

# Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan: Partial Update



Hampshire's Environment



Hampshire's Community



Hampshire's Economy

## Update Report

October 2023



## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	1
What is a Minerals & Waste Plan?	1
Who does it?	1
Why is this a partial update?	1
Where are we in the process?	1
How were my comments taken into account?	2
What happens next?	2
Have your say	2
<b>2 Introduction, Vision and Plan Objectives</b>	3
<b>3. Development Management Policies</b>	6
Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development)	6
Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation)	7
Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species)	7
Policy 4 (Protection of designated landscapes)	8
Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside)	8
Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt) & Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets)	9
Policy 8 (Water resources)	9
Policy 9 (Protection of soils)	10
Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments)	10
Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being)	11
Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention)	12
Policy 13 (Managing traffic)	13
Policy 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments)	13
<b>4. Minerals Policies</b>	15
Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources & Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure	15
Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure	15
Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source	16
Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development	17
Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots	17
Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates	18
Policy 21: Silica sand development, Policy 22: Brick-making clay & Policy 23: Chalk development	18
Policy 24: Oil and gas development	19
<b>5. Waste Policies</b>	22
Policy 25: Sustainable waste management	22

---

Policy 26: Safeguarding - waste infrastructure .....	22
Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development.....	23
Policy 28: Energy recovery development .....	24
Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management .....	25
Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development .....	25
Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste-water management .....	26
Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill.....	26
Policy 33: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste development.....	27
Policy 34 Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure .	27
<b>6. Plan Appendices .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Appendix A: Site Allocations .....	29
Appendix B: List of safeguarded minerals and waste sites .....	51
Appendix C: Implementation and Monitoring Plan .....	51
Appendix D: Supporting documents.....	52
Policies Map .....	53
<b>7. Public Engagement .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Glossary.....</b>	<b>55</b>

---

# 1. Introduction

## What is a Minerals & Waste Plan?

- 1.1 A Minerals and Waste Plan sets out how the area will provide a supply of minerals to meet local construction needs (homes, roads etc), and appropriate locations and approach to deal with waste, such as recycling sites. All Minerals and Waste Planning authorities are legally required to have a plan in place to ensure sufficient mineral supply and appropriate waste management.
- 1.2 The Plan sets out the framework, planning applications must then be submitted, these are judged against the Plan – are they in the locations that have been allocated for this purpose and do they meet all of the policy requirements. Only once planning permission is granted can any development take place.

## Who does it?

- 1.3 Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and the South Downs National Park Authority (collectively referred to as the ‘Hampshire Authorities’) are working together to prepare a partial update to the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (adopted 2013).

## Why is this a partial update?

- 1.4 The previous plan was adopted in 2013 and set out policies and identified sites to meet the Counties needs to 2030. It is now necessary to update the plan and ensure ongoing needs are met to 2040. This is called a ‘partial update’ because some of the 2013 adopted plan is still relevant and can be carried forward to the new plan.

## Where are we in the process?

- 1.5 The Hampshire Minerals Waste Plan has been through the first statutory consultation which took place from November 2022 to January 2023. The Hampshire authorities have been working on the Plan and making necessary changes taking account of the following:
  - Consultation responses
  - Environment impact
  - Community impact
  - Overall need
  - Viability
  - Sustainability

- 1.6 As a result of this the majority of Policies in the Plan have been amended since the last consultation. All 22 proposed allocation sites listed in the Draft Plan at the previous consultation have been reviewed.

### How were my comments taken into account?

- 1.7 The remainder of this Paper sets out how comments were taken into account, as follows:
- Plan Vision and Objectives (Section 2)
  - Development Management Policies (Section 3)
  - Mineral Policies (Section 4)
  - Waste Policies (Section 5)
  - Plan Appendices (Section 6)
- 1.8 A more detailed account of the comments and changes made will be made available as part of the consultation.

### What happens next?

- 1.9 The Hampshire Authorities are now preparing to launch the second statutory consultation on the plan, first all five authorities must gain formal sign off from appropriate committees. This takes time due to the meeting timetables in the different authorities. The following is the current programme of decision-making:

Date of decision	Authority (and meeting)
9 November	South Downs National Park Authority (Planning Committee)
21 November	New Forest National Park Authority (Planning Committee)
28 November	Portsmouth City Council (Cabinet)
12 December	South Downs National Park Authority (Authority Meeting)
12 December	Portsmouth City Council (Council)
12 December	Hampshire County Council (Cabinet)
19 December	New Forest National Park Authority (Authority Meeting)
19 December	Southampton City Council (Cabinet)

- 1.9 Each of the authorities must agree to undertake the consultation on the Proposed Submission Plan, in accordance with the national planning regulations. The Plan will therefore be published ready for the first of these meetings on 30 October 2023.

### Have your say....

- 1.10 It is intended that the consultation will launch in January 2024 and will run for eight weeks. Further details on how to get involved will be published in the coming weeks. This will include details about what you can comment on and how to make these comments, so they are in accordance with the planning regulations.

## 2 Introduction, Vision and Plan Objectives

### Introduction

#### What you said

- 2.1 A brief summary of the issues raised are set out below:
- Greater consideration of the climate emergency is required.
  - There should be a focus on reducing the need for minerals and waste (and the circular economy).
  - Consideration of the historic environment needs to be included and fuller identification of environment designations.
  - Minerals are important and can only be extracted where they are found.

