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Non Technical Summary

This is the Non Technical Summary of the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Report of the emerging Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) on Oil and Gas Development and Minerals and Waste Safeguarding which are being prepared to facilitate the implementation of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Introduction

Hampshire County Council (HCC), Portsmouth City Council (PCC), Southampton City Council (SCC), the New Forest National Park (NFPNPA) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) jointly prepared the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (hereafter referred to as the ‘HMWP’). It was adopted in 2013 and covers the geographic areas covered by the Authorities, providing a framework for future minerals and waste development in Hampshire.

SPDs on Minerals and Waste Safeguarding and Oil and Gas Development are being prepared to sit alongside the HMWP and provide guidance on the plans implementation. The SPDs will cover the areas administered by HCC, PCC, SCC and the NFNPA. It does not cover the area of Hampshire covered by the SDNPA.

Why is Integrated Sustainability Appraisal required?

The preparation of the HMWP was subject to a full Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) and this has been used as a basis for ISA work for the SPDs.

The purpose of ISA is to promote sustainable development through integrating social, environmental and economic considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans. It is an integral part of good plan-making involving ongoing iterations to identify and report on the significant effects of the emerging plan and the extent to which sustainable development is likely to be achieved. The difference between SEA and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is that SEA is more focused on environmental impacts, while Sustainability Appraisal includes wider ranging considerations, extending to the social and economic impacts as well the environmental impacts. The SA and SEA has been combined into the ISA. ISA is used to mean ‘sustainability appraisal incorporating the requirements of SEA’.

SPDs do not require a SA to be undertaken but may require a SEA if they are likely to have significant environmental effects that have not already been assessed during the preparation of the Local Plan (in this case the HMWP)¹. The Hampshire Authorities have decided that due to the strategic nature of both the issues covered by the SPDs, it is appropriate to undertake a ISA of both documents to ensure any significant environmental effects are identified and mitigated in the drafting of the Reports. As the SPDs do not contain any policies, the ISA for the SPDs considered the findings of the ISA for the HMWP and built upon this.

The report will show how policy approaches and options that informed the HMWP have been reviewed and how it was determined whether further appraisal was required. In order to demonstrate compliance with the SEA Directive\(^2\), all SEA requirements are listed in **Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Checklist**\[See page 62\].

This report constitutes the ISA Report which supports the consultation of the draft SPDs. If necessary, a revised version will be produced following the consultation if amendments or further appraisal is required.

SA Guidance\(^3\) specifies five stages (A to E) of work that have to be undertaken during the ISA of a development plan. However, the ISA process is iterative in that at each stage in the development plan preparation, the SA needs to be updated and revised. These stages are as follows:

- **Stage A** (Setting the context, establishing the baseline, deciding on the scope and defining the objectives);
- **Stage B** (Developing and refining options and assessing effects);
- **Stage C** (Preparing the ISA report);
- **Stage D** (Consulting on the ISA Report); and
- **Stage E** (Monitoring implementation of the Plan).

The Hampshire Authorities are currently in **Stage C** of the process by consulting on this draft ISA report. Stage A was completed in 2014 following the publication and finalisation of a Scoping Report and Joint Baseline Report (2014) (JBR)\(^4\). The Scoping Report set out the framework for undertaking the ISA of the SPDs. A summary of the consultation responses on the documents can be found in **Appendix 3: Consultation responses received at the Scoping Stage** [See page 67]. Stage B was completed through the preparation of this report.

More information on the ISA process can be found in the main report within **Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Framework** [See page 31] and **Methodology** [See page 15].

**Characteristics of the area covered by the SPDs**

Hampshire is an extremely diverse county, which is characterised by large urban areas, the coast and significant nature conservation and landscape designations. **Description of the area covered by the SPDs** [See page 21] provides more information on the main characteristics of the area covered by the SPDs.

**Relationship with other plans and programmes**

The first stage of the ISA process (**Stage A**) is to identify relevant policies, plans and programmes. This draws on the requirements set out under the SEA Directive to take into account the environmental protection objectives established at international, national and local level. This is an important part of the ISA process as it ensures the work is consistent with up-to-date policy, is informed by sound information and also helps in the process of identifying environmental and sustainability issues.

---

4. ISA of SPDs: [www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/planning-policy-home/isa.htm](http://www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/planning-policy-home/isa.htm)
Relevant policies, plans and programmes [See page 22] sets out the policies, plans and programmes that are considered to be directly relevant to the SPDs and have been selected following a comprehensive review. A full review of the relevant documents and what implications they have on the SPDs is provided in the JBR (2014). The JBR also sets out these policies, plans and programmes which are considered to be immediately and indirectly related to the SPDs.

Key sustainability issues, constraints and opportunities

The key sustainability issues for the SPD have been identified and are summarised in Summary of the baseline and key sustainability issues [See page 25], Assumptions [See page 29] and Limitations [See page 30].

Appraisal

The vision and objectives relevant to the ISA for the SPDs is based on the HMWP vision and objectives. This is set out in Appendix 5: HMWP Vision and objectives [See page 77]. An assessment of compatibility indicates that the objectives of the SPD are generally compatible.

Mitigation measures

The ISA as well as other forms of appraisal e.g. Habitats Regulation Assessment were taken into account through the formulation of potential mitigation measures when the HMWP was being prepared. These are relevant to the SPDs. These included any:

• proposals meeting other policies within the Plan; and
• mitigation measures implemented as a requirement of planning permissions granted for minerals development.

The policies within the Plan will be used to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment and communities. Mitigation measures can also be included as a requirement of planning permissions granted for minerals development. More information is set out in Mitigation measures [See page 55].

Monitoring of sustainability effects

The HMWP will be delivered in the context of the Plan as a whole. This means that the effects of the implementation of the HMWP will be influenced by the degree to which the policies are successfully implemented. For this reason, monitoring the sustainability effects of the HMWP is conducted as part of an overall approach to monitoring taking account of broader social, economic and environmental trends. This also means that monitoring of the implementation of the SPDs will be undertaken as part of the wider monitoring of the HMWP. More information on the ISA monitoring proposed for the HMWP can be found in the HMWP ISA report5 and Monitoring [See page 54].

1. Introduction

1.1 Hampshire County Council (HCC), Portsmouth City Council (PCC), Southampton City Council (SCC), the New Forest National Park Authority (NFPNPA) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) jointly prepared the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (hereafter referred to as the ‘HMWP’) and accompanying documents as required under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004\(^6\). The HMWP was adopted in 2013 and covers the geographic areas covered by the minerals and waste authorities as demonstrated in the following map.

Figure 1: Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan

1.2 The HMWP provides a framework for future minerals and waste development in Hampshire. The HMWP covers the period up to 2030 and aims to protect Hampshire’s environment, maintain its communities and support the local economy through the provision of sustainable minerals and waste development. The HMWP comprises overarching strategic policies as well as strategic site allocations for minerals and waste. It includes policies relating to the following areas:

- Sustainable minerals and waste development;
• Protecting Hampshire's environment (habitats and species, designated landscapes, countryside, Green Belt, historic environment, soils and restoration);
• Maintaining Hampshire's communities (public health, safety and amenity, flood risk, traffic, design and community benefits); and
• Supporting Hampshire's economy (safeguarding, total aggregate supply (marine-won, recycled and secondary aggregate, imports and land-won), silica sand, brick-making clay, chalk, oil and gas, sustainable waste management, waste capacity, energy recovery, locations of waste sites, construction, demolition and excavation waste, liquid waste and waste water management, non hazardous waste landfill, hazardous and low level radioactive waste and safeguarding potential wharves and rail depots).

1.3 The preparation of the HMWP was subject to a full Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA), in line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and current planning policy guidance. The preparation of the HMWP was also in accordance with the requirements of European Directive 2001/42/EC (known as the Strategic Environment Assessment, or SEA Directive)\textsuperscript{7}. This has been used as a basis for the preparation of the ISA for the SPDs.

1.4 Following the adoption of the HMWP, a new partnership has been formed between HCC, PCC, SCC and the NFNPA (hereafter known as the Hampshire Authorities) to monitor and implement the HMWP. The Hampshire Authorities are producing SPDs on Oil and Gas Development in Hampshire and Minerals and Waste Safeguarding. The SPDs will support the implementation of the adopted HMWP.

1.5 Since the adoption of the Plan, the issue of oil and gas development and the potential for hydraulic fracturing (‘fracking’) has shown itself to be an issue of interest and concern to Hampshire communities. The HMWP contains a policy specifically on oil and gas development (\textit{Policy 24}). Due to the interest in this subject, the County Council and its partners consider that the development of a SPD on this issue would provide greater clarity and certainty to Hampshire’s communities and interested parties on issues associated with this type of development. The intention to prepare a SPD also follows the Oil and Gas Development in Hampshire event, which took place in June 2014. The SPD will set out the local expectations for oil and gas planning applications submitted in Hampshire.

\textsuperscript{7}SEA Directive: \url{http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/sea-legalcontext.htm}
1.6 Minerals and waste safeguarding is also an issue which requires further implementation guidance now that the HMWP has been adopted. The HMWP includes clear policies on the safeguarding of mineral resources (Policy 15), minerals infrastructure (Policy 16), waste infrastructure (Policy 26), and potential wharves and rail depots (Policy 34). Further guidance is required to ensure that Hampshire’s District and Borough Councils consult the relevant minerals and waste planning authority effectively when non minerals or waste proposals impact the mineral resources and minerals and waste infrastructure safeguarded by the Plan. In addition, to ensure that developers (for non minerals or waste developments) consider safeguarding issues at the earliest stages of preparation of planning applications, further guidance is needed. The SPD will set out an agreed approach between the County Council and its partners and Hampshire’s District and Borough Councils on the consideration of safeguarding issues when non minerals or waste developments are proposed. It will also provide further guidance to potential developers of non minerals and waste developments about the consideration of these issues when preparing masterplans and planning applications.

1.7 The SPDs cover the area highlighted in the following map.

Figure 2: Area covered by the SPDs

Source: Hampshire Authorities, 2015
1.8 The timescales for the completion of the SPDs are set out in the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Development Scheme which came into affect in September 2014. The SPDs will form part of a suite of documents prepared to support minerals and waste planning decision-making in Hampshire. This includes the adopted HMWP as well as national planning policy as highlighted in the following diagram.

Figure 3: Linkages between the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan and other plans, programmes and documents

Role of this report

1.9 This report constitutes the ISA Report for the emerging draft SPDs. The Hampshire Authorities have produced this ISA Report, to support the public consultation of the draft SPDs. The report reviews the policy approaches and options that informed the HMWP and determine whether further appraisal is required.

---

1.10 This ISA meets the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which should be conducted in accordance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive\(^9\) and the SEA Regulations 2004\(^10\). The objective of SEA is to ‘provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations in the preparation of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development’. SEA is a more refined approach than Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which focuses solely on environmental impacts. In line with Government guidance\(^11\), the two processes have been combined as ‘Integrated Sustainability Appraisal’ (ISA), due to the high degree of overlap in line with current Planning Advisory Service (PAS) guidance on SA (“SA Guidance")\(^12\). This involves extending the breadth of the environmental issues required to be considered under SA. This report addresses the requirements of both the SA and SEA simultaneously through the ISA approach.

1.11 The purpose of ISA is to promote sustainable development through integrating social, environmental and economic considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans. It is an integral part of good plan-making involving ongoing iterations to identify and report on the significant effects of the emerging plan and the extent to which sustainable development is likely to be achieved. The difference between SEA and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is that SEA is more focused on environmental impacts, while Sustainability Appraisal includes wider ranging considerations, extending to the social and economic impacts as well the environmental impacts. The SA and SEA has been combined into the ISA. Throughout this report 'ISA' is used to mean 'sustainability appraisal incorporating the requirements of SEA'.

1.12 According to Government policy\(^13\):

'Assessments should be proportionate, and should not repeat policy assessment that has already been undertaken. Wherever possible the local planning authority should consider how the preparation of any assessment will contribute to the plan’s evidence base. The process should be started early in the plan-making process and key stakeholders should be consulted in identifying the issues that the assessment must cover'.

1.13 In order to demonstrate compliance with the SEA Directive, all SEA requirements are listed in Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Checklist [See page 62].

1.14 The SEA Directive states that the ISA Report should include: 'information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, (and) its stage in the decision-making stage'. The report is structured as follows.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of the Report</th>
<th>Information to be included</th>
<th>Where this is set out in this report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical Summary</td>
<td>• Background to the SPDs</td>
<td>See Non Technical Summary [See page 0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aims, structure and purpose of the ISA Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to comment on the ISA Report</td>
<td>See Introduction [See page 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>• Policy context for the SPDs including compliance with the SEA Directive</td>
<td>See Introduction [See page 1] and Integrated Sustainability Appraisal - Background [See page 8] which covers the requirements and background to the ISA of the SPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>• Appraisal Methodology</td>
<td>See Methodology [See page 15] which covers the appraisal methodology for the ISA and work previously undertaken on the ISA of the HMWP and associated work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The ISA process in developing the SPDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>• Relationship with other Plans and Programmes</td>
<td>See Context for the area covered by the Supplementary Planning Documents [See page 21] which includes information on relevant plans and policies, and baseline information and a description of the plan area, the relationship with other plans and programmes, a summary of the baseline information and sustainability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary of baseline information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key sustainability Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limitations and assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context for the Hampshire Authorities</td>
<td>• Relationship with other Plans and Programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA Framework</td>
<td>• Summary of options</td>
<td>See Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Framework [See page 31] which includes sustainability objectives (including appraisal criteria), and information on compatibility of the emerging SPDs and ISA framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Practical approach to, and appraisal of reasonable options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options Appraisal</td>
<td>• Proposed mitigation measures</td>
<td>See Appraisal of the Supplementary Planning Documents [See page 38] which covers the appraisal of the SPD. The section also considers implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>• Links to other tiers of Plans and Programmes</td>
<td>See Context for the area covered by the Supplementary Planning Documents [See page 21] (see description above), Appraisal of the Supplementary Planning Documents [See page 38] (see description above) and Monitoring [See page 54] which includes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What the report does not include

1.15 Should any further issues arise following the public consultation, further work on the ISA will be undertaken as required and a revised ISA Report will be produced to accompany the adopted SPDs.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Checklist [See page 62];
- Appendix 2: ISA Scoped out at the Scoping Stage [See page 66]; [See page 66]
- Appendix 3: Consultation responses received at the Scoping Stage [See page 67];
- Appendix 4: Responses [See page 76] received following consultation (if required); [See page 76]
- Appendix 5: HMWP Vision and objectives [See page 77];
- Appendix 6: ISA Framework for HMWP [See page 79]; and
- Appendix 7: Relevant Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan policies [See page 83].

