

# Minerals and Waste in Hampshire Monitoring Report 2022



March 2024



## Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Foreword.....  | 3  |
| Executive Summary .....                                    | 4  |
| Abbreviations .....  | 6  |
| 1. Introduction .....                                      | 7  |
| 1.1 The requirement for a Monitoring Report .....          | 7  |
| 1.2 What is the purpose of this Monitoring Report? .....   | 8  |
| 2. Update on Minerals and Waste Policy and Guidance .....  | 10 |
| 2.1 Partnership Working.....                               | 10 |
| 2.2 Local Planning Guidance .....                          | 10 |
| 2.3 Regional Planning Policy .....                         | 10 |
| 2.4 National Planning Policy and Guidance .....            | 10 |
| 3. Progress with the Development Scheme .....              | 12 |
| 3.1 The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme .....        | 12 |
| 3.2 Review of the Development Scheme .....                 | 12 |
| 4. Monitoring the Policies .....                           | 13 |
| 4.1 How do we monitor mineral and waste policies?.....     | 13 |
| 4.2 Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).....          | 13 |
| 4.3 Monitoring Indicators.....                             | 13 |
| 5. Reviewing the Monitoring Targets.....                   | 25 |
| 5.1 Monitoring Review.....                                 | 25 |
| 5.2 Policy Review.....                                     | 25 |
| 5.3 Previous Policy Review Comments.....                   | 28 |
| 5.4 Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Partial Update ..... | 34 |
| 6. Cooperation in plan-making .....                        | 35 |
| 6.1 Duty to Cooperate .....                                | 35 |
| 6.2 Duty to Cooperate requests in 2022.....                | 35 |
| 7. Further Information.....                                | 37 |

## Foreword

- I. This is the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Monitoring Report 2022.
- II. This report provides information on minerals and waste development in the administrative areas of Hampshire County Council, the unitary authorities of Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and the area of the South Downs National Park Authority within Hampshire (the 'Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA'). The report is used to demonstrate the effectiveness of the policies of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).
- III. This Monitoring Report outlines **planning performance for the calendar year period from January 2022 to December 2022**, therefore any changes that have happened after this period are not included in the report. Previously, some monitoring indicators used data based on the financial year. In an attempt to standardise data collection and make all the data comparable, efforts have been made to report data solely on a calendar year basis.

## Executive Summary

- I. This Monitoring Report is prepared in accordance with Section 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>1</sup>.
- II. The Monitoring Report reviews the effectiveness of the policies in the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (HMWP) that was adopted in 2013<sup>2</sup>, using a set of ‘monitoring indicators’. The reporting period covers the 2022 calendar year. The report also includes details of the work associated with the monitoring and implementation of the adopted HMWP.
- III. The HMWP includes policies to enable minerals and waste decision-making, as well as minerals and waste allocations (rail depots and wharves, land-won sand and gravel quarries, brick-making clay quarries and landfill).
- IV. The Hampshire Authorities have continued collaborative working on strategic priorities with neighbouring and other planning authorities. The actions and outcomes to fulfil this requirement or ‘Duty to Co-operate’ are also summarised in this report.
- V. This Minerals and Waste Monitoring Report 2022 continues in a similar format to the 2021 report<sup>3</sup>. Monitoring reports, dating back to 2012/2013, are available on the Strategic Planning webpages of the Hampshire County Council website<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 – Section 34: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/regulation/34/made>

<sup>2</sup> Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013): <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>

<sup>3</sup> Hampshire Minerals and Waste Monitoring Report 2021: <https://documents.hants.gov.uk/planning-strategic/minerals-waste-sites/2021monitoringreport.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Hampshire Minerals and Waste Monitoring Reports (2012 – 2021): <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>

**Key points from 2022 include:**

- The sales of primary (land-won) aggregates in Hampshire in 2022 were 0.64 million tonnes (Mt) – a reduction of 21% from 0.81 Mt in 2021;
- The 'landbank'\* of sand and gravel reserves in Hampshire, in 2022, was at 6.79 years – a decrease from 7.69 years in 2021\*\*;
- The reported sales of recycled and secondary aggregates in 2022 was 0.74 million tonnes – a decrease of 1.3% from 0.75 million tonnes in 2021;
- The landbank for brick-making clay in 2022 breached respective thresholds for more than five successive years;
- Municipal waste arisings in Hampshire have decreased by 5.4% in 2022 to 755,956 tonnes – from 799,337 tonnes in 2021;
- The amount of non-hazardous (household, commercial and industrial) waste sent for recovery in Hampshire in 2022 was estimated to be 54.4%, a 4.9% decrease from 2021;
- The amount of non-hazardous waste landfilled in Hampshire in 2022 was 115,158 tonnes – an increase from 113,352 tonnes in 2021 - of which 61.5% (71% in 2021) came from within Hampshire;
- The amount of non-hazardous (household, commercial and industrial) waste exported from Hampshire in 2022 was 722,476 tonnes. This includes 140,957 tonnes sent to landfill, 436,409 tonnes sent for recovery, 5,404 tonnes sent for treatment and 80,427 tonnes sent for incineration;
- The amount of inert waste exported from Hampshire in 2022 was 498,513 tonnes. This includes 153,826 tonnes sent to landfill, 342,219 tonnes sent for recovery, and 234 tonnes sent for incineration; and,
- The amount of hazardous waste exported from Hampshire in 2022 was 103,189 tonnes. This includes 9,769 tonnes sent to landfill, 37,303 tonnes sent for recovery, and 3,533 tonnes sent for incineration.

\*Landbank figure based upon the Local Requirement (1.56 mtpa) and current permitted reserve.

\*\*Landbank based on Annual Provision Rate (APR) and current permitted reserve was 11.9 years in 2022 and 10.42 years in 2021.

## Abbreviations

|      |   |        |   |
|------|---|--------|---|
| AD   | Anaerobic Digestion                           | MRF    | Material Recovery Facilities                |
| AONB | Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty           | MSA    | Mineral Safeguarding Area                   |
| CD&E | Construction, Demolition & Excavation (waste) | MSW    | Municipal Solid Waste                       |
| CHP  | Combined Heat & Power                         | MWDS   | Minerals and Waste Development Scheme       |
| CLU  | Certificate of Lawful Use                     | NE     | Natural England                             |
| DPD  | Development Plan Documents                    | NFNPA  | New Forest National Park Authority          |
| EA   | Environment Agency                            | NP     | National Park                               |
| EIA  | Environmental Impact Assessment               | NPPG   | National Planning Practice Guidance         |
| EHO  | Environmental Health Officer                  | NPPF   | National Planning Policy Framework          |
| EFW  | Energy from Waste                             | SAC    | Special Area of Conservation                |
| ERF  | Energy Recovery Facility                      | SEEAWP | South East England Aggregate Working Party  |
| HCC  | Hampshire County Council                      | SEWPAG | South East Waste Planning Advisory Group    |
| HMWP | Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013)        | SDNPA  | South Downs National Park Authority         |
| HWRC | Household Waste Recycling Centre              | SEP    | South East Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy) |
| IBAA | Incinerator Bottom Ash Aggregate              | SPA    | Special Protection Area                     |
| ISA  | Integrated Sustainability Appraisal           | SPD    | Supplementary Planning Document             |
| LAA  | Local Aggregate Assessment                    | SSSI   | Site of Special Scientific Interest         |
| LACW | Local Authority Collected Waste               | TPA    | Tonnes Per Annum                            |
| LPA  | Local Planning Authority                      | WPA    | Waste Planning Authority                    |
| HE   | Historic England                              | WEEE   | Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment   |
| MPA  | Minerals Planning Authority                   | WWTW   | Waste Water Treatment Works                 |
| MWPA | Minerals and Waste Planning Authority         |        |   |
| MR   | Monitoring Report                             |        |   |



## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 The requirement for a Monitoring Report

1.1.1 Mineral and Waste Planning Authorities have a duty to produce Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which set out policies and proposals for the future development and management of mineral resources and sustainable waste management.

1.1.2 This is the 19th Monitoring Report (MR) produced by Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council, the New Forest National Park Authority, and the South Downs National Park Authority (hereafter referred to as 'the Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA') in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>5</sup> - 'the 2004 Act' - as amended by the Localism Act 2011<sup>6</sup> and the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017<sup>7</sup>.

1.1.3 Under Section 35 of the 2004 Act (as amended by the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017), authorities are required to produce a Monitoring Report, containing:

- information on how the preparation of the minerals and waste DPDs are progressing; and
- the extent to which the policies set out in the associated documents are being implemented.