#### What we changed

- 2.2 The portrait of Hampshire in 2011 has been updated to provide a portrait of Hampshire in 2021. Many of the maps associated with the portrait have been updated and amended from the Draft Plan following comments received, most notably regarding the need to consider designations beyond the Plan boundary. The Issues for the Plan remain largely unchanged, but the other relevant Plans and Programmes now also include other National Policy Statements.
- 2.3 Consideration of climate change has been included further throughout the Plan and policies (see '*Development Management Policies*' for more detail).
- 2.4 The Plan's purpose is to enable a steady and adequate supply of minerals and ensure that there is sufficient capacity for sustainable waste management. The Plan does seek to encourage the production of recycled aggregate and supports the circular economy but does not outline proposals for waste reduction. These are set out separately by the Hampshire Authorities.
- 2.5 A number of helpful amendments were provided by Historic England and many of these have been included in the Proposed Submission Plan.
- 2.6 Minerals can only be extracted where they are found due to the local geology. As such, it can mean that sites come forward in locations that already have operational sites. Therefore, the Plan needs to ensure the impacts of this are taken into consideration and measures are taken to ensure there is no significant impact on local communities and the environment (see *Policy 11: Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being* for more details).

### Vision, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram

#### What you said

- 2.7 A brief summary of the issues raised are set out below:
- The Vision needs to consider environmental and landscape designations outside of the Plan area.

- It is not clear how the climate emergency has been taken into account in the Vision and how net zero (carbon neutral) will be achieved.
- The Vision and Spatial Strategy fail to address the impacts of minerals and waste development.
- The Spatial Strategy should include alternatives to reduce the need for minerals and source outside of the plan area.
- The Spatial Strategy needs a strategic approach for areas which have a number of minerals and waste operations such as the New Forest and surrounding areas.
- The Spatial Strategy needs greater consideration of climate change in terms of the location of sites and transportation.
- It should be made clear that the Key Diagram does not show all constraints.
- It would be helpful if the Key Diagram showed settlements on the boundary of the Plan area as these can also be impacted.

### What we changed

- 2.8 Only minor amendments have been made to the Vision as this is intended to set out the ambition of the Plan. The Plan Objectives set out more detail on how the Vision is to be achieved and the Spatial Strategy sets out how this is to be delivered. As such, most of the updates have been applied to the Spatial Strategy rather than the Vision.
- 2.9 The Vision has been updated to outline that the Plan will be supporting the transition to carbon net zero to reflect its role rather than suggesting that it will be able to achieve this within the Plan period. References have been added including net self-sufficiency and the need for strategic delivery of protection and enhancement of the environment. Reference to “our” has been removed in this context to reflect that this needs to be considered beyond the Hampshire boundary.
- 2.10 Updates to the Spatial Strategy include a focus on increasing the recognition of potential impacts and highlighting the need for considering wider landscape-scale issues. Climate change comments were a general focus on the planning policies in general and therefore, careful consideration has been given to how this issue can be addressed in the policies but also how this translates, most notably in the Plan Objectives which set out how the Vision will be achieved.
- 2.11 The Key Diagram has also been updated to reflect current circumstances and the updated Policies. Further information was sought for representation on the Key Diagram, but this significantly impacted the clarity of diagram. Therefore, the description of the diagram was amended to clarify its use and limitations.
- 2.12 A number of the Figures were also updated to reflect comments made, most notably regarding the need to consider designations beyond the Plan boundary.

## What does this mean for Hampshire?

- 2.13 It is intended that the updated Vision and Spatial Strategy will help towards the transition to meeting the UK target of carbon neutrality by 2050 and the plan-making Authorities' own climate change targets but recognises the purpose of the Plan.
- 2.14 Greater consideration is given to the quality of life and well-being of Hampshire's residents and those living close by in neighbouring areas such as Dorset. This includes seeking to ensure that minerals and waste development does not reduce air quality and that residents are less disturbed by minerals and waste activities. This will be achieved by high-quality design and restoration schemes which improve health and well-being.
- 2.15 By implementing landscape-scale considerations, Hampshire's environment will benefit and ensure that its wider connections, including across borders, will be enhanced.



### 3. Development Management Policies

- 3.1 Comments were received on all of the Development Management Policies. The policies and supporting text have been reviewed and updated, where appropriate.
- 3.2 The Plan has been updated to reflect the recently published update to the National Planning Policy Framework<sup>1</sup>.

#### Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development)

##### What you said

- 3.3 The key issues raised are set out below:
- The policy is a weakening of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and should be revised.
  - Concern that the ‘Community benefits’ policy is no longer in place and that compensation for communities is needed.
  - Consideration of operator performance is welcomed but more clarity is needed.
  - There needs to be greater emphasis on engaging with local communities.
  - Concern that there are sufficient resources to adequately monitor and enforce sites.
  - Planning obligations for transport should have regard to Local Transport Plan (LTP) 4.