Further information

1.16 The SPDs do not include any appraisal of policies or site allocation options as these are not relevant to the SPDs. All options which were considered as part of the HMWP plan-making are documented in the HMWP ISA Report14.

1.17 If you require any further information about the ISA, or on the SPDs and supporting documents please

- see the HCC website: www3.hants.gov.uk/planning-policy-home.htm;
- Telephone: 0300 555 1389;
- Email: planning.policy@hants.gov.uk; or
- Write to: Minerals and Waste Policy Team, Strategic Planning, Economy, Transport & Environment Department, Hampshire County Council, Floor 1 Elizabeth II Court West, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 8UD.

2. Integrated Sustainability Appraisal - Background

2.1 Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) is an assessment of the main environmental, social and economic impacts associated with the SPDs which support the implementation the HMWP.

2.2 This section of the ISA Report sets out information on:

- what ISA encompasses;
- what the legal requirements are to undertake this process;
- information on how this report was prepared; and
- information on option generation and appraisal.

What is ISA?

2.3 SEA guidance\(^{15}\) specifies five stages (A-E) of work to be undertaken during the ISA. The ISA process at each stage is iterative in that within each stage, the ISA needs to be updated and revised, as required. The following diagram highlights the remaining ISA appraisal stages and tasks remaining for the SPD preparation. More detailed information on the stages of the ISA process is documented in 2 'Integrated Sustainability Appraisal - Background'. [See page 31]

Table 1: ISA appraisal stages and tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage A: Setting the context, establishing the baseline, deciding on the scope and defining the objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage C: Preparing the ISA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage D: Consulting on the plan and the ISA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the legal requirements for appraising the SPDs?

2.4 There is no legal requirement to undertake a SA of SPDs. However, SEA maybe required if there is likely to be significant environmental effects that have not already been assessed during the preparation of the Local Plan (i.e. the HMWP)\(^{16}\). The Hampshire Authorities have decided that due to the strategic nature of both the issues covered by the SPDs, it is appropriate to undertake a ISA of both documents to ensure any significant environmental effects are identified and mitigated in the drafting of the Reports.

---

How does this report satisfy the requirements?

2.5 The requirements of the SEA directive are summarised within Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Checklist [See page 62].

The role of stakeholder engagement

2.6 As already indicated, SA guidance recommends that the SA framework is developed with input from key statutory stakeholders\(^{17}\) and is open to wider comments and discussions. This includes on-going liaison with statutory consultees. Extensive engagement was carried out on ISA as part the work for the HMWP and this forms the foundations for the engagement on the SPDs.

2.7 Statutory consultees were consulted on the ISA Scoping Report for the SPDs and the comments given formed the basis for the Revised Scoping Report produced in December 2014.

2.8 Initial engagement was made with interested parties on Oil and Gas Development in Hampshire at an event held in June 2014 which explored the issues and gauged the appetite for an SPD on Oil and Gas.

2.9 This ISA Report will be subject to public consultation alongside the draft SPDs. An event on Minerals & Waste Safeguarding will form part of the consultation.

2.10 A Revised ISA Report will be produced following the consultation if amendments or further appraisal is required.

How the ISA informed the preparation of the SPDs

2.11 The ISA has been progressed in parallel with the development of the SPDs, informing their development. The purpose of the ISA is to inform the process by identifying the key sustainability issues facing the SPD area and to predict what would be the likely effects of the SPDs. The aim is to ensure that the SPDs have as many positive effects as possible, and that any negative effects are avoided or mitigated where possible.

2.12 The following figure shows how the ISA process is incorporated into the preparation of the SPDs.

\(^{16}\) National Planning Practice Guidance para. 009 / Reference ID 11-009-20140306: http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/

\(^{17}\) Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England
How the ISA links to other appraisals and documentation associated with the SPDs

Habitat Regulation Assessment

2.13 A Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken in parallel to the ISA for the development of the SPDs. The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of plans and proposals on the integrity on European Sites (Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)) which are protected under the EU Habitats Directive. If the assessment reveals any significant negative effects, mitigation measures and/or alternative options should be examined to avoid any potential damaging effects.

2.14 The first stage of conducting an HRA is the screening stage for an initial evaluation of the SPDs effect on European Sites. Once established the objectives will be compared with all aspects of the guidance document likely to have an affect on those objectives. Consultation will be undertaken with relevant professional bodies, such as Natural England, throughout the course of the HRA. If the SPD is considered to have a significant effect, a full assessment of the document must be undertaken. This will involve scoping and information gathering to assemble the relevant information to carry out the Assessment. The types of impact need to be identified, for example:
• direct and indirect effects;
• short and long term effects;
• construction, operational and decommissioning effects; and
• isolated, interactive and cumulative effects.

2.15 If the outcome of the HRA finds that the document does have adverse effects, it will be necessary for the Hampshire Authorities to implement mitigation measures. These will be drafted taking into account the information already gathered and advice from organisations such as Natural England. If found to be a viable option, alternative options may be identified for consideration. This process includes assessing the alternatives against a list of conservation criteria and consulting relevant bodies.

2.16 The findings of the HRA preparation to support SPDs have been taken into account when preparation this ISA report.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

2.17 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)\textsuperscript{18} and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)\textsuperscript{19} set out the Government’s policy on flooding and the requirement for a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

2.18 A SFRA was initially prepared in May 2008 and the most recent version was produced in 2011 to support the preparation of the HMWP. The 2011 SFRA concluded that none of the sites in the Plan were subject to flood risk or would result in an increase in the level of potential flood risk.

2.19 As the SPDs will not include additional policies or sites which would impact flood risk a further update of the SFRA is not required. It should be noted that the HMWP includes a policy on Flood risk and prevention (\textit{Policy 11}) and this will be applied as part of the Plan implementation.

Equality Impact Assessment

2.20 An Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) was completed at various preparation stages of the HMWP. Although the SPDs will not include any additional policies or sites, an EQIA will be carried out to assess how the application of the SPDs will affect the people and communities of Hampshire.

Statement of Community Involvement

2.21 The Hampshire Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)\textsuperscript{20} (2014) sets out the approach for involving the community in the preparation, alteration and continuing review of all minerals and waste development documents, and in publicising and dealing with planning applications. The SCI sets out the minimum requirements for publicising planning applications received by the County Council. It includes a commitment for the authority to consult water companies on all oil or gas proposals within their catchment areas.

\textsuperscript{18}National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 100: \url{www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2/}
\textsuperscript{19}National Planning Practice Guidance: \url{http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/}
\textsuperscript{20}Hampshire Statement of Community Involvement (2014): \url{www.hants.gov.uk/sci-2.htm}
2.22 Portsmouth City Council\textsuperscript{21}, Southampton City Council\textsuperscript{22} and the New Forest National Park Authority\textsuperscript{23} have their own SCIs' which would be followed if a proposal were to be received for oil and gas development within their administrative areas.

2.23 The SCIs' set out how the Hampshire Authorities will involve the community in the preparation of the SPDs and therefore is of direct relevance.

**Community Strategies**

2.24 The objectives of Hampshire's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)\textsuperscript{24} were taken into consideration during the preparation of the HMWP as well as the development of the SCI. The SCS sets out quality of life issues, key trends that impact on Hampshire and 11 long term ambitions to achieve the vision that: 'Hampshire continues to prosper, providing greater opportunity for all without risking the environment'.

2.25 Southampton\textsuperscript{25} and Portsmouth\textsuperscript{26} also have Sustainable Community Strategies which seek to improve economic, social and environmental well-being. These Strategies were also taken into consideration as part of the HMWP preparation.

2.26 The SPD Objectives which are being assessed as part of the ISA process are the HMWP Plan Objectives. Therefore, the SPD Objectives will support the SCS Vision.

**Achieving Sustainable Development**

2.27 Delivering sustainable development is a core principle underpinning the United Kingdom planning system and it is very important that the planning system adequately reflects the Government sustainable development policy. A widely used definition of sustainable development is: 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs\textsuperscript{27}.

2.28 In 2005, the UK Government agreed five shared principles of sustainable development which were set out in their publication 'Securing the Future: Delivering the UK Sustainable Development Strategy'\textsuperscript{28}. The five principles are as follows:

- living within the planet’s environmental limits;
- ensuring a strong, healthy and just society;
- achieving a sustainable economy;
- promoting good governance; and
- using sound science responsibly.

\textsuperscript{22}Southampton Statement of Community Involvement: www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/mgIssueHistoryHome.aspx?Id=10117
\textsuperscript{23}New Forest National Park Statement of Community Involvement: www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/info/20040/planning_policy/106/community_involvement
\textsuperscript{26}Sustainability in Portsmouth: www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/community-and-environment/green-living/sustainability-in-portsmouth.aspx
The Government’s view on achieving sustainable development is set out in the NPPF and outlines the three dimensions to sustainable development as well as the roles the planning system will need to perform (collectively) to address these:

- an **economic** role - contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
- a **social** role - supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- an **environmental** role - contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

It should also be noted that at the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be considered as a ‘golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking’.

The sustainable development principles identified above are covered within the ISA objectives and criteria for the SPDs, and underpin the HMWP.

**Option generation and appraisal**

All policies relevant to minerals and waste safeguarding and oil and gas development have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPDs.

The options considered during the preparation of the HMWP are not considered to be relevant as the SPDs do not include ‘policies’ or specific sites. The previous options considered were focused on policy approaches and sites for minerals and/or waste uses. The SPDs do not contain any policies or sites which means such options are not relevant.

Different options specific to the policy approaches set out in the SPDs were not considered, other than to produce the SPD or rely on the policies and the supporting text of the adopted HMWP. It is considered that the two SPDs would improve the implementation of the plan on these issues.

Options on what content is included in the SPD have been considered alongside how information will be presented.

---

Compliance

2.36 It is essential that the SPDs are compliant, and do not conflict with the policies in adopted HMWP. There are no other options relevant to this.

Ensuring flexibility

2.37 The level of data, information and criteria included in the SPD has been considered. It is important that the SPD does not set out information which will become out of date. It is also important that the SPDs are flexible in their guidance, to ensure that they are relevant following adoption. Therefore, as the documents have emerged, consideration of areas which would be inflexible has occurred.

Level of information included

2.38 The oil and gas SPD has a lot of background information in support of it. This information was previously within early drafts of the oil and gas development SPD. However, this has since been removed and placed in a background study to ensure that the SPD would not be out of date if background information changed following adoption. By placing this information in the background study, it allows the Hampshire Authorities to factually update this as it is required.
3. Methodology

3.1 This section covers how the work and consultation was undertaken on the ISA of the HMWP and how this links to this ISA of the SPDs.

3.2 The ISA of both the HMWP and hereafter the SPDs has been undertaken in line with current SA guidance as well as seeking to meet the requirements of both the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the SEA Directive.

3.3 This section of the report sets out the:

- ISA appraisal methodology;
- work previously undertaken on the ISA of the HMWP (as well as other associated work); and the appraisal of the Plan.

Appraisal methodology and link to the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan

3.4 As already indicated, SA guidance specifies five stages (A-E) of work to be undertaken during the sustainability appraisal of a plan or programme. The ISA process at each stage is iterative in that in each stage of preparation, the ISA needs to be updated and revised, as required. The ISA report for the HMWP sets out how ISA was undertaken during the preparation of the plan. How the ISA has been applied to the SPD preparation is summarised below.

Stage A: Setting the context, establishing the baseline, deciding on the scope and defining the objectives

3.5 This stage was completed in 2014, building on previous ISA work for the HMWP. A draft Scoping Report was prepared and consulted on in October 2014, setting out the objectives and tools for undertaking the ISA of the Plan. The report links to the ISA frameworks agreed for the HMWP as documented in the ISA report. The objectives and criteria of the framework will be used to assess the potential sustainability impacts of implementing the SPDs.

3.6 The formal discussions and consultation on the Scoping Report allowed stakeholders to comment on the ISA framework and the suitability of the ISA objectives for the ISA of the Plan.

3.7 The Scoping Report was sent to the following local representatives of statutory environmental bodies and other stakeholders with environmental, social and economic interests:

- Natural England;

---
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• Environment Agency;
• English Heritage (now known as Historic England);
• Ecological specialists - Hampshire County Council;
• Landscape specialists - Hampshire County Council;
• Climate change, sustainability and energy specialists - Hampshire County Council;
• Historic environment specialists - Hampshire County Council;
• Transportation specialists - Hampshire County Council;
• Waste specialists - Hampshire County Council.

3.8 The draft Scoping Report was also accompanied by a revised Joint Baseline Report (2014). Government guidance states that “baseline information’ refers to the existing environmental, economic and social characteristics of the area likely to be affected by the Local Development Document (LDD) and the 'likely evolution without implementation of new policies’. It also highlights that the effects of LDDs outside of the planning authority boundary should be considered. The report included the following types of information:

- description of the likely future conditions (without the plan);
- characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected, including areas wider than the physical boundary of the plan area where practicable;
- difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods;
- existing challenges for the SPDs; and
- plans, policies, programmes and legislation which are considered to be relevant to the SPDs.

3.9 The JBR (2014) contains textual, factual and data updates to the JBRs which supported the ISA of the HMWP. The updated information has been provided by the relevant experts within the Hampshire Authorities, where appropriate.

3.10 The consultees were consulted in October-November 2014. The consultation responses were generally favourable and provided constructive advice and information, particularly in relation to baseline information and the ISA objectives. The consultation resulted in some changes being made to the Scoping Report and the JBR following comments received. Both reports were finalised in December 2014.