1.1.4 These requirements are detailed in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>8</sup> (the 'TCP 2012 Regulations') which also:

- consolidate the existing Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and the amendments made to them; and
- make new provision and amendments to take account of the changes made by the Localism Act 2011.

1.1.5 The Localism Act 2011 removes the requirement to submit an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to the Secretary of State. However, councils are still required to prepare a Monitoring Report in order to be able to routinely monitor and report on the timetable specified in the local planning authority's local development scheme for the preparation of the Local Plan or the effectiveness of policies contained within the (adopted) Local Plan. In order to effectively monitor developments, produce comparable figures year on year and gain information at a timescale that allows for corrective action, the Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA have resolved to continue preparing a Monitoring Report annually and set this out in the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme.

<sup>5</sup> Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: [www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents)

<sup>6</sup> Localism Act 2011: [www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted)

<sup>7</sup> Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/20/contents>

<sup>8</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/contents/made>

- 1.1.6 The Localism Act also amended the 2004 Act to require a Local Planning Authority's MR to give details of what action they have taken during the period covered by the report with respect to collaborative working with another Local Planning Authority, County Council, or a body or person.
- 1.1.7 The National Planning Policy Framework<sup>9</sup> (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Specific waste policies which are set out in the National Planning Policy for Waste<sup>10</sup> which should be read in conjunction with the NPPF and associated planning practice guidance<sup>11</sup>. The NPPF places an additional requirement on Local Planning Authorities to prepare an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA).
- 1.1.8 The adopted Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013)<sup>12</sup> (hereafter referred to as 'the Plan' or 'HMWP') also includes a commitment to monitor the implementation of the Plan. This is set out in its Implementation and Monitoring Plan (Appendix C of the HMWP).
- 1.1.9 The proposed approach of the Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA will be to prepare two reports – the MR and an LAA. As a result, this Monitoring Report does not contain detailed reporting on minerals issues as these are considered in the LAA. The Monitoring Report focuses on the reporting of all other policies including the waste policies. The Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA plan to publish the LAA and Monitoring Report each year around December.

## 1.2 What is the purpose of this Monitoring Report?

- 1.2.1 This report provides information on the progress of minerals and waste development within the Hampshire Authorities' administrative area and the part of the SDNPA within Hampshire, in the 2022 calendar year. The report is divided into three key sections:
- progress with the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) - the timetable;
  - monitoring policy performance (monitoring the policies from the HMWP); and
  - monitoring outcomes and identifying relevant actions (the issues identified and the actions to be taken).
- 1.2.2 The joint planning area that the Hampshire Authorities cover is referred to as the 'Hampshire Plan area' in this report. All references to Hampshire should be taken to mean the Hampshire Plan area and include the area covered by all Hampshire Authorities and the part of the SDNPA within Hampshire, unless otherwise specified.

<sup>9</sup> National Planning Policy Framework: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

<sup>10</sup> National Planning Policy for Waste (2014): [www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste)

<sup>11</sup> National Planning Practice Guidance for waste: <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/waste/>

<sup>12</sup> Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013): <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>



1.2.3 The report provides detailed information on the progress of the documents set out in the MWDS, which provides a timetable for the preparation of work associated with the monitoring and implementation of the adopted HMWP. This includes:

- what documents are to be produced; and
- at which stage each document preparation is at.

1.2.4 This report highlights the latest figures on the monitoring indicators for the policies contained within the HMWP and will help to answer a number of questions, which include:

- are the policies and proposals achieving their objectives and, in particular, delivering sustainable development?
- are the policies having any unintentional consequences?
- are the assumptions and objectives behind the policies still relevant?
- are targets being achieved?

1.2.5 The questions above are addressed in Section 5 ([Reviewing the Monitoring Targets](#)) of this MR.

## 2. Update on Minerals and Waste Policy and Guidance

### 2.1 Partnership Working

2.1.1 Following the adoption of the HMWP, the plan-making partnership between Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council (SCC), Portsmouth City Council (PCC), the New Forest National Park Authority (NFNPA) and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) came to an end. A new partnership was established between Hampshire County Council, SCC, PCC and the NFNPA (the ‘Hampshire Authorities’) to monitor and implement the plan.

2.1.2 A separate Service Level Agreement (SLA) between Hampshire County Council and the SDNPA has been established for the monitoring of the plan only.

### 2.2 Local Planning Guidance

2.2.1 The Hampshire Authorities have produced two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) on Oil and Gas Development and Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire<sup>13</sup>. These documents provide additional guidance on the associated policies in the adopted HMWP.

### 2.3 Regional Planning Policy

2.3.1 As reported in previous MRs, the South East Plan (SEP) was revoked in March 2013<sup>14</sup>, with the exception of two saved policies. The SEP is therefore no longer a material consideration in plan making in Hampshire with the exception of the saved policy of relevance to the plan area - Policy NRM6: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

### 2.4 National Planning Policy and Guidance

2.4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)<sup>15</sup> sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (formerly the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) published a revised NPPF in July 2018, this was updated in February 2019, July 2021. Specific waste policies, which are set out in the National Planning Policy for Waste<sup>16</sup>, should be read in conjunction with the NPPF and associated planning practice guidance<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> Hampshire County Council Minerals and Waste SPDs: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan/supplementary-planning-documents>

<sup>14</sup> The Regional Strategy for the South East Order 2013: [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2013/427/pdfs/ukxiem\\_20130427\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2013/427/pdfs/ukxiem_20130427_en.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> National Planning Policy Framework: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

<sup>16</sup> National Planning Policy for Waste (2014): [www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste)

<sup>17</sup> National Planning Practice Guidance for waste: <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/waste/>

2.4.2 The Localism Act 2011<sup>18</sup> was enacted on 15 November 2011 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>19</sup> were brought into force on 6 April 2012. More recently the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017<sup>20</sup> was enacted on 27 April 2017.

2.4.3 National planning policy for waste is currently contained in a suite of documents and together they form the National Waste Management Plan, including:

- National Planning Policy for Waste<sup>21</sup> (October 2014);
- Waste Management Plan for England<sup>22</sup> (December 2013);
- National Waste Prevention Programme<sup>23</sup> (December 2013);
- National Policy Statements (i.e. on renewable energy<sup>24</sup>, hazardous waste<sup>25</sup> and wastewater<sup>26</sup>); and
- all Waste Development Plan Documents.

2.4.4 The National Waste Management Plan should be read in conjunction with the NPPF.

---

<sup>18</sup> Localism Act 2011: [www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted)

<sup>19</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/contents/made>

<sup>20</sup> Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/20/contents>

<sup>21</sup> National Planning Policy for Waste (2014): [www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste)

<sup>22</sup> National Waste Management Plan (2013): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/waste-management-plan-for-england>

<sup>23</sup> National Waste Prevention Programme (2013): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/waste-prevention-programme-for-england>

<sup>24</sup> National Policy Statement for renewable energy (2013): [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/47856/1940-nps-renewable-energy-en3.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47856/1940-nps-renewable-energy-en3.pdf)

<sup>25</sup> Hazardous waste national policy statement (2013): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hazardous-waste-national-policy-statement>

<sup>26</sup> National Policy Statement on waste water (2013): [www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/69505/pb13709-waste-water-nps.pdf](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69505/pb13709-waste-water-nps.pdf)

## 3. Progress with the Development Scheme

### 3.1 The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme

3.1.1 The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) is a statutory document that provides a timetable for the preparation of work associated with the monitoring and implementation of the adopted HMWP (2013), as well as any related planning documents. The MR reports on changes to the MWDS itself, as well as how timetables within the current MWDS are being followed.

### 3.2 Review of the Development Scheme

3.2.1 The MWDS<sup>27</sup> was updated in December 2020 to outline the timetable for the Partial Update to the HMWP, beginning in March 2021, this was further revised in July 2022.

3.2.2 As outlined in the AMR for 2020, a review of the HMWP (2013) was undertaken in 2020, with the resulting report being published in November 2020. The report<sup>28</sup> concluded that a Partial Update of the Plan was required.

3.2.3 In 2021, work began on the preparation of a Partial Update to the Plan. This included a Call for Sites, updating the relevant evidence base and Duty to Cooperate meetings.

3.2.4 Due to unforeseen circumstances, the partial update timetable was extended with the Regulation 18 Draft Plan consultation planned for late 2022. This was reflected in an update to the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme in May 2022.

