

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Decision Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Regulatory Committee
<b>Date:</b>	16 March 2016
<b>Title:</b>	Asphalt Plant with Site Access, Offices, Weighbridge, Storage Bays and Relocation of Mobile HBM Plant at Micheldever Highways Depot, Stockbridge Road, Micheldever Station, SO21 3AP. (Application No. 15/02619/HCS) (Site ref: WRG007 (part of safeguarded site WR197))
<b>Reference:</b>	7391
<b>Report From:</b>	Head of Strategic Planning

**Contact name:** Katherine Snell

**Tel:** 01962 845938

**Email:** [katherine.snell@hants.gov.uk](mailto:katherine.snell@hants.gov.uk)

#### 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The proposal is for an asphalt plant with site access, offices, weighbridge, storage bays and relocation of mobile Hydraulically Bound Material (HBM) plant at Micheldever Highways Depot, Stockbridge Road, Micheldever Station.
- 1.2. This application was considered at the meeting of the Regulatory Committee held on 10 February 2016. The Committee resolved to defer the application to allow for a members' site visit to a similar operating asphalt plant. This report is an updated version of the report presented to the meeting on 10 February. The recommendation contains an additional condition requiring the submission of a traffic management plan (condition 4).
- 1.3. On 29 February 2016, members of the Committee visited Linhay Quarry, located in Devon, to observe an operating asphalt plant which involved a similar process to the one proposed in the application. Details of the similarities and differences between the two plants were provided to those attending to inform this visit.
- 1.4. The planning application is regarded as a consolidation of the existing uses and the location of proposed new plant. The primary focus of the application is the re-introduction of an asphalt plant (applied for by Hampshire County Council (HCC) under Regulation 3 provisions). The relocation of the HBM plant (waste activity) and offices is a secondary issue as the principle of the location of the HBM plant and ancillary infrastructure has already been established as acceptable on this site through previous planning permissions

granted at the site. The asphalt proposal represents a use consistent with the surrounding development due to the existing operations and structures on site. It would result in the co-location of sympathetic land uses which complement the existing highway activities, and as such would constitute sustainable development. Information supplied by the applicant has been thoroughly assessed by the statutory consultees and there are no harmful impacts associated with the proposed processes. The site has direct links to the nearby A303, providing access to the strategic road network. The site does not have any immediate sensitive neighbours.

- 1.5. Concerns over traffic, odour, noise, lighting and pollution, potential health impacts on local residents and the environment have been raised as the main issues by the local Member of Parliament, County Councillor, Parish Council and the local residents.
- 1.6. A members' site visit to the application site took place on 4 January 2016 in advance of consideration by the Regulatory Committee.
- 1.7. It is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). Whilst technically in the countryside (Policy 5), the development sits within an existing highways site and recycled road surface facility (Policies 25, 27, 29 & 30), contributes to meeting Hampshire's demand for aggregates (Policy 17) and shares synergies of land use and so offers sustainable development (Policy 1). The proposal is not considered to be visually intrusive due to the existing structures and natural screening in place (Policy 13). The proposal will not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts as the odour, noise and emission levels will be acceptable (Policy 10) and mitigated where necessary through Environmental Permitting. 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 (Policy 12) and there is no significant flood risk or surface water increase as a result of the proposal (Policy 11). Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the conditions listed in Integral Appendix B.

## **2. The site**

- 2.1. The proposed development is based 4.5 kilometres (km) north of Micheldever, 540 metres (m) north of Micheldever Station, 9 km south west of Basingstoke and 15km east of Andover. The application site occupies an area of 1.1 hectares and is an existing Hampshire County Council (Micheldever) Highway depot. The proposed new plant sits within the site, some 140m from each end of the site, in a central position. The trees along the southern perimeter of the site (immediately south of the Proposed Development) have crown heights of between 15m and 20m above ground level.
- 2.2. The Micheldever Spoil Heaps Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Micheldever Oil Terminal Site for Importance of Nature Conservation (SINC) are both located within 100m of the site, to the north and east respectively.

Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, notably for arable plants, are located 90m north of the site and extending beyond.

- 2.3. The site is accessed from Stockbridge Road which links Overton Road and Sutton Scotney and forms the westbound on-slip to the A303. There are two access points onto the site. The easterly entrance gives access to Hampshire Transport Maintenance (HTM) Vehicle Maintenance Depot and the Highways Maintenance Depot. The westerly entrance provides access to the Hampshire County Council Highways Laboratory.
- 2.4. The distances to the nearest residential properties will depend on which part of the site boundary/ plant is used as the reference point. As such, to provide consistent measurements, the table below has been prepared based on distinct points within the development, namely the:
- application Boundary;
  - proposed Asphalt Plant Stack; and the
  - centre of the relocated mobile HBM area.
- 2.5. Each measurement is taken to the nearest edge of the residential building as illustrated on the Ordnance Survey (OS) 1:10,000 mapping for the area.

	<b>Application Boundary /m</b>	<b>Asphalt Plant Stack/m</b>	<b>Mobile HBM Plant/m</b>
Coxford Farm	185	335	250
The Bungalow	220	370	290
The Boundary	435	570	500
Western Farm	375	445	435
Traveller's Rest	710	740	780
Brunel Close	545	590	650

- 2.6. The nearest residential property to the site is approximately 200m distant at Coxford Farmhouse. Around 40m to the north of Coxford Farmhouse is The Bungalow. Approximately 40m north of these two houses are The Grain Store (a granary) and Scats Countrystore. There are also existing scrap metal uses adjacent to the Grain Store. All of these properties are separated from the application site by the A303.
- 2.7. Western Farm House is approximately 400m to the south east and the nearest boundary of a house within Brunel Close is approximately 540m to the south.
- 2.8. Travellers Rest is approximately 730m to the south east and is a bungalow in a parcel of arable land. Over recent years this field, and other land near the site, between The Boundary and The Bungalow/Coxford Farm to the north of the A303 and on highway verges, have been used by the Travelling and Gypsy community. There are currently no designated sites for this purpose provided by Hampshire County Council in this area.

