development of the proposed logistics facility, with the associated uplift in performance at the WRTS facility (Scenario 2) and a logistics depot on an alternative site within Fareham (Scenario 3). The assessment clearly indicates that Scenario 2 performs better as there is a decrease in landfill and reduction in transport miles, giving a reduction of 6,400,000 tonnes *kgCO₂eq* greenhouse gases/21.5 million average car miles over the lifetime of the facility.

- 8.9. Targets for dealing with the arisings of non-hazardous, inert and hazardous wastes up to 2030, in line with the objectives of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) are set out in Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development). The policy sets out the minimum amounts of additional waste infrastructure capacity which is estimated to be required for non-hazardous recycling capacity, non-hazardous recovery capacity and non-hazardous landfill void. Policy 27 also sets out criteria where waste proposals which maintain and provide additional capacity for non-hazardous recycling and recovery will be supported. This proposal would meet the site location criteria of b 'extension to suitable sites' as the development is 'ancillary to the operation of the existing site and improve current operating standards'.
- 8.10. However, paragraph 6.180 of the Plan does stipulate that 'where new waste management development is proposed on an existing waste management site or adjacent to an existing site, it will be necessary to take into account the cumulative impacts of the development itself and the effects of several developments in the same locality'. There are no significant adverse impacts as a result of extending the existing waste site via the proposal.
- 8.11. Also, when considering impacts from the development, it is important to note that paragraph 6.181 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) clearly states that "proposals to extend existing waste sites will only be supported where there is a good past performance of the existing operations." There has not been a record of complaints associated with the existing WRTS site. As explained above, the proposed logistics facility development would not provide additional waste management capacity in its own right. However, its development would free operational space at the existing WRTS facility and provide the infrastructure for waste management operations which would facilitate an increase in the supply of secondary aggregates on the adjacent WRTS site. On this basis, the proposal would be in accordance with Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
- 8.12. In addition to the operational benefits already discussed, the proposal will remove the risk of conflict between operational vehicles and site operatives / visitors at the existing WRTS. Therefore the development would increase the

Health and Safety standards for employees, which is supported by Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Visual impact and landscape

- 8.13. Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires that waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape.
- 8.14. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) protects residents from significant adverse visual impact. In this case, whilst the site is located on pastoral land outside the settlement boundary, it is not considered as countryside in terms of policy. However, the proposal would be located on greenfield land and so the visual impact on the landscape and amenity needs to be considered in this context.
- 8.15. The exterior fabric of the site would remain mostly unchanged as the perimeter tree and hedge vegetation would be protected during the earthworks, with only very localised loss of vegetation to accommodate the proposed site entrance, and a pedestrian route to the neighbouring WRTS facility. With the proposed [landscaping scheme](#), the perimeter planting effectively screen and filter views of the existing and proposed developments at the site. The removal of these trees will not significantly alter the existing screening offered to the site. Therefore, the effects of the minimal tree and planting removal are not considered significant in respect of landscape fabric or character.
- 8.16. The local landscape is varied between urban and rural areas, and there is also a variation in landscape scale; which ranges from the more enclosed and intimate area south of the M27 and west of the A27, and the more open exposed area to the north and east of these two roads. The road corridors effectively divide the areas where urban and rural influences are more prevalent, and the proposed development would be located within a wide belt of extensive urban development.
- 8.17. The closest land uses include car parks, industrial buildings and a former military site. The proposed workshop building would be modest in scale when compared with other nearby structures. The changes within the site would be consistent with the existing neighbouring land uses and are not significantly greater in mass, height or scale. Therefore the proposed workshop/office building and new hardstanding are acceptable when considered in the local context and so do not have a significant adverse impact on the local landscape character.
- 8.18. [A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment](#) was submitted with the application, which showed that there are limited clear views of the proposed development. The places with the most likely view points of the site are considered to be the public footpath (Paradise Lane (505)) and north of the M27. However, the views obtained of the site are minimal and the changes proposed would only be marginally perceived, and so do not constitute a significant loss of visual amenity.