3.2.5 Further information is provided in Section 5.4 regarding the progress of the Partial Update to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Any further updates will be posted on the HMWP – Partial Update webpages of HCC<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>

<sup>28</sup> 2020 Review of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan - <https://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/HWMP-2020Review.pdf>

<sup>29</sup> Hampshire County Council HMWP - Partial Update website: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan/minerals-waste-plan-partial-update-consultation>

## 4. Monitoring the Policies

### 4.1 How do we monitor mineral and waste policies?

4.1.1 Mineral and waste policies contained within Development Plans (or Local Plans) are monitored to check if they are providing adequate management of minerals and waste. This is achieved via a number of 'monitoring indicators' that are set out in an implementation and monitoring plan.

### 4.2 Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)

4.2.1 The HMWP contains a suite of policies for delivering Hampshire's 'vision and objectives' for minerals and waste development to 2030. The Plan is based upon the principle of ensuring we have the right development to maintain a reliable and timely supply of minerals and excellent management of our waste, whilst protecting the environment and our communities.

4.2.2 The HMWP also considers matters which may arise from exceptional circumstances. By monitoring the indicator for each policy in the Plan, it will be possible to note if the intended outcome ('the Vision') - of land use for minerals and waste development in Hampshire – is the correct 'direction of travel' and on course to meet its objectives.

### 4.3 Monitoring Indicators

4.3.1 The monitoring framework for this report consists of a number of 'monitoring indicators' for each policy.

4.3.2 The HMWP contains a monitoring indicator for each of its 34 policies, which are listed in Appendix C of the adopted HMWP.

4.3.3 The data for the monitoring indicators for 2022 is presented in the table below. Data from the previous year (2021), where available, is shown in brackets '( )', for comparison.

4.3.4 A red / amber / green colouring system has also been added for clarity of indicator status.

## 4.3.5 2022 Monitoring Indicator Schedule:

| Policy Title & Number                                   | Monitoring Indicator   | Monitoring Indicator target  | Outcome in 2022 (2021) | Commentary  |
|---|--|--|------------------------|---|
| Policy 1:<br>Sustainable minerals & waste development   | Percentage of planning applications processed within 13 weeks  | >60% of Planning applications processed within 13 weeks (excluding those subject to Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) or a Planning Performance Agreement or other agreed extension of time) | 95% (97%)              | Two Portsmouth City Council applications were not decided within the required timescales.                               |
| Policy 2:<br>Climate change - mitigation and adaptation | Percentage of planning permissions granted against Environment Agency (EA) advice                                | Number of planning permissions granted against EA advice = 0   | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted against EA advice.   |
| Policy 3:<br>Protection of habitats and species         | Planning permissions granted against Natural England (NE) advice (Planning permissions in designated areas)      | Number of planning permissions granted within designated sites (SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI etc.) against NE advice = 0  | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions within designated sites were granted against NE advice.   |
| Policy 4:<br>Protection of the designated landscape     | Planning permissions granted against Natural England advice (Planning permissions in designated landscape areas) | Number of planning permissions granted within designated landscape areas (NP / AONB) against NE advice = 0   | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted in designated landscape areas against NE advice.                                   |
| Policy 5:<br>Protection of the countryside              | Planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy   | Number of planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy = 0   | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy.  |
|   | Restoration conditions in exceptional developments   | For exceptional developments, number of planning permissions granted without restoration conditions = 0  | 0 (0)                  | No planning permission (where restoration and aftercare were considered necessary) was granted without such conditions. |
| Policy 6:<br>South West Hampshire Green Belt            | Planning permissions granted in the Green Belt contrary to policy  | Number of planning permissions granted in the Green Belt contrary to policy = 0  | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted in the Green Belt (in South-West Hampshire) that were contrary to policy.          |
|   | Restoration conditions in exceptional developments   | For exceptional developments, number of planning permissions without restoration conditions = 0  | 0 (0)                  |   |



| Policy Title & Number  | Monitoring Indicator  | Monitoring Indicator target  | Outcome in 2022 (2021) | Commentary   |
|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| Policy 7:<br>Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets | Planning permissions against Historic England (HE) advice   | Number of planning permissions against Historic England (HE) advice = 0                  | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted against HE advice.  |
| Policy 8:<br>Protection of soils                                     | Number of planning permissions that result in a net loss of Best & Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land in Hampshire. | Number of planning permissions that result in a net loss of BMV land in Hampshire > 0    | 0 (0)                  | There was no net loss of BMV agricultural land in Hampshire due to planning permissions. BMV is land classified as Grade 1, 2 or 3a. |
|  | Planning permissions against Natural England (NE) advice  | Number of planning permissions granted against NE advice = 0                             | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted against NE advice.  |
| Policy 9:<br>Restoration of minerals and waste sites                 | Relevant planning permissions have restoration and aftercare conditions   | Number of relevant planning permissions without restoration and aftercare conditions = 0 | 0 (0)                  | No planning permission (where restoration and aftercare were considered necessary) was granted without such conditions.              |
| Policy 10:<br>Protecting public health, safety and amenity           | Planning permissions against Environment Agency (EA) advice   | Number of planning permissions granted against EA advice = 0                             | 0 (0)                  | No planning permission was granted that were against EA advice.  |
|  | Planning permissions against Environment Health Officer (EHO) advice  | Number of planning permissions granted against EHO advice = 0                            | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted that were against EHO advice.   |
| Policy 11:<br>Flood risk and prevention                              | Planning permissions granted against Environment Agency (EA) advice   | Number of planning permissions against EA advice = 0                                     | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted against EA advice.  |
| Policy 12:<br>Managing traffic                                       | Planning permissions granted contrary to Highway Authority (HA) Advice  | Number of planning permissions contrary to Highway Authority (HA) advice = 0             | 0 (0)                  | No planning permissions were granted against HA advice.  |

| Policy Title & Number   | Monitoring Indicator  | Monitoring Indicator target   | Outcome in 2022 (2021) | Commentary  |
|---|---|---|------------------------|---|
| Policy 13:<br>High-quality design of minerals and waste development | Planning permissions in the view of MWPA are of satisfactory design   | Number of planning permissions without satisfactory design = 0  | 0 (0)                  | All planning permissions granted were considered to be of satisfactory design.  |
| Policy 14:<br>Community Benefits                                    | Percentage of major applications with community benefits  | Percentage of major applications with community benefits > 50%  | 0% (0%)                | <p>There was no data on major planning applications with community benefits and a number of potential issues with this policy are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a low number of major applications;</li> <li>• the time needed for agreements relating to community benefits to be put in place;</li> <li>• the policy relates to encouraging, rather than requiring, community benefits; and,</li> <li>• as benefits are arranged outside the planning process this data is not routinely available.</li> </ul> <p>Action points from this are to include encouragement of community benefits in the pre-application and application process.</p> |
| Policy 15:<br>Safeguarding - mineral resources                      | Area of Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) sterilised by non-mineral development granted permission by Local Planning Authority (LPA) against Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) advice | Area of MSA sterilised by non-mineral development granted permission by LPA against MPA advice = 0 hectares | 5.3 ha<br>(25 ha)      | <p>Where comment was made by the MWPA, only one application was approved without reference to minerals and waste or requested conditions.</p> <p>N.B. A number of applications commented on in 2022 are still awaiting decision.</p>  |

| Policy Title & Number                                       | Monitoring Indicator  | Monitoring Indicator target   | Outcome in 2022 (2021)  | Commentary  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Policy 16:<br>Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure        | Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-mineral uses by LPA permission against MPA advice | Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-mineral uses by LPA permission against MPA advice = 0   | 0 (0)   | No safeguarded sites were developed against MPA advice. Please note that "sites developed" is measured through planning permissions granted for development, rather than a physical development, as waiting until a site is developed would introduce significant delays to the monitoring process.   |
| Policy 17:<br>Aggregate supply - capacity and source        | Reduction in aggregate production capacity  | Aggregate production capacity is not reduced by more than 556,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 5.56mtpa)<br><br>Land-won aggregate sales exceed 1.15 Mtpa | 7.03 Mt<br>(5.98 Mt)<br>(7.45 Mt in 2020)<br><br>0.64 Mt<br>(0.81 Mt) | There was an estimated 18% (1.05 million tonnes) increase in the amount of aggregate production capacity in 2022.<br><br>Meanwhile, land-won aggregate sales did not reach the monitoring target in 2022. The monitoring target for sales has been lowered in line with the newly adopted sand and gravel Annual Provision Rate.<br><br>This is the seventh year that capacity was provided by the operators.<br><br>Data from Local Aggregate Assessment 2023. |
| Policy 18:<br>Recycled and secondary aggregates development | Production of high quality recycled and secondary aggregate                                     | Year on year decrease in the (capacity for) production of high quality recycled and secondary aggregates  | 2.8 Mt<br>(2.49 Mt)   | There was a 12% increase in recycled and secondary aggregates production capacity in 2022.<br><br>It is noted that, while the response rate for sites surveyed increased significantly in 2022, less than 50% of sites provided capacity estimates during surveying.<br><br>Data from Local Aggregate Assessment 2023.  |