- 2.9. A Public Right of Way (PROW) footpath (Micheldever footpath 23 (FP23)) runs parallel to the site, starting at the north of the site, running down to the housing at Micheldever Station. The definitive route of FP 23 illustrated on the County Council mapping site confirms that the footpath does not extend as far as Stockbridge Road and as such is effectively a dead end. It is understood from public consultation responses that this PROW is used by dog walkers from Micheldever Station who do a circuit of the field, albeit the majority of the circuit is not on the PROW.
- 2.10. The main rail line between Basingstoke and Southampton also runs in a north/south direction and is approximately 35m from this footpath and the highway depot site.
- 2.11. The existing site contains a laboratory services building, vehicle maintenance workshop, salt barn and site offices. The present activities include crushing and screening of recycled road planings and other recyclable material to aid the production of HBM, cement bound material (CBM) and other recyclable products. The storage of salt, as well as highways maintenance vehicles and gritting operations are housed on site. The existing salt barn is 12.8m high and the mobile Rapidmix plant is 13m high when fully erected.
- 2.12. Hampshire County Council currently contracts out highway maintenance operations to Amey LG. This contract runs until 2017. The County Council will continue to contract out these services to private sector partners in the future through long term contracts.

### **3. Planning History**

- 3.1. Copies of drawings held by Hampshire County Council Records Office, dating back to 1950, show the presence of an asphalt plant on the site. The Ordnance Survey (OS) map for 1961 indicates that numerous buildings were present on the site. The 1974 OS map also indicates the presence of an asphalt plant. The asphalt plant and other depot developments are also illustrated on the OS maps for 1990 and 1994. The approved planning drawings for planning consent 04/01855/HCS are stamped 2004 and these indicate an existing asphalt plant on the site in the same location as that illustrated in 1974. As such an asphalt plant was present and operational at the site for at least 50 years. The relevant drawings, OS maps and 2004 approved planning drawing for planning consent 04/01855/HCS were provided in the planning application (Appendix A). According to County Council records the previous asphalt plant ceased operations in April 2005 when it was decommissioned and removed from the site.
- 3.2. It is noted that there are two site references for this location. This is an administration function, as the submission of planning application 04/01835/HCM for the mobile plant was applied for by a private operator, and not Hampshire County Council as the other applications had been. Therefore, an alternative site reference was given.

## 3.3. The planning history of the site is as follows:

<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Site no.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date issued</b>
14/00205/HCS	WRG007	Highways laboratory	Re-cladding and extension of the existing workshop with associated mechanical and electrical works	March 2014
10/00869/HCS	WRG007	Highways laboratory	Proposed new agricultural type barn to hold approximately 6000t of rock salt for winter service operations	July 2010
04/03140/HCS	WRG007	Highways laboratory	Erect three stainless steel flues on roof	Jan 2005
04/01835/HCM	WR197	Depot	Installation & operation of mobile foamix & stabilisation plant with crushing facility when required for more that 28 days per calendar year	August 2004
04/00966/HCS	WRG007	Coating plant	Renewal of temporary permission for temporary	May 2004

			offices with associated car parking	
0101405HCS W02114/04	WRG007	Coating plant	Renewal of temporary permission for temporary offices with associated car parking	June 2001

3.4 The site is identified in the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) as a safeguarded site for the production of coated roadstone.

#### 4. The Proposal

4.1. The proposal is for an asphalt plant with site access, offices, weighbridge and storage bays. The proposal also includes the relocation of the mobile HBM plant from the northern end of the site to the southern end.

4.2. The main focus of the proposal is for the re-establishment of asphalt production at the site, which is anticipated to produce 79,000 tonnes of asphalt per annum. The proposed asphalt plant would service all of Hampshire.

4.3. The Planning Statement Addendum (submitted 14 December 2015) provides a breakdown of Hampshire County Council historic asphalt requirements and this is replicated below.

Year	Planned surfacing (tonnes)	Routine and planned footway works (tonnes)	Total tonnage (tonnes)
15/16	48,000	29,661	77,661
14/15	75,000	71,501	146,501
13/14	77,000	80,584	157,584
12/13	77,000	64,924	141,924
11/12	77,000	51,726	128,726

4.4. The market and demand for bituminous products has soared over recent years. Nationally over the next 5-10 years it is expected that the demand for supplies will increase further due to the multi-billion pound investment in the national road infrastructure. This plant would provide Hampshire County Council with the ability to produce asphalt on demand to service roads across Hampshire and significant resilience for the future. This will be achieved by jointly developing the site with its existing term highways contractor to produce material for the current term highway maintenance contract. The applicant states that 200 linear meters of new dual carriageway (full construction) accounts for approximately 2,000T of asphalt. Therefore 79,000 tonnes would be the equivalent of circa 7.9Km of new dual carriageway. In

respect of resurfacing of single carriageway roads (7.3m wide and 40mm depth of surfacing) 79,000 tonnes would be the equivalent of circa 115km of resurfacing.

4.5. Permanent consent is being sought so that the County Council's current and future highway maintenance contract service providers are able to continue asphalt and HBM/CBM production as well as other recycling operations.

4.6. The asphalt plant would comprise of:

- Five Cold Feed Hopper Bins at c.3.9m high;
- A dryer Drum at c.4.5 high and c.13.5m long;
- A Bag House at c.13.8m high and c.9.9m long;
- A Filler Silo at c.13m high;
- Asphalt Plant Tower at c.16.5m high;
- Recycling Bin, Recycling Elevator and Recycling Tower;
- Two 60m<sup>3</sup> Bitumen Tanks at c.2.9m in diameter and c.13.3m long;
- Hot Oil Heater at c.2.7m (high powered by a 200kVa generator);
- 45m<sup>3</sup> Fuel Tank (for the Dryer Drum), c.2.9m in diameter and 10.6m long;
- 3000 litre Fuel Tank;
- Control Cabin; and
- Compressor Containers.

4.7. The proposed asphalt plant will be fully mobile and could be installed and decommissioned within two weeks.

4.8. Existing retaining walls forming storage bays would be removed and new retaining walls would be constructed (as illustrated in planning drawing 1744-01-04 RevF).

4.9. It is anticipated that circa 68,000 tonnes of aggregate would be required for the annual production of 79,000 tonnes of asphalt. It is anticipated that circa 5000 tonnes of bitumen would be required. Approximately 869,000 litres of fuel oil would be required to power the Hot Oil Heater.

4.10. Dust and exhaust emissions generated from the dryer drum are removed to the Bag House which would limit emissions into air. The Bag House is connected to the Filler Silo and the dust would be transferred to be re-used in the asphalt production process as filler material.