3.11 The consultation responses received are summarised in Appendix 2: Consultation responses received at the Scoping Stage [See page 67]. The ISA framework for the HMWP was agreed following consultation.

3.12 The ISA Framework focuses on fourteen broad issues with objectives and associated criteria for each of these issues, as illustrated in the following table.

---

3.13 Responses to the consultation were fed into changes to the ISA objectives, as appropriate.

**Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects**

3.14 Sustainability considerations were taken into account throughout the development of options for the HMWP. They have also been taken into account in the same way through the development of the SPDs. The SEA Directive requires ‘reasonable alternatives’ to be taken into account, and so not every possible alternative needs to be considered. In some instances, other policy considerations (such as national or regional policy) predetermine which policy option will need to be included within the Plan, effectively ruling out some options.

3.15 This stage includes:

- testing the Plan Document objectives against the SA framework;
- developing the plan options;
- predicting the effects the plan;
- evaluating the effects of the plan;
- considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects; and
- proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the plan;

3.16 Sustainability considerations have been taken into account throughout the development of options in Stage B of the ISA process.

**Stage C: Preparing the ISA report**

3.17 This report constitutes Stage C of the ISA process. The ISA report includes the findings of the ISA on likely significant effects in the environmental, social and economic factors. This report has been written to meet all of the requirements of the SEA Directive and these are signposted throughout the report. This report has been prepared to support the draft SPDs. It documents the outputs from stages A-C of the ISA process. It outlines the reasons for selecting options and the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the Plan. The report has been written to meet all of the requirements of the SEA Directive

3.18 The ISA report has been produced to support the consultation on the two SPDs. It will be updated as required before the adoption of the SPDs. This stage includes:

- public participation on the draft SPDs and the ISA Report;
- appraising significant changes;
- appraising significant changes resulting from representations;
- making decisions and providing information.

---

3.19 Consultation on this report constitutes Stage D of the process. Any changes required following the completion of the consultation on the draft SPDs will be made, as required, prior to the adoption of the SPDs.

**Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan**

3.20 Stage E will follow the adoption of the SPDs and will include the monitoring and implementation of the SPDs alongside the adopted HMWP. This report includes a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive and SA guidance. This is considered in 7 'Monitoring of the Minerals and Waste Plan'. [See page 54].

**Work undertaken on ISA**

3.21 There has been significant work completed to date on ISA in advance of preparing the SPDs, during the preparation of the HMWP. The following table summarises the ISA work which has been undertaken to date on the ISA which facilitated the development of the HMWP. This work relates directly to the ISA of the SPDs.
### Table 2: ISA work and consultation undertaken to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan document and ISA stage</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Public consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (HMWCS):**  
  • Scoping  
  • Interim  
  • ISA | August 2005  
  August 2005  
  March 2006 | March 2005 – April 2005  
  September 2005 - November 2005  
  May 2006 - July 2006 |
| **Draft Hampshire Minerals Plan (HMP):**  
  • Scoping (& Revised)  
  • Draft ISA | May 2006, revised  
  September 2006  
| **Draft Hampshire Waste Plan (HWP):**  
  • Scoping (& Revised) | May 2006, revised  
| **Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (Partial review):**  
  • Scoping | November 2009 | July 2009 - August 2009 |
| **Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (adopted) (2013):**  
  • Scoping  
  • Interim ISA report - Policy options  
  • Interim ISA report- Proposals  
  • ISA reports (draft) - publication (pre submission), submission, submission revised  
  • Final ISA Report and associated adoption statement - September 2013 | July 2010  
  February 2011  
  2011-2013 | July 2010 - August 2010  
  February 2011 - March 2011  
  February 2011 - March 2011 |
| All of the stages outlined above have contributed towards the development of the ISA for the Minerals and Waste Plan. | | |
| **Oil and Gas in Hampshire AND Mineral and Waste Safeguarding SPDs:**  
  • Scoping and associated JB  
  • Scoping and JBR revisions  
  • ISA Report v1 | October 2014  
  December 2014  
  June 2015 | October - November 2014  
  June - August 2015 |

### Areas scoped out

3.22 As there has been a significant amount of ISA work undertaken through plan development, as noted above, ISA criteria which have been evolved as part of this process have fed into the ISA for the SPDs. Some criteria previously established were also scoped out as part of the ISA work for the HMWP and these are documented in the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan ISA Report (2013)\(^{41}\). The areas scoped out for the SPDs are documented in Appendix 2: Scoped out ISA criteria [See page 66].

3.23 The areas have been scoped out as they were considered to be either:

- too detailed for the purposes of the SPDs;
- not suitable for the scale of analysis required for the SPDs;
- issue is considered not to be directly relevant to minerals and waste sustainability issues; and

---

• there was already a satisfactory amount of baseline information on the specific topic within the existing evidence base.
4. Context for the area covered by the Supplementary Planning Documents

4.1 As already indicated, the SPDs will support the implementation of the adopted HMWP.

Description of the area covered by the SPDs

4.2 The SPDs cover the geographical and administrative areas of HCC, PCC, SCC and the NFNPA. They will not cover the administrative area of the SDNPA.

4.3 Hampshire is an extremely diverse county, which is characterised by large urban areas, the coast and significant nature conservation and landscape designations. Some of the main characteristics of the area covered by the SPDs can be summarised in the following ways:

- Hampshire has a number of urban areas which characterise their surrounding locations. On the south coast of the county, the cities of Portsmouth and Southampton form the largest urban concentrations in the South East Region outside of London and the coastline. The cities are major centres of employment and the economic, social and cultural services they provide are considerable. Other large urban areas are located further north, at Basingstoke and in the Blackwater Valley.
- Southern Hampshire includes areas of:
  - high residential population densities - resulting in significant production of waste and consumption of minerals in this area of the county;
  - areas of deprivation;
  - some congestion hotspots, especially around the M3 and M27 corridors.
- The southern coastline of the county is made up of the Solent, its harbours and its estuaries, all of which have a special character, and are a mixture of intensive development and open spaces which are of national and international importance for biodiversity.
  - The coast and its hinterland contain significant sand and gravel deposits, which have been significantly exploited in the past, although there are major reserves remaining.
  - The coast has also been used as a location for important waste management facilities. In the last fifty years major landfills have been located on the coast and recently two energy from waste plants (located at Portsmouth and Marchwood) and strategic recycling facilities have been commissioned.
- Hampshire has two designated National Parks (New Forest National Park and the South Downs National Park). Both designations afford them greater protection to ensure that future generations will have the opportunity to understand and enjoy their special qualities.
  - The fringes of the New Forest have significant sand and gravel resources, as well as some potential oil reserves on the boundary with Dorset, some of which will continue to be exploited providing this does not damage the special qualities of the National Park;
  - There is nationally important resources of soft sand and silica sand located within the boundaries of the South Downs National Park, as well as oil...
reserves, and there has been a long history of exploitation of oil within the area now covered by the National Park, both within Hampshire and beyond.

- Hampshire's outstanding landscape derives from a rich historical heritage and in addition to the two National Parks, the county has parts of three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty within its area. These are Chichester Harbour, North Wessex Downs and Cranborne Chase.

- Hampshire has a number of strategic development areas under construction or in the pipeline including Welbourne (north of Fareham), North Whiteley, Wellesley (Aldershot Urban Extension), West of Waterlooville, Barton Farm (Winchester), Manydown (Basingstoke) and Whitehill Bordon. The Whitehill Bordon development area is located on Ministry of Defence land, in the east of the county. There are known significant resources of soft sand and silica sand in this area. East Hampshire District Council is leading the development project with involvement from a large number of other parties including HCC. Prior extraction and on-site use of the mineral is being encouraged through the policies of the HMWP to prevent needless sterilisation.

- The forest area has a largely rural economy and relies to a certain extent on tourism. There are also high levels of Hampshire's elderly residents located in this part of Hampshire.

- Hampshire is mainly rural in nature and is characterised by large areas of open countryside.

- Hampshire also has a significant number of international and nationally designated nature conservation sites located across the county.

Relevant policies, plans and programmes

4.4 The first stage of the ISA process (Stage A) is to identify relevant policies, plans and programmes. This draws on the requirements set out under the SEA Directive to take into account the environmental protection objectives established at international, national and local level. This is an important part of the ISA process as it ensures the work is consistent with up-to-date policy, is informed by sound information and also helps in the process of identifying environmental and sustainability issues.

4.5 The following table sets out those policies, plans and programmes that are considered to be directly relevant to the SPDs and have been selected following a comprehensive review. A full review of the relevant documents and what implications they have on the SPDs is also provided in the JBR (2014). The JBR (2014) also sets out these policies, plans and programmes which are considered to be intermediately and indirectly related to the SPDs.

Table 3: Relevant Policies, Plans, Programmes and Legislation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Policy, Plan, Programme or Legislation Title</th>
<th>Relevance to SPD preparation</th>
<th>Author &amp; Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minerals and waste safeguarding</td>
<td>Oil and gas development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Planning Policy for Waste</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>The Environment Act 1995 (c.25)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Environment Agency (EA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>DCLG, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>DCLG, 2014 (Live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>HCC, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>HCC, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Vision for Portsmouth 2008 - 2018</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southampton's Community Strategy - Southampton Connect Plan 2012 - 2015</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>Southampton City Council (SCC), 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2031</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>HCC, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southampton Local Transport Plan (LTP3) - Strategy and Implementation Plan, Final Draft February 2011</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>SCC, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Portsmouth Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2031</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>Portsmouth City Council (PCC), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local Transport Plan (LTP3) Strategy for South Hampshire</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) (HCC, PCC, SCC) 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Minerals &amp; Waste Plan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Minerals &amp; Waste Plan Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Minerals &amp; Waste Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment Record (Final)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Minerals &amp; Waste Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment Appendices (Final)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Minerals &amp; Waste Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment Baseline Report (Final)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Biodiversity Opportunity Area Statements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Hampshire Corporate Strategy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Review (saved policies)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Fareham Borough Council Core Strategy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Winchester District Local Plan Review (saved policies)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Links to the HMWP vision

4.6 The SPDs directly link to the vision in the adopted HMWP. The vision and its associated objectives are set out in Appendix 5: HMWP Vision and objectives [See page 77].

Summary of the baseline and key sustainability issues

4.7 The baseline provides a basis for predicting and monitoring the likely effects of the SPDs and helps to identify any potential problems and identifies ways of resolving them. It is an important part of the ISA process as it ensures that the process is based on a sound evidence base and provides the basis for identifying environmental or sustainability effects of the SPD.

4.8 Sustainability issues identified as relevant to the development of the SPDs include:

- biodiversity;
- human health;
- social considerations;
- soil;
- air;
- water;
- climatic factors;
- material assets;
- cultural heritage;
4.9 These are addressed in detail within the JBR (2014). The main messages include:

**Biodiversity**

4.10 Hampshire contains a diverse range of habitats, including chalk downland, heathland, ancient woodland, river valleys and coastal habitats. Hampshire has a large number of sites that are specifically designated for nature conservation at an international, national and local level.

4.11 There may be an opportunity for minerals and waste development schemes to enable the 'enhancement' of biodiversity and opportunities to improve, restore or create habitats, particularly through restoration schemes where possible.

**Human health**

4.12 Life expectancy is increasing across Hampshire and this is putting pressure on resources and services.

4.13 Mortality rates caused by circulatory disease and cancer are higher in general in Southampton and Portsmouth than Hampshire and the South East of England.

4.14 Mortalities from land transport accidents in Hampshire are generally declining except for within Portsmouth, Havant, Hart, Gosport, Eastleigh and East Hampshire.

**Social considerations**

4.15 Hampshire has an ageing population. The population of Hampshire (including Southampton and Portsmouth) is projected to increase which will result in an increase in the number of dwellings and households leading to greater demands on resources and infrastructure.

4.16 Hart district is the least deprived district in England, whilst the cities of Southampton and Portsmouth ranked 72nd and 76th out of 354 (1st being most deprived). Unemployment rates are highest in Gosport, Havant, Southampton and Portsmouth.

4.17 Traffic congestion in Hampshire is most severe on the motorway network, in particular the M27 and M3 in south Hampshire.

**Soils**

4.18 Hampshire soils perform a number of important functions and are a finite resource that acts as a foundation for its landscape, wildlife and rural economy. Issues associated with Hampshire’s soils include the threat from development of important agricultural land, conflicts between agriculture and the need for water management in chalk areas, and the need for more diverse vegetation on farmland. Almost 60% of graded agricultural land in Hampshire is considered to be ‘best and most versatile agricultural land’. 
Air

4.19 Most parts of Hampshire enjoy good levels of air quality. There are 26 Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) declared across Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton, all of which are located in urban areas and the majority of the areas relate to vehicle emissions. The only non transport related AQMA is at Fawley. AQMAs relate to amenity issues and human health. In Hampshire, currently less than 1% of minerals and waste sites are located within or adjacent to AQMAs.

4.20 Air quality in Hampshire may also have an impact on biodiversity.

Water (including flooding, water quality, groundwater and water resources)

4.21 Water supply in Hampshire is usually of high quality and resources depend on the groundwater stored in the chalk aquifers of the Hampshire Downs.

4.22 Hampshire is likely to suffer high level water stress in the future with increased consumption levels partially due to a demographic increase and a changing climate. Public water supply sources and large potable abstractions are protected from pollution by Source Protection Zones (SPZ), which prevent polluting discharges to groundwater. Activities are controlled within SPZs, on Major Aquifers, and to some extent Minor Aquifers. Diffuse pollution from farmland, roads, car parks and industrial sites can enter rivers and cause water quality pollution which is detrimental to aquatic life.

4.23 Hampshire has experienced severe flooding in parts of the County, in particular South East Hampshire in 2000/01. More recently widespread flooding in winter 2013/14 affected large parts of the county including Hambledon, Romsey, near Basingstoke and Winchester.

4.24 The district of New Forest and boroughs of Basingstoke & Deane and Test Valley have a high percentage of river length with good biological quality. These districts as well as East Hampshire also have river length of good chemical quality. Gosport has no rivers assessed to have good biological or chemical quality.