| Policy Title & Number                           | Monitoring Indicator                              | Monitoring Indicator target  | Outcome in 2022 (2021)                                | Commentary   |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Policy 19:<br>Aggregate wharves and rail depots | Rail depot capacity<br><br>Wharf capacity         | Rail depot capacity reduced by more than 130,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 1.3mtpa)<br><br>Wharf capacity reduced by more than 256,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 2.56mtpa) | 1.03 Mtpa (1.03 Mtpa)<br><br>2.13 Mtpa (1.55 Mtpa)    | There have been no rail depots or wharves lost in 2022.<br><br>Wharf capacity estimates have increased by 37%, this is due to new sites becoming active and an increase in the survey response rate.<br><br>Data from Local Aggregate Assessment 2023. |
| Policy 20:<br>Local land-won aggregates         | Landbank for Aggregate supply                     | Landbank falls below 7 years' worth of aggregate supply<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i>  | 6.79 years (7.69 years)                               | The landbank dropped below the NPPF requirement of 7 years in 2022.<br><br>Landbank of current aggregate reserves based upon the Local Requirement.<br><br>Data from Local Aggregate Assessment 2023.  |
| Policy 21:<br>Silica sand development           | Permitted reserve at individual silica sand sites | Permitted reserve falls below 10 years at individual silica sand sites<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i>                                     | 19 years<br><br>(3 years)<br><br>(3 years in 2020)    | Based on the 3-year average sales.<br><br>See Paragraph 5.2.6 for further discussion.<br><br>Data estimated using the Local Aggregate Assessment 2023.   |
| Policy 22:<br>Brick-making clay                 | Landbank for brick-making clay                    | Landbank falls below 25 years' worth of brick-making clay supply<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i>   | 17 years*<br><br>(18 years)<br><br>(19 years in 2020) | *Estimated based upon the 2021 figures.<br><br>The landbank in Hampshire for brick-making clay has now breached the monitoring benchmark for more than three years.  |

| Policy Title & Number                      | Monitoring Indicator   | Monitoring Indicator target  | Outcome in 2022 (2021)        | Commentary  |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Policy 23:<br>Chalk development            | Amount of chalk extracted in tonnes per annum (tpa)                | Amount of chalk extracted in tonnes per annum (tpa) < 25,000tpa                  | 15,042 tonnes (17,922 tonnes) |   |
| Policy 24:<br>Oil and gas development      | Planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy | Number of planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy = 0 | 0 (0)                         | No oil and gas planning permissions granted in 2022.  |
| Policy 25:<br>Sustainable waste management | Amount / percentage of non-hazardous waste recycled                | Recycling not reaching 60% by 2020   | 71%<br>(71%)<br>(68% in 2020) | <p>The 2022 Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator shows that of all household, commercial and industrial 'waste removed' from sites in Hampshire – 67% (67%) was sent for 'recovery' while 3% (4%) was sent for 'treatment'. In addition, 11% (13%) was sent for incineration. Please note these figures will include some waste arisings which did not originate in Hampshire.</p> <p>Figures for 2020 and 2021 have been corrected due to rounding errors.</p> <p>Based on data from Waste Data Flow, MSW waste arisings in 2022 were 755,956 (799,337) tonnes. The treatment of this waste was as follows:</p> <p>Recycled 25% (25%)<br/>Composted 14% (13%)<br/>Recovered 56% (57%)<br/>Landfill 5% (5%)</p> |

| Policy Title & Number                                   | Monitoring Indicator   | Monitoring Indicator target   | Outcome in 2022 (2021)   | Commentary  |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Policy 26:<br>Safeguarding - waste infrastructure       | Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-waste uses by Local Planning Authority (LPA) permission, against Waste Planning Authority (WPA) advice | Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-waste uses by LPA permission, against WPA advice = 0  | 0 (0)  | No safeguarded sites were developed against WPA advice.<br><br>Please note that "sites developed" is measured through planning permissions granted for development, rather than a physical development, as waiting until a site is developed would introduce significant delays to the monitoring process.  |
| Policy 27:<br>Capacity for waste management development | Capacity and operational status of waste management facilities   | Provision of additional recycling and recovery capacity:<br><br>2011-2015 = 370,000 tonnes<br>2016-2020 = 205,000 tonnes<br>2021-2030 = 102,000 tonnes<br><br>No net loss of waste management capacity from closure of sites and/or no new recycling or recovery capacity proposals<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i> | 77,000 tonnes per annum<br><br>Cumulative to 2022: 792,670<br><br>No net loss<br><br>(11,000 tonnes per annum<br><br>Cumulative to 2021: 715,670<br><br>No net loss) | New waste management capacity was permitted for:<br><br>15,000 tonnes - aggregate and soil recycling (21/02058/HCC - The Plant Centre, Wilson Plant Bowling Alley, Crondall)<br><br>~62,000 tonnes - road planings crushing and screening to create recycled aggregate (20/01188/HCS - Down Farm, Down Farm Lane, Headbourne Worthy)<br><br>Note: Based on the new capacity methodology used in the draft Plan preparation, the cumulative additional capacity to 2022 is estimated at 996,394 tpa. |



| Policy Title & Number                                  | Monitoring Indicator   | Monitoring Indicator target  | Outcome in 2022 (2021)  | Commentary   |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Policy 28:<br>Energy recovery development              | Number of facilities and amount of renewable energy produced | Decrease in number of facilities and/or amount of renewable energy produced.<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i> | 19 sites<br>423,278 MWh<br><br>(19 sites<br>442,800 MWh in 2021)<br><br>(19 sites<br>392,859 MWh in 2020) | 8 landfill gas sites, 3 energy recovery facilities, 3 sewage sludge, 3 biomass (CHP) and 2 Anaerobic Digestion (AD) facilities with a total installed capacity of 67.91 MW (69.61 MW). There was a 2.4% decrease in the installed capacity between 2021 and 2022, the main loss of capacity was at landfill gas sites due to the installing of smaller gas engines, in response to lower rates of gas production.<br><br>The total energy generated in 2022 decreased by 4.4%. The biggest site decreases, in MWh, were seen at the landfill gas sites and one of the energy recovery facilities (ERF). This was likely in relation to decreasing gas production as the landfills age and planned site outages at the ERF. It has been confirmed that the sewage sludge plant decrease was due to planned and reactive maintenance on the engine.<br><br>Data is based on operator information.<br><br>The data for 2021 has been corrected. |
| Policy 29:<br>Locations and sites for waste management | Planning permissions in Accordance with Policy 29            | Planning permissions not in accordance with Policy 29  | 1 (0)   | One application was granted not in accordance will Policy 29.  |

| Policy Title & Number   | Monitoring Indicator  | Monitoring Indicator target   | Outcome in 2022 (2021)   | Commentary  |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Policy 30:<br>Construction, demolition and excavation waste development | Amount of high quality recycled and secondary aggregate production  | Once 1mtpa production reached, production of high quality recycled and secondary aggregate production decreases below 1mtpa<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i> | Recycled:<br>0.74 Mt<br>(0.75 Mt)<br><br>Recovered:<br>516 kt<br>(634 thousand tonnes (kt))<br><br>Reclamation:<br>0 kt (0 kt)<br><br>Construction:<br>0 kt (0 kt) | This indicator shows the four broad classifications for beneficial uses of inert waste.<br><br>Overall, the amount of inert waste put to beneficial uses has decreased by 8.7% from 1.38Mt in 2021 to 1.26Mt in 2022.<br><br>Although a drop in inert waste put to beneficial uses has been seen in 2022, the overall figure is still more than 1 mtpa.<br><br>Recycled is the figure as recorded in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2023. The 2021 figure has been corrected.<br><br>Recovered, reclaimed and construction figures are taken from the Environment Agency 2022 Waste Management in South East England data tables. |
| Policy 31:<br>Liquid waste and waste water management                   | Number of and capacity of Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) with co-disposal of liquid wastes and/or biogas recovery | Decrease in number of WWTW and/or capacity for co-disposal of liquid wastes and/or biogas recovery<br><br><i>(Breach of benchmark over two successive years)</i>                          | 3 sites,<br>5.60 MW<br><br>(3 sites,<br>5.47 MW)   | Figure only records capacity of those WWTW with co-disposal capability.<br><br>Please note that this capacity is also included in the capacity reported for the Policy 28 monitoring indicator.<br><br>Data is based on operator information.   |