4.11. In addition to the Asphalt Plant the following proposed developments are included in the application:

- use of Salt Barn for alternative storage;
- covered storage bays;
- new highway access to the HTM Depot and Highways Depot from Stockbridge Road;
- minor modifications to the existing site entrance;
- replacement site offices and welfare facilities;

- hardstanding and surface drainage;
  - weighbridge; and the
  - re-location of the substation and existing HBM/CBM and Crushing/Screening Plant and inclusion of additional mobile HBM plant.
- 4.12. The current consent for the salt barn expressly referenced that the barn was for the storage of salt only. Due to a recent permission and subsequent construction of a new salt storage facility at Hampshire County Council's Broadmarsh Depot, near Havant, the Micheldever salt storage facility is no longer required from a strategic perspective as part of the Hampshire Winter Maintenance Service. Consequently, the salt within the barn has not been used for a number of years and because of the current planning restriction the building has not been used for any other highways maintenance function. This new proposal seeks to expand the permitted uses of the barn to include the storage of aggregates for the asphalt plant and any other highways maintenance materials (such as manholes, kerbs, pipes etc), plant or equipment that may be necessary to ensure the effective maintenance of Hampshire's roads. Examples of other storage uses could be the preparation and storage of sand bags for flood response emergency works.
- 4.13. The applicant proposes that all operations may occur over a twenty four hour period, seven days a week. The asphalt plant will need to operate at any point subject to demand i.e. emergency repairs following poor weather. In terms of crushing and screening, this activity is connected to the existing HBM operations to crush road planings and would predominantly take place during day time hours.
- 4.14. Existing travel flows from the site are mainly split between traffic movements north east bound and south-west bound. HBM traffic is already part of the existing baseline under previous consents and the proposed associated mobile plant does not add any additional traffic. The majority of HCVs will access and leave the site via the A303. The Procurement Team and Batch Manager will ensure suppliers and those collecting materials are made aware that all deliveries (unless in exceptional circumstances) will need to use the A303 (as seen Operational Traffic Management Plan). Hampshire County Council and its highways maintenance contractor operate a non-compliance system in respect of instructions to delivery drivers and all non-compliance is reviewed weekly. Offenders driving through Micheldever and Micheldever Station without approval will be treated as being in breach of County Council instructions. Hampshire County Council, through its highways maintenance contractor, will ensure future compliance or remove the offending driver from operating out of the depot. The County Council is confident that it can enforce this requirement and will carry out audits to check compliance. Occasionally HCVs will need to travel through Micheldever/ Micheldever Station to provide surfacing / HBM for the immediate roads around and within these settlements.
- 4.15. The development will increase the number of traffic movements at the site as a result of deliveries of aggregate, filler, bitumen and fuels as well as the export of asphalt. On average days there would be around 50 vehicle movements per day (25 in and 25 out). Of these 50 movements, the average

number of Heavy Commercial Vehicle (HCV) movements is 44 (22 HCVs in and 22 HCVs out) and will be associated with asphalt plant material delivery and export. The other 6 movements will be associated with asphalt plant staff vehicles. The average figure of 44 HCV movements is based on the predicted average across the year. On a daily basis, the actual number of HCVs will vary above and below this figure. As a consequence the applicant considered a worst case scenario for the predicted maximum daily HCV movements. The detailed calculation of the predicted HCV movements is provided in Appendix C of the Transport Statement provided with the planning application and this is based on the typical operating scenarios provided in paragraph 4.11 of the associated planning statement. This calculates the likely maximum number of HCV movements as 124. However, the assessment rounds this up to 126 movements (63 vehicles in, 63 out). On peak times there would be 132 two way vehicle movements (66 vehicles in, 66 out), of which 126 would be HCV movements.

- 4.16. The applicant predicts that on the busiest day the asphalt plant would produce approximately 700 tonnes of asphalt. However, this level of production is only anticipated to occur on approximately 20 days of the year due to planned maintenance. The busiest days are likely to occur in the summer months to make best use of longer daylight hours, weekends and holiday periods. This work is planned to minimise the disruption to the public and schools etc.
- 4.17. The relocation of gritting operations and some highways maintenance operations to other highway depots would reduce the existing vehicle numbers by approximately 16 HCV movements (8 in, 8 out).
- 4.18. The sizes of vehicles are set out in the applicant's supporting information (Appendix C of the Transport Statement) and are summarised as follows:

Import of asphalt materials /supplies:

- Bitumen: 30 Tonne tankers;
- Aggregate: 30 Tonne Articulated Vehicles;
- Filler: 30 Tonne Articulated Vehicles; and
- Export of Asphalt: 16 Tonnes Insulated HCVs.

- 4.19. The proposed layout provides holding areas for a minimum of 14 asphalt HCV delivery vehicles within the site, which is in excess of the number required to service the predicted hourly maximum production. As such there would be no queuing of HCVs on the public highway. In addition, it is expected that new entrance gates to the site would be opened in advance of the commencement of asphalt production, and vehicles would be able to gain direct access into the depot without any backing up of traffic on to the public highway. To facilitate this new access, the submitted Arboricultural Survey confirms that three immature trees would need to be removed; one Sycamore and two Ash.

In addition, the report recommends the felling of a further two trees due to their poor condition.

- 4.20. There are adequate parking areas provided for the continued use of the relocated HBM facility, and the parking spaces associated with the asphalt plant and weighbridge offices. In total there would be 10 dedicated car parking spaces to cover normal requirements, six of these are directly associated with the proposed weighbridge offices. With the redeployment of winter gritting operations and relocation of some highways maintenance staff to other depots, not all the previous parking spaces would be required. The site also retains flexibility to accommodate additional parking when needed to be used for emergency works, such as the preparation of sand bags for flood protection.
- 4.21. The proposed new entrance would be used for incoming and outgoing vehicles from the Highways Transport Maintenance Depot, where there is no need for vehicles to use the proposed weighbridge. The proposed new fencing and new gates will allow the Highways Transport Maintenance depot to operate independently when the Highways depot is closed and vice versa. Deliveries of material which requires weighing would use the new entrance and vehicles would exit via the existing entrance.
- 4.22. The existing exit would remain two ways to enable bitumen tankers, fuel oil tankers and any other vehicles that do not need to use the weighbridge to access the site.
- 4.23. The proposed development has been assessed under Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011; 10(a) - Urban development projects and 11(b) Installations for the disposal of waste (unless included in Schedule 1) and does not require an Environmental Impact Assessment.

## **5. Development plan**

- 5.1. As the application is for the consolidation of highway depot which includes the production of road surfacing products with waste materials and a new asphalt plant which will share facilities, the following policies have been considered with the proposal:

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

- 5.2. The following sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are relevant to this proposal:
  - Paragraph 14 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development);
  - Paragraph 34 (Sustainable transport); and
  - Paragraph 118 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment).

