

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Decision Report**

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Decision Maker: | Cabinet |
| Date: | 10 September 2012 |
| Title: | Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan |
| Reference: | 4161 |
| Report From: | Director of Economy, Transport and Environment |

Contact name: Adrian Flavell

Tel: 01962 846730

Email: adrian.flavell@hants.gov.uk

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The purpose of this paper is to update the County Council on the progress of preparing the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP), including the outcomes from the recent public hearing and the next steps towards adoption of the Plan.
- 1.2. The Plan is being prepared to protect Hampshire's environment and communities and support to Hampshire's economy through sustainable management of minerals and waste development to 2030.
- 1.3. Following approval by the planning authorities, including the County Council in October 2011, and a subsequent public consultation, the HMWP was submitted to the Government on 29 February 2012. Mr Andrew Freeman was appointed as the Planning Inspector to conduct a public examination into the soundness of the Plan, and to report back on this to the planning authorities.
- 1.4. The Planning Inspector has conducted the first stage of the Public Examination of the HMWP and has now asked the authorities to review specific elements of the Plan with a view to proposing changes to ensure that the plan is 'sound' – that is, positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. These changes will then be subject to a public consultation on their soundness.
- 1.5. Similarly, informal discussion with the planning inspector has provided helpful guidance on ensuring that any proposed changes are sound, especially in relation to new National Policy.

- 1.6. In considering the elements of the HMWP the Inspector suggested for review, the outcomes from the first stage of the public examination have been used. As the plan preparation process is essentially iterative in nature, updates and amendments are to be expected and officers are content that the review has taken into account both the legal and planning advice and dealt with any new evidence which arose as a consequence of the first stage of the process
- 1.7. A number of changes to the HMWP are proposed; many are minor in nature, however, where the changes are more significant and exceed the delegation afforded the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport at the County Council meeting of the 13 October 2011, they are now brought to the attention of Members,
- 1.8. A detailed schedule highlighting all the proposed changes has been prepared, and copies of this have been made available to Members in their offices in Winchester, hard copy on request and on the web at <http://consult.hants.gov.uk/portal>
- 1.9. A summary of the main changes is included in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.
- 1.10. Throughout the plan preparation process it has been considered prudent to seek expert legal advice and this has also informed this review.
- 1.11. This paper seeks to
 - update the County Council on progress of preparing the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan;
 - summarise the outcomes of the Public Hearing;
 - identify the potential changes to the HMWP identified as a consequence of the discussion at the hearing to ensure it is sound;
 - request authority to publish and consult on the schedule of changes;
 - identify the next steps in the plan preparation process; and
 - clarify the position of the HMWP with respect to the intended revocation of the South East Plan.

2. Introduction and Plan-making Progress

- 2.1. The County Council, as a minerals and waste planning authority, has a statutory requirement to prepare a plan for the provision of minerals and waste development.
- 2.2. The County Council is working in partnership with Southampton City Council, Portsmouth City Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and the South Downs National Park Authority to prepare the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan to manage minerals and waste development to 2030.

- 2.3. Current policy for minerals and waste development in Hampshire is derived from the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy which was adopted in 2007. This policy document now requires updating to take account of new national policy. In addition, the HMWP aims to significantly strengthen the protection it affords Hampshire's environment and communities and provide robust direction for business.
- 2.4. Thus, the HMWP aims to ensure that the right development is built at the right time and in the right place. Examples of minerals and waste development include construction, demolition and excavation waste recycling sites, rail depots and marine wharves, local quarries, material recycling facilities, energy from waste facilities and landfill.
- 2.5. The draft HMWP was prepared using technical evidence and responses to various public consultations gathered over several years.
- 2.6. On 13 October 2011, the County Council resolved to publish the HMWP for comment on its 'soundness' – that is, is the plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
- 2.7. From 7 November 2011 until 19 December 2011, a total of 1,912 representations were received. Following this, in accordance with the resolutions of the County Council in October 2011, some minor changes were made to the plan, which was then submitted to government on 29 February 2012.