Climatic factors

4.25 Hampshire is likely to see more extreme weather events, including heatwaves and flooding. These are likely to have significant effects on national infrastructure, businesses and the economy, health and well-being and emergency planning.

4.26 Industry and commerce is the greatest source of carbon dioxide emissions in Hampshire. Waste management generates carbon dioxide and methane which are both greenhouse gases. However, there is the potential to produce useable heat and electricity from thermal and biological treatment processes.

4.27 Hampshire has four permitted energy recovery facilities and two combined heat and power (CHP) plants. Climate change may lead to potential changes in the profile and volume of municipal waste in Hampshire.
Material assets (including land use and transport)

4.28 Hampshire has excellent road, rail, air and sea transport links. Although the area includes a strategic network of motorways and 'A' roads there are some areas that are prone to congestion. The Port of Southampton is the fourth largest port in the UK and exports arrive by road, rail and sea. Freight is also transported via Hampshire’s rail network and through its wharves.

4.29 The area is also served by a number of airports and airfields including Southampton and Bournemouth.

4.30 A large proportion of Hampshire (58% in 2007) consists of farmland, contributing approximately 18% of the South East region's farmland. Woodland also accounts for approximately 18% of the landcover.

Material assets (including minerals and waste)

4.31 Hampshire's most abundant mineral reserves are sand, gravels, chalk and clay. Sand and gravel are supplied from land-won and marine dredged sources. Land-won sand and gravels are primarily located along the south coast, the Avon Valley and the North of the County.

4.32 Chalk extraction has reduced over recent years and there is only one permitted site for clay extraction which is linked to the brickworks. Oil and gas is extracted from three productive oil fields. Crushed rock is imported into Hampshire through rail depots.

4.33 It is estimated that approximately 4.8 million tonnes of controlled waste was handled (or deposited) in Hampshire in 2010. The way in which Hampshire's waste has been managed has varied over time and is highlighted most significantly by the increase in municipal solid waste treatment at Hampshire’s energy from waste facilities and decreased reliance on landfill.

Material assets (including noise, light pollution and renewable energy)

4.34 In Hampshire, ambient noise concerns are associated with noise generated by vehicle engines or vibration on road surfaces. There are concerns regarding the impact and intrusion of noise pollution on the National Parks located within Hampshire (New Forest and South Downs).

4.35 Studies indicate light pollution is worsening, with an increase by 13% of the area of Hampshire affected by excessive lightening in the seven years between 1993 and 2000.

4.36 The majority of energy in Hampshire is generated by fossil fuels which contribute to the greenhouse effect. Three of Hampshire’s energy from waste facilities manage municipal waste and have the capacity to take 420,000 tonnes of waste per annum producing 36 Megawatts per annum. The use of biomass as a fuel could increase opportunities for energy generation within Hampshire.
Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage)

4.37 Hampshire has a rich historic environment with many nationally designated heritage assets, which encompasses archaeological sites, historic buildings and settlements, historic landscapes, parks and gardens, conservation areas and one historic battlefield site. The historic landscape character of Hampshire is diverse including field patterns and formal enclosures reflecting changing agricultural practice. Nationally important water meadows are also characteristic in many parts of Hampshire.

Landscape and Townscape

4.38 Hampshire's landscape is exceptional in terms of national significance of its built, natural and historic environment.

4.39 The New Forest National Park, the South Downs National Park and three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, collectively cover 38% of Hampshire.

Economic considerations

4.40 Hampshire has a diverse and vibrant economy and is strategically well placed. Hampshire has a number of market towns which form service centres for the surrounding areas.

4.41 Hampshire is home to 1.7 million people and has an economic output of around £35 billion.

4.42 Tourism contributes greatly to Hampshire's economy.

4.43 The construction industry relies on minerals supply (90% of aggregate minerals are used in this industry). There has been a decline of aggregate sales in the UK since mid 2008 with sales falling 35%.

Assumptions

4.44 A number of assumptions on the impacts (both positive and negative) of minerals and waste development were made when predicting the effects of the HMWP as part of plan preparation. These assumptions are listed in Table 4.4 of the HMWP ISA Report\(^{42}\) which also include potential mitigation measures that could help to reduce particular impacts.

4.45 The assumption made at the time of plan preparation that development will need to comply with all of the relevant policies contained within the Plan also applies to the preparation of the SPDs. As such, it is assumed that no significant adverse affects will arise from proposals, except in exceptional circumstances as all the policies in the Plan would need to be complied with before development commences.
Limitations

4.46 There are a number of data gaps that have been identified following the preparation of the JBR (2014). Each section in the JBR includes information on data limitations (difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods).

4.47 In summary there were difficulties obtaining updated information and data including the following:

- assessment of carbon impact;
- Nitrogen Oxide levels;
- emissions from waste facilities;
- soil loss data at a County level;
- Hampshire wide noise mapping;
- the impact of minerals and waste operations on biodiversity;
- regular measurements of light levels (only currently measured every 7 years);
- employment levels in minerals and waste;
- perceptions of minerals and waste;
- capacity and dual uses of waste facilities;
- concise data on recycled aggregate sales; and
- unpredictability of climate change events (frequency and intensity) makes assessment of impacts on minerals and waste operations difficult.

4.48 A number of data sources are also not up-to-date and this has impacted the collection of data for baseline information. As, and when, new information is made available, the JBR will be updated accordingly.

4.49 It should be made clear however, that because a need for additional data has been identified this does not commit the Hampshire Authorities to commissioning work to fill this need.
5. Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Framework

Sustainability Objectives

5.1 As already noted, the SPDs will assist in the implementation of policies contained within the HMWP. They do not contain any new policies. Therefore, the SPDs use the relevant Plan objectives as well as the Vision set out in the adopted HMWP (see Appendix 5: HMWP Vision and objectives [See page 77]). The ISA for the SPDs will not contain separate SPD objectives as a result.

5.2 ISA Objectives are required to test and minimise the social, environment and economic effects of the emerging SPDs. The SEA Directive\(^ {43} \) requires that the ISA Objectives reflect the issues set out in the Directive. The ISA Objectives and Criteria used for the assessment of the HMWP are set out in Appendix 6: ISA Framework for HMWP [See page 79]. These relate to the following areas:

- A1: Biodiversity;
- A2: Landscape & Townscape;
- A3: Water Resources & Flooding;
- A4: Air Quality;
- A5: Prudent use of Natural Resources;
- A6: Climate Change;
- A7: Transportation;
- A8: Historic Environment;
- A9: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition;
- A10: Communities and Amenity;
- A11: Access and Open Space;
- A12: Health and Quality of Life;
- A13: Economic Growth and Development;
- A14: Poverty and Deprivation.

5.3 The following table shows how the SEA issues are represented within the ISA Objectives.

---

Table 4: Relation of ISA Objectives to the SEA Directive issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Issue</th>
<th>ISA Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population*</td>
<td>A10, A11, A12, A13, A14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Health</td>
<td>A12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Considerations</td>
<td>A10, A12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic Factors</td>
<td>A3, A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Assets*</td>
<td>A6, A7, A9, A10, A12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>A2, A5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These terms are not clearly defined by the Directive

5.4 To ensure that the ISA Objectives do not contradict with each other the objectives have been tested to check their compatibility. The following table shows that none of the ISA Objectives are incompatible with each other, although a number are considered to have no effect.
The SPD Objectives and ISA Framework Objectives are set out in Appendix 5: HMWP Objectives [See page 77] and Appendix 6: ISA Framework for HMWP [See page 79] respectively and the following table shows the results of the compatibility test.

### Table 5: Compatibility of Sustainability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISA Objective</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>A9</th>
<th>A10</th>
<th>A11</th>
<th>A12</th>
<th>A13</th>
<th>A14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- ✓ Compatible
- X Incompatible
- o No effect
- ? Neutral / Uncertain

**Relationship with the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan objectives and the ISA**

5.5 The SPD Objectives and ISA Framework Objectives are set out in Appendix 5: HMWP Objectives [See page 77] and Appendix 6: ISA Framework for HMWP [See page 79] respectively and the following table shows the results of the compatibility test.
### Table 6: ISA and SPD Objectives Compatibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISA Objectives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- ✓ Compatible
- X Incompatible
- o No effect
- ? Neutral / Uncertain

5.6 The assessment of compatibility indicates that the ISA Objectives are generally compatible with the SPD Objectives. There were a number of Objectives that have an uncertain compatibility and this is generally due to the fact that the Objectives are not location specific. The compatibility of the Objectives is explained in more detail below.

**Protecting Hampshire’s environment and maintaining communities (SPD Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5)**

5.7 SPD Objectives 1 (Protecting and conserving), 2 (Climate Change), 3 (Community health, safety and amenity), 4 (Countryside) and 5 (Managing traffic) are all compatible with the ISA Objectives A1 (Biodiversity), A2 (Landscape/Townscape), A3 (Water resources and flooding), A4 (Air Quality), A5 (Prudent use of resources), A6 (Climate Change), A7 (Highways), A8 (Historic Environment), A9 (Sustainable design), A10 (Communities and amenity), A11 (Countryside/open space), A12 (Health and QoL) and A13 (Economic growth and development) as it is recognised that a quality environment (rural and urban) as well as creating a place that people want to live and work all contribute to a sustainable economy.
5.8 Whilst the SPD Objectives are likely to have a positive impact on Hampshire’s economy, it is not clear that this would subsequently have an impact on Hampshire’s pockets of deprived areas. Therefore, there is likely to be no effect on Objective A14 (Poverty and Deprivation).

**Encouraging engagement between developers, site operators and communities so there is an understanding of respective needs (SPD Objective 6)**

5.9 SPD Objective 6 is compatible with the ISA Objectives A9 (Sustainable design), A10 (Communities and amenity) and A12 (Health and Quality of Life) as these are elements that can be part of the discussions and negotiations between the parties involved within a development and likely to have the most direct impact. However, there is some uncertainty of the compatibility with all of the other ISA objectives. For example, the impact of the objective on the ability to reduce the adverse effects of the transportation of minerals and waste is uncertain as this will depend on where a site will be located in relation to its main markets and the method of transportation which will determine extent of the impact. Therefore, to a certain extent, many of the uncertainties are based on potential site specific impacts which cannot be considered as the SPDs will not be considering specific sites.

5.10 The effective implementation of the SPD Objectives 3 (Community health, safety and amenity) and 5 (Managing traffic impacts) would further help to address any concerns likely to be raised by communities and would be addressed by the developer and site operator.

**Supporting Hampshire’s continued economic growth, as well as the economies influenced by Hampshire and the opportunities for urban regeneration where possible (SPD Objective 7)**

5.11 SPD Objective 7 is compatible with ISA Objectives A9 (Sustainable Design), A10 (Communities and amenity), A13 (Economic growth) and A14 (Poverty and deprivation) as there is a direct link between meeting these objectives. The compatibility between SPD Objective 7 and ISA Objective A14 is positive as the opportunities for urban regeneration correlate with some of Hampshire’s pockets of deprivation including Portsmouth and Southampton.

5.12 The compatibility of Objective 7 with the remaining ISA Objectives would be improved by the implementation of the SPD Objectives 1 (Protecting and conserving), 2 (Climate Change), 3 (Community health, safety and amenity), 4 (Countryside), 5 (Managing traffic) and 10 (Engagement) and would help to prevent and mitigate any negative impacts arising from this objective.
Safeguarding mineral resources, necessary existing minerals and waste infrastructure and land for potential wharf or rail depot infrastructure as a contribution to a steady and adequate supply of minerals and provision of waste management facilities (SPD Objective 8)

5.13 SPD Objective 8 is compatible with ISA Objectives A1 (Biodiversity), A2 (Landscape/Townscape), A5 (Prudent use of resources), A6 (Climate Change), A7 (Highways), A9 (Sustainable Design) and A13 (Economic growth) as safeguarding will protect the needless sterilisation of primary resources as well as protecting existing infrastructure which may reduce the need for facilities over and above these identified within the HMWP. However, there is some uncertainty over its compatibility with ISA Objectives A2 (Landscape/Townscape), A3 (Water resources and flooding), A4 (Air Quality), A10 (Communities and amenity), A11 (Countryside and open space), A12 (Health and QoL) and A14 (Poverty and deprivation).

5.14 The effective implementation of the SPD Objectives 1 (Protecting and conserving), 2 (Climate Change), 3 (Community health, safety and amenity), 4 (Countryside), 5 (Managing traffic) and 10 (Engagement) would help to prevent and mitigate any negative impacts arising from these objectives.

Steady and adequate supply of minerals (SPD Objectives 9, 10, 11 and 12)

5.15 SPD Objectives 9 (An adequate supply of minerals), 10 (Brick-making clay), 11 (Chalk extraction) and 12 (Oil and gas) are only compatible with ISA Objective A13 (Economic Growth) as ensuring a steady and adequate supply of minerals will encourage economy growth through supporting the delivery of infrastructure, housing and the provision of jobs. The compatibility of the Objective with the other ISA Objectives is uncertain as the impact would be dependent on the location of the source of the mineral and are therefore site specific. The SPDs will not be considering specific sites.

5.16 The effective implementation of the SPD Objectives 1 (Protecting and conserving), 2 (Climate Change), 3 (Community health, safety and amenity), 4 (Countryside), 5 (Managing traffic) and 10 (Engagement) would help to prevent and mitigate any negative impacts arising from these objectives.

Encouraging a zero waste economy whereby landfill is virtually eliminated by providing for more recycling and waste recovery facilities including energy recovery (SPD Objective 13)

5.17 SPD Objective 13 is compatible with ISA Objectives A4 (Air Quality), A5 (Prudent use of resources), A6 (Climate Change), A13 (Economic Growth) as the elimination of landfill will reduce greenhouse gases and the use of waste as a resource and fuel will reduce reliance on natural resources and can contribute positively to the local economy. However, the compatibility of the objective with the remaining ISA Objectives is uncertain as providing more facilities could have an negative impact on those objectives seeking to protect Hampshire's environment and communities however this would be dependent on the location of the facilities.
5.18 The effective implementation of the SPD Objectives 1 (Protecting and conserving), 2 (Climate Change), 3 (Community health, safety and amenity), 4 (Countryside), 5 (Managing traffic) and 10 (Engagement) would help to prevent and mitigate any negative impacts arising from this objective.