- 8.19. Whilst Fareham Borough Council has objected to the proposal, it is considered that due to the existing landscape and the size and scale of the proposed development, the impact of the redeveloped site and its activities on the landscape and visual amenity are limited and so are acceptable in accordance with Policies 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Paragraph 11 of the [NPPF \(2012\)](#). The Borough Council indicated that in the event that planning permission were to be granted that they would like to see conditions relating to external materials and hard surfacing materials and landscaping included in any permission. These are included in integral appendix B.

Soil Protection and land contamination

- 8.20. Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development to protect and, wherever possible, enhance soils. It also states that development should not result in the net loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and gives provisions for the protection of soils during construction. Paragraph 112 of the NPPF (2012) also indicates that the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land should be taken into account.
- 8.21. The Agricultural Land Classification (ACL) system classifies land into five grades, with Grade 3 subdivided into Subgrades 3a and 3b. The best and most versatile land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a.
- 8.22. It is noted that the current use of the land is horse paddock and the site is considered to be Grade 2 agricultural land based on the data available to the Waste Planning Authority. However, the applicant has submitted a [soil assessment](#) that shows the soil on site to be 3b. Due to the small scale of the development and the current use of the site, the loss of this agricultural land is not regarded as significant in line with Policy 8 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and paragraph 112 of the [NPPF \(2012\)](#), and is acceptable.
- 8.23. The Borough Council indicated that in the event that planning permission were to be granted that they would like to see a condition relating to the investigation of the site for contamination. However, the MPA do not consider this necessary as the site has not been developed and the neighbouring land is regulated under Environmental Permits.

Cultural and Archaeological Heritage

- 8.24. Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development to protect and, wherever possible, enhance Hampshire's historic environment and heritage assets (designated and non designated), including their settings unless it is demonstrated that the need for and benefits of the development decisively outweigh these interests.
- 8.25. A [Heritage Statement](#) was submitted with the application and considered the available archaeological evidence for the vicinity and concluded that there is an archaeological potential particularly relating to the early

prehistoric periods. The County Archaeologist reviewed this information and is satisfied that there will be no adverse impact subject to a condition to secure an archaeological survey where preparatory works are intended. This condition is included in integral appendix B.

- 8.26. In addition, the [Heritage Statement](#) took into account the setting of the Victorian fortified landscape, which includes the Grade II Listed Wallington Fort to the west and Military Road (undesignated) and forms the area beyond the southern boundary. It is considered that these heritage assets are not compromised by development as the development will be primarily shielded by the boundary screening and is similar in nature to the existing WRTS and other industrial units within the area. As there is minimum impact on the nearby listed buildings and the potential archaeology of the area will be adequately managed, the development is in accordance with Policy 7 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Ecology

- 8.27. Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out a requirement for minerals and waste development to not have a significant adverse effect on, and where possible, should enhance, restore or create designated or important habitats and species. The policy sets out a list of sites, habitats and species which will be protected in accordance with the level of their relative importance. The policy states that development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon the identified sites, habitats and species will only be permitted where it is judged that the merits of the development outweigh any likely environmental damage. The policy also sets out a requirement for appropriate mitigation and compensation measures where development would cause harm to biodiversity interests.
- 8.28. The impact of the proposal has been considered by Natural England as the statutory consultee. Information was prepared by the applicant on the designations and potential protected species as submitted within the [Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey \(September 2016\)](#). Following receipt of this information, Natural England advised that the proposal, if undertaken in strict accordance with the details submitted, is not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which Portsmouth Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar have been classified and an Appropriate Assessment to assess the implications of this proposal on the site's conservation objectives under the [Habitat Regulations \(Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 \(as amended\)\)](#) is not required. In addition, Natural England is satisfied that the proposed development being carried out in strict accordance with the details of the application, as submitted, will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the Portsmouth Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified.
- 8.29. With regards protected species, the [Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey \(September 2016\)](#) recommends that measures will be in place to retain and enhance bat foraging and commuting routes post development

and protect breeding birds. Thereby minimising any adverse impacts on these protected species groups.