3. Public Examination and Hearing

- 3.1. As part of his public examination of the HMWP the planning inspector convened a public hearing from 6 to 15 June 2012, where he invited participants to comment and discuss their views on the soundness of the Plan.
- 3.2. At the Hearing the Inspector prepared a programme whereby all aspects of the HMWP were covered. At his invitation, participants highlighted the elements of the Plan they felt were not sound; the Inspector then provided an opportunity for the planning authority to respond and where appropriate offer to review those elements of the HMWP. The hearing was adjourned by the Inspector on 15 June.
- 3.3. The Inspector noted that there are several parts of the plan that require attention to ensure that it is sound. There are two types of changes; minor (such as typing errors, matters of clarification or policy consolidation), and more significant changes. Under the terms of the previous resolutions of the County Council, and partner authorities, minor changes can be dealt with under delegated authority, but more significant changes, such as amendments to policies or sites, require consideration by the County Council and its equivalent arrangements amongst the partners.

- 3.4. These range from those changes required due to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - which was published after the plan was submitted, or due to new information that came to light as a consequence of stakeholder involvement at the Hearing. The Inspector has also indicated that the Planning Authorities should review elements of the HMWP based on his consideration of the evidence to date.
- 3.5. The elements of the HMWP requiring more significant review include:
- a) The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and the Inspector has advised that he wishes to see a similar policy in the HMWP;
 - b) Following the submission of new evidence to the Inspector by the operator of Kingsley Quarry in East Hampshire, to the effect that the mineral should be classified as Silica Sand, an industrial mineral, the Inspector has asked that the planning authority review the HMWP in relation to the provision for silica sand, to ensure that it is in accordance with NPPF;
 - c) New evidence was submitted to the Inspector by the operator of Michelmersh Brickworks, which showed that the sites allocated in the HMWP contain a substantially lower amount of brick clay than was hitherto considered. The Inspector has requested that the allocation of sites at Michelmersh should be reviewed to comply with the NPPF landbank requirements;
 - d) The Inspector has indicated that the planning authorities should review the shortfall in aggregate provision at the end of the plan period and provide additional sites;
 - e) The Inspector has indicated that the planning authorities should review the findings of the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) on extension sites for land-won sand and gravel;
 - f) New Forest District Council has challenged the revisions to the wording of Policy 33 (Long term safeguarding for future wharfs) discussed at the hearing and in particular with respect to procedures for Habitats Regulation assessment and their contention that an Appropriate Assessment is required.
- 3.6. Despite Government commitments to early revocation, at the time of writing, the SE Plan remains extant. The Government has stated on numerous occasions its intention to revoke regional spatial strategies (RSS's), including the SE Plan, which was adopted in 2009.
- 3.7. In July the Department for Communities and Local Government reaffirmed the Government's commitment to removing the SE Plan. A parallel process for revoking the East of England RSS is now formally underway. Nevertheless, until the SE Plan is revoked, the legal requirement for the HMWP to be in 'general conformity' with the SE Plan remains. This is a

concern, as the SE Plan itself it is inconsistent with the NPPF and is based on out of date aggregate apportionment assumptions, thus causing a legal issue for the HMWP.

- 3.8. The Inspector has asked the planning authorities to prepare a schedule of all those changes to the HMWP they consider necessary to ensure the HMWP is sound following the discussions at the Hearing, in readiness to consult on these changes at a later date.
- 3.9. The areas of review and the proposed changes all relate to the Hampshire County Council area, with the exception of Kingsley Quarry which also affects the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) area and the issues surrounding the long term policy for wharves and depots, which also affect Southampton City Council (SCC). Therefore the County Council has led on this, working with the partner planning authorities where relevant.
- 3.10. The planning authority has also updated the evidence base where appropriate, including revisions to the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulation Assessment.