Aiming for Hampshire to be 'net self-sufficient' in waste management facilities whereby it can accommodate all the waste that arises, whilst accepting there will be movements into and out of the area to facilities such as the nationally important incinerator at Fawley (SPD Objective 14)

5.19 SPD Objective 14 has an uncertain compatibility with all of the ISA Objectives as 'net self-sufficiency' is a principle and does not have clear implications of its effects within Hampshire. However, it could be considered to have a slightly positive effect on managing traffic impacts outside of Hampshire as there should be less reliance on the use of facilities outside of Hampshire and therefore, a reduction in transportation of waste. However, it is recognised that some transportation of waste will have to occur outside of Hampshire and that some waste may have to come from outside of Hampshire due to the specialised nature of some waste types (e.g. hazardous waste).
6. Appraisal of the Supplementary Planning Documents

6.1 Whilst there is no statutory reason to undertake an ISA of SPDs, the Hampshire Authorities have considered whether an ISA of the draft SPDS is required. The Hampshire Authorities have determined that the draft SPDs are unlikely to have significant environmental, social or economic effects. In coming to this conclusion the authorities are mindful that the draft SPDs do not create new policies and serve only to expand on existing policy within its ‘parent DPD’, the HMWP (which has already been subject to ISA incorporating SEA). This conclusion has been founded on the information presented in the remaining part of this section which is split in the following ways:

- Minerals and Waste Safeguarding [See page 38]; and
- Oil and Gas Development in Hampshire [See page 41].

6.2 The ISA of the HMWP policies relevant to the SPDs have been reviewed. An assessment of compatibility indicates that the objectives of the SPD are generally compatible. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPDs will alter the appraisal of the policies previously undertaken. The guidance will seek to enhance the implementation of plan policies so in that regard it will have a positive impact on the application of the relevant policies.

Appraisal of Minerals and Waste Safeguarding SPD

6.3 Policies 15 (Safeguarding - mineral resources), 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure), 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure) and 34 (Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot) of the HMWP are relevant to minerals and waste safeguarding.

Policy 15 (Safeguarding - mineral resources)

6.4 As minerals can only be worked where they are found, it is important to 'safeguard' viable mineral resources from needless sterilisation by other development to secure a future long term supply of minerals. The NPPF sets out the requirement to define Mineral Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific mineral resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised. This is met by Policy 15 of the HMWP.

6.5 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- did not result in any significant impacts associated; and
- may have the potential for negative impacts dependent on how the site is operated and what mitigation measures are in place. However, safeguarding helps provides certainty of supply for businesses.

6.6 It was also noted that the outcome of the assessment is dependent on the area covered by the mineral safeguarding.

6.7 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 15 in the HMWP.
The results of the ISA of Policy 15 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to minerals safeguarding.

Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure)

6.8 The adopted HMWP meets the NPPF requirement to safeguard existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for bulk transport by rail, sea or inland waterways of minerals, as well as existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching through Policy 16.

6.9 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- resulted in a number of significant positive impacts generally in relation to Transportation, Sustainable Design, Construction & Demolition, Health and Quality of Life and Economic Growth & Development; and that
- the policy did not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria.

6.10 It was also noted that the impact of this policy would be dependent on:

- the current impact of the safeguarded minerals infrastructure development; and
- when permission was granted and how stringent the policies were at that time.

6.11 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 16 in the HMWP.

Table 7: ISA results for Policy 15 (Safeguarding - mineral resources) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 15 (Safeguarding - mineral resources)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 16 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to minerals safeguarding.

Table 8: ISA results for Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure)</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure)

6.12 Hampshire is a leading authority in household waste management and has an established waste infrastructure. Many existing sites are considered critical to meeting Hampshire’s long term needs, and it is important they are protected against competing land uses through safeguarding. It is also important that existing and potential waste uses for the sites are not hindered by ‘encroachment’ of development near to the existing site. Some larger scale waste management facilities play a ‘strategic’ role in waste management beyond Hampshire, and it is important that capacity is maintained.

6.13 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- impact will depend on the safeguarding of sites, extensions to safeguarded sites and new sites and the associated existing impacts caused by the site and the location of the development;
- does not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria; and
- is likely to result in a number of positive impacts for Hampshire.

6.14 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 26 in the HMWP.

Table 9: ISA results for Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure)</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td>+ /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 26 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to waste safeguarding.

Policy 34 (Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure)

6.15 Evidence collected as part of plan preparation indicated that there is no need for further wharf and rail depot capacity within the plan period. However, it was also acknowledged that changes in land use and land availability may mean that new sites / areas may become available within the plan period which could be suitable for further wharf and rail depot facilities if they meet the requirements of environmental and amenity policies and guidance. The NPPF sets out the requirement to safeguard planned and potential rail heads, rail linked quarries, wharfage and associated infrastructure. This requirement is met by Policy 34.

6.16 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:
• does not result in any significant negative effects;
• the impacts on the majority of the criteria where uncertain. This is largely due to the fact that it would depend on the type and location of land which may become available for potential safeguarding; and
• there may be significant positive impacts on economic growth and development if new land were to become available which is suitable for a large deep water wharf. However, this also depends to a certain extent on the land which may become available and the type of facility which could be developed on such land.

6.17 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 34 in the HMWP.

Table 10: ISA results for policies in the Supporting Hampshire’s economy section of the HMWP

|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

The results of the ISA of **Policy 34** have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to minerals and waste safeguarding.

**Appraisal of the Oil and Gas Development SPD**

6.18 The following policies of the HMWP are considered to be directly relevant to the emerging SPD on oil and gas development.
Sustainable minerals and waste development

Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development)

6.19 This policy considers the presumption in favour of sustainable development and how this will be applied through the plan and through development management.

6.20 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy did not result in any significant negative impacts and resulted in positive impacts on all criteria.

6.21 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 1 in the HMWP.

Table 11: ISA results for Policy 1 of the adopted HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 1 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Protecting Hampshire’s environment

Policy 2 (Climate change - mitigation and adaptation)

6.22 There is national requirement for the Plan to include policies on climate change and Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term including factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. Climate change mitigation and adaption is considered to be a strategic priority by the Government. This is considered within Policy 2.

6.23 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- did not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria; AND
- is likely to have a positive impact on Hampshire as Policy 2 specifically addresses climate change.

6.24 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 2 in the HMWP.

Table 12: ISA results for Policy 2 (Climate change - mitigation and adaptation) of the HMWP
The results of the ISA of Policy 2 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species)

6.25 Hampshire has a wealth of wildlife habitats including chalk grassland, heathland, ancient woodland, chalk rivers, old meadows, wetlands and coastal habitats, and species of plants and animals that are considered nationally or locally rare or important. There is a national planning policy requirement for the plan to include policies relating to the protection of habitats and species. The NPPF also states that 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. Policy 3 meets these requirements.

6.26 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- did not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria; and
- will have a significant positive impact on Hampshire's biodiversity as well as having a positive impact on Hampshire's landscape and tourism industry.

6.27 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 3 in the HMWP.

Table 13: ISA results for Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the HMWP

The results of the ISA of Policy 3 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.
Policy 4 (Protection of the designated landscape)

6.28 Hampshire’s landscape is exceptional in terms of the national significance of its built, natural and historic environment. This is reflected in the designation of two national parks and three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). The NPPF indicates that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas such as National Parks and AONBs. It also states that planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances. This is considered within Policy 4.

6.29 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

- does not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria;
- will have a significant positive impact on Hampshire’s landscapes as well as having a positive impact on Hampshire’s biodiversity, access to the countryside and open space, and the tourism industry.

6.30 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 4 in the HMWP.

Table 14: ISA results for Policy 4 (Protection of the designated landscape) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4 (Protection of the designated landscape)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 4 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside)

6.31 Hampshire’s countryside outside of designated areas also requires protection as it is also highly valued and it is important to respect its special qualities. One of the main core planning principles identified in the NPPF relates to taking into account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it. In addition to the areas which are subject to formal landscape designations, there are areas of the countryside that are highly valued, and it is important to respect the special qualities of these areas. This is considered within Policy 5 which seeks to prevent minerals and waste development in the countryside unless certain criteria are met.

6.32 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:
6.33 It was also noted that the impact of development on biodiversity and landscape would be dependent on the location but would have to comply with other policies in the plan.

6.34 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 5 in the HMWP.

Table 15: ISA results for Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside)</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 5 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt)

6.35 Hampshire has one Green Belt, located in the south west of the county (the South West Hampshire Green Belt). This has been designated to contain development pressures from the Bournemouth urban area. These areas are often sensitive landscapes important to the setting of settlements. One of the main core planning principles identified in the NPPF relates to taking into account of the different roles and character of different areas and protecting the Green Belts. Minerals development is generally considered an exception to the restrictions on development in the Green Belt, since it is a temporary use and should not detract from the 'openness' of the land and so continue to contribute to the separation of settlements.

6.36 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

- is likely to have a positive impact on Hampshire’s prudent use of resources, sustainable design and access to the countryside;
- impacts on biodiversity and landscape would be dependent on the actual location of the development.

6.37 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 6 in the HMWP.

Table 16: ISA results for Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt)</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ISA of Policy 6 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets)

6.38 Hampshire has a rich and diverse heritage of archaeological sites, historic buildings, vessels and historic landscapes. The NPPF indicates that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. It is important to ensure that archaeological material and knowledge, including a record of historically or architecturally significant buildings, is preserved for future generations. This is considered through Policy 6 which seeks to conserve Hampshire's historic environment and heritage assets.

6.39 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

• will have a significant positive impact;
• does not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria; and
• is likely to have a positive impact on Hampshire's economy, landscape and townscape.

6.40 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 7 in the HMWP.

Table 17: ISA results for Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets)</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 7 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.
Policy 8 (Protection of soils)

6.41 Hampshire has a rich and diverse range of soils which perform essential functions which underpin Hampshire's environment, society and economy. The NPPF indicates that the planning systems should protect and enhance valued soils. It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

- seeking to protect soils and specifically best and most versatile agricultural land will have a significant positive impact;
- does not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria; and
- may also have a positive impact on biodiversity but it is dependent on where development is proposed and the quality and function of the soils.

6.42 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 8 in the HMWP.

Table 18: ISA results for Policy 8 (Protection of soils) the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8 (Protection of soils)</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 8 have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD just provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments)

6.43 The effective restoration as well as the long term aftercare of minerals development is an integral part of all mineral extraction in Hampshire. Although oil and gas extraction are only considered to be temporary land uses, it is critical that the restoration and aftercare of these sites is carefully planned and maintained, to ensure that maximum benefits are achieved for local communities and environment. Once oil and gas development has been completed, a site may be returned to the former land use or to a number of different 'after-uses'. Restoration is a key area where positive benefits can be created through minerals development. NPPF states that policies should be put in place to ensure worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place, including for agriculture (safeguarding the long term potential of best and most versatile agricultural land and conserving soil resources), geodiversity, biodiversity, native woodland, the historic environment and recreation. Policy 9 provides an opportunity to improve or enhance sites within Hampshire which can provide a number of environmental or social benefits that can also lead to economic benefits.
6.44 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach did not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria.

6.45 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 9 in the HMWP.

**Table 19: ISA results for Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the HMWP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments)</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>A9</th>
<th>A10</th>
<th>A11</th>
<th>A12</th>
<th>A13</th>
<th>A14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ + + 0 + 0 + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of *Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments)* have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD just provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

**Maintaining Hampshire’s communities**

**Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity)**

6.46 It is important that minerals and waste management activities should not give rise to pollution or have a materially undue adverse environmental impact or impact on community amenity. The Plan considers these issues through policy 10. The policy sets out to the community the principles for controlling pollution, potential impacts on health, quality of life and amenity, as well as public safety. The NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability. This is taken into account through Policy 10.

6.47 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

- does not result in any significant negative impacts; and
- may result in positive impacts associated with biodiversity, landscape and townscape, water resources and flooding, air quality, transportation, historic environment, sustainable design, construction and demolition, countryside and access and health and quality of life.

6.48 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 10 in the HMWP.

**Table 20: ISA results for Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the HMWP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity)</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>A9</th>
<th>A10</th>
<th>A11</th>
<th>A12</th>
<th>A13</th>
<th>A14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ + + + 0 + 0 ++ + + + +</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ISA of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention)

Hampshire is heavily influenced by its water sources and there are many streams, lakes and reservoirs throughout Hampshire. Hampshire also lies on the Solent, which serves the busy ports of Portsmouth and Southampton. National planning policy on flooding aims to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding and sets out a sequential approach for determining appropriate locations. This approach is based on the indicative Flood Maps prepared by the Environment Agency. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was prepared to support the HMWP.

Policy 11 was included in the HMWP. It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- did not result in any significant negative impacts;
- is considered to have a significant positive impact on water resources and flooding and sustainable design, construction and demolition;
- policy may also result in positive impacts on communities and amenity, health and quality of life and economic growth and development; and
- there is some uncertainty attached to the impact on transportation, economic growth and development and poverty and deprivation.

The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 11 in the HMWP.

Table 21: ISA results for Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.
Policy 12 (Managing traffic)

6.52 *Policy 12 (Managing traffic)* is relevant to the emerging SPD on oil and gas development only.

6.53 The supply of minerals and the management of waste resources are dependent on a variety of transport infrastructures that the Plan needs to consider. It is therefore critical that the HMWP includes a policy on managing the potential impacts of traffic associated with minerals and waste development. The NPPF encourages sustainable transportation and this is reflected in Policy 12 of the HMWP.

6.54 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- did not result in any significant negative impacts;
- is considered to have a significant positive impact on transportation;
- may also result in positive impacts on biodiversity, air quality, communities and amenity and health and quality of life; and
- there is some uncertainty attached to the impact on A5 (Prudent use of resources, land and soils etc).