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) (2013)

5.3. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development);
- Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species);
- Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside);
- 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 17 (Aggregate supply);
- Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management);
- Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development);
- Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management); and
- Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development).

Winchester City Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (WCLPpt1) (2013)

5.4. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- Policy MTRA 4 - Development in the Countryside

Winchester City Council (Winchester District Local Plan Review- Saved policies (2006)

- Policy DP.11 - Unneighbourly Uses

## **6. Consultations**

### **6.1. Councillor Porter:**

“I understand the reasons why this application is being made by Hampshire County Council, and have been made aware of the responses to the queries that were posed by residents at the public meeting in December. A previous asphalt plant on the same site was closed in the 90's, to the joy of local residents who had experienced the smut, noise and smell of it for decades.

Unfortunately, the technical team at the public meeting were ill prepared and could not answer the points to reassure the public about the new plant there and then. This has created an air of suspicion and concern.

The Mineral and Waste Plan shows the availability of this land used for the processing of road coating material, and this plant (a renewal of an older and dirtier processing plant here on the same site in the 90's) was always a possibility, but it was expected that this covered the current processing plant on the site and not the addition of a new one for asphalt.

I asked for details of other sites in the UK where we could visit to reassure the considerable number of objectors that the plant is as safe as Hampshire County Council claims. To date, I haven't been informed of other sites we could visit.

Therefore, at this time, I must represent my residents and say that I cannot support this application at least until we have had chance to evaluate a plant elsewhere.”

6.2. **Winchester City Council:** No objection subject to the conditions relating to noise levels limited to protect local amenity, landscaping and external lighting.

6.3. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** The proposal includes works to an ordinary watercourse which will require prior consent of the LLFA. This consent is required as a separate permission to planning. The LLFA notes that the proposed works will have no significant effect on surface water drainage and therefore provided not comments on this at this time.

6.4. **Micheldever Parish Council:** Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- lack of engagement with the Parish Council and local communities about the proposal from the applicant. There has only been limited neighbourhood notification associated with the consultation of the planning application;
- impact of the development on rural businesses (food producers, local farming industry);
- pollution and contamination of nearby agricultural land;
- noise emanating from the plant and reversing alarms on the HCVs;
- night time working and associated hours of working do not consider local amenity and hours of rest;
- Micheldever Station has undergone a great deal of development in recent years since an asphalt plant last operated on the site.

- increase in emissions and reduction in air quality associated with the plant, associated health issues and air borne pollutants;
- lighting and potential impacts on amenity alongside existing light pollution from the site; and the
- close proximity of residential properties.

Additional comments were received and presented to 10 February 2016 committee meeting as follows:

- Micheldever Parish Council has submitted further representations since the end of the consultation period and feel it to be essential that members of the Regulatory Committee should visit an asphalt plant before any decision is made regarding the proposal.
- It was also felt that a proper and thorough investigation be carried out upon the County Council site at Dummer, as this is regarded by the MPC and Councillor Porter (County Councillor) as a more suitable site than Micheldever Station, having less sensitive receptors. This should be undertaken prior to the Committee considering this application.

**6.5. Natural England:** In our previous letter of response to this application (dated 10th December 2015) we informed you that this application site is in close proximity to Micheldever Spoil Heaps SSSI. We advised that further information was required to assess any potential impacts to the SSSI arising from this application in relation to air quality. This additional Air Quality assessment dated 21st December 2015 has been received by Natural England and has now been reviewed. We are now satisfied that this application will not have a significant impact on Micheldever Spoil Heaps SSSI. Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species which should be applied as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications. The application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

**6.6. Winchester City Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO):** The City Council is familiar with the site and the proposed operations have no adverse comments to make regarding this application subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to details of external lighting being submitted and approved by the Waste Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and conditions to ensure the protection of local amenity against adverse noise impact. If this application is successful, the operation of the asphalt plant will require an Environmental Permit, issued by the City Council, which will place emission limits on the particles from the plant plus other conditions to ensure that it is operating within 'best practicable means'.

6.7. **Environment Agency:** Has no objection subject to a surface water drainage scheme condition to be applied, and advises that materials and chemicals likely to cause pollution should be stored in appropriate containers, in areas with sealed drainage and adhere to Pollution Prevention Guide 26 for the storage of drums and intermediate bulk containers.

6.8. **Highway Authority:** Has no objection to the application subject to a condition regarding the implementation of the access.

## 7. Representations

7.1. At the time of writing, a total of 89 representations to the proposal have been received on the proposal. There was 1 representation in support of the proposal. 88 objected to the proposal. The main areas of concern raised in the objections related to the following areas:

- impact on wildlife;
- impact of the site and its activities on the rural location;
- impact on nearby countryside / agricultural land (including soot and discolouration of the land);
- proximity to residential properties;
- Impact on the amenity of the village and local residents including 24 hour working;
- impact on air quality;
- impact of lighting associated with the development especially at night;
- associated health impacts;
- impact on the young and elderly;
- odour associated with the development;
- chemical pollution;
- pollution and emissions associated with the development;
- visual impact and visibility of the plant;
- chemical content of materials uses / development's use of toxic material
- surrounding highways not suitable for additional HCV movements;
- HCV traffic using local roads through Sutton Scotney, the A30 towards Stockbridge or the Overton Road and associated carbon impacts;

- lack of consideration of other / alternatives sites and locations for the development;
- inaccurate information submitted as part of the planning application (e.g. noise assessment, location of the nearest property);
- noise impacts;
- the development is out of character in the rural area and should be located in an industrial, not a rural location;
- size of the site and lack of demonstrated need for the development in Hampshire;
- impact on the nearby railway;
- lack of public consultation;
- perception that HCC application is being considered differently to external applicants;
- impacts of the proposed development are the same as potential impacts of the CleanPower proposal at Micheldever which was not supported by the council;
- loss of rural jobs;
- lack of benefits for the local community;
- proposal is not allocated in a Local Plan;
- impact on house prices; and
- impact on local businesses (agriculture, food producers etc).

7.2. The above issues will be discussed and addressed within the following commentary, except where identified as not being relevant to the decision. In respect to this:

- the impact of a development on the value of neighbouring property does not constitute a material planning consideration.

## **8. Commentary**

### Development Plan

8.1. The proposal is being considered by Hampshire County Council as Local Planning Authority for a number of reasons. The applicant is Hampshire County Council and so can apply for permission through regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992. The asphalt plant is

associated with the existing waste uses on site through shared infrastructure/operational features. The site is also safeguarded through the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) (2013) for concrete batching facilities, which is the same requirement for the safeguarding of asphalt plants in the NPPF (paragraph 143).