##### What we changed

- 3.4 Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) has been updated to ensure that it aligns with the NPPF but also emphasises that the Plan should be considered as a whole with policies not viewed in isolation.
- 3.5 Community benefits are not something that the Hampshire Authorities can implement and therefore, the Policy remains unchanged. However, the supporting text continues to encourage engagement between developers and communities to facilitate discussion on this matter.
- 3.6 Further detail has been provided on how operator performance will be taken into account including the factors that need to be considered.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (2023):  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1182995/NPPF\\_Sept\\_23.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1182995/NPPF_Sept_23.pdf)

- 3.7 The supporting text has also been updated to provide additional information on how decision-making is undertaken including taking the views of local communities into account. Reference to the Local Transport Plan has also been included in the text regarding legal obligations for transport improvements to the highway network.
- 3.8 The concerns regarding resources are noted but this is outside the remit of the Plan, so no changes were made regarding this matter.

## **Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation)**

### **What you said**

- 3.9 The key issues raised are set out below:
- The Policy needs to be stronger to reflect the climate change emergencies and targets set by the Councils.
  - The 2050 target should be reduced to 2030 to better reflect the climate emergency.
  - Consideration should be given to habitat resilience and nature-based solutions.
  - Reference should be made to the need for a circular economy, cutting all emissions from waste and transport and carbon capture.

### **What we changed**

- 3.10 Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation) has been updated to require developments to prepare Climate Change Assessments giving consideration to measures that can be applied to mitigate and adapt but also for development to demonstrate how they will support the transition to carbon neutrality in 2050.
- 3.11 The 2050 target has been retained as this aligns with the Government’s target and the Vision.
- 3.12 References to nature-based solutions and carbon capture have been included in the supporting text. The circular economy is already referenced and the need for considering emission reduction has been incorporated into the requirement for a Climate Change Assessment (specific reference has been made to energy developments such as oil and gas and energy from waste due to the level of interest in these areas in response to the Draft Plan).

## **Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species)**

### **What you said**

- 3.13 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Habitats should be assessed on a range of features in considering how replaceable the habitat is.
  - The policy should include nutrient neutrality.

- The wording used in the policy should be strengthened.
- Welcome the recognition of neighbouring authority designations.
- Further consideration of Biodiversity Net Gain is required.

### What we changed

- 3.14 Policy 3 (Protecting habitats and species) has been updated to reflect the requirements for biodiversity net gain and the need for wider strategic-scale consideration for ecological protection and enhancement highlights the important relationship between the Plan and the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
- 3.15 Reference to nutrient pollution has been added to the supporting text. However, this matter is also covered in *Policy 8: Water Management* and *Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste-water management*.
- 3.16 The terminology used within the Policy is compliant with national policy, but some additional references have been added regarding Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, river basins and a wider consideration of ecology beyond Hampshire's borders.
- 3.17 Further detail has been included on Biodiversity Net Gain although further guidance is expected from Government in due course which will also need to be taken into account.

## Policy 4 (Protection of designated landscapes)

### What you said

- 3.18 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Local landscape designations should be referenced.
  - Views from outside and within designated landscapes should be considered.
  - Elements of this section should be moved to the section which addresses countryside.

### What we changed

- 3.19 The title of Policy 4 has been amended to Policy 4 (Nationally Protected Landscapes) to differentiate the policy from the updated Policy 5 which now considers locally designated landscapes and other landscapes of value.
- 3.20 The supporting text for Policy 4 and Policy 5 has been restructured so they reflect the relevant policy. Reference has also been added to consider views from outside and within designated landscapes.

## Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside)

### What you said

3.21 The key issues raised are set out below:

- The definition of countryside needs further reconsideration.
- The policy should also apply to countryside within National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Further consideration of public rights of way and viewpoints is required.
- Reference should be made to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

### **What we changed**

3.22 The title of Policy 5 has been updated to Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes) as it now considers locally designated landscapes and those landscapes of value. The relationship with Policy 4 (Nationally Protected Landscapes) has been made clearer.

3.23 The definition of countryside has been updated and further consideration of rights of way has been added to the supporting text. The supporting text also provides guidance on the application of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

## **Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt) & Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets)**

### **What you said**

3.24 The key issues raised are set out below:

- The changes to the Policy 6 are supported.
- The policy structure and wording need to be revised to ensure compliance with the NPPF and improve reading of policy 7.

### **What we changed**

3.25 Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt) and Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) have not required further change to their content but the structure of Policy 7 has been improved.

## **Policy 8 (Water resources)**

### **What you said**

3.26 The key issues raised are set out below:

- Greater consideration of nutrients is needed.
- The policy title should also refer to water quality.
- Some clarification is needed between the policy and supporting text.
- Chalk streams should have a specific reference.

## What we changed

- 3.27 Policy 8 has been renamed Policy 8 (Water management) to clarify that the policy addresses both water quality and water supply.
- 3.28 The supporting text now refers to nationally important chalk streams and clarifications have been included, where relevant, particularly in relation to local karst features.
- 3.29 The Policy wording has been updated to include reference to nutrient neutrality requirements and the need for a Water Framework Directive screening assessment.

## Policy 9 (Protection of soils)

### What you said

- 3.30 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Reference should be made in the policy to the Defra guidance on soil handling.
  - Mitigation should include minimising soil disturbance.
  - Further consideration needs to be given to best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land, and soils in construction, operation, and restoration.