- 8.30. It is recommended that any permission granted includes conditions relating to the protection of breeding birds, bats and ecological enhancements i.e. reptiles, dormice and lighting. These recommended conditions have been included in Integral Appendix B.
- 8.31. In light of the information supplied and the responses from consultees, it is concluded that the proposal will not harm any protected species or designated areas of ecology value and so is in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Impact on amenity and health

- 8.32. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires that any development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. Also, any proposal should not cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between waste developments and other forms of development.
- 8.33. The development will be essentially a logistics centre with offices, parking and a lorry workshop and is not dealing with any waste or generating emissions by way of heavy industrial activities. The only increase in emissions will be from the 6 more staff vehicles that will be parked at the site that used to be based in Southampton. This level of vehicle emissions is not significant in terms of air quality. There are no sensitive neighbours nearby and in light of the type of activities there are no concerns raised over adverse impacts to local amenity and health by way of noise, air quality, dust, odour, vibration or pollution.
- 8.34. The Borough Council indicated that in the event that planning permission was to be granted, that they would like to see conditions relating to the control of noise included in any permission. These have not been recommended as the MPA consider that these are not necessary or reasonable as the site is situated within a mixed use area and the noise generated from the site is not above that associated with industrial uses which are located closer to the housing areas than this proposed site. However, a condition relating to reversing beepers associated with on site vehicles is included in integral appendix B as these are commonly a source of complaint for noise disturbance. In light of the nature of the proposal, it is concluded that the proposal is in accordance with Policy 10 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Flood risk and Potential pollution to the water environment

- 8.35. Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) relates to minerals and waste development in flood risk areas and sets criteria which developments should be consistent with relating to flood risk offsite, flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures, design of drainage, net surface water run-off and Sustainable Drainage Systems.

- 8.36. According to the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) the site is located in Flood Zone 1. This is categorised as a low probability of flooding (Land having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding). A flood risk assessment is required when a development is over 1ha, and this was supplied with the application ([section 9 of the planning statement](#)). The [drainage strategy](#) has been prepared based upon calculations that make allowance for increased rainfall intensities over the lifetime of the development. The assessment concluded that surface water run-off can be suitably mitigated and would not increase flood risk either on the site or within the wider hydrological catchment. The Lead Local Flood Agency found that the proposals for surface water drainage meet the current standards/best practice in relation to surface water drainage and so the proposal is in accordance with Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
- 8.37. In addition, a [Hydrogeological Risk Assessment](#) (HRA) was supplied by the applicant as the site is located on the Portsdown Chalk, a Principal Aquifer, within a Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) for the Maindell Public Water Supply Borehole. This HRA considered the SPZ1 and the associated risks of developing and operating the site in close proximity to the local public water source. Portsmouth Water and the EA have reviewed this document and are satisfied that the development will provide adequate impermeable surfacing and precautionary measures to maintain an effective barrier to the vertical passage of potential contamination and protect the water supply. The Environment Agency (EA) has recommended conditions to this affect and these should be applied if permission is granted.
- 8.38. Paragraph 050 of the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) states that Planning Authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively rather than seek to control any processes, health and safety issues or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under other regimes. Planning and permitting are two separate systems. The Environment Agency have a role to play in both. The need for an Environmental Permit is separate to the need for planning permission. The granting of planning permission does not necessarily lead to the granting of an Environmental Permit. Planning and permitting decisions are separate but closely linked. Planning permission determines if a development is an acceptable use of the land. Permitting determines if an operation can be managed on an ongoing basis to prevent or minimise pollution.
- 8.39. Taking into account the above and the proposed mitigation measures it is concluded that the proposal is in accordance with the Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Highways impact

- 8.40. Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development to 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. It also requires highway improvements to mitigate any significant adverse effects on

highway safety, pedestrian safety, highway capacity and environment and amenity.