4. Changes to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan

- 4.1. Following the Inspector's advice to review elements of the HMWP, the planning authorities have considered these points, and in certain cases sought expert legal advice.
- 4.2. A schedule of proposed changes has been prepared. This details all the changes to the HMWP considered to be required. Many of these changes are minor in nature such as typographic, formatting or policy consolidation changes; these are classed as 'additional changes'. Those proposed changes that are more significant are separately identified as 'main changes'.
- 4.3. The changes have been shared with the planning inspector and he has not raised any issues with them. However this is merely informal discussion, his report will only be compiled once the public consultation on the changes has been completed.
- 4.4. The full schedule is available in Members rooms in Winchester, hard copy on request and also on the web at <http://consult.hants.gov.uk/portal>.
- 4.5. A summary of those changes considered to affect the integrity of the HMWP (classed as 'main changes') is provided below.

CHANGE 1 (dC15) Revised Vision

- 4.6. The vision has been amended to provide greater clarity on the links between this and the strategic aims of the HMWP.

CHANGE 2 (dC17, dC18) Revised Spatial Strategy

- 4.7. The spatial strategy section has been revised to include links to the NPPF requirements for collaborative working on strategic priorities and additional text on the importance of recycled aggregates, clarifying the position on landfill provision and hazardous waste management capacity.

CHANGE 3 (dC23) New Policy 1 - Sustainable Minerals and Waste Development

- 4.8. The HMWP clearly states its aim to protect Hampshire's environment, maintain Hampshire's communities and support Hampshire's economy.
- 4.9. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was issued on 27 March 2012, following the submission of the HMWP on 29 February 2012. The Inspector considered that following advice from the Department for Communities and Local Government, the guidance contained within the NPPF regarding the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be included in the plan.
- 4.10. The NPPF states "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."
- 4.11. Providing it is made clear that a local interpretation of this policy for Hampshire is devised through additional supporting text, then this can only strengthen the plan and its objectives.
- 4.12. It is recommended that change dC23 be made to the HMWP in order to bring this guidance into effect. This change is included in the schedule attached at Appendix C to this report.
- 4.13. It is further recommended that this forms part of the public consultation during the next stage of the process.

CHANGE 4 (dC28) Revise policy on designated landscapes

- 4.14. The policy on protection of designated landscapes, such as the National Parks and AONB's has been amended to ensure that HMWP is consistent with national policy

CHANGE 5 (dC30) Clarify criteria for protection of the Countryside

- 4.15. The policy which provides the basis for protection of the wider countryside has been revised to provide clarity on the criteria for development.

CHANGE 6 (dC34) Revise policy on development in the Green Belt

- 4.16. The policy on protection of the South West Hampshire Green Belt has been revised to ensure compliance with the NPPF.

CHANGE 7 (dC43) Revise policy on Protecting Public Health, Safety and Amenity.

- 4.17. The policy on protecting public health, safety and amenity has been revised to ensure compliance with the NPPF, clarify the development criteria and to highlight the importance of cumulative impacts

CHANGE 8 (dC58) Deletion of Policy on planning conditions and obligations

- 4.18. The policy covering development management through the use of planning conditions and obligations is deleted as this is now covered in new Policy 1 Sustainable minerals and waste development.

CHANGE 9 (dC80) Revise policy on Aggregate wharfs and rail depots

- 4.19. The policy on Aggregate wharfs and rail depots has been revised to ensure compliance with the NPPF and to provide development criteria for new wharf proposals.

CHANGE 10 (dC97) new Policy 21 – Silica sand

- 4.20. As part of the preparation for the public hearing, the operator of Kingsley Quarry in East Hampshire provided evidence to the Inspector that stated that the mineral at that quarry was silica sand based on its uses. Despite several opportunities and ongoing dialogue with the operator, this information has never previously been submitted the planning authorities at any stage of the process.
- 4.21. Silica sand is a particular high quality type of soft sand that has a very high Silica (SiO₂) content, such that it can be used in industrial processes, specifically for glass-making.
- 4.22. In this regard, mineral deposits of this type enjoy a different and more stringent planning protection than those types of sand and gravel which are used for construction.
- 4.23. The NPPF states that “Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by co-operating with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals to ensure adequate provision is made to support their likely use in industrial and manufacturing processes by providing a stock of permitted reserves of at least 10 years for individual silica sand sites to support the level of actual and proposed investment required for new or existing plant and the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment”

