

Is this your own personal response, or are you responding on behalf of an organisation?	This response is on behalf of an organisation or group
The full name of your organisation or group	Cemex UK Operations Ltd
The full address of your organisation or group	Cemex House, Binley Business Park, Harry Weston Road, Coventry, CV3 2TY
Your full name	██████████
Your position in the organisation or group	Principal Development Planner
Contact email address	████████████████████
Main Modification 6 comments	Policy 3, paragraph 2 - should this not specify it only applies to development which may have an effect on a European site? As currently reads that all development requires a HRA
Main Modification 7 comments	The Major Development Assessment required seems to replicate content of landscape and visual impact assessment which is already within the ES and information within the planning statement which already requires assessment of need, alternatives and impacts. Why do we need a further assessment to duplicate this again?
Main Modification 8 comments	Modification 4.53 – use of the word ‘And’ in the supporting text putting in place a default position that the public right of way network should be not only protected but enhanced in every instance. There is no justification for this. Each case should be considered on its merits
Main Modification 14 comments	The requirement for a proportionate Health Impact Assessment feels rather subjective and looks like fertile ground for objectors and their legal representatives. Everything in the list to the policy just seems to replicate other areas that would be in an ES anyway
Main Modification 23 comments	Support inclusion of Hamble Airfield and Midgham Farm. 6.75 - last sentence does not appear to make sense. 6.77 - dates need to be changed. Hamble is 2027 at the earliest
Main Modification 39 comments	What is purpose of putting “within the plan period” does this mean outside this period it would not be acceptable? - Point 3 – “possible compensation is likely” seems wrong and not sure where this presumption came from – is not the case currently - Point 9 – still not clear what this means. Mitigation for what? Is this for amenity or ecology or something else - Point 12 – At appeal the Inspector agreed it was difficult to objectively “assess” the existing informal recreational use as surveys are likely to be

	<p>biased. Not clear in any case the point of “assessing” it when we know that it is trespass and we are already providing a recreational after use which is required by same bullet point</p>
<p>Main Modification 41 comments</p>	<p>Page 100 – 5th point – the words where possible should be added at the end of the development consideration because buffering of off-site woodland will only be possible where Cemex have control of the land - Page 101 –12th point – Reference to the presumption of large open water bodies and the acceptability of small ponds is all rather subjective especially where the Cemex proposals involve somewhere in between to achieve the necessary water balance for the project. This development consideration needs redrafting. It could say for example that there is a preference for smaller waterbodies - Page 101 – 15th point – I think this should spell out that the priority junction is for the site access. It also refers to the conveyor belt crossing over Lomer Lane, however it could be the case that a conveyor is not used and does not allow flexibility for alternatives which may also be acceptable. - Page 102 – 18th point – If “enhancement” of the rights of way is to be included it should be more specific as the operator and the ROW officer may differ on this. The operator is not likely to consider resurfacing/urbanising ROW an enhancement.</p>