- 8.41. A [Transport Statement](#) provided summarised the current access and existing traffic conditions as a baseline for assessing the proposed vehicle access arrangements. The site is located in close proximity to the [strategic highway network](#) and HGVs have direct access to the Industrial Estate roads and the M27. As the primary function of the proposal is to replace facilities already on the adjacent site, the highway impacts of the scheme are expected to be negligible. A condition to ensure that the sites are linked is recommended in Integral Appendix B (Condition 17). In addition, it is considered that the co-location of the workshop would confer significant sustainability benefits in terms of reducing transport movements associated with visiting the workshop in Southampton for repairs and maintenance.
- 8.42. The Highways Authority has no objection to the proposal based on the projected traffic figures and a Construction Environmental Management Plan condition to ensure that the site is developed with minimal disruption to the local highway network. This condition is proposed in integral appendix B. The Borough Council also indicated that in the event that planning permission were to be granted, they would like to see conditions relating to vehicle routing and highway safety. In agreement a condition for the vehicle routing has been recommended (integral appendix B) using same approach as that permitted for the WRTS but the Highways Authority are satisfied that the new access is safe and so no further measures are required on this particular point.
- 8.43. Taking the above into account the development is considered to be in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

9. Summary

- 9.1 Whilst Fareham Borough Council does not consider that the proposal complies with [Fareham Borough Local Plan - Part 1: The Adopted Core Strategy \(2011\)](#) (Policy CS6 (The Development Strategy) and Policy CS14: (Development Outside Settlements) and the [Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites](#) (Policies DSP9: (Economic Development Outside of the Defined Urban Settlement Boundaries)), it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the adopted [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) as the site is in an acceptable location and is an extension to an operational waste site (Policy 29). The development of the logistics facility and the consequential improvements in the performance of the adjacent WRTS facility would result in significant benefits in terms of the sustainable management of waste (Policies 1 & 25), waste capacity targets (Policies 27 & 30) for recycled aggregate and a reduction in greenhouse gases to minimise the impact on the causes of climate change which would outweigh the minimal visual impact. There is limited visual impact but this is not considered significant due to the surrounding land use, neighbouring industrial features and natural screening

in place (Policies 10 and 13). The proposal will not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts as the odour, noise and emission levels will be acceptable (Policy 10). The nature of the development would not give rise to an adverse impact on the protected species or local ecological designations (Policy 3). The proposal is acceptable in highway terms as there will be no increase in traffic (Policy 12) and there is no significant flood risk or surface water increase as a result of the proposal (Policy 11). The loss of the agricultural land is acceptable as it is not significant (Policy 8).

10. Recommendation

10.1 That planning permission shall be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in integral Appendix B.

Appendices:

Integral Appendix A – Corporate or Legal Information

Integral Appendix B – Conditions

Appendix C – Location Plan

Appendix D – Proposed Site Plan (WE04116-C-101 Rev C)

Appendix E - Proposed Office and Workshop Elevations and Typical Section (WE04116-C-108)

Appendix F - Landscape Design (1822-01-01RevA)

Other documents relating to this application:

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=17580>

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):	
OR	
This proposal does not link to the Corporate Strategy but, nevertheless, requires a decision because: The proposal does not link to the Corporate Strategy but, nevertheless, requires a decision because the proposal is an application for planning permission and requires determination by the County Council in its statutory role as the minerals and waste planning authority.	

Other Significant Links**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.)

DocumentLocation

P/16/1047/CC

Hampshire County Council

FA083

Land South to Fareham Waste Transfer Station, Enterprise Park, Military Road, Fareham

Proposed development of a logistics depot comprising a workshop/office building, driver welfare building, hardstanding for vehicle parking, soft landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

CONDITIONS

Time Limits

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

Ancillary development

2. The development hereby permitted shall be used only as a logistics facility associated with and ancillary to the use of the adjacent Wallington Waste and Recycling Transfer Station as granted by planning permission P/14/1095/CC or any subsequent variations (as shown on plan 111 Rev D).