| Policy Title & Number                                   | Monitoring Indicator                                       | Monitoring Indicator target   | Outcome in 2022 (2021)   | Commentary  |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Policy 32:<br>Non-hazardous waste landfill              | Lifetime of Landfill capacity void                         | Lifetime of Landfill capacity void drops below 4 years                | 2.2 years<br>(3.4 years)<br>(3.2 years in 2020)  | <p>Landfill capacity estimated as of 31.12.22 based upon averaged annual inputs as recorded by the Environment Agency and voids as reported by the operators.</p> <p>Based on data from the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator, the amount of non-hazardous waste received at Hampshire's only operating non-hazardous landfill (Blue Haze) was 112,608 (112,970) tonnes, of which 61% (71%) came from Hampshire.</p> <p>Around 140,957 (162,035) tonnes of household, industrial and commercial waste received in non-Hampshire landfills came from Hampshire.</p> <p>At the same time, around 44,369 (32,760) tonnes of Household, Industrial and Commercial waste from other authorities was received at landfills in Hampshire.</p> |
| Policy 33:<br>Hazardous and low-level waste development | Amount of hazardous waste management arisings and capacity | Hazardous waste management capacity is higher than estimated arisings | <p>Arisings:<br/>166,825<br/>(150,175)</p> <p>Deposits:<br/>131,445<br/>(126,707)</p> <p>Capacity:<br/>266,758<br/>(282,360)</p> | <p>Existing capacity is more than the estimated waste arisings.</p> <p>Data on arisings from Hampshire and deposits in Hampshire are from the Environment Agency's Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator.</p> <p>The deposits data for 2021 has been corrected.</p>   |

| Policy Title & Number   | Monitoring Indicator  | Monitoring Indicator target  | Outcome in 2022 (2021) | Commentary  |
|---|---|--|------------------------|---|
| Policy 34:<br>Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure | Planning permissions granted contrary to advice of the Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) / Waste Planning Authority (WPA) | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of the MPA/WPA = 0 | 0 (0)                  | No safeguarded sites were developed against WPA advice. |

## 5. Reviewing the Monitoring Targets

### 5.1 Monitoring Review

5.1.1 The review of the output indicator outcomes and commentary shows that the majority of output indicator targets (79% of policies had a green rating) were achieved during 2022. Where targets were not achieved, it may be due to a variety of factors:

- inappropriate indicator / target;
- external factors, such as in government policy; and,
- changes in market conditions or behaviour from the general public.

5.1.2 Where indicators have been breached, or are close to breaching in subsequent years, the Hampshire Authorities monitor the situation closely and take account of the identified need in their decision making. The Hampshire Authorities and SDNPA also engage with operators and landowners in order to support the submission of sustainable planning applications in accordance with minerals and waste planning policy. Should it be noted that certain indicators have been breached in successive years, these areas will be noted for particular attention during any upcoming reviews of planning policy.

5.1.3 Indicators associated with silica sand and brick-making clay are prone to considerable variations and subject to confidentiality issues due to the small number of sites and operators. The Hampshire Authorities and SDNPA are actively engaged with the operators running these sites, though it will ultimately be an operator decision whether to apply for further planning permissions in order to increase reserves.

### 5.2 Policy Review

5.2.1 A summary of issues which have arisen during the application of the HMWP policies to date, by Hampshire Authorities and SDNPA officers, is included here. These comments will help in the monitoring of the HMWP, as well as in shaping any future planning policy.

5.2.2 The downward trend for the indicator for *Policy 25* seen between 2016 and 2018 (a drop in recycling from 49% to 47% and then 44%) is considered to be due to varying commercial circumstances, as the figure rose to 54% in 2019, to 67% in 2020 and to 72% in 2021. This figure has remained steady at 70% in 2022. The historic fluctuation highlights that waste trends are affected by factors outside of an LPAs control (e.g. drops in profitability for recycled materials). This indicator will be closely monitored and further exploration of the causes and potential remedies, to reduced recycling rates, within the LPAs control will be required. It should be noted while the term used by the source data is “sent for recovery”, this generally refers to processes that cover recycling.

5.2.3 The indicator for *Policy 28* has seen its first decrease in energy production since 2019. This has been attributed to planned outages at Hampshire ERFs and more importantly the installation of smaller engines at landfill gas sites. This is a situation that will

continue to arise as the landfill gas generation slows at restored non-hazardous landfill sites, it is expected that installed capacity at such sites will reduce over time and eventually cease operations.

- 5.2.4 The general downward trend for landfill capacity (indicator for *Policy 32*) is the subject of ongoing consideration, though it should be noted that the Plan provides for the expansion of one of the existing landfills, a landfill allocation and a landfill criteria-based policy which should enable all operators to pursue further landfill opportunities.
- 5.2.5 It should also be noted that *Policy 22 (Landbank from brick-making clay)* has breached its threshold for more than two successive years. Due to the small number of sites, these indicators are highly dependent on site operations. If these sites choose not to expand and/or other sites do not come forward, the indicators are expected to continue to decline.
- 5.2.6 *Policy 21 (Permitted reserve at individual silica sand sites)* had breached its threshold for more than two successive years (2015 – 2021), however in 2022 the permitted reserves rose above the threshold limit of 10 years. The reserves based on 3-year average sales have risen above the 10-year threshold due to low sales and the addition of extensions granted to active sites.
- 5.2.7 It is particularly worth noting the issue with getting reliable data for the mineral policies, particularly from smaller operators. This may have caused a number of mineral policies to be recorded as amber or red and this will need to be reviewed in subsequent years.
- 5.2.8 A number of comments have been received from the Development Management team that focus on the implementation of the policies. Key themes are the need for clearly defined terminology, consideration of the increased importance of climate change prevention, mitigation and adaptation issues and how minerals and waste sites often require differing application of the same policy.

| HMWP Policy                                      | Comment   |
|--|---|
| <i>Policy 2 (Climate Change):</i>                | Current plan policy not definitive position. Still uncertainty on Scope 3.  |
| <i>Policy 3 (Habitats and species):</i>          | A lot more overlap being seen between Landscape/Ecology and LLFA going forward. Sits more in the implementation plan.   |
| <i>Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside):</i> | Where do we get definition of Countryside for our applications - using District boundaries or ONS data?<br>Interaction between District policy on what is acceptable in the countryside and vs what is in HWMP. Which takes precedence? |
| <i>Policy 7 (Heritage assets):</i>               | Do we need to consider Locally Listed at all - no weight under NPPF? Conservation Officers often flag non-designated historic assets and the impact. Non-designated assets are recognised by NPPF in the judgement balance              |
| <i>Policy 8 (Soils):</i>                         | New soils guidance from DEFRA   |