6.55 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 12 in the HMWP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12 (Managing traffic)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of *Policy 12 (Managing traffic)* have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development)

6.56 The sustainable design and operation of minerals and waste development in Hampshire plays a critical role in ensuring potential impacts are reduced or avoided. National planning policy attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and it is considered to be a key element in achieving sustainable development. The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. This was reflected in Policy 13 of the HMWP.

6.57 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

- did not result in any significant negative impacts;
- is considered to have a significant positive impact on biodiversity, landscape and townscape, water resources and flooding, prudent use of resources, land and soils
etc, sustainable design, construction and demolition, communities and amenity and health and quality of life; and

- may also result in positive impacts on biodiversity, landscape and townscape, water resources and flooding, air quality, climate change and the historic environment.

6.58 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 13 in the HMWP.

Table 23: ISA results for Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP's preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD just provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Policy 14 (Community benefits)

6.59 A frequent concern of communities that host or might host minerals and waste development is that there is no immediate community benefits to 'compensate' for the inconvenience that occurs. The NPPF highlights that the planning system can play an important role in creating healthy, inclusive communities. The HMWP encourages community involvement and the principle of local community benefits through Policy 14.

6.60 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy approach:

- did not result in any significant negative impacts; and
- may result in positive impacts on Communities and amenity, Health and Quality of Life, Economic growth and development) and Poverty and deprivation.

6.61 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 14 in the HMWP.

Table 24: ISA results for Policy 14 (Community benefits) of the HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14 (Community benefits)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the ISA of Policy 14 (Community benefits) have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.

Supporting Hampshire’s economy

Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure)

6.62 The adopted HMWP meets the NPPF requirement to safeguard existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for bulk transport by rail, sea or inland waterways of minerals, as well as existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching through Policy 16.

6.63 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy:

- resulted in a number of significant positive impacts generally in relation to transportation, sustainable design, construction & demolition, health and quality of life and economic growth & development; and
- did not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria.

6.64 It was also noted that the impact of this policy would be dependent on:

- the current impact of the safeguarded minerals infrastructure development; and
- when permission was granted and how stringent the policies were at that time.

6.65 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 15 in the HMWP.

Table 25: ISA results for Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure) of the adopted HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure)</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the ISA of Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure) have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the SPD on Oil and Gas Development. It is not considered that the preparation of the SPD would result in any changes to the previous ISA appraisal of the policy undertaken at the time of the HMWP’s preparation. This is on the basis that the SPD only provides additional guidance on the application of this policy in relation to oil and gas development.
Policy 24 (Oil and gas development)

6.66 Oil and gas are important mineral resources and primary sources of energy in the UK. There is a ready and continuing need for the minerals in the foreseeable future with the Government's energy policy being to ensure secure, diverse and sustainable supplies and the sustainable use of energy minerals such as oil and gas. Hampshire has a number of areas of onshore oil and gas which are the result of considerable exploration activity in the last 25 years. The issue of oil and gas development is considered through Policy 24.

6.67 It was concluded at the time of plan preparation that the policy did not result in any significant negative impacts associated with any of the ISA criteria.

6.68 The following table sets out the results of the ISA of Policy 24 in the HMWP.

Table 26: ISA results for Policy 24 (Oil and gas development) of the adopted HMWP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 24 (Oil and gas development)</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
<td>+ /?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Monitoring

7.1 This section of the report sets out the proposals for monitoring. The SEA Directive requires that "member states shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans or programmes... in order, inter alia, to identify at an early stage, unforeseen adverse effects, and be able to undertake appropriate remedial action" (Article 10.1) and that the environmental report should provide information on "a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring" (Annex 1 (i)).

7.2 The Vision, objectives and policies of the HMWP will be delivered in the context of the Plan as a whole, and the wider policy framework which sits alongside the planning system. This means that implementation of the HMWP will be influenced by how well it is reflected in the other plans and programmes forming part of the HMWP, and by the degree to which these are successfully implemented. For this reason, monitoring the sustainability effects of implementing the HMWP will be conducted as part of an overall approach to monitoring the sustainability effects of the HMWP as a whole, as well as taking account of broader social, economic and environmental trends. This will be the same for the SPDs.

7.3 The Hampshire Authorities are required under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) to prepare a Monitoring Report (MR) to assess the extent to which policies in each Minerals and Waste Plan are being implemented. The HMWP includes an implementation and monitoring plan which is used to inform the MR. More information on this is set out in the ISA report for HMWP.

7.4 The HMWP Monitoring Indicators will be applied to the SPDs as these will be implementing the policies contained within the HWMP. In summary:

- the Oil and gas SPD will be applied through the development management process in the processing and determination of oil and gas proposals; and
- the minerals and waste safeguarding SPD will be applied through the consideration of minerals and waste safeguarding issues in other non minerals or waste developments.

---


8. Mitigation measures

8.1 The ISA as well as other forms of appraisal e.g. HRA were taken into account through the formulation of potential mitigation measures when the HMWP was being prepared. These included any proposals:

- meeting other policies within the Plan; and
- mitigation measures implemented as a requirement of planning permissions granted for minerals and waste development.

8.2 The policies within the Plan will be used to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment and communities through the implementing the Plan.

8.3 Mitigation measures can also be included as a requirement of planning permissions granted for minerals development. The following table sets out the type of mitigation measures which can be employed to reduce potential impacts on Hampshire’s environment and communities from minerals developments such as oil and gas.
### Table 27: Potential mitigation measures for minerals development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential impacts</th>
<th>Potential mitigation measures</th>
<th>Oil and gas development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>Enclosure of material storage areas and lorries prior to leaving a site</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheel and body washing of vehicles</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spraying of internal haul roads/site</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrictions on sites / vehicle movements, including hours/days/season of operation and speed limits to reduce noise and disturbance to sensitive receptors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleaning of roads along Lorry Route</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil contamination</td>
<td>Wheel and body washing of vehicles</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud on the road</td>
<td>Cleaning of roads along Lorry Route</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual intrusion</td>
<td>Screening / landscaping of the site from sensitive habitats and receptors (e.g. using trees, fencing, earth bunds)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siting and design of facilities and use of Best Available Technologies (BAT) (e.g. quiet processing machinery to reduce disturbance)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise disturbance</td>
<td>Restrictions on sites / vehicle movements, including hours/days/season of operation and speed limits to reduce noise and disturbance to sensitive receptors.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siting and design of facilities and use of Best Available Technologies (BAT) (e.g. quiet processing machinery to reduce disturbance)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative impacts associated with oil or gas developments and other minerals and waste developments working alongside each other</td>
<td>Phasing of developments at multiple sites in close proximity to each other to avoid cumulative impacts</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance or impacts on the historic environment</td>
<td>Prior recording, removal or preservation of historic / archaeological material</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on communities recreation and access</td>
<td>Minimising loss of recreation and access facilities, or offering alternative provision (diversions) or arrangements (signage and information)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination of the land</td>
<td>Permeability cap to minimise the formation of leachate, and / or, an artificial sealing liner to collect leachate and avoid soil and ground/surface water contamination</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest control</td>
<td>Regular pest control treatments by independent specialist contractors to reduce vermin</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary and acronyms

**Aftercare**: Action necessary to bring restored land up to the required standard for an agreed after-use such as agriculture, forestry or amenity.

**Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**: Areas of countryside considered to have significant landscape value, and protected to preserve that value. Originally identified and designated by the Countryside Commission under Sections 87 and 88 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. Natural England is now responsible for designating AONBs and advising Government and other organisations on their management and upkeep.

**Best and Most Versatile agricultural land (BMV)**: The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. It helps underpin the principles of sustainable development. The ALC system classifies land into five grades, with Grade 3 subdivided into Subgrades 3a and 3b. The best and most versatile land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a by policy guidance (see PPS7). This is the land which is most flexible, productive and efficient in response to inputs and which can best deliver future crops for food and non food uses such as biomass, fibres and developers and the public if development is proposed on agricultural land or other greenfield sites that could grow crops. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.

**Bird strike**: Risk of aircraft collision with birds, which are often attracted to landfill sites containing organic waste.

**Climate change**: The significant and lasting change in the statistical distribution of weather patterns over periods ranging from decades to millions of years.

**Co-location**: The placement of several businesses in a single location.

**Community Strategy**: Community Strategies outline the local community’s wishes and priorities, they can be used as a tool to ensure local government and other services meet local needs.

**Conservation Areas**: Designated areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.

**Countryside**: Areas that are not urbanised.

**Cumulative impact**: Impacts that accumulate over time, from one or more sources, and can result in the degradation of important resources.

**Development Scheme**: A project plan for the development of statutory and other planning documents. Separate Development Schemes for minerals and waste have been agreed, although the timetables within them are consistent.
**Energy from waste (EFW):** Conversion of waste into a useable form of energy, either by incineration or by the production of gas.

**Energy Recovery Facility (ERF):** A facility at which a part of all of the waste material produced in a process is burned to generate heat or electricity.

**Environment Agency (EA):** A public organisation with the responsibility for protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales. Its functions include the regulation of industrial processes, the maintenance of flood defences and water resources, water quality and the improvement of wildlife habitats.

**Green Belt:** An area designated in planning documents e.g. Structure Plans, providing an area of permanent separation between urban areas. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness.

**Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA):** Statutory requirement for Planning Authorities to assess the potential effects of land-use plans on designated European Sites in Great Britain. The Habitats Regulations Assessment is intended to assess the potential effects of a development plan on one or more European Sites (collectively termed 'Natura 2000' sites). The Natura 2000 sites comprise Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs). SPAs are classified under the European Council Directive on the conservation of wild birds (79/409/EEC; Birds Directive) for the protection of wild birds and their habitats (including particularly rare and vulnerable species listed in Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, and migratory species).

**Hampshire County Council (HCC):** The county council that governs the county of Hampshire in England.

**Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA):** An appraisal process, undertaken as part of the development of this Strategy, which fulfils the statutory requirements of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment.

**Joint Baseline Report (JBR):** Outlines the baseline information on the main sustainability issues for Hampshire and supports the Sustainability Appraisal.

**Local Nature Reserves (LNR):** A statutory designation made (by principal local authorities) under Section 21 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. They are places of local, but not necessarily national, wildlife or geological importance and also often have good public access and facilities. Local Nature Reserves are almost always owned by local authorities, who often pass the management of the Local Nature Reserves onto County Wildlife trusts.

**Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities:** The local planning authorities (County and Unitary Councils) responsible for minerals and waste planning. In Hampshire, Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils, the New Forest National Park Authority and South Downs National Park Authority are minerals and waste planning authorities.
National Nature Reserve (NNR): A nationally important biological or geological site declared by Natural England, and managed through ownership, leasehold or a nature reserve agreement.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The national planning policy framework. This was issued in March 2012.

New Forest National Park: The New Forest National Park was created in March 2005. The National Park lies mainly in south-west Hampshire – from east of the Avon Valley to Southampton Water and from the Solent coast to the edge of the Wiltshire chalk downs.

New Forest National Park Authority (NFPNA): The New Forest National Park Authority took up its full powers in April 2006, it’s purposes are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the park, to promote opportunity for understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities and to seek to foster the social and economic well-being of local communities within the park.

Portsmouth City Council (PCC): The city of Portsmouth is administered by Portsmouth City Council, a unitary authority.

Rail depot: A railway facility where trains regularly stop to load or unload passengers or freight (goods). It generally consists of a platform and building next to the tracks providing related services.


Restoration: Process of returning a sites to its former use, or restoring it to a condition that will support an agreed after-use such as agriculture or forestry.

Safeguarding: The method of protecting needed facilities or mineral resources and of preventing inappropriate development from affecting it. Usually, where sites are threatened, the course of action would be to object to the proposal or negotiate an acceptable resolution.

Sensitive Receptors: Locations where people live, sleep, work or visit that may be sensitive to the impact of minerals and waste activity on health, well-being and quality of life. Examples include houses, hospitals, schools and graveyards.

Southampton City Council (SCC): The city of Southampton is administered by Southampton City Council, a unitary authority.

South Downs National Park: The National park was formerly established on 1 April 2011 and includes areas in the Hampshire County Council boundary.

South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA): From 1 April 2011, the South Downs National Park Authority has been responsible for all planning in the South Downs National Park.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI): A Local Development Document which sets out the standards which the Planning Authority intend to achieve when involving the community in the preparation of Local Development Documents, or in a significant development control decision. It also sets out how the Authority intends to achieve these standards. A consultation statement must be produced showing how the Authority has complied with its SCI.

Sterilisation: When a change of use, or the development, of land prevents possible mineral exploitation in the foreseeable future.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): A system of incorporating environmental considerations into policies, plans, programmes and part of European Union Policy. It is sometimes referred to as strategic environmental impact assessment. SEA is intended to highlight environmental issues during decision-making about strategic documents such as plans, programmes and strategies. The SEA identifies the significant environmental effects that are likely to result from implementing the plan or alternative approaches to the plan.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA): An assessment of the potential flood risk such as from groundwater and fluvial flood risk undertaken at the appropriate level (county or district).

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Any document of a description referred to in regulation 5 (except an adopted policies map or a statement of community involvement) which is not a local plan. SPD also ‘add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues, such as design. Supplementary planning documents are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan.

Sustainability Appraisal: In United Kingdom planning law, an appraisal of the economic, environmental, and social effects of a plan from the outset of the preparation process, to allow decisions that are compatible with sustainable development. Since 2001, sustainability appraisals have had to conform to the EU directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Sustainability Report: A report complying with the requirements for Sustainability Appraisal (see above).

Sustainable Development: Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Townscape: The appearance of a town or city; an urban scene.