Reason: To ensure that the development is providing a sustainable waste management benefit which outweighs the potential visual amenity impacts associated with the development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and with Policies 10 (Protection of public health, safety and amenity), 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments), 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 27 (Capacity for sustainable waste management development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Hours of Working

3. No heavy goods vehicles (vehicles over 3.5 tonnes gross weight) shall enter or leave the site and no plant or machinery shall be operated except between the following hours: 04.30 - 22.00 Monday to Sundays, including recognised Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

Layout

4. The site (as outlined in red on plan no 111Rev C) shall be set out and maintained for the duration of the permission in accordance plan no 101 Rev C.

Reason: In the interests of the efficient operation of the site and in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

5. Skips, and containers, on the site shall not exceed a height in excess of 3 metres above site ground level at the point where the said containers/skips are permitted to be stored.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) and because the base of the site slopes upwards towards the pushwalls.

Types of Waste

6. There shall be no storage, handling, processing or recycling of wastes on the site.

Reason: In the interests of pollution prevention and local amenity in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Access

7. The site access shall be set out, constructed and maintained (including visibility splays, soft and hard landscaping, vertical and horizontal alignment and drainage) in accordance with plan 1822-01-01 Rev A for the duration of the development.

Reason: To ensure the access is constructed with due regard to highway safety and the local environment in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Lighting

8. All external floodlighting and other illumination shall be located and operated at the site in accordance with the lighting scheme (plan no. 101 Rev C) and the recommended lighting strategy for bats as stipulated in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey (September 2016), paragraph 5.18 and maintained for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity), 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

Noise

9. All reversing beepers shall be fitted with low tonal white noise type alarms.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Water Protection

10. No development shall commence until a scheme to manage the pollution risks associated with the installation and operations of the proposed fuel storage tank have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Waste Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a:
 1. Design and Method Statement for installation of the above ground fuel tank and fuel lines
 2. Design and Method Statement for decommissioning of above ground storage tanks
 3. Maintenance and management plan for the above ground fuel tank and fuel lines. This plan should include the following requirements:
 - Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals on the application site shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls
 - The volume of the bunded compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%.
 - If there is multiple tankage, the compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, or the combined capacity of interconnected tanks, plus 25%.
 - All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses must be located within the bund.
 - The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata.
 - Associated pipework shall be located above ground and protected from accidental damage.
 - All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets shall be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund.
 - All fuel lines must be double skin with interstitial monitoring
 - The condition of both primary and secondary containment barriers shall be constantly monitored for leaks using a Class 1 leak detection system.
 - Appropriate measures to avoid accidental losses through theft (including consideration of the location of the tank and security arrangements).

Details must be submitted to and approved, by the local planning authority, prior to installation for comment and approval. Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: The site lies on the Portsdown Chalk Formation, which is classified as a principal aquifer and is located in a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 for a public water supply. Adequate details need to be provided to ensure that the proposed above ground fuel storage tank is installed and maintained so that it does not pose a risk to groundwater and to prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

11. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Waste Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the Waste Planning Authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination identified during the construction works is fully characterised and assessed and to prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

12. No infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Waste Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: and to prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

13. No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The CEMP shall cover all construction and demolition work (including the breaking up and removal of any hard surfacing) on the application site and comprise the following:

- Detailed demolition and construction design;
- Any phases of development;
- Management of pollution during construction;
- Surface water control measures to minimise groundwater pollution;
- the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- Construction Quality Assurance Plans and Reports (CQA) to British Standards for the design, installation and operation of the above ground tank, site surface and drainage system;
- Details of any remediation works of existing infrastructure to prevent pollution to groundwater.

The CEMP shall be strictly adhered to throughout the duration of the construction period.

Reason: To protect the principal aquifer groundwater Source Protection

Zones 1 and prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

14. The management and disposal of surface water shall be carried out in accordance with the approved surface water management scheme (CL(19)01 Rev P3) for the duration of the development.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

15. The fuel tank from the adjacent Waste Transfer Station (located to the west of the site) shall be removed. There shall be no fuel tanks within the whole waste and logistics site (land ownership shown in plan 111 Rev D) other than the approved fuel tank as shown on drawing 101 Rev C.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Nature Conservation

16. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented and proceed in accordance with the measures for protection of breeding birds and bats as stipulated in the paragraphs 5.13 to 5.26 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Survey (September 2016), and maintained for the duration of the development.

Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, the local authority's duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and in the interests of nature conservation in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

17. Within three months of the date of this permission, a detailed scheme of biodiversity enhancements to be incorporated into the development (including features such as bird and bat boxes, tree protection, enhancement planting, species rich grassland), shall be submitted for written approval to the Waste Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with any such approved details and be maintained for the duration of the development.

Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, the local authority's duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and in the interests of

nature conservation in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

Landscaping

18. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall specify the types, size and species of all trees and shrubs to be planted; details of all trees to be retained; and details of fencing/enclosure of the site, phasing and timescales for carrying out the works, and provision for future maintenance. 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: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

19. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the external materials and hard surfacing shall be submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority in writing. The details shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Historic Environment

20. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological evaluation in accordance with a written specification that has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

21. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with a written specification that has been submitted to and approved by the Mineral/Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

22. Following completion of archaeological fieldwork a report will be produced in accordance with an approved programme including where appropriate post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

Lorry Routing

23. The site access as shown on plan no. 107 Rev C (meaning the junction of the internal access road of the site with Standard Way and the internal access road itself) shall be used to receive heavy good vehicles (defined as vehicles over 3.5 tonne un-laden) entering from Standard Way only and shall not be used to admit such vehicles entering from Pinks Hill. The site access shall only be used to permit egress of heavy good vehicles towards Pinks Hill. The site access shall only be used to permit egress of HGV's towards Pinks Hill between the hours of 0800 and 0600 Monday to Friday and from 0900 to 12.30pm on Saturdays and at all other times heavy good vehicles egress is only permitted to Standard Way.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Sustainable waste management location

24. The development hereby permitted shall be used only as a logistics facility associated with and ancillary to the use of the adjacent Wallington Waste and Recycling Transfer Station as granted by planning permission P/14/1095/CC or any subsequent variations (as shown on plan 111 Rev D).

Reason: To ensure that the development is providing a sustainable waste management benefit which outweighs the potential visual amenity impacts associated with the development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and with Policies 10 (Protection of public health, safety and amenity), 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments), 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 27 (Capacity for sustainable waste management development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

25. At such time as the development is no longer used for the purpose hereby permitted (a logistics facility serving the adjacent Wallington

Waste and Recycling Transfer Station), the facility including the buildings and associated plant, infrastructure, hardstanding shall be removed from the site and the land restored back to agricultural use. The restoration details for the site shall be submitted within three months of the cessation of use for written approval by the Waste Planning Authority. The restoration shall be completed in accordance with the approved details within six months of approval.

Reason: To prevent the retention of a development that is no longer providing a sustainable waste management benefit and the development not outweighing the potential visual amenity impacts associated with the development in accordance National Planning Policy Framework and with Policies 10 (Protection of public health, safety and amenity), 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments), 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 27 (Capacity for sustainable waste management development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Plans

26. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: **WE04116-C-100 Rev A, WE04116-C-101 Rev C, WE04116-C-103 Rev A, WE04116-C-104 Rev A, WE04116-C-105 Rev A, WE04116-C-106 Rev A, WE04116-C-108 Rev A, WE04116-C-109 Rev A, WE04116-C-110 Rev B, WE04116-C-111 Rev D, WE04116-C-112 Rev A, CL(19)01 Rev P3, WE04116-C-107 Rev A, 1822-01-01 RevA**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Note to Applicants

1. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior agreement of the Environment Agency is required for discharging dewatering water from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse.
2. The site lies within groundwater protection Zone 1 for the Maindell Public Water supply. Potable supplies are therefore at risk from activities at the site and all precautions should be taken to avoid discharges and spillages to the ground both during construction and subsequent operation.
3. In determining this planning application, the Waste Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. Consultee responses were provided to the applicant in a timely manner to ensure there were given the ability to respond to any concerns raised. This approach has been taken positively and proactively in accordance with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012.

4. This decision does not purport or convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or any other Acts, including Byelaws, orders or Regulations made under such acts