### What has changed?

- 3.31 Policy 9 (Protection of soils) has been updated to recognise the important role soils have in carbon management (release and absorption). The Policy wording also sets out clearer requirements on the need to protect soils.
- 3.32 The supporting text makes reference to relevant guidance and the need to submit Agricultural Land Classification Assessments, where applicable.

## Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments)

### What you said

- 3.33 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Further consideration needs to be given to heathland restoration schemes.
  - References should be made to the historic environment and landscape.
  - The policy should have greater links to Policy 3 and biodiversity net gain.
  - Restoration to best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land needs further consideration.
  - Post restoration monitoring would be beneficial.

## What we changed

- 3.34 Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) has been updated to strengthen the requirement for climate change mitigation and adaptation to be taken into account as well as landscape and the historic environment.
- 3.35 Specific reference to heathland restoration schemes has not been included but the supporting text has been updated to improve the linkages with the other policies in the Plan including both Policy 3 (Protecting habitats and species) and Policy 9 (Protecting soils). Both of these policies have amendments to their supporting text to better enable heathland restoration. Policy 9 also addresses BMV land.
- 3.36 Reference to monitoring of restoration schemes has been included in the supporting text.

## Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being)

### What you said

- 3.37 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Clarification on what is considered “acceptable” is required.
  - The reference to 100m minimum buffers should be included but, on a case-by-case basis.
  - Greater emphasis and consideration of cumulative impacts is required.
  - Further consideration of health impacts is needed including silicosis.

### What we changed

- 3.38 Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being) has been amended to strengthen protection and how this is considered. The supporting text has been updated regarding the reference to the application of buffers between development and sensitive receptors. The Policy also makes reference to supporting opportunities for improvements and also requires a Health Impact Assessment to be carried out in support of certain types of development.
- 3.39 The term “acceptable” has been rephrased throughout the Plan to “significant adverse” as this can be more clearly determined through environmental assessment.
- 3.40 Cumulative impacts are considered to be suitably addressed by Policy 11 and also in Policy 13 (Managing traffic) and therefore, no further amendments are proposed.

- 3.41 Concerns regarding silicosis were raised in relation to a number of the proposed mineral extraction allocations and in response to this policy. As noted, a Health Impact Assessment is now required for certain developments including mineral extraction. However, the risk of silicosis has been explored by the Hampshire Authorities in relation to mineral extraction.
- 3.42 In brief, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) guidance states that *“one of the health risks from working in the quarry industry is that of exposure to fine dust containing crystalline silica (otherwise known as quartz). Quartz is found in almost all kinds of rock, sands, clays, shale and gravel. Workers exposed to fine dust containing quartz are at risk of developing a chronic and possibly severely disabling lung disease known as “silicosis”. It usually takes a number of years of regular daily exposure before there is a risk of developing silicosis. Silicosis is a disease that has only been seen in workers from industries where there is a significant exposure to silica dust, such as in quarries, foundries, the potteries etc.*
- 3.43 There is no UK established or recommended ambient air quality standard for respirable crystalline silica (RCS) nor is there any recommended methodology for the assessment for potential RCS emissions to ambient air or potential off-site impacts. The Health and Safety Executive advice (Appendix KEH10 PoE Katrina Hawkins) is that *‘No cases of silicosis have been documented among members of the general public in Great Britain, indicating that environmental exposures to silica dust are not sufficiently high to cause this occupational disease’.*

## **Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention)**

### **What you said**

- 3.44 The key issues raised are set out below:
- More up-to-date references are required.
  - 1:50 year events should be considered rather than 1:100-year events.
  - Natural flood management should be prioritised.

### **What we changed**

- 3.45 Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention) now references the County Council’s recently prepared Catchment Management Plans. The supporting text also refers to the South Marine Plan.
- 3.46 Natural flood management has been included into the supporting text with a link to Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments).
- 3.47 The suggestion of applying 1:50 year events was noted and reviewed. However, this suggestion was not taken forward as consistent mapping or modelling is not readily available for this return period.

## **Policy 13 (Managing traffic)**

### **What you said**

- 3.48 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Greater consideration of public rights of way and other highway users.
  - Concern that the policy is now weaker on mitigation.
  - Further strengthening of the policy to regulate the types of roads and routes used by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) to and from the major road network.

### **What has changed?**

- 3.49 Policy 13 (Managing traffic) has been updated to provide greater clarity on the detail of what is expected as part of a Transport Assessment and Statement. Other road users are given greater consideration as well as the mitigation that would need to be required and suitability of the routes to be used.

## **Policy 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments)**

### **What you said**

- 3.50 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Further consideration of impact on utilities is required.
  - Clarification on what is considered “acceptable” is required.
  - Consideration of impact on public rights of way is needed.

### **What we changed**

- 3.51 The supporting text to Policy 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) has been updated to provide improved signposting to other relevant policies. The supporting text makes references to consideration of utilities and users of public rights of way.
- 3.52 The term “acceptable” has been replaced with “significant adverse” in line with Policy 11.

### **What does this mean for Hampshire?**

- 3.53 The changes to the Policies help to strengthen and provide more detail on their implementation.
- 3.54 The Plan now ensures climate change is considered throughout the policies and encourages the transition of the minerals and waste industry towards net zero carbon emissions.