Wharf: A landing place or pier where ships may tie up and load or unload.
Appendices
Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Checklist
Government guidance contains a Quality Assurance checklist to help ensure that the requirements of the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC) are met. Those requirements relevant to the scoping stage (Stage A) and how they are met in this report are shown below:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SEA Directive Requirements</strong></th>
<th><strong>How the Requirement is met:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of an environmental report</strong> in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is (Article 5 and Annex I):</td>
<td>This ISA Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</td>
<td>See <strong>Introduction [See page 1]</strong>, <strong>Context for the area covered by the Supplementary Planning Documents [See page 21]</strong>, Scoping Report (2014) and Joint Baseline Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;</td>
<td>See <strong>Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Framework [See page 31]</strong> and Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</td>
<td>See <strong>Context for the area covered by the Supplementary Planning Documents [See page 21]</strong>, Joint Baseline Report (2014) and Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;</td>
<td>See <strong>Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Framework [See page 31]</strong> and Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;</td>
<td>See Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects);</td>
<td>See Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;</td>
<td>See Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of knowhow) encountered in compiling the required information;</td>
<td>See Scoping Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;</td>
<td>See Joint Baseline Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings;</td>
<td>See Joint Baseline Report (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2).

**Consultation:**
- authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4);
- authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2);
- other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Art. 7).

See Joint Baseline Report (2014)

**Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making (Art. 8)**

See Scoping Report (2014) and Methodology [See page 15]

**Provision of information on the decision:** When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Art. 7 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:
- the plan or programme as adopted
- a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report of Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Art. 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Art. 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and
- the measures decided concerning monitoring (Art. 9)

Will form part of the process to adopt the SPDs

**Monitoring** of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Art. 10)

See Monitoring [See page 54]

Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive (Art. 12)

See Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Checklist [See page 62]
Appendix 2: Scoped out ISA criteria

The following areas were scoped out at the Scoping Stage.

- **social** - considerations such as teenage pregnancies, levels of education, abuse to children, divorces, number of libraries;
- **economic** - consideration such as business start up success rates, employment by ethnicity, debt levels, property values, income distribution, average incomes, retail sales;
- **water** - considerations such as the amount of road salt used on rural regional roads, new septic tank permits;
- **air** - considerations such as information on comparisons made with other regions in the country with regards to air quality;
- **climate change** - considerations such as rainfall, greenhouse gas emissions from specific sources for example agriculture in Hampshire; and
- **transport and land use** - considerations such as public perception and attitudes towards public transport, punctuality of public transport services and employment in public transport services and commuting to methods.
Appendix 3: Consultation responses received at the Scoping Stage
The following table outlines the comments received by consultees on the Scoping Report and Joint Baseline Report produced in October 2014. The table also sets out the response by the Hampshire Authorities and the changes that have been made and are provided in the Scoping Report (2014) and Joint Baseline Report (December 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Summary of comments received</th>
<th>Hampshire Authorities response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Consultation questions and how to comment</td>
<td>English Heritage (EH)</td>
<td>EH commented that they couldn't locate section 7.2 but are satisfied with the proposed structure of the ISA Report as set out in Table 7.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>How does this link to the Joint Baseline Report</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH observed some inconsistency with regards to referencing Material Assets (including architectural and archaeological heritage) in Section 3.3.5 and later referring to Cultural Heritage in 4.3.31. Preference is given to the latter.</td>
<td>The initial reference was a typo and has been amended to reflect the correct title 'Cultural Heritage'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Context and Baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>Sustainability Context and Baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>Natural England (NE)</td>
<td>NE would advise the following sources of information are considered: 1) National Characters Areas; 2) Hampshire Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.</td>
<td>Noted. These have now been included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Context and Baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>4.1 Description of the area covered by the SPDs</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH commented that there are now only 3 AONB's in Hampshire not 4 as mentioned and there is little reference to Hampshire's rich historical heritage.</td>
<td>The text has been revised to reflect the current AONB status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Context and Baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>4.2 Main messages from the context review of relevant policies, plans and programmes</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH would like reference to Hampshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment, unless it forms part of the Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment.</td>
<td>The Historic Landscape Character Assessment is not incorporated and has now been included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Context and Baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>4.3 Main messages from the established baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH would like section 4.3.2 to reflect Para. 9 of the NPPF which states that sustainability also includes the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Confirming that pursuing sustainable development involves &quot;seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment&quot;.</td>
<td>The section has been amended to incorporate the historic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH request that 4.3.3 should make specific reference to the historic environment or cultural heritage.</td>
<td>The paragraph has been amended to reflect this request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH welcomes the section 4.3.31 and its heading, although would like the section to mention battlefields. Conservation Areas should be mentioned either in this paragraph or paragraph 4.3.32. The paragraph could also helpfully note that many of the heritage assets in the county are nationally designated.</td>
<td>The sections have been amended to reflect the suggested changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Context and Baseline for Hampshire</td>
<td>4.5 Relevant Sustainability Challenges to be Addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td>The EA agree with the sustainability issues that are identified in para. 4.3.4 as being relevant to the development of the SPDs. Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td>The EA are confident that the broad characteristics of Hampshire's biodiversity have been captured in 4.3.4. Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td>The EA suggest that para 4.3.5 should be more ambitious. Biodiversity enhancement should be sought from all applications. The paragraph has been amended to reflect the wording in Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td>The EA questioned the accuracy of para 4.3.16 and stated that although water efficiency is obviously a very important factor in Hampshire, the trend of demand year on year is actually decreasing. The paragraph has been amended to reflect this comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td>The EA stated that the wording in para 4.3.17 implies that only certain areas were affected by recent flooding. The EA suggest that the para is amended to &quot;Hampshire has experienced severe flooding in parts of the County, in particular South East Hampshire in 2000/01. More recently widespread flooding in winter 2013/14 affected large parts of the county, including Hambledon, Romsey, near Basingstoke and Winchester&quot;. The paragraph has been amended as suggested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hampshire County Council (HCC) Transport</strong></td>
<td>HCC Transport agree to a point the statement made in 4.5.15, although believe a more practical approach would be to reduce the environmental impacts on existing and proposed highways through the following considerations: 1) Encouraging combined loads, return loads etc; 2) Encouraging less 'malign' vehicles - especially electric and lower emission vehicles; 3) Utilising opportunities for new technology for examples dynamic route scheduling if there has been an accident (this could potentially strengthen the routing statement in para 3.1.6.27 and 3.2.1.34 of the JBR); and 4) Reducing the harm to Hampshire's road network by ensuring the appropriate axle loads and use of weighbridges etc. The paragraph has been amended with reference to the mitigation of adverse impacts on the environment, amenity and pedestrian safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Heritage</strong></td>
<td>EH commented that para 4.5.20 has reverted to including the historic environment with the overall &quot;Material Assets&quot; rather than a heading in its own right. They welcome the recognition to conserve the County's rich historic environment and diverse landscape character. The paragraph has been amended accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency</strong></td>
<td>The EA suggested the wording in para 4.5.9 could be amended to make it more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Integrated Sustainability Stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the ISA Report be prepared to support the development of the SPDs</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>NE stated that they assume that references made were regarding Table 7 and are satisfied with the structure. However, they would emphasise the importance of not just appraising alternatives but how the alternatives have been arrived at. Table 7 has been amended to reflect the comments made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will not be covered in Future ISA Reports</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH agree with the sustainability criteria that have been scoped out as set out in Section 6, with the exception of soil quality, which appears to have been scoped in. The scoped out criteria have been amended to reflect the comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>NE commented that Water, Air and Climate Change should not be scoped out of the Report. The specific criteria that has been scoped out is not relevant to the SPDs or the data is not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Assessment Work</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The EA agree with the proposed approach to Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as the SPDs will not include additional policies or sites which would impact flood risk. Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH welcome and support, in principle Objective 1, but consider that it would be clearer if it said: &quot;Protecting, conserving and enhancing the New Forest and South Downs National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, other valued landscapes, sensitive habitats and our archaeological and historic heritage&quot;. Objective 1 is from the HMWP and was subject to public examination. Therefore, this cannot be amended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>Hampshire County Council Transport</td>
<td>HCC Transport believe that Objective 7 should be further reinforced to include the points outlined previously should be addressed. The Objective has been amended to reflect the comments made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH welcomes Objective A8 but also suggest a further criteria: &quot;Will provide for increased understanding and interpretation of the historic environment?&quot;. The additional criteria has been included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>NE comment that it is possible that policy options will have differential effects on the attractiveness of access to the countryside and urban green, whilst still having the same effect in terms of &quot;Protect and promote linkages between and the creation of public open spaces, and enable safe access to the countryside and urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


green”. NE suggest that this criteria may need to be reconsidered.

EH suggest that the indicator and monitor for Objective A8 should also include planning permissions against the Council's built conservation, archaeological and historic landscape advisers.

The indicators are from the HMWP which was subject to public examination. Therefore, they cannot be changed.

### Joint Baseline Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Summary of comments received</th>
<th>Hampshire Authorities response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies, Plans, Programmes and Legislation</td>
<td>Summary List of Policies, Plans, and Legislation</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Table 2.1 should include reference to the Historic Landscape Character.</td>
<td>Table 2.1 has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed list of Relevant international, national and local Policies, Plans and Programmes</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH suggested that para 2.2.1 and the relevant Table should include reference to &quot;The Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention)&quot; and &quot;The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention)&quot; as well as the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. EH welcome the inclusion of Good Practice Advice Notes.</td>
<td>The references have been included as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the Baseline Environment</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Hampshire County Council Transport</td>
<td>HCC Transport believe the baseline should be more focused to oil and gas developments.</td>
<td>The Scoping Report and JBR are to support the ISA process for both SPDs (Oil and Gas AND Safeguarding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the Baseline Environment</td>
<td>Climatic Factors</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The EA advise that the information presented in 3.1.1.14 should be checked as it suggests that UKCP09 shows a rise of 36.3cm for the central, medium emissions scenario for London by the 2080s.</td>
<td>The data has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the Baseline Environment</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>EH commented that it would be helpful if section 3.1.5 referred to the NPPF definition of a heritage asset and to explain the difference between designated and non-designated assets. Para 3.1.5.5 should either include all types of heritage asset (as set out in 3.1.5.3) or say &quot;which includes...&quot; rather than &quot;which encompasses...&quot;</td>
<td>Additional information has been included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the Baseline Environment</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>In para 3.1.5.10 the reference to the largest number of Conservation Areas being in Hart District and New Forest District is interesting, although a more meaningful</td>
<td>Information has been presented as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Comment/Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>The EA commented that methane is not normally monitored in AQMAs. Oil and Gas exploration, development and production have the potential to release fugitive emissions as well as operational emissions such as flaring. Greenhouse gas emissions need to be understood and monitored to evaluate their impact upon air quality and climate change and to establish baseline conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The EA supports the information that has been included within section 3.1.7 in particular the introduction section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the Baseline Environment</td>
<td>The EA requested that the term 'fluvial' is replaced with 'pluvial' within 3.1.7.24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The EA commented that para. 3.1.7.26 seems to refer mainly to groundwater flooding, however, it is included under the surface water section. The EA suggest moving this to the groundwater section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The EA commented that the map featured within 3.1.7.31 provides a summary of the location of flood risk zones and defences in Hampshire. Whilst the flood map is still available, the Risk of Flooding Map from Rivers and Sea is now also available. It shows the risk of flooding taking into account the modelled depth and velocity of flood water, as well as allowing for defences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EA suggests the following amendments to section 3.1.7.42: 1) The SPZ maps used in the Report have been recently updated and are now available. These activities may present a risk of pollution to groundwater that would otherwise be protected by overlying low permeability deposits. 2) Groundwater sources that are protected from surface water activities by the presence of low permeability deposits (such as clays) were not all considered to need a mapped SPZ. Recent increase in interest in deep surface activities such as onshore oil and gas exploration and ground source heating and cooling systems has meant there is a need to consider protection zones for deep groundwater sources. 3) In Hampshire the majority of household drinking water comes from groundwater. The water quality is closely monitored. Disruptions to the supply of drinking water needs to be avoided or the need for additional costly treatments to clean it up by protecting groundwater resources. Groundwater also feeds the rivers and supports habitats. 4) Groundwater is protected by regulating activities that may cause pollution and by providing advice and guidance to EA customers. To help identify those areas where greater protection is needed, the EA have created vulnerability maps showing principal and secondary aquifers as well as modelling SPZs around sensitive groundwater abstractions. 5) The EA Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice document (GP3) sets out the Agency’s position with regard to oil and gas development including underground coal gasification, coal bed methane and shale gas extraction. Section C: Infrastructure sets out the Position Statements including C7 on developments in sensitive locations.

The EA supports the requirement for developers to carry out hydrological and hydrogeological investigations and risk assessments to address any impacts that proposed developments may have on the water environment, as set out in 3.1.7.55. The EA recommend that these investigations are carried out, submitted and discussed prior to any application so that any significant issues can be addressed.

HCC Transport comment that data used in the transport section appears to be out of date and more recent figures should be available from the relevant agencies. Examples include: 1) The map on page 138.
showing motorway congestion using 2007 figures. 2) Table 3.10 on page 142 noting the tonnage handled by major local ports up to 2011. 3) The 2008 airport figures quoted in paras. 3.2.1.14 and 3.2.1.15. 4) The travel to work figures used in Figure 32. 5) Consider additional data relating to oil and gas developments such as carriageway restrictions. 6) Move transport related information from sections 3.2.1.24-29 and parts of 3.2.1.30-34 into transport section. 7) Reference to Southampton to Nuneaton rail gauge upgrade should be made in either 3.2.1.10 or 3.2.1.12.
Appendix 4: Responses received following consultation (if required)

Appendix to be completed following public consultation (if required).
Appendix 5: HMWP Vision and objectives

The Minerals and Waste Plan sets out the vision and objectives for minerals and waste development within the plan area. The Plan includes a spatial strategy and a suite of development management policies to guide minerals and waste development as well as site allocations. The vision outlined below is based on the amended version as part of the public hearings for the plan, although the principles remain largely the same.