- 8.2. The proposed site is included within a site safeguarded under Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure) of the HMWP (2013) (safeguarded site WR197). It is safeguarded as a highways maintenance depot which produces coated roadstone. The proposal would result in the co-location of synergistic land uses which would be complementary to the function of the existing highways depot and highway maintenance activities. It is therefore concluded that the proposed site would not result in the introduction of any uses which may prejudice the existing depot operations. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure) of the adopted HMWP (2013). Policy 17 (Aggregate supply) is also relevant as it seeks to maintain a supply of aggregate which in part relies on safeguarded infrastructure. The applicant has proved the Local Planning Authority with figures of recent asphalt use. This demonstrates a need for the production of asphalt in Hampshire, and the plant at the Micheldever site would ensure a ready supply of the Highways Authority to service the County's roads and be self-reliant.
- 8.3. With regard to the relocation of the waste uses, the principle of using the site for this type of use has already been established through previous permissions at the site. This means that the proposal is already considered to be in accordance with Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management), 27 (Capacity for waste management development), 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) of the adopted HMWP (2013).
- 8.4. As the site is identified as countryside in the Winchester City Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (WCLPpt1) (2013), Policy 5 of the HMWP and Policy MTRA 3 of the WCLPP1 need to be considered. The site itself is regarded as Previously Developed Land (PDL) as it has built structures, made ground and a long history of industrial, mineral and waste uses. Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) allows for development in the countryside where it provides a suitable reuse of previously developed land. As mentioned above, the asphalt plant would be co-located with the existing highway operations and so the principle for reinstating the asphalt operation in this instance is acceptable and in accordance with Policy 5. Policy 5 also requires that when development ceases, the site shall be restored to its former condition. As the site is already made ground, a condition is applied which would require the removal of buildings and plant should the use cease.
- 8.5. It is noted that Policy MTRA 4 (Development in the Countryside) of the WCLPP1 does not have such a provision for reusing developed land, only buildings, and so it could be considered that the proposal would not comply with this policy. However, as the new development is associated with the existing waste uses,

the HWMP is the more relevant development plan, meaning that the HMWP policies carry more weight than those within WCLPp1.

- 8.6. 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.

#### Ecology

- 8.7. Many representations received relate to the potential impact on wildlife. The site is located within 100m of a SSSI and SIN. This issue has been considered in detail by the Natural England as the statutory consultee and by the County Council's Ecologist.
- 8.8. Natural England had originally objected to the proposal on the grounds of lack of information in the original submission on the potential impacts on the nearby SSSI. A more detailed assessment was requested which modelled the Air Quality dispersal and this was prepared by the applicant. Following receipt of this information, Natural England are satisfied that there would be no significant effect on the SSSI and have removed their objection.
- 8.9. In addition, the County Ecologist requested that any permission granted included conditions relating to the precautionary method of works in relation to reptiles, dormice and lighting that is sensitive to any bats in the area. These have been included in Integral Appendix B.
- 8.10. In light of these responses, 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).

#### Landscape

- 8.11. Whilst the site is located within predominately rural landscape, the proposal would be located on brownfield land within the existing highway depot. The site comprises of made ground and existing industrial structures. The proposed main structures have been assessed against the existing plant and the trees which surround the site. The proposed asphalt plant would be 16.5m high. This is marginally higher when compared to the existing salt barn (which is 12.8m high) and the existing mobile 'Rapidmix' plant (which is 13m high when fully erected). Whilst built development is not commonplace in the wider landscape, in the immediate vicinity of the site the A303, a large scale grain storage, the railway line and the existing Highways Depot, HTM Depot and Highways Laboratory exert an influence on the local landscape character. Therefore the changes within the site would be consistent with the existing use as a highways depot and historic use as an asphalt plant and are not significantly greater in mass, height or scale.
- 8.12. The main landscape element that contributes to the wider landscape is the perimeter woodland and tree planting. The wide belt of trees to the south and

north of the site would be unaffected by the proposed development. The vegetation along the A303 verges and slip roads effectively screen and filter views of the existing and proposed developments at the site, particularly as the highways depot is located at a lower level than the properties to the north of the A303. It is noted that three trees along the north western boundary of the site would be removed as a result of the proposed development and a further tree would be removed due to its poor conditions. However, two of the trees to be removed are of moderate quality, one is of low quality and two are unsuitable for retention irrespective of the proposed development due to their poor condition. The removal of these trees will not significantly alter the existing screening offered to the site. Also, the overall group value of the trees along Stockbridge Road would not be significantly diminished. Therefore, the effects of the tree removal are not considered significant in respect of landscape fabric or character.

- 8.13. A Visual Impact Assessment has been 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 (Micheldever Footpath 23) which is situated to the south of the site and the two-storey houses at the northern edge of Micheldever Station. 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.
- 8.14. Whilst Winchester City Council has requested a condition on landscape on the perimeter of the site, it is not felt appropriate to apply such a condition. This is due to the limited views gained from vehicle users on Stockbridge Road and as no such condition has been applied before to very similar uses. Therefore, it is considered to be unreasonable to apply a condition in these circumstances.
- 8.15. 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 terms of Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development).

#### Impact on amenity and health

- 8.16. As detailed in the representations section, there have been concerns raised over adverse impacts to local amenity and health. These issues are interlinked but have been split into subcategories for the purpose of clarity in this report.
- 8.17. The proximity of the development to residential properties has been expressed as a concern in representations received. However, the closest resident is over 200 m to the north, separated from the site by the A303. The railway runs adjacent to the main residential area, which is over 500m to the south of the site.

- 8.18. The impact of any additional external lighting associated with the development, especially at night has also been identified as an area of concern by the Winchester City Council Environmental Health officer (EHO) and the County Ecologist, due to the potential for amenity and ecological implications. A condition has been requested to control this element of the development, and should be applied if planning permission be granted.