3.55 It is intended that the revised and updated Development Management Policies will enhance implementation and decision-making through the removal of any ambiguity and strengthen the protection of Hampshire's environment and communities, including a better management of Hampshire's important water resources.

## 4. Minerals Policies

### Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources & Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure

#### What you said

- 4.1 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Concerns regarding the application of Policy 15 in conjunction with Local Plan allocations.

#### What we changed

- 4.2 Policy 15 regarding safeguarding mineral resources remains unchanged as no major issues were raised in relation to the Policy. The concern regarding application of the Policy in relation to Local Plans is noted but the Hampshire Authorities work collectively on the preparation of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan, and Hampshire County Council works closely with districts and boroughs within Hampshire to ensure mineral safeguarding is carefully considered.

### Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure

#### What you said

- 4.3 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Wording proposed to improve clarity and refer to unnecessary sterilisation or jeopardising its current or future use, throughput and/or capacity.
  - Recognition of regeneration opportunities welcomed.
  - Consideration of whether infrastructure serves a wider sub-region, such as relationship with the Isle of Wight.
  - Consideration of the need to safeguard facilities for future use, including potential expansion.
  - Need to strengthen the test in policy 16 when assessing the need for development.
  - Importance of safeguarding rail depots, given reliance on importation of mineral.

#### What we changed

- 4.4 Policy 16 which relates to safeguarding minerals infrastructure has been updated to strengthen its implementation including specific reference to current or future use and a sites throughput and/or capacity. Reference to 'Hampshire' has also been removed in relation to supply in the Policy wording to demonstrate that the supply may be critical to other areas.

- 4.5 Rail depots are safeguarded and sites which are not actively contributing to aggregate supply but may in the future have been specifically identified in Policy 34 (Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure).

## **Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source**

### **What you said**

- 4.6 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Aggregate requirement figure questioned.
  - Economic forecasts should be updated.
  - Support for reverting to Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) rate if sales change +/- 10%
  - Lowering of plan rate results in fewer sites and may restrict sales, resulting in increased importation which is unsustainable.
  - Need for landbanks to be maintained to 2040.

### **What we changed**

- 4.7 Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) has been updated to reflect current data and forecasts for demand in Hampshire. The policy now states that an adequate and steady supply of aggregates will be provided until 2040 at rates of 0.9 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) of which 0.16mtpa will be soft sand (meaning a total of 0.74mtpa of sharp sand and gravel). This is a reduction from a total of 1.56mtpa in the 2013 adopted Plan and a total of 1.15mtpa in the Draft Plan. These revised figures take into account past sales but also forecasted demand.
- 4.8 Due to current high levels of demand and long-term uncertainties, a clause has been added into the Policy which states that should sales exceed the stated provision rate by more than 10% for a period of three years, the Local Aggregate Assessment rate which is produced annually will be considered the provision rate until such time that the Plan is updated. This will ensure that there is no under provision and an over reliance on imports.
- 4.9 The capacities of alternative sources of aggregate remain unchanged from the Draft Plan.
- 4.10 Reference has also been included to the requirement for a 7-year landbank of permitted reserves as set out in National Policy<sup>2</sup>. Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) part 3 allows other developments to be supported to enable the maintenance of the landbank, if required, subject to the development not posing unacceptable harm to the environment and local communities. As this is something that is commercially driven, the Hampshire Authorities are unable to enforce this requirement.

---

<sup>2</sup> NPPF (Para. 213 (f))

## **Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development**

### **What you said**

- 4.11 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Strong support for this policy, over the need for land-won sites and marine.
  - Need more commitment to how production will be encouraged.

### **What we changed**

- 4.12 Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregate development) remains largely unchanged. The Hampshire Authorities are supportive of recycled and secondary aggregate development through the enabling policies including Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregate development), Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) and Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) which specifically supports ancillary development.

## **Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots**

### **What you said**

- 4.13 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Impact on neighbouring residents and amenity.
  - Concerns that development opportunities would be restricted.
  - Need for consistency with Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) capacity estimates.
  - Confirmation on operational status of wharves.

### **What we changed**

- 4.14 Policy 19 (Aggregate wharves and rail depots) has been updated to remove those aggregate wharves that are inactive as they are not currently providing capacity but are safeguarded under Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure) and/or Policy 34 (Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure).
- 4.15 Following further discussions with Network Rail, the proposals allocations for rail depots have been revised (see Section 6 ‘Plan Appendices’). Further future opportunities are also now listed under Policy 34.
- 4.16 The Policy now provides a more accurate picture of those wharves that are contributing to wharf capacity, and this aligns with the Local Aggregate Assessment.
- 4.17 The wording of the Policy remains mainly unchanged as it seeks to enable provision to address any shortfalls if suitable sites are identified. Potential amenity impacts associated with development would be addressed under Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being) and part 3(c) of Policy 19.

## **Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates**

### **What you said**

- 4.18 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Objections received to proposals and site-specific comments are set out under the relevant site.
  - Operator to be able to demonstrate need rather than reliant on monitoring data.
  - Concerns over cumulative impacts.
  - Plan figure questioned, however some recognition that at this stage of the plan process there is a contingency element in the figure.