- 4.24. The Inspector has requested that the planning authorities review the HMWP to make provision for silica sand in accordance with the NPPF.
- 4.25. The technical guidance to the NPPF provides helpful advice by defining industrial minerals, and clarifying that silica sand is a mineral “necessary to support industrial and manufacturing processes”.
- 4.26. Furthermore it identifies the method by which the landbank for a silica sand site is calculated; the average of the last three years for which sales are available.
- 4.27. It is accepted that the mineral extracted from Kingsley Quarry and potentially other sites in the vicinity, satisfy the physico-chemical properties of silica sand and that the mineral extracted from the site is used for both construction and non-construction uses.
- 4.28. The NPPF clearly equates the protection afforded silica sand sites, to the need for its use as an industrial mineral. The sand from Kingsley Quarry is not used for industrial uses, but predominantly used for recreation and horticulture with a minority used for construction.
- 4.29. To that end, it is suggested that:
- a) a new policy on silica sand is included in the HMWP (new Policy 21)
 - b) the status of the current Frith End and Kingsley sites are amended to include reference to silica sand
 - c) the levels of supply of soft sand (aggregate) for construction be revised accordingly.
- 4.30. The operator of Kingsley Quarry has also been promoting an extension to the current site, however this was not allocated as a sustainable extension site in the HMWP.
- 4.31. This remains the case as, in the view of the planning authorities there is no need for an extension to the current site; the site already has a landbank in excess of the NPPF requirement
- 4.32. The operational extraction site at Frith End, East Hampshire produces similar material to the Kingsley site and the operator has confirmed that not only does the material satisfy the physical requirements of Silica sand, but it is also used for similar purposes such as recreation and horticulture as the Kingsley Quarry material.
- 4.33. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 146 of the NPPF, it is suggested that a new Policy 21 – Silica sand, is inserted into the HMWP which incorporates criteria to guide further silica sand development; this is included in the schedule attached at Appendix C to this report.

4.34. It is further recommended that this forms part of the public consultation during the next stage of the process.

CHANGE 11 (dC100dC186) Brick Clay site revision

4.35. New information from the operator of Michelmersh Brickworks was received following the publication of the HMWP, that the areas allocated in the Plan have very low workable reserves.

4.36. The Inspector indicated that the supply of brick-making clay for Michelmersh should be reviewed, taking into account the new information. Further site appraisal work and an assessment of geological constraints and potential community impacts have indicated that a new area should be put forward for allocation.

4.37. The NPPF requires a 25 year landbank for brick-making clay. The existing permitted reserves alongside a proposed new allocated site would provide for an estimated 22 year landbank. It has been acknowledged by the operator that there are no other viable options for extraction in this locality at this time, and it has been agreed that the new allocation is sufficient for their needs.

4.38. It has been concluded therefore, that due to the geological constraints and the problematical nature of the areas surrounding the brickworks and the impacts on residents, that Area A (comprising School House Field and Hillside Field) are allocated.

4.39. It is also suggested that Inset Map 7 is revised to include the new proposed areas and that suitable development management criteria be added to the wording of Policy 22

4.40. These changes are included in the schedule attached at Appendix C to this report.

4.41. It is further recommended that this forms part of the public consultation during the next stage of the process.

CHANGE 12 (dC86) Shortfall in provision of land-won aggregates

4.42. Policy 17 of the HMWP specified that land-won provision of aggregates should be at the rate of 1.56million tonnes per annum (mtpa). Policy 20 of the HMWP then identified how this requirement would be met; from a mixture of the permitted reserves, extensions to existing sites, new sites and criteria for other sites.

4.43. This is in accordance with the NPPF which states “Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates... Such provision should take the form of specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search and locational criteria”.

- 4.44. Policy 20 provides for such a supply through permitted reserves, suitable extensions, new sites and such criteria to allow for unallocated sites.
- 4.45. The HMWP noted that this approach is sufficient until late 2028. The Inspector has requested that the planning authority should review this situation with a view to eliminating any shortfall in provision.
- 4.46. The HMWP describes how unallocated sites have previously been forthcoming, and have provided 4.76mt of supply capacity in the last 15 years.
- 4.47. Based on this assumption it is considered that Policy 20, with some minor amendments to remove an internal inconsistency in the criteria is sound.
- 4.48. Consequently it is suggested that Policy 20 should be amended by clarifying the criterion for unallocated sites being deliverable; this change is included in the schedule attached at Appendix C to this report.
- 4.49. It is further recommended that this forms part of the public consultation during the next stage of the process.