| HMWP Policy   | Comment  |
|---|--|
| <i>Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments):</i>         | Make it clear that this can apply to waste sites where they are extending into countryside/greenfield sites as an extension of an existing site. Restoration when approved use ceases.<br>Ensure changes to restorations are as good as or better than approved plan.  |
| <i>Policy 10 (Protecting public health and safety):</i>                   | Silica dust still and issue - Lee Castle Appeal decision will give some clarity.   |
| <i>Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention):</i>                             | Inter-relationship with ecology.   |
| <i>Policy 12 (Managing traffic):</i>                                      | Highways noise and vibration amenity issue. How far down the traffic route do we have to consider amenity impacts from HGV traffic. Difficult to address where there is an incremental increase of traffic heading to a site.  |
| <i>Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development):</i> | Easier to apply to waste site (where permanent sites) Minerals sites are quite different. Something in policy about the difference in how this works for waste sites vs minerals sites (climate change, restoration, landscape/visual impact - more temporary impact for minerals vs benefits of mineral final restoration). Minerals need to focus on temporary mitigation (e.g. bunds and how they shift around during phases) |
| <i>Policy 14 (Community benefits):</i>                                    | Stressing the external funding and liaison panels.   |
| <i>Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure):</i>                | Helps with extensions of existing sites. Less pronounced for minerals than it is for waste sites and wharves and rail depots - encroachment could be an issue (visual impacts for outside developments).   |
| <i>Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source)</i>                 | More needed on the benefits of discrete market areas. Also, that all minerals extracted doesn't necessarily go to the County and could be cross border.  |
| <i>Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregates development)</i>          | Define high quality aggregates better and also stress the benefits of 'lower' quality aggregates in civils works e.g. drainage.  |
| <i>Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregate):</i>                              | Windfall minerals sites could struggle to be justified given part (a)  |
| <i>Policy 21 (Silica sand development):</i>                               | Policy is supportive of any silica sands regardless of what it gets used for. Can explain the differences in the suitability of the different types of sand and suitability for industrial vs recreational.  |
| <i>Policy 24 (Oil and gas development):</i>                               | Finch v Surrey Appeal case will influence the application of this policy.  |
| <i>Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure):</i>                   | Helps with extensions of existing sites. Less pronounced for minerals than it is for waste sites and wharves and rail depots - encroachment could be an issue (visual impacts for outside developments). E.g. metal recycling site creating complaints due to encroachments from offices and housing.  |
| <i>Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development):</i>             | Could do with more on the specific types of wastes being dealt with and the need for these subsets (e.g. metal, aggregates, household)<br>ERF issue with recent experience - past permissions weren't used for recovery. Not everyone is using the same information to justify the demand / capacity shortfall.  |

| HMWP Policy  | Comment   |
|--|---|
| <i>Policy 28 (Energy recovery development):</i>  | Digestate management - how will it be used, stored, where?<br>Importance of design (visual impacts) - ERFs and AD plants.<br>Environment Agency requirement that AD plants that have a waste input (not agricultural feedstock) will now be considered a waste use and so determined by Waste Planning Authority.           |
| <i>Policy 29 (Location of waste sites):</i>  | The issue of extensions/expansions have been allowed under the special need requirement due to existing safeguarded site.   |
| <i>Policy 31 (Liquid waste and waste water management):</i>                                      | Is the policy geared to the larger sites? We often determine small modifications that are not covered by Permitted Development (PD) (things like larger kiosks/control rooms that tag on to other PD developments on the sites). Helpful to support these smaller improvements.<br>Supporting text needs to cover nitrates. |
| <i>Policy 34 (Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure)</i> | Only have issues arise if there is a site that isn't on the list of existing sites.   |

5.2.9 The aforementioned areas in particular should be given particular attention during any upcoming reviews of planning policy.

### 5.3 Previous Policy Review Comments

5.3.1 Comments from previous Monitoring Reports are included below in order to maintain a comprehensive overview.

5.3.2 Previous policy review comments:

| HMWP Policy  | Comment   |
|--|---|
| <i>Policy 1 (Sustainable mineral and waste development):</i> | Needs reviewing in light of the climate emergency declaration by Hampshire County Council.<br>A reference to the Circular Economy principles needs to be worked in, especially with regards to waste.<br>The vision in Section 2 could better reflect sustainability in a current policy and strategic context.   |
| <i>Policy 2 (Climate Change):</i>                            | Climate change emergency declarations have been shown to be material considerations by the Planning Inspectorate in recent appeal decisions.<br>It may help if text or policy could refer to the consideration of self-sustaining sites (in terms of energy) to achieve more sustainable outcomes. Items such as solar panels on roofs and banks, wind power and building orientation may provide opportunities. The use of green roofs may also increase biodiversity, if appropriate, if there are no other possibilities to enhance within the site boundary.<br>Needs strengthening, particularly in consideration for the impacts on the causes of climate change.<br>Consider placing more emphasis on requirement for Greenhouse Gas and Health assessments.<br>While no development has yet been refused using this policy, the policy needs to be stronger to be in line with the emerging focus on climate change. Comparison with new emerging Plans in Neighbouring Authorities could provide insight.<br>The provisions of the Environment Bill need to be worked into the policy.<br>The need for more policy direction on the consideration of climate change matters through the update of the HMWP |

| HMWP Policy  | Comment   |
|--|---|
| <i>Policy 3 (Habitats and species):</i>            | <p>Upcoming mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) legislation will need to be covered in any update to this policy.</p> <p>There should be a focus on local net gain, so as not to be trading net gain outside of the county.</p> <p>Although the policy is about protection from adverse impacts as well as mitigation and compensation for loss, it may be useful to proactively encourage biodiversity enhancement through design, layout and management.</p> <p>It is important that the Plan is not 'limiting' minerals as often biodiversity net gain can be above 10%.</p> <p>The issue of nutrient neutrality should be considered as part of this policy.</p> <p>Need for more guidance on long term management requirements for BNG</p> <p>The provisions of the Environment Bill may need to be considered within this policy.</p> |
| <i>Policy 4 (Designated Landscape):</i>            | <p>More needed in the Plan about the setting of National Parks and how they may be impacted by proposals outside of their boundaries.</p> <p>Valued landscapes, tranquillity and dark skies may also need some more explanation.</p> <p>Could benefit from more clarity with regard to what kind of restoration is appropriate if a business was to fail (go into liquidation).</p> <p>More reasoning is needed in the supporting text on the importance of protecting designated landscapes.</p>   |
| <i>Policy 5 (Countryside):</i>                     | <p>The scope / expectations of this policy has caused issues on recent applications.</p> <p>Could benefit from more clarity with regard to what kind of restoration is appropriate if a business was to fail (go into liquidation).</p> <p>Consultee's have noted that the policy is not strong enough to allow them to object to proposals.</p> <p>Possibly need definitions of what 'requires' a countryside location. This should be linked to paragraphs in Policy 29.</p> <p>The inclusion of National Landscape Character Areas could be considered.</p>  |
| <i>Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt):</i> | <p>'as far as possible' and 'highest standards' need defining. These are currently easily challenged.</p> <p>The special circumstances and beneficial uses of the green belt need clearly defining.</p> <p>It is important to be complimentary of National Policy rather than repeating it.</p> <p>Make sure the mapped boundaries are correct as it was noted with recent applications that it wasn't</p> <p>This policy needs strengthening and/or enforcing with regards to the use of the highest standards of design, operation, and restoration.</p>  |
| <i>Policy 7 (Heritage assets):</i>                 | <p>Policy needs to be more explicit on how a balance is made in relation to assets that may be impacted.</p> <p>Heritage impacts should be evaluated with Policies 4 and 9.</p> <p>A better definition of a locally recognised asset would be helpful.</p> <p>Any upcoming changes to the NPPF, with regard to the historic environment, will need to be considered.</p>  |
| <i>Policy 8 (Soils):</i>                           | <p>Natural England do not always provide a comment on this issue.</p> <p>When soils are restored to agriculture they will not be of best and most versatile agricultural land quality until some time has passed so they need to be monitored until soil structure shows what final quality is attained.</p> <p>Need for an increased understanding of soil protection, retention and restoration.</p> <p>More information is required with regards to the use of Grade 3a/3b agricultural land.</p> <p>May need to work in Natural England advice on what is considered to be relevant (size) in terms of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).</p>   |