### **What we changed**

- 4.19 Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) has been updated to reflect the current status of permissions. Furthermore, the sites listed in Policy 20 has been amended based on the information obtained through the Draft Plan consultation and to address the revised land-won aggregate requirement in Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregate).
- 4.20 Following the Draft Plan consultation, information gathered suggested that some proposed allocations cannot be progressed, and these have been excluded from the Proposed Submission Plan. The Development Considerations of the remaining proposals have also been updated and would need to be addressed as part of any planning application (see Section 6 'Plan Appendices').
- 4.21 Monitoring data is collated annually for the whole Plan area and is reported in the Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA). The information in the LAA is important for decision-making, particularly in circumstances where the 7-year landbank is not being met.
- 4.22 It is recognised that cumulative impact is an issue, particularly in areas where minerals are found. As such, cumulative impact is addressed under Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being) and Policy 13 (Managing traffic).

## **Policy 21: Silica sand development, Policy 22: Brick-making clay & Policy 23: Chalk development**

### **What you said**

- 4.23 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Support for policy 21 but minor wording changes proposed to improve clarity and compliance with NPPF.
  - Reference should be made in Policy 22 to avoid giving the impression there are minimal constraints to development in other locations outside of the areas identified.
  - No key issues were raised for Policy 23.

## What we changed

- 4.24 Silica sand development (Policy 21) and Chalk development (Policy 23) remain largely unchanged.
- 4.25 Policy 22 (Brick-making clay) has been amended to include reference to other relevant policies within the Plan ensuring that development does not pose significant adverse impact to the environment and local communities. In addition, the supporting text has been updated to reflect the situation with regard to future brick-making clay supply.

## Policy 24: Oil and gas development

### What you said

- 4.26 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Downstream combustion of oil and gas is not considered in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
  - Given the policy changes in relation to emissions and climate change, the use for these resources is likely to change.
  - Renewable sources of energy should be discussed alongside.
  - Calls to discourage the renewal of old licenses and not support new licence applications.
  - Opposition to oil and gas extraction or transportation of oil, with calls to shift focus onto future energy development.
  - Concern about carbon net zero target.
  - Oil and gas exploration developments should not be located in sensitive groundwater locations.

### What we changed

- 4.27 Policy 24 (Oil and gas) has had the emphasis amended to reflect that criteria that will need to be met for development to be permitted. The supporting text has been amended to reflect the need for proposals to comply with Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation) and demonstrate how they support the transition to carbon neutrality by 2050.
- 4.28 The Policy has been updated to reflect the current circumstances regarding oil and gas development. Consideration will be given to the status of the SPD once the Plan is updated and the format of any update, taking into account current Government proposals to discontinue SPDs.
- 4.29 The Plan should be considered as a whole, and energy generation is also considered under Policy 28 (Energy recovery development). Other forms of renewable energy are outside the remit of the Plan.

- 4.30 The Hampshire Authorities do not issue licences. These are issued by the North Sea Transition Authority. The Hampshire Authorities are the relevant planning authority and licensees have to apply for planning permission for onshore oil and gas activities.
- 4.31 Criteria for determining carbon storage facilities has been included in the Policy. This was previously outlined as a position in the supporting text, but it was considered that this did not give a suitable framework for decisions.
- 4.32 Current national planning policy requires minerals and waste planning authorities to plan positively for oil and gas development. Therefore, it is necessary to retain policies relating to these activities otherwise, the plan will not comply with the requirements of national policy. However, the policies in the Plan have been made more rigorous in respect of the climate impact of such development in light of the transition to net zero.
- 4.33 Proposals for oil and gas would be considered against Policy 24 but also all relevant policies in the Plan. Therefore, the Policy refers to ensuring no significant adverse environmental impact, but the detail of impacts such as in relation to groundwater, would be addressed by other policies (e.g. Policy 8 (Water management)).

#### **What does this mean for Hampshire?**

- 4.34 Policy 15 and 16 continue to support appropriate safeguarding of minerals resources and infrastructure to provide for Hampshire's needs.
- 4.35 Policy 17 provides a steady and adequate supply of aggregates to enable the infrastructure and buildings that Hampshire needs. The Policy is also flexible to respond to changes in demand to ensure there is no barrier to growth from mineral supply.
- 4.36 The provision of recycled and secondary aggregates as an alternative to land-won aggregates continues to be supported and enabled in Hampshire through Policy 18.
- 4.37 Policy 19 sets out an accurate provision of current and potential wharves and rail depots in the Plan area. Use of this infrastructure has the benefits of reducing the number of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on the road reducing impacts on local communities and climate change through a reduction in vehicle emissions.
- 4.38 Policy 20 outlines how a steady and adequate supply of aggregates will be achieved which will enable the provision of infrastructure and buildings that Hampshire needs.
- 4.39 The allocation of sites gives an element of certainty to industry and local communities regarding what development will take place and where. However, all allocations will still require planning permission.
- 4.40 Policy 21, Policy 22, and Policy 23 continue to support appropriate development for silica sand, brickmaking clay and chalk to provide for Hampshire's needs.
- 4.41 Policy 24 specifies that oil and gas development will only be permitted in appropriate locations and where the impacts of the development on climate change have been fully

considered. It also now provides for decision-making on carbon storage which may be required to support the transition to Net Zero.