Conclusions relating to Extension Sites

- 4.50. the Inspector has also requested that the findings reached on several extension sites to current sand and gravel quarry operations be similarly reviewed. These conclusions were based on an assessment of the sites through the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal process.
- 4.51. The ISA and conclusions on the extension sites have been reviewed, updated and are considered sound.

CHANGE 13 (dC142, dC143, dC144) Clarification on location of waste management development

- 4.52. The policy and supporting text on locating waste management development has been revised as a consequence of the hearing sessions to provide greater clarity and strengthen the guidance for a wider range of waste management land uses.

CHANGE 14 (dC149) Revise policy on CDE Waste development

- 4.53. The policy on Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste development has been revised to clarify the target capacity requirements and the beneficial uses of inert waste.

CHANGE 15 (dC158, dC159) Remove references to London's Waste.

- 4.54. The references to London's waste are deleted from the HMWP as this requirement is part of the SE Plan which is due to be revoked.

CHANGE 16 (dC173, dC174, dc175) Safeguarding of potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure

- 4.55. During the hearing there was substantial discussion on this matter and alternative wording to that submitted was proposed for Policy 33.
- 4.56. This policy aims to ensure that potential future opportunities for wharves and rail depots are safeguarded, that is they are “safeguarded from unnecessary sterilisation from non-mineral development” as defined by the NPPF. This policy does not therefore presume development.
- 4.57. New Forest District Council sought legal opinion relating to the matter, specifically in challenging the process undertaken by the planning authorities relating to Habitats Regulation Assessment. This legal advice suggested that the planning authority had not carried out the process correctly and that an Appropriate Assessment should be carried out.
- 4.58. The planning authorities have also sought expert legal opinion from a specialist planning barrister on this matter. It is suggested that although some minor rewording of Policy 34 (previously 33) is required, in order to ensure clarity with respect to the purpose of the safeguarding, it is otherwise a sound policy and the due process with respect to HRA has been followed. Therefore it is still considered that an Appropriate Assessment on this matter is not required.
- 4.59. This change is included in the schedule attached at Appendix C to this report.
- 4.60. It is further recommended that this forms part of the public consultation during the next stage of the process.

CHANGE 17 (dC191) Update list of safeguarded sites.

- 4.61. The list of Safeguarded minerals and waste sites has been updated to include concrete batching plants and sites identified for potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure.

CHANGE 18 (dC193) Revise implementation and monitoring plans.

- 4.62. The separate implementation and monitoring plans have been combined to provide a cohesive and improved framework to guide minerals and waste development, and monitor progress against the policies in the HMWP to ensure the right development in the right place at the right time.

5. General Conformity and the South East Plan

- 5.1. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires a planning authority to prepare a local plan which is in ‘general conformity’ with the Regional Spatial Strategy; in our case the South East Plan (SE Plan).