Noise, air quality, dust, odours, vibrations

- 8.19. Noise has also been raised as an area of concern in objection letters and it has been claimed that there was inaccurate survey information submitted in the noise assessment. However, the Winchester City Council Environmental Health officer has reviewed this and has no objections. The noise assessment concluded that the site is suitable for the intended development as noise is not expected to be a significant issue associated with the proposed development. The site is already in use for similar highways facilities, and the noise climate surrounding the site is mainly dominated by road and rail noise sources at the nearest residential receptors. The asphalt plant noise levels predicted at night, are below the World Health Organisation guideline levels of 40dB(A) L<sub>night,outside</sub>. An assessment has also been undertaken for a mobile HBM batching plant which may also run at night. The level for this plant are also predicted to be below 40dB(A) L<sub>night,outside</sub>. The two plants would not run concurrently during the night to avoid possible cumulative noise issues. The BS4142 assessment has shown that the development will not affect the nearest noise sensitive receptors during the day, and is unlikely to cause significant effects during the night. It is expected that the new noise sources can be controlled to achieve the recommended plant noise emission limits. Broadband reversing beepers would be used rather than tonal alarms.

Winchester City Council and EHO have requested the inclusion of three conditions related to noise. These relate to noise amenity, noise limit at nearest property set at 40dB(A) L<sub>eq15min</sub> and no concurrent working of plant at night and control of noise beepers. The imposition of such conditions will restrict the noise levels associated with the site to an acceptable level. It is therefore recommended to apply these conditions if planning permission be granted to protect local amenity.

- 8.20. Essentially, the noise assessment has confirmed that the proposed plant can comply with the noise limits set by the EHO, without the benefit of additional mitigation due to the distance from properties and noise sources associated with each operation. The day time and night-time background noise levels being dominated by traffic on the A303 and trains on the railway.
- 8.21. A particular concern raised on the impact on the amenity of the village and local residents from noise was the proposed 24 hour working. However, the noisiest activity would be the crushing and screening of road planings which is connected to the existing HBM operations, and would predominantly be used during the day time as required. This particular activity was consented by planning permission 04/01855/HCS and permitted the relocation of mobile

plant within the application boundary. The existing consent does not impose any restrictions in respect of crushing and screening operations at the site. Therefore, the principle for 24 hour working for this activity has been set in terms of noise and amenity and there have been no history of complaints received by the Hampshire County Council.

- 8.22. The comments made by the Parish Council, the local MP and members of the public regarding potential impacts on residential amenity and health as a result of air emissions are acknowledged..
- 8.23. The core principles of the previous asphalt plant and proposed new plant are the same i.e. the heating and drying of aggregates to remove moisture and then mixing them with hot bitumen. However since the previous asphalt plant was located on site, asphalt production technologies have advanced in response to the need for higher specification road surfacing and more stringent restrictions, monitoring and control of emissions such as particulates and odour. For example the current permissible particulate emission limit of 50mg/m<sup>3</sup> is half that of the previous limits and modern plants operate well below this maximum permitted limit. The core difference between the previous and proposed new plant is the means by which the emissions to atmosphere of dust are controlled.
- 8.24. The previous plant used water jets to arrest the post drying process. Fine dust and the slurry from this process was then settled in settlement lagoons and recycled around the systems. These systems have now been phased out in the UK as they are not capable of achieving the lower more stringent Environmental Permit requirements.
- 8.25. The proposed new plant uses a series of cloth bag filters, rather like a modern vacuum cleaner, to scrub particles from the air and reuse them within the manufacturing process, such that a limit of 50mg/m<sup>3</sup> (dust) can be achieved. Several hundred cloth bags are suspended on wire cages within the system. Air containing dust is drawn through the cloth bag filter house and particles are captured by the cloth. This allows particles to be trapped on its surface, allowing air to pass through but dust to be contained. The dust is then collected in this sealed environment as a recycled filler and reused within the manufacturing process.
- 8.26. The bitumen is added hot and kept hot in sealed tanks by means of a hot oil jacket system. The drying system on the plant is by means of a tube dryer, at no point is any combustion taking place with the aggregate, as the goal is to inject all of the heat from the process into the core of each particle of the aggregate. Therefore, there is no free oxygen for combustion left available and at no point is bitumen in contact with a naked flame.
- 8.27. The proposed asphalt plant comprises a single fuel oil burner within the drier drum which is used to drive out the moisture from the aggregate before it is mixed with the binder and filler material. There are a number of small electricity generators which are used to power the various elements of the plant.

- 8.28. Unlike the previous plant the proposed plant is now accurately controlled by a computer system which monitors all the aspects of the plants activities and provides immediate feedback to the operative on what is happening at each part of the process. This provides instant safety and air quality checks.
- 8.29. As stated above, Winchester City Council's EHO has been consulted and has no objection to the proposal. Emissions to air, noise and odour would be regulated by the Environmental Permit as issued by Winchester City Council. Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are a very small component of emissions associated with asphalt plant, so much so that specific emission levels are not necessary as part of the Environmental Permit to ensure public health. In light of this, it is considered that Policy DP.11 (Unneighbourly Uses) of the Winchester City Council (Winchester District Local Plan Review- Saved policies (2006) is not relevant, as it deals with development which would create, consolidate or expand noisy or noxious uses and this development is not considered as harmful to health. Whilst there is noise associated with the proposal, it is not a loss to local amenity and is dealt with adequately under Policy 10 of the HWMP.
- 8.30. In contrast the application for the previous pyrolysis plant on an adjacent site considered a wide range of potential pollutants including carcinogens as this would have been necessary to secure an Environmental Permit due to the nature of that particular project.
- 8.31. Therefore, active dust suppression and management within the asphalt plant is through the bag filter and is captured by the bag filter to be re-used as filler in the final asphalt and is regarded as a valuable resource in the asphalt production process, In addition, storage bays and hoppers would be covered to reduce the risk of any fugitive dust emissions from the site and management activities such as damping down with a water sprayer during dry periods, and a periodic cleaning of trafficked surfaces with a road sweeper would be employed to ensure that this requirement is complied with.
- 8.32. The applicant states that it takes its responsibilities and duty of care for neighbouring land uses very seriously and had commissioned further air quality dispersal modelling to be undertaken as part of the application process, in response to concerns raised through consultation. This confirmed, with reference to the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance, that the predicted impacts at the receptors are negligible.
- 8.33. In respect of odour, the Environmental Permit will require that all emissions are free from odour and dust at the site boundary, as perceived by the regulator. As such, Environmental Permit (issued under the Pollution, Prevention and Control Act 1999 and Environmental Permitting (England and Wales Regulations) 2010 compliance will ensure residential amenity in this respect. The EHO has not raised odour as an issue due to the limited exposure of the bitumen to the atmosphere and distance of sensitive properties from the site. It is therefore not considered to be necessary to include additional conditions on amenity in this particular issue.