## 5. Waste Policies

### Policy 25: Sustainable waste management

#### What you said

- 5.1 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Following the waste hierarchy needs to be strengthened.
  - Recycling facilities should be prioritised over recovery ones.
  - Whether the 65% target is insufficient.
  - Whether the 65% recycling target is excessive.
  - Unrealistic recycling targets may discourage recovery and push waste towards landfill.
  - Need to consider the particular situation of replacing aging waste infrastructure.

#### What we changed

- 5.2 Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management) remains largely unchanged except the provision of non-hazardous waste arisings has been updated to reflect current target of 65% for recycling. As this is set nationally, the Hampshire Authorities are required to achieve the target. However, 95% diversion from landfill remains the same.
- 5.3 In addition, applicants are now asked to demonstrate how their proposal is being managed at the highest level of the waste hierarchy which places re-use and recycling above recovery and disposal (landfill) as a least favoured option. This will take the form of a Waste Hierarchy Assessment which is required to accompany any waste development planning application. The co-location of facilities also requires consideration of regeneration plans within the area.
- 5.4 The supporting text also makes reference to the circular economy which will help reduce reliance on landfill.
- 5.5 The need to replace aging waste infrastructure has been taken into account by tying the capacity requirements to regular updates through the Annual Monitoring Report. This includes consideration that efficiency may reduce over time but also that replacement technologies could increase also increase efficiency in the future, which will be reflected in the current capacity of sites.

### Policy 26: Safeguarding - waste infrastructure

#### What you said

- 5.6 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Is there a need to safeguard sewage treatment works?
  - Need to more explicitly prevent “downgrading” of facilities in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy.
  - Should sites that are no longer suitable continue to be safeguarded?

- Difficulties in finding alternative provision.

### What we changed

- 5.7 Policy 26 has been updated to reflect the mineral infrastructure safeguarding policy, clarifying how alternative capacity can be sought and how the agent of change principle should be applied.
- 5.8 Safeguarding helps to prevent the encroachment of other forms of development which could impact on the operation of existing waste infrastructure. As waste-water treatment works are considered critical infrastructure, their safeguarding is considered necessary.
- 5.9 As noted under Policy 25, all proposals for waste management development will need to be accompanied by a Waste Hierarchy Assessment which will address the risk of “down-grading”.
- 5.10 Policy 26 provides protection for existing infrastructure but also a framework for decision-making on safeguarding should it be considered that the protection afforded by the safeguarding is no longer required/needed.
- 5.11 Provision for site locations for waste management is set out under Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management).

### Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development

#### What you said

- 5.12 The key issues raised are set out below:
- There is considerable variability in waste prediction and a range of outcomes should be considered.
  - Recycling facilities should be prioritised over recovery ones.
  - Questions over the growth figures chose for Commercial & Industrial (C&I) waste in particular.
  - The potential impacts of government targets to reduce residual waste by 50% on the need for recovery facilities.
  - Overprovision of recovery facilities could affect recycling for the lifetime of these facilities.

#### What we changed

- 5.13 Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) has been updated to address the current level of arisings and capacity required to management the waste forecasted up to 2040, based on the latest full year data available (2021). Waste arisings have been amended to include: 3.0 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) of non-hazardous waste (increase from 2.62mtpa in the adopted Plan, decrease from 5.5mtpa in the Draft Plan); 2.6mtpa of inert waste (decrease from 2.49mtpa in the adopted Plan, increase from

1.8mtpa in the Draft Plan) and 0.28mtpa of hazardous waste (increase from 0.16mtpa in the adopted Plan, increase from 0.18mtpa in the Draft Plan).

- 5.14 The Policy includes a capacity requirement of at least 0.11mtpa of non-hazardous recycling capacity (a reduction from 0.29mtpa in the current Plan, reduction from 1.99 in the published Plan), up to 0.37mtpa of non-hazardous recovery capacity (a reduction from 0.39mtpa in the current Plan, reduction from 0.95mtpa in the published Plan)) and up to 2.3 million tonnes (mt) of non-hazardous landfill void (an increase from 1.4mt in the current Plan, reduction from 3.9mt in the published Plan).
- 5.15 As these changes demonstrate, there can be considerable variability from year to year in the predictions of future waste arisings. This was reflected in the comments received in relation to this Policy. To address this issue, we are now proposing that the Policy is more closely tied to the Monitoring Report, so that it is more responsive to fluctuations in data and circumstances and any future changes proposed by Government.
- 5.16 Issues concerning the type of facilities would be addressed by the Waste Hierarchy Assessment outline as a requirement under Policy 25.

## **Policy 28: Energy recovery development**

### **What you said**

- 5.17 The key issues raised are set out below:
- No recyclable materials should be sent to recovery and the Plan should be stronger on this.
  - Requiring heat use from recovery plants is positive.
  - Requiring heat use from recovery plants is unnecessarily limiting and might be counterproductive.
  - Need to consider the best use and appropriate locating of Anaerobic Digestion (AD) plants.