- 5.2. The Government has made it clear on numerous occasions, including a statement from DCLG Minister, Baroness Hanham, on 25 July 2012, that it intends to revoke the SE Plan. However, at the time of writing, the SE Plan is still extant.
- 5.3. The Inspector decided to progress with the Public Examination of the HMWP on the basis that the SE Plan was intended to be revoked. During the hearing he examined the planning authority arguments as to the *flaws* in the SE Plan policies.
- 5.4. As the planning authority has spent several years opposing the requirements of the SE Plan on the basis that those requirements are out of date, there was considerable, robust and up to date evidence available to promote this argument .
- 5.5. The Inspector has asked for the proposed changes necessary to ensure that the HMWP is sound be identified. The schedule of draft proposed changes do not include changes to policy to reflect the SE Plan requirements. If agreed by Members the changes will form the basis of the forthcoming consultation that will also be carried out on the basis that the case for departure from the SE Plan requirements has been made.
- 5.6. Following the consultation and any subsequent hearings, the next stage of the process, requires the Planning Inspector to report his findings on the soundness of the HMWP.
- 5.7. Should the SE Plan remains extant at that time, due to the legal general conformity requirement, continuing to that stage risks an unsound judgement by the Inspector.
- 5.8. An unsound plan has to be abandoned, or be restarted at an earlier stage of the process, with changes proposed to make it sound.
- 5.9. Therefore, it is suggested that if this situation occurs then a formal request should be made to the Inspector for the Public Examination into the HMWP to be suspended, to allow for the revocation of the SE Plan. This will allow the soundness of the Plan to be judged without reference to the general conformity issues.
- 5.10. When the NPPF was brought into force, transitional provisions for 12 months were allowed for local planning authorities to adapt their policies accordingly. It seems reasonable to suggest that the SE Plan will also be revoked by that time.
- 5.11. Therefore it is suggested that authority is given to seek a suspension of the Public Examination at that stage, to allow the plan to proceed once the SE Plan revocation is completed. Since the timing of any suspension request will be dependent on the Government's progress in revoking the SE Plan, and the support of the Planning Inspectorate, the opportune time may not

coincide with a programmed meeting. Therefore delegated approval is sought to allow timely action on behalf of the County Council in this matter.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1. It is intended to publish the full schedule of changes and the revised version of the HMWP for public consultation limited to the proposed changes only.
- 6.2. The representations received would then be collated, analysed and a report compiled which would be presented to the Inspector in due course.
- 6.3. Once the Inspector has the representations and the report, he may wish to reconvene the Hearings which were adjourned on 15 June 2012.
- 6.4. Otherwise, pending the revocation of the SE Plan and any temporary suspension of the Examination he will then finalise his report on the soundness of the HMWP, and submit this to the Planning Authorities.

7. Risks

- 7.1. If the Plan making process continues without delay and the South East Plan remains extant, then it is a certainty that the Inspector will find the HMWP unsound, and the County Council will be unable to adopt the HMWP. It will not even be a material consideration for planning decisions. In this case the options are to abandon the Plan or to start the plan making process again
- 7.2. If the process is delayed significantly then the Inspector may demand that an updating of the evidence base is required. This is not a significant risk but may provide a further delay to reporting and adoption proceedings.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 That it be recommended to Council:
 - a) That the proposed changes to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan be agreed;
 - b) That a schedule of the proposed changes be published and comments invited on their 'soundness' for submission to the Inspector;
 - c) That authority be delegated to the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Transport to formally request, if necessary, of the Planning Inspector that the Public Examination process be suspended and/or undertake other procedural action necessary, to safeguard the Plan, until the revocation of the South East Plan is completed.

Rpt/4161/AF

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

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

Other Significant Links

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Links to previous Member decisions: | | |
| <u>Title</u> Draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan | <u>Reference</u> 2756 | <u>Date</u> 13 October 2011 |
| Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives | | |
| <u>Title</u> National Planning Policy Framework Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended The South East Plan | | <u>Date</u> 27 March 2012 2004 2009 |

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

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

| <u>Document</u> | <u>Location</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| Draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (submission) February 2012 | Winchester |
| Complete schedule of main and additional changes to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan | Winchester |

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 1.1 The proposals in this report have been developed with due regard to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, including the Public Sector Equality Duty and the Council's equality objectives.
- 1.2 An assessment of the impacts of the HMWP can be found at: <http://consult.hants.gov.uk/file/2115069> and in this service area can be found at <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/equality-impact-assessments/ete/delivering-infrastructure.doc>
- 1.3 It is considered that the issues covered by this report will not have impacts requiring further specific actions by the Council above those already established in its existing policies and working procedures.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1. None

3. Climate Change:

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

Sustainable minerals and waste development contributes to the reduction of the carbon footprint of Hampshire

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

The proposals and the plan have been subject to integrated sustainability appraisal to ensure that they contribute to mitigation of, and adaption to climate change.