| HMWP Policy  | Comment   |
|--|---|
|  | A linkage is required with Policy 9 in regard to the enhancement of soils as part of restoration works.   |
| <i>Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments):</i>        | <p>Links to wider BNG and environmental net gain need to be worked into this policy. It may be beneficial to include the words 'public water supply/storage' and 'recreation/access etc.' in the actual policy as opposed to the supporting text.</p> <p>Issues with restoration completing on time; consideration required to allow for the delivery of improved restoration schemes if extensions of time are requested. Need to consider new policy areas of climate change and net gain.</p> <p>The policy needs to be flexible to allow the most effective and up-to-date restoration achievable, for when it is delivered.</p> <p>A restoration Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) could be a useful tool for achieving the best restorations.</p>   |
| <i>Policy 10 (Protecting public health and safety):</i>                  | <p>The expectation of the environmental permitting regime needs to be set out more clearly in the supporting text to ensure we don't end up in situations where there is an overlap.</p> <p>The pandemic has increased the sense of community and enjoyment of local areas from what has been seen in recent applications.</p> <p>May need to review the criterion 'g' and 'i' as the formatting can confuse the reader. Criterion 'j' could also be improved, as its cumulative impact of the development on the locality which may be in conjunction with existing or allocated development, or in conjunction with land use (e.g. internationally designated sites, landscape character areas etc.).</p> <p>Consideration of putting the aviation and safeguarding elements into a separate policy, as well as cumulative impacts into a separate policy.</p> <p>Air quality should be mentioned and supporting paragraphs needed to help assess this.</p> <p>Need to consider aerosol impacts associated with Anaerobic Digestion (AD)</p> <p>Concerns raised about health impacts associated with silica dust raised being raised in public representations.</p> |
| <i>Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention):</i>                            | <p>May be better if re-titled 'Flood risk and groundwater protection / drainage'.</p> <p>Need for consistent decision making and guidance from EA.</p>  |
| <i>Policy 12 (Managing traffic):</i>                                     | <p>Could be strengthened with regards to emissions, vehicle types and traffic movements in close proximity to National Parks and other specially designated areas (SPAs, SACs etc.)</p> <p>This policy could be linked with Policy 2 (Climate Change). The policy could be strengthened with regards to emissions, vehicle types and traffic movements through the national parks.</p> <p>Links to air quality should be mentioned and supporting paragraphs needed to help assess this - particulate matter raised regularly in public representations.</p> <p>Impacts on amenity associated with highways.</p>  |
| <i>Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development)</i> | <p>This policy should be design specific and leave other aspects to be dealt with by Policies 9 and 10.</p> <p>Need for implementation guidance in order to enable further implementation of policy.</p> <p>The requirement for developments to 'use high quality recycled and secondary source building materials where appropriate' should be enforced as well as the need to 'minimise the use of primary aggregates' in developments.</p>   |
| <i>Policy 14 (Community Benefits):</i>                                   | <p>The requirement for liaison panels should be maintained within any Plan update.</p> <p>The community benefits package needs to be included somewhere in the plan but making it very clear that it lies outside of the planning process.</p>  |

| HMWP Policy  | Comment  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>It may be necessary to give more clarity with regard to the form of land use/enhancement with recreational and other benefits. The supporting text for <i>Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside)</i> refers to the restoration of mineral and waste developments that can lead to enhanced public access and additional recreational uses, providing benefits to rural communities and this may be better placed under).</p> <p>This policy does not relate directly to work done by the Minerals or Waste Planning Authority, as it refers to bilateral agreements that do not include the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. It is also difficult to monitor on an annual basis as such agreements, as the policy encourages, can take time to be established and implemented. There is also no obligation for such agreements to be reported to the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority.</p>              |
| <p><i>Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources):</i></p>              | <p>How strong are parts a., b., and c. when Local Authorities propose developments on or adjacent to safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Historic England noted that “Malmstone is not safeguarded in Hampshire for the reasons set out in paragraphs 6.16 and 6.17 of the HMWP, i.e. that a resource has not been identified or worked for over half a century and there is no evidence that it is sourced in Hampshire other than recycling from old buildings. Historic England is part-funding a Strategic Stone Study of England on a county by county basis. Unfortunately, Hampshire has yet to be studied but when it is, should a source of Malmstone be identified, we hope that the County Council will consider safeguarding it for conservation works.”</p> <p>Would suggest that the Supplementary Planning Document will need to be reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose post adoption of an updated HMWP</p> |
| <p><i>Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure):</i></p>        | <p>This policy could be linked to inert recycling facilities and incinerator bottom ash recycling facilities.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to reviewing the Safeguarding SPD.</p> <p>Could be strengthened with mention of the Agent of Change Principle</p> <p>The policy could provide more protection to smaller sites, some of which have been lost/redeveloped recently.</p>  |
| <p><i>Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source):</i></p>        | <p>Clarification is required that the apportionment of aggregate requirements is a minimum rather than a ceiling figure.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to circular economy policies when this policy is reviewed.</p>   |
| <p><i>Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregates development):</i></p> | <p>The policy comes across as a position statement and could be developed and strengthened.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to circular economy policies when this policy is reviewed. Especially with regards to applying the Waste Hierarchy by requiring the consideration of recycled and secondary aggregates to fulfil market need.</p>   |
| <p><i>Policy 19 (Aggregate wharves and rail depots):</i></p>             | <p>Consideration should be given to strengthening this policy with regard to prioritising wharf space for marine aggregate importation over land-based sources.</p>  |
| <p><i>Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregate):</i></p>                      | <p>The site list for this policy needs updating.</p> <p>Consideration may need to be made for sites that will provide for other needs, such as inert void space.</p> <p>The policy could be updated to emphasise the requirement of land-won aggregates as a last resort over recycled and secondary aggregates.</p> <p>Consideration should be made for making allocations more flexible/adaptable to ensure developments are of good enough quality when they come forward, based upon the requirements in the future.</p> <p>Part 4, on new sites, might need to be strengthened or altered slightly</p> <p>Windfall minerals sites could struggle to be justified given part (a)</p>   |
| <p><i>Policy 21 (Silica sand development):</i></p>                       | <p>Silica for non-specialist uses may need to be considered through a review of this policy.</p>   |



| HMWP Policy   | Comment  |
|---|--|
| <i>Policy 22 (Brick-making clay):</i>                   | Selborne Brick works is no longer a deliverable site and so needs to be removed from the policy.<br>The policy needs to be updated to allow for importation of material onto site for brick making.  |
| <i>Policy 23 (Chalk):</i>                               | This policy needs to be reviewed based upon the current markets and uses for chalk, current sites are showing changes that the policy needs to address.<br>Clearer definitions need to be made within the supporting text.<br>The supporting text around dormant sites could be stronger.  |
| <i>Policy 24 (Oil and gas development):</i>             | The changing UK position on energy security might change this policy in the future.<br>This policy should be reviewed in line with the climate change strategy, including the use of fossil fuels and whether commercial development should be supported.<br>Clarification could be required on issues surrounding Hydraulic Fracturing.<br>The SPD could be reviewed alongside the policy.<br>Need to make sure emerging policy on this matter is taken into account<br>The supporting text could be updated to include the potential uses of old sites.  |
| <i>Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management):</i>        | Some clarification of the use of 'near' in terms of waste acceptance. PPG for Waste states that WPAs have a duty to allow neighbouring authorities to use waste management.<br>Need to consider the balance between transfer and processing facilities within Hampshire.<br>The circular economy package should be included in this policy in line with the NPPF.<br>Consideration should be made on how much residual landfill capacity is apportioned to out of area waste.<br>Consideration should be given to strengthening the policy to encourage the processing of waste indoors to reduce the social impact of sites.  |
| <i>Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure):</i> | Caution is needed with regard Energy Recovery Facility technology, as future technology may appear within the Plan period.<br>Need to strengthen the potential relocation of capacity.<br>Definitions could be included of the smaller energy recovery facilities such as Anaerobic Digestion and Pyrolysis.   |
| <i>Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management):</i>       | Operator performance has been noted in committee decisions, so this needs to be strengthened.<br>Any performance related strengthening needs to be defensible at possible appeals.<br>A comment was made that "Particularly in waste policies, [there is] no provision for non-new sites and for changes that occur on a site that would not change the substantive function or introduce new capacity." While this is covered in <i>Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development)</i> there may be a possibility in the future to clarify the policy position on ancillary developments on waste sites.<br>Consider the role of facilities higher up the waste hierarchy. |
| <i>Policy 28 (Energy recovery development):</i>         | Define 'have been discounted' in part a.<br>Is 'wherever practicable' in part b. strong enough?<br>Need to consider strengthening and enforcing issues around the policy, e.g. on driving waste up the hierarchy and providing combined heat and power.<br>AD plants may need a different approach.<br>Consideration should be given to requiring operators to prove they have explored other options with regard to the waste hierarchy.  |
| <i>Policy 29 (Location of waste sites):</i>             | Part 1 uses Roman numerals while parts 2 and 3 letters of the alphabet and the layout may be better if labelled part 'A' (currently parts 1 and 2) and part 'B' (currently part 3).  |
|   | Potential conflict with Policy 9, as there is tension between restoration and reuse of developed land.   |