### **What we changed**

- 5.18 Policy 28 (Energy recovery development) has been amended to require that proposals only deal with residual waste and to ensure combined heat and power is provided as a minimum. The Policy also seeks the best possible use of waste treatment residues rather than accepting any sustainable management arrangements.
- 5.19 It is recognised that there are competing priorities in the ambition to drive waste up the hierarchy by avoiding energy recovery and thereby promoting recycling, but also by avoiding landfill. The balance of these factors is addressed by the updated Policy. However, additional supporting text has been included outlining the need for energy recovery facilities to address their role in transitioning to net zero by 2050. This aims to address the issues with the declining carbon efficiency of waste from energy recovery compared to other waste management methods.

5.20 The potential importance of AD plants has been stressed due to their different characteristics to other energy recovery facilities and the role they may be required to play as part of government proposals for separate food waste collections.

## **Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management**

### **What you said**

- 5.21 The key issues raised are set out below:
- The key urban areas should be specified, particularly the south with the two major cities.
  - The Primary Road Network (PRN) may be less suitable for transport of waste than the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Communities along unsuitable narrow roads should be protected from HGV traffic.
  - Road requirements should be specified.
  - Rail and water freight routes should be prioritised.
  - The sites allocated are insufficient for net self-sufficiency.
  - The Call for Sites should be repeated to find more waste sites.

### **What we changed**

- 5.22 Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) has been amended to encourage accessibility to movements by rail or sea, as well as the importance of safe and suitable access to appropriate roads.
- 5.23 Following a 'call for sites' from operators, proposed strategic waste management allocations had been initially identified and included in Policy 29 (4). After further review, the only remaining options were considered to be extensions and, as existing sites already have their operations safeguarded, they were not allocated. Existing sites will also be already known to communities and developers, so allocating them does not add certainty, particularly when there is limited information on the specific proposals for those extensions.
- 5.24 Monitoring of the adopted Plan has also demonstrated that the existing criteria-based approach has been successful at enabling capacity to meet requirements. It is intended that the further updates to the Plan will encourage waste facilities that align with the hierarchy to support the need to meet national recycling targets.

## **Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development**

### **What you said**

- 5.25 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Issue of satisfactory restoration of priority habitat over landfill.
  - Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CDE) waste management is rarely appropriate in rural and tranquil settings.

### **What we changed**

- 5.26 Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) has an updated level of arisings that are expected during the plan period (1.1mtpa, compared to the previously estimated 1.77mtpa). The need to consider potential impacts fully has been outlined.
- 5.27 Restoration and protection or enhancement of priority habitats is addressed under Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) and Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species). As the Plan is considered as a whole, these issues do not need to be addressed under Policy 30.
- 5.28 Furthermore, Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes) addresses the issues of proposals in rural areas and Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being) addresses impacts on amenity such as noise and lighting.

### **Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste-water management**

#### **What you said**

- 5.29 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Issue of plans to use recycled effluents.
  - The Plan should ensure that enough potable water is delivered.

#### **What we changed**

- 5.30 Policy 31 has not been significantly amended, as the issues raised are not generally ones within the remit of the Plan.
- 5.31 Furthermore, Policy 8 (Water management) addresses the need to protect water quality and supply.

### **Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill**

#### **What you said**

- 5.32 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Issues of smells from landfill.
  - There should be no more landfill by 2030.

#### **What we changed**

- 5.33 Policy 32 (Non-hazardous waste landfill) has been updated to reflect the latest waste growth predictions, estimating a need for 2.33mt of additional void space. Currently, not all waste materials can be recycled or recovered and therefore, there is still a need for an element of landfill.

- 5.34 Policy 32 makes provision for the protection of environmental or amenity impacts. However, proposals would also need to be considered under Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).

### **Policy 33: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste development**

#### **What you said**

- 5.35 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Need to address the release of Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) from waste products due to their global warming potential.
  - Insufficient protection of residents from hazardous waste leaks.

#### **What we changed**

- 5.36 Policy 33 (Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste development) has been updated to reflect the latest waste growth predictions, estimating a need for an additional capacity of 0.16mtpa.
- 5.37 The policy doesn't address specific technologies or waste streams (generated by waste products), as there are a wide variety of different materials that might need to be treated through specialist waste management facilities. However, it is noted that new technologies, particularly renewable and low-carbon ones, may require new types of waste management facilities. Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation) requires all proposals to include a Climate Change Assessment. Issues relating to emissions from specific products is outside the remit of the Plan.
- 5.38 Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being) addresses impacts on communities from emissions.

### **Policy 34 Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure**

#### **What you said**

- 5.39 The key issues raised are set out below:
- General support was provided for Policy 34.

#### **What we changed**

- 5.40 Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure (Policy 34) includes a more comprehensive list of railways sidings and wharves, including those that have historically contributed to minerals and waste supply, or which have previously been considered suitable for such uses. Following further discussion with Network Rail, additional rail depots have been included in Policy 34 as these have the potential to contribute to the movement of minerals or waste within the Plan area but there is no certainty that development will take place within the Plan period.

## What does this mean for Hampshire?

- 5.41 The updated Policy 25 will encourage more sustainable waste management in Hampshire and actively support an increase in recycling capacity. It also seeks to support the Government's drive for a circular economy reducing waste production overall.
- 5.42 Policy 26 continues to support appropriate safeguarding for waste management infrastructure in order to provide for Hampshire's needs.
- 5.43 The updated Policy 27 will encourage more sustainable waste management in Hampshire and