### Pollution associated with the development

- 8.34. 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 (paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 27-012-20140306). In respect of this, the EHO is satisfied that the Environmental Permit which will accompany the plant would regulate emissions to the atmosphere and control any dust and odours associated with the facility. Concerns have been raised about the chemical content of materials used as part of the proposed development, in particular with regard to toxicity. The Environment Agency has requested condition on storage of chemicals and materials and a condition to this effect has been recommended by the Local Planning Authority if permission is granted.
- 8.35. As there are no significant emissions anticipated from the development, it is considered that there is no risk to the safe operating of the nearby railway.
- 8.36. Taking into account the above, the proposed mitigation measures and the associated environmental permitting, it is concluded that the proposal is in accordance with the Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the adopted HMWP (2013).

### Flooding

- 8.37. According to the 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. The assessment took into account potential flooding from a variety of water sources. This included the existing drainage ditch which runs along the western boundary of the site and ground water, as the site overlays a major aquifer. The assessment concluded that given that the proposals will not result in a significant change in impermeable areas at the site and the current drainage arrangements will be used post development; flood risk is low. This is acceptable to the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Agency and so complies with Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention).

### Highways

- 8.38. The site is located in close proximity to the strategic highway network and HCVs have direct access to the A303. HCVs will access and leave the site via the A303. This will be reinforced through contractual arrangements with Hampshire County Council's highway maintenance contractors. The Procurement Team and Batch Manager will ensure suppliers and those collecting asphalt materials are made aware that all deliveries (with the exception of those referenced below) will need to use the A303.

- 8.39. Hampshire County Council and its highways maintenance contractor operate a non-compliance system in respect of instructions to delivery drivers and all non-compliance is reviewed weekly. Offenders driving through Micheldever and Micheldever Station without approval will be treated as being in breach of County Council instructions. Hampshire County Council, through its highways maintenance contractor, will ensure future compliance or remove the offending driver from operating out of the depot. The County Council is confident that it can enforce this requirement and will carry out audits to check compliance.
- 8.40. The other surrounding local highway routes are not suitable for HCV movements associated with the site. There are a limited number of scenarios when some HCVs will need to travel on nearby local roads e.g. through Micheldever, Micheldever Station, Sutton Scotney, the A30 towards Stockbridge or the Overton Road). This will relate to specific highway maintenance requirements in these areas to provide surfacing or HBM for the immediate roads around and within these settlements. This would be the only exception to HCVs being required to use the A303.
- 8.41. In addition, it is considered that the co-location of the plant adjacent to the other highway depot uses would confer significant sustainability benefits in terms of reducing transport movements associated with the movement of materials.
- 8.42. The Highways Authority has no objection to the proposal based on the projected traffic figures and a condition to ensure that the new access is in place prior to the asphalt plant being operational, Taking the above into account the development is considered to be in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the adopted HMWP (2013).

Other issues raised in representations

- 8.43. A lack of consideration of other/alternatives sites and locations for the development has been raised as a criticism in letters received. However, this is not necessary information and the application must be considered on its own merits.
- 8.44. It is noted that there is a perception that this application is being considered differently to external applicants as it is being made by Hampshire County Council. This is not the case and the application has been through all the relevant adopted procedures and has complied with all planning laws and regulations. As part of this, due process was applied to public consultation and notification letters were also sent to a number of properties beyond the standard requirements. The applicant was also present at the local Parish Council meeting and has been liaising with the local County Councillor.

## Summary

8.45 It is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). Whilst technically in the countryside (Policy 5), the development sits within an existing highways site and recycled road surface facility (Policies 25, 27, 29 & 30), contributes to meeting Hampshire's demand for aggregates (Policy 17) and shares synergies of land use and so offers sustainable development (Policy 1). The proposal is not considered to be visually intrusive due to the existing structures and natural screening in place (Policy 13). The proposal will not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts as the odour, noise and emission levels will be acceptable (Policy 10) and mitigated where necessary through Environmental Permitting. 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 (Policy 12) and there is no significant flood risk or surface water increase as a result of the proposal (Policy 11).

## **9. Recommendation**

9.1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed in integral Appendix B.

### Appendices:

Integral Appendix A – Corporate or Legal Information

Integral Appendix B – Conditions

Integral Appendix C – Annexes to Reasons for Conditions/Refusal

Appendix D - Location Plan

Appendix E – Layout Plan

Appendix F Traffic Logistics Plan

Other documents relating to this application:

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/application-details.htm?id=16886>

RefRpt/7391/KS

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

<b>Hampshire safer and more secure for all:</b>	No
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>Maximising well-being:</b>	No
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>Enhancing our quality of place:</b>	No
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
<b>OR</b>	
<b>This proposal does not link to the Corporate Strategy but, nevertheless, requires a decision because:</b>	
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

15/02619/HCS

Hampshire County Council

WRG007

Micheldever Highways Depot Stockbridge  
Road Micheldever Station Hampshire  
SO21 3AP  
Asphalt Plant with Site Access, Offices,  
Weighbridge, Storage Bays and  
Relocation of Mobile HBM Plant

## CONDITIONS

### Commencement

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence 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.

### Tonnage

2. There shall be no more than 79,000 tonnes per calendar year of asphalt produced at the site.

A written record of asphalt leaving the site associated with the permission hereby granted shall be kept onsite and shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority for inspection upon request.

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

### Highways

3. There shall be no operation of the asphalt plant until the new vehicular access to the site (indicatively shown on drawing number 1744-01-04 Rev F) has been completed as approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

4. There shall be no operation of the asphalt plant until a Traffic Management Plan, which shall include details of vehicle routing and driver protocols, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All vehicle movements associated with the operation of the plant shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Traffic Management Plan thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

5. For the duration of the development measures shall be taken to clean vehicles leaving the site to prevent mud and spoil from being deposited on the public highway. 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 it has been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud and spoil being carried on to the public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Protection of Water Environment**

6. Within three months of the date of this permission, surface water draining from areas of hardstanding shall be passed through an oil interceptor or series of oil interceptors, prior to being discharged into any watercourse, soakaway or surface water sewer. The interceptor(s) shall be designed and constructed to have a capacity compatible with the area being drained, and shall be retained and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development. Clean roof water shall not pass through the interceptor(s). Vehicle washdowns and detergents shall not be passed through the interceptor.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage of the site in accordance with Policies 10 (Protection of health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

7. 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 in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Materials**

8. Within three months of the date of this permission samples and/or details of the materials and finishes to be used for the plant, offices, gates and fencing shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to secure a high quality development in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) .