| HMWP Policy   | Comment   |
|---|---|
| <i>Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development):</i> | The British Standards for Concrete have been updated, this policy should be updated in line with these.   |
| <i>Policy 31 (Liquid waste and wastewater management):</i>                    | Several applications have been affected by the nitrates issue recently. Thames Water commented on the need for a specific wastewater treatment policy: "as fundamentally, wastewater treatment has different geographical and technical requirements from other forms of waste management or waste treatment that form the majority of waste proposals that the HMWP is intended to provide policy guidance for. For example, wastewater treatment plants are constrained by the location of the sewerage network and need to be located close to where the sewerage network terminates (which is generally low lying ground to enable flows to gravitate and avoid high energy consumption associated with unnecessary pumping) and need to be located close to a suitable receiving watercourse into which the treated effluent can be discharged. In relation to existing wastewater treatment plants the existing discharge point can often be a critical issue as effluent discharges can form a significant proportion of river flows which are required to be maintained by the Environment Agency. Hence, these are reasons why a specific wastewater policy is required." The adopted HMWP includes a policy on wastewater treatment (Policy 31), however these comments may inform any future review. |
| <i>Policy 32 (Non-hazardous waste landfill):</i>                              | Policy needs updating with most up-to-date sites.<br>Additional landfill capacity will be an issue for this policy. All new proposals will need to demonstrate that all alternatives are not possible.<br>The Environment Bill, Waste Strategy and/or Circular Economy Package could make it hard to demonstrate need for a new landfill proposal.<br>The shift towards regional landfill modelling needs to be considered and potentially included in a review of this policy.   |
| <i>Policy 33 (Hazardous and low-level radioactive waste development):</i>     | Issues concerning drainage need to be included in this policy.  |
| <i>Safeguarding policies (Policies 15, 16, 26, 34):</i>                       | The indicators relate to development, however annual monitoring can most directly be done on granted permissions. Additionally, a need for improved guidance and processes in this area were identified, leading to the development of the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Supplementary Planning Guidance.   |
| <i>CLUs</i>   | Granting Certificates of Lawful Use (CLUs) has highlighted a discrepancy that exists in how these decisions are made to those of a planning application submitted before a development takes place. Due to the fact that in CLUs the development already exists and is simply certified as lawful by the Local Planning Authority, rather than permitted per se, there is little opportunity to ensure it is in accordance with the adopted Plan. A review of the Plan would need to consider whether there is a way of affecting this through new policy or if the current legal framework prevents this issue from being addressed.   |

## 5.4 Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Partial Update

5.4.1 In 2018, The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan was reviewed in accordance with national planning guidance<sup>30</sup> regarding the requirement for a 5-yearly review of plans<sup>31</sup>.

5.4.2 The Review concluded that, in 2018 (5 years since adoption), the policies were working effectively to achieve the Vision and there was no requirement to update the HMWP.

5.4.3 It was concluded that there were limitations to the 2018 review, including:

- The monitoring indicators and triggers may not have been defined sufficiently;
- There were a number of uncertainties which would have an impact on future capacity requirements such as Brexit; and
- The Government's drive to boost the housing market would have an impact on construction aggregates but the timescales and quantities were difficult to define.

5.4.4 To determine the effectiveness of the policies and whether there is a need to amend site allocations, it was concluded that the HMWP would be reviewed again in 2020, with a stakeholder event taking place in 2019.

5.4.5 A HMWP Review Workshop, attended by a wide range of Stakeholders, was undertaken in September 2019 to investigate the issues raised within the 2018 Review and how trends in minerals supply and sustainable waste management provision are developing.

5.4.6 In line with the conclusions of the 2018 Review, the HMWP was reviewed again in 2020. The 2020 Review, which has been published online<sup>32</sup>, concluded that an update to the Plan was required to ensure compliance with the NPPF and NPPW, as well as to deliver a steady and adequate supply of minerals.

5.4.7 Work began on a partial update to the currently adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) in March 2021. This included the running of a Call for Sites exercise as well as updating the Plan's evidence base. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the partial update timetable was extended with the Regulation 18 Draft Plan consultation planned for late 2022.

5.4.8 Throughout 2022, the sites submitted as part of the Call for Sites were assessed for potential allocation, and the Draft Plan was finalised. In November 2022, the Regulation 18 Draft Plan consultation on the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan – Partial Update began and will run for a total of 12 weeks.

---

<sup>30</sup> Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 051 Reference ID: 61-051-20180913) (Revision date: 13 09 2018) - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/plan-making>

<sup>31</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (2018) (Para. 33) - [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/740441/National\\_Planning\\_Policy\\_Framework\\_web\\_accessible\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/740441/National_Planning_Policy_Framework_web_accessible_version.pdf)

<sup>32</sup> Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Webpage - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan/supplementary-planning-documents>

## 6. Cooperation in plan-making

### 6.1 Duty to Cooperate

- 6.1.1 The 'duty to cooperate' was created by the Localism Act 2011<sup>33</sup>, and amends the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>34</sup>. It places a legal duty on local planning authorities, County Councils in England and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local and Marine Plan preparation relating to strategic cross boundary matters.
- 6.1.2 The Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities. This includes the provision of waste management infrastructure, minerals and energy.
- 6.1.3 Cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement and councils are encouraged to work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans.
- 6.1.4 The Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA take this duty seriously, have produced the HMWP in partnership, and continue to work together on minerals and waste issues.
- 6.1.5 To satisfy this requirement for ongoing collaboration, Hampshire County Council is actively engaged in the sub-regional working group SEWPAG (South East Waste Planning Advisory Group), on behalf of the Hampshire Authorities. SEWPAG has adopted a 'manifesto' which includes the following statement to define the purpose of the group: 'To help waste planning authorities in the area to fulfil the Duty to Co-operate on strategic issues enshrined in the Localism Bill, and specifically to give effect to the Government's stated intention to place the responsibilities of the former Regional Technical Advisory Bodies with local authority grouping'.
- 6.1.6 Hampshire County Council is also a member of SEEAWP (South East England Aggregates Working Party), a technical group with the role of advising government, Mineral Planning Authorities and industry on aggregates. Like with SEWPAG, Hampshire County Council represents the Hampshire Authorities on this working party.

### 6.2 Duty to Cooperate requests in 2022

- 6.2.1 The Hampshire Authorities and SDNPA are often contacted by other mineral / waste planning authorities in order to discuss plan-making issues. Lists of those authorities that have made formal duty to cooperate requests during 2022 are shown below. Additionally, the Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA regularly respond to

<sup>33</sup> Localism Act 2011: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents>

<sup>34</sup> Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: [www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents)

consultations on minerals and waste plan preparation for neighbouring and other authorities.

6.2.2 All requests were responded to positively by the Hampshire Authorities and the SDNPA.

6.2.3 2022 Duty to Cooperate requests and meetings:

| <b>Date</b> | <b>Planning Authority</b> | <b>Information Request</b> |
|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| 10/03/2022  | Surrey                    | Minerals & Waste           |
| 21/03/2022  | Hertfordshire             | Waste                      |
| 25/05/2022  | Somerset                  | Meeting                    |
| 01/07/2022  | Bracknell Forest          | Meeting                    |
| 01/07/2022  | Oxfordshire               | Meeting                    |
| 22/11/2022  | Cheshire East             | Waste                      |

## 7. Further Information

7.1 Additional published data and information on the Hampshire County Council website's Strategic Planning section<sup>35</sup> allows for a more dynamic approach to supplying the information on permitted minerals and waste sites and planning applications. This method allows more detailed and up-to-date reporting of what is happening throughout the Hampshire Plan Area with updates of the Hampshire County Council planning applications (those granted, refused, withdrawn etc.) throughout the year rather than at a single point in time. The following information is available online:

### 7.2 Daily updates

- Details of all planning applications made for mineral or waste activities in Hampshire<sup>36</sup>;
- List of all applications open for consultation<sup>37</sup>;
- List of all applications recently determined<sup>38</sup>; and
- Details of all appeals to planning permission refusal<sup>39</sup>.

### 7.3 Annual updates

- All permitted mineral and waste sites, including noting which sites are safeguarded and for which sites chargeable site visits are undertaken by the Monitoring and Enforcement team; and
- Further information on the work carried out by the Policy, Development Management and Monitoring and Enforcement teams within the Strategic Planning section<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>35</sup> Hampshire County Council Strategic Planning webpage: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/>

<sup>36</sup> Search and view planning applications: <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/>

<sup>37</sup> Applications open for consultation: <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/SearchResults.aspx?OpenForConsultation=True>

<sup>38</sup> Recent decisions: <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/SearchResults.aspx?RecentDecisions=True>

<sup>39</sup> Search and view planning applications: <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/>

<sup>40</sup> Hampshire County Council Strategic Planning webpage: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>

---

**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 Policy in the Strategic Planning group:**

**Email: [planning.policy@hants.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@hants.gov.uk)**

Write to:

Minerals and Waste Policy  
Hampshire 2050  
Hampshire County Council  
Floor 3, Elizabeth II Court South  
Winchester  
SO23 8UH

Website: <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning>