The Vision for the Minerals and Waste Plan states that: 'Over the next 20 years, minerals and waste development will help to meet Hampshire’s present and future needs by protecting the environment, maintain community quality of life and supporting the economy by:

• Protecting and conserving the New Forest and South Downs National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other valued landscapes. Sensitive habitats like the Thames Basin Heaths and our archaeological and historic heritage will be treated similarly.
• Helping to mitigate the causes of, and adapt to, climate change by developing more energy recovery facilities and the appropriate restoration of mineral workings.
• Protecting community health, safety and amenity in particular by managing traffic impacts, ensuring sustainable, high quality and sensitive design and imposing adequate separation of minerals and waste development from residents by providing appropriate screening and/or landscaping.
• Valuing the countryside for its own merits and protecting the South West Hampshire Green Belt from inappropriate development but recognising local geology, the rural economy and protection of amenity.
• Managing traffic impacts including the encouragement of rail and water borne transport of mineral and waste
• Encouraging engagement between developers, site operators and communities so there is an understanding of respective needs.
• Supporting Hampshire’s continued economic growth, as well as the economies influenced by Hampshire and opportunities for urban regeneration where possible.
• Safeguarding, mineral resources, necessary existing minerals and waste infrastructure and land for potential wharf or rail infrastructure as a contribution to a steady and adequate supply of minerals and provision of waste facilities.
• Helping to deliver an adequate supply of minerals and mineral-related products to support new development, deliver key infrastructure projects and provide the everyday products that we all use in Hampshire, as well as in neighbouring areas. This will be achieved by ensuring sufficient aggregate is supplied to the construction industry from an appropriate combination of sources including:
  • local sand and gravel from around Southampton, south west Hampshire, Ringwood Forest, east of Andover, the Bordon area and north-east Hampshire;
  • marine dredged sand and gravel via wharves on the River Itchen, River Test and Portsmouth and Langstone Harbours;
  • rail imported limestone via existing depots in south Hampshire and new rail depots located in north Hampshire; and
• giving particular support for recycled/secondary aggregates from various sites before supply from other sources.
• Provide for brick-making clay for the brickworks at Michelmersh, near Romsey and Selborne, near Bordon.
• Appropriately planning for chalk extraction for agricultural use.
• Exploration and production of oil and gas.
• Encouraging a zero waste economy whereby landfill is virtually eliminated by providing for more recycling and waste recovery facilities including energy recovery.
• Aiming for Hampshire to be 'net self sufficient' in waste facilities whereby it can accommodate all the waste that arises, whilst accepting there will be movements into and out of the area to facilities such as the nationally important incinerator at Fawley'.
Appendix 6: ISA Framework for HMWP

The following table sets out the proposed ISA Sustainability Objectives and Criteria for the emerging SPDs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Issue</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria - to what extent do the options....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Biodiversity                         | A1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity.                                 | • Conserve and proportionally protect biodiversity and avoid harm to internationally or nationally designated sites and priority habitats and species?  
• Enhance biodiversity including creating and improving the ecological value of green networks?  
• Conserve, enhance or protect Hampshire's geodiversity?                                                |
| Landscape & Townscape                | A2: To maintain and enhance Hampshire’s landscape and townscape character, distinctiveness, sensitive areas, aesthetic quality and setting, and to minimise the visual impact of minerals and waste development. | • Protect, safeguard and/or enhance the character, distinctiveness and aesthetic quality of Hampshire’s landscape areas and the setting of the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other areas of high landscape sensitivity or high landscape value?  
• Safeguard and improve the contribution that development makes to townscape character, distinctiveness and place shaping, paying particular regard to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas etc?  
• Protect Green Belts and strategic gaps?  
• Encourage the appropriate use of previously developed land and buildings?                                    |
| Water Resources & Flooding           | A3: To protect and improve Hampshire’s water resources, including coastal and inland waters and their management and reduce flood risk. | • Protect and/or enhance the quality of surface and groundwater resources (paying particular regard to sensitive aquifers, portable reserves and Source Protection Areas) and inland coastal waters adjacent to minerals and waste development?  
• Minimise the risk of flooding as a result of minerals and waste development and operation to communities, property and minerals and waste developments, and to reduce risk where possible, in line with National Planning Policy? |
| Air Quality                          | A4: To protect and improve air quality.                                   | • Minimise the impact upon air quality and to ensure that they are appropriately developed and located?  
• Ensure that development does not adversely impact Air Quality Management Areas or areas of biodiversity? |
| Prudent use of natural resources     | A5: Prudent use of Hampshire's resources, including maintaining and enhancing sensitive land and soil types. | • Minimise the loss of best and most versatile land?  
• Maintain, conserve and enhance sensitive land and soil types taking into account soil function and type and to encourage the re-use of soils locally?  
• Facilitate the recycling of soils and recycled materials?  
• Safeguard mineral reserves?  
• Reduce the demand for or extend the life of resources by applying the waste hierarchy in waste management? |
| Climate change | A6: To mitigate and adapt to climate change. | • Reduce the overall carbon footprint of development?  
• Maximise opportunities for energy supply from local renewable and low-carbon sources and heat through minerals and waste development in Hampshire?  
• Impact Hampshire’s wider ability to mitigate and adapt to the consequences of climate change (paying particular regard to flood risk, water use and restoration plans)? |
| Transportation | A7: To reduce the adverse effects of transport of minerals and waste in Hampshire. | • Reduce the reliance on road haulage for the transport of minerals and waste (through the appropriate location of development) as well as opportunities for more sustainable forms of transport through rail and water borne sources?  
• Take into account the suitability of highways and have suitable access into Hampshire's strategic highways network?  
• Increase opportunities for the co-location of minerals and waste development?  
• Reduce through mitigation the potential adverse impacts on environment, amenity and highway and pedestrian safety. |
| Historic Environment | A8: To conserve, and where possible enhance, Hampshire’s historic environment. | • Conserve, protect, restore or enhance the fabric and setting of the most important features and areas of Hampshire's historic environment in both urban and rural areas?  
• Provide an increased understanding and interpretation of the historic environment. |
| Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition | A9: To promote sustainable design, construction, management and demolition in Hampshire. | • Encourage the use of sustainable design, demolition and construction techniques which demonstrate good practice?  
• Ensure that all development and all sections of the community are suitability able to reduce, reuse and recycle as much of their waste as possible, to maximise the value?  
• Seek to reduce hazardous waste arisings?  
• Minimise the amount of water consumed as a result of minerals and waste development and associated operations?  
• Minimise adverse impacts resulting from light pollution in vulnerable areas?  
• Minimise adverse impacts resulting from noise pollution? |
| Communities and amenity | A10: To create and sustain vibrant communities with high levels of local amenity and access to locally available waste and mineral services in Hampshire. | • Ensure minerals and waste infrastructure is adequate to cope with population, household and business growth?  
• Increase opportunities for local communities to manage their waste through appropriate and high quality infrastructure?  
• Enable improvements to local amenity and meet community plan aspirations? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access and open space</th>
<th><strong>A11:</strong> To encourage appropriate and safe access to the countryside and open spaces in Hampshire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safeguard existing development from the adverse environmental effects associated with mineral and waste development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Quality of Life</td>
<td><strong>A12:</strong> To improve the overall health and quality of life of Hampshire’s population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect and promote linkages between and the creation of public open spaces, and enable safe access to the countryside and urban green?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage mitigating measures to ensure attraction and enjoyment of countryside and open spaces are not adversely impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth and development</td>
<td><strong>A13:</strong> To encourage sustainable economic growth and reduce disparities in economic performance in Hampshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affect health and quality of life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the adverse health effects of minerals and waste development and ensure that sites are sufficiently distant from sensitive receptors to minimise health impacts and nuisances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimise the adverse impact to public safety by preventing the risk of accidents caused by bird strike and the proximity to other constraints such as blast zones, where necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and deprivation</td>
<td><strong>A14:</strong> To reduce relative poverty and deprivation in Hampshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide a good quality environment which improves the competitiveness and productivity of local firms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage a climate for investment and the development of new waste technologies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote rural diversification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure minerals and waste infrastructure does not prejudice the development of the sustainable leisure or tourism industry in Hampshire through restoration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide employment opportunities in suitable skill levels for the socially disadvantaged in or accessible from socially deprived areas through minerals and waste development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comply with Equalities standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Relevant Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan policies

This appendix includes the policies included within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (adopted October 2013).

Sustainable minerals and waste development

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 accord 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.

Protecting Hampshire's Environment

Policy 2: Climate change - mitigation and adaptation

Minerals and waste development should minimise their impact on the causes of climate change. Where applicable, minerals and waste development should reduce vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts of climate change by:

a. being located and designed to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the more sustainable use of resources; or

b. developing energy recovery facilities and to facilitate low carbon technologies; and

c. avoiding areas of vulnerability to climate change and flood risk or otherwise incorporate adaptation measures.
Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species

Mineral 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 4: Protection of the designated landscape

Major minerals and waste development will not be permitted in the New Forest or South Downs National Parks, or in the North Wessex Downs, the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs, and Chichester Harbour Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), except in exceptional circumstances. In this respect, consideration will be given to:

a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations;
b) the impact of permitting, or refusing the development upon the local economy;
c) the cost and scope for meeting the need outside the designated area, or meeting the need in some other way; and
d) whether any detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and / or recreational opportunities can be satisfactorily mitigated.

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

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

Small-scale waste management facilities for local needs should not be precluded from the National Parks and AONBs, provided they can be accommodated without undermining the objectives of the designation.
Policy 5: Protection of the countryside

Minerals and waste development in the open countryside, outside the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, will not be permitted unless:

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 the 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 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt

Within the South West Hampshire Green Belt, minerals and waste developments will be approved provided that they are not inappropriate or that very special circumstances exist.

As far as possible, minerals and waste developments should enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt.

The highest standards of development, operation and restoration of minerals and waste development will be required.
### Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets

Minerals and waste development should protect and, wherever possible, enhance Hampshire’s historic environment and heritage assets, both designated and non-designated, including the settings of these sites.

The following assets will be protected in accordance with their relative importance:

- a) scheduled ancient monuments;
- b) listed buildings;
- c) conservation areas;
- d) registered parks and gardens;
- e) registered battlefields;
- f) sites of archaeological importance; and
- g) other locally recognised assets.

Minerals and waste development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of historical assets unless it is demonstrated that the need for and benefits of the development decisively outweigh these interests.

### Policy 8: Protection of soils

Minerals and waste development should protect and, wherever possible, enhance soils and should not result in the net loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Minerals and waste development should ensure the protection of soils during construction and, when appropriate, recover and enhance soil resources.
Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments

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

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

The restoration of mineral extraction and landfill sites should be phased throughout the life of the development.
Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity

Minerals and waste development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts.

Minerals and waste development should not:

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 mineral 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 increase flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall;

b) incorporate flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures 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 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 14: Community benefits

Hampshire Authorities encourage negotiated agreements between relevant minerals and waste developers/operators and a community as a source of funding for local benefits.

Supporting Hampshire’s Economy

Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources

Hampshire’s sand and gravel (sharp sand and gravel and soft sand), silica sand and brick-making clay resources are safeguarded against needless sterilisation by non-minerals development, unless ‘prior extraction’ takes place.

Safeguarded mineral resources are defined by a Mineral Safeguarding Area illustrated on the Policies Map.

Development without the prior extraction of mineral resources in the Mineral Safeguarding Area may be permitted if:

a) it can be demonstrated that the sterilisation of mineral resources will not occur; or

b) it would be inappropriate to extract mineral resources at that location, with regards to the other policies in the Plan; or

c) the development would not pose a serious hindrance to mineral development in the vicinity; or

d) the merits of the development outweigh the safeguarding of the mineral.

The soft sand / potential silica sand resources at Whitehill & Bordon (Inset Map 5), further illustrated on the Policies Map are included within the MSA and are specifically identified for safeguarding under this policy.
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 24: Oil and gas development

Oil and gas development will be supported subject to environmental and amenity considerations.

1) Exploration and appraisal of oil and gas will be supported, provided the site and equipment:
   a) is not located within the New Forest National Park or South Downs National Park except in exceptional circumstances, where the reasons for the designation are not compromised and where the need for the development can be demonstrated; and
   b) is sited at a location where it can be demonstrated that it will only have an acceptable environmental impact; and
   c) the proposal provides for the restoration and subsequent aftercare of the site, whether or not oil or gas is found.

2) The commercial production of oil and gas will be supported provided the site and equipment:
   a) is not located within the New Forest National Park or South Downs National Park except in exceptional circumstances, where the reasons for the designation are not compromised and where the need for the development can be demonstrated; and
   b) a full appraisal programme for the oil and gas field has been completed; and
   c) the proposed location is the most suitable, taking into account environmental, geological and technical factors

Policy 26: Safeguarding - waste infrastructure

Waste management infrastructure that provides strategic capacity is safeguarded against redevelopment and inappropriate encroachment unless:

a. the merits of the development clearly outweigh the need for safeguarding; or
b. the infrastructure is no longer needed; or
c. the capacity can be relocated or provided elsewhere and delivered; or
d. the proposed development is part of a wider programme of reinvestment in the delivery of enhanced waste management facilities.

The infrastructure safeguarded by this policy is illustrated on the Policies Map and identified in Appendix B - List of safeguarding minerals and waste sites.
Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure

The following areas are safeguarded, so that their appropriateness for use as a for minerals or waste wharf or rail depot can be considered, if they become available or are released from their current uses:

a. land located to the north west of Hythe identified in the Port of Southampton Master Plan; and

b. land identified in the Southampton Core Strategy as operational port land; and

c. Marchwood Military Port (also known as Marchwood Sea Mounting Centre); and

d. land at HM Naval Base and commercial port as identified in the Portsmouth Core Strategy for port and employment uses; and

e. existing and former railway siding and other land that could be rail linked.

The locations identified for safeguarding are shown on the Policies Map.
This document can be made available in large print, on audio media, in Braille or in some other languages.
For further information, please contact Minerals and Waste Planning Policy in the Strategic Planning group:
Telephone: 0300 555 1389 or 01962 846591
Email: planning.policy@hants.gov.uk
Write to:
Minerals and Waste Planning Policy
Strategic Planning
Economy, Transport & Environment Department
Hampshire County Council
Floor 1 Elizabeth II Court West
Winchester SO23 8UD

Internet: www.hants.gov.uk/county-planning