## Lighting

9. Within three months of the date of this permission, a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall include details of all outside lighting, including floodlighting, safety lighting and illumination from within the plant, and measures to prevent light pollution and be implemented as approved for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual highway safety in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

## Noise

10. Noise from all the operations at the site shall not exceed 40dB(A) Leq15min when measured at the boundary of the nearest noise sensitive premises.

Reason: To prevent noise disturbance to the residents of the nearest houses in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

11. Reversing beepers shall not be used on the site between 1900 hours and 0700 hours. 'White noise' reversing alarms, or reversing lights or cameras will be acceptable alternatives.

Reason: To minimise noise disturbance from operations at the site in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

12. The site shall be operated to ensure there is no concurrent operation of the asphalt plant and the Hydraulic Bound Material plant between 2300hours and 0700hours (excluding maintenance).

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

## Nature Conservation

13. The development hereby permitted shall proceed in accordance with the recommendations set out in the 'Conclusion and Recommendations' section of the Micheldever Asphalt Plant – Technical Note (ECOSA, 22nd December 2015).

Reason: To protect dormice, which are a European Protected Species, and in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

14. Within three months of the date of this permission, details of the methods to be followed (including timing and any ecological supervision) for the clearance of the identified suitable reptile habitat shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with any such approved details.

Reason: To avoid impacts to reptiles, which are a protected species under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Restoration**

15. Any buildings/structures shall be removed from the land within three months following cessation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure appropriate restoration in accordance with Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Plans and particulars**

16. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the follow approved plans: **1744-01-01 Rev B, 1744-01-02 Rev B, 1744-01-03 Rev A, 1744-01-04 Rev F, 1744-01-05 Rev B, 1744-01-06 Rev C, 1744-01-07 Rev C, 1744-01-09 Rev A, 1744-01-10 Rev B, 1744-01-11 , 1744-01-13 Rev A, 1744-01-14 Rev A, EC/RJ501242/100, EC/RJ501242/101**

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

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

**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012**

**Paragraph 14 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development**

14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

For plan-making this means that:

- local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

For decision-taking this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

**Paragraph 34 – Sustainable Transport**

Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.

**Paragraph 118 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment**

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;
- opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;
- planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss; and
- the following wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites:
  - potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;
  - listed or proposed Ramsar sites;<sup>26</sup> and
  - sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.

In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should:

- identify and include policies for extraction of mineral resource of local and national importance in their area, but should not identify new sites or extensions to existing sites for peat extraction;
- so far as practicable, take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials, before considering extraction of primary materials, whilst aiming to source minerals supplies indigenously;
- define Minerals Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development, whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked; and define Minerals Consultation Areas based on these Minerals Safeguarding Areas;

- safeguard:
  - existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport by rail, sea or inland waterways of minerals, including recycled, secondary and marine-dredged materials; and
  - existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material.

## **Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HWMP) 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 (NPPF). 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 NPPF taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

### **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:

- a. 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;

- b. nationally designated sites including Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves, nationally protected species and Ancient Woodland;
- c. local interest sites including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, and Local Nature Reserves;
- d. habitats and species of principal importance in England;
- e. 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 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:

- a. it is a time-limited mineral extraction or related development; or
- b. the nature of the development is related to countryside activities, meets local needs or requires a countryside or isolated location; or
- c. 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 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:

- a. release emissions to the atmosphere, land or water (above appropriate standards);
- b. have an unacceptable impact on human health;
- c. cause unacceptable noise, dust, lighting, vibration or odour;
- d. have an unacceptable visual impact;
- e. potentially endanger aircraft from bird strike and structures;
- f. cause an unacceptable impact on public safety safeguarding zones;

- g. cause an unacceptable impact on:
  - i. tip and quarry slope stability; or
  - ii. differential settlement of quarry backfill and landfill; or
  - iii. subsidence and migration of contaminants;
- h. cause an unacceptable impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters;
- i. cause an unacceptable impact on public strategic infrastructure;
- j. 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:

- a. not result in an increased flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall;
- b. 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;
- c. have site drainage systems designed to take account of events which exceed the normal design standard;
- d. not increase net surface water run-off; and
- e. 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:

- a. highway safety;
- b. pedestrian safety;
- c. highway capacity; and
- d. environment and amenity.

### **Policy 13 – High-quality design of minerals 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:

- a. the merits of the development clearly outweigh the need for safeguarding; or
- b. the infrastructure is no longer needed; or
- c. the capacity of the infrastructure can be relocated or provided elsewhere. In such instances, alternative capacity should:
  - i. meet the provisions of the Plan, that this alternative capacity is deliverable; and
  - ii. be appropriately and sustainably located; and
  - iii. conform to the relevant environmental and community protection policies in this Plan; or
- d. 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 in 'Appendix B - List of safeguarded minerals and waste sites'.

### **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.
- e.

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:
  - i. 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
  - ii. 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 – Construction, demolition and excavation 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.

## **Winchester City Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (WCLPpt1) 2013**

### **Policy MTRA 4 – Development in the Countryside**

In the countryside, defined as land outside the built-up areas of Winchester, Whiteley and Waterlooville and the settlements covered by MTRA 2 and 3 above, the Local Planning Authority will only permit the following types of development:

- development which has an operational need for a countryside location, such as for agriculture, horticulture or forestry; or
- proposals for the reuse of existing rural buildings for employment, tourist accommodation, community use or affordable housing (to meet demonstrable local housing needs). Buildings should be of permanent construction and capable of use without major reconstruction; or
- expansion or redevelopment of existing buildings to facilitate the expansion on-site of established businesses or to meet an operational need, provided development is proportionate to the nature and scale of the site, its setting and countryside location; or
- small scale sites for low key tourist accommodation appropriate to the site, location and the setting.

Development proposed in accordance with this policy should not cause harm to the character and landscape of the area or neighbouring uses, or create inappropriate noise/light and traffic generation.

## **Winchester City Council (Winchester District Local Plan Review – Saved policies 2006)**

### **Policy DP.11 – Unneighbourly Uses**

Development which would create, consolidate or expand noisy or noxious uses, or which would generate volumes or types of traffic unsuited to the local area will not be permitted.

Exceptionally, if such development needs to be provided in a local area, it may be permitted where it can be designed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, and is:

- (i) remote from existing housing or other pollution-sensitive development;
- (ii) well screened by landform or vegetation that will withstand the pollution;
- (iii) accessed by a means suitable for heavy vehicles;
- (iv) capable of containing the land use within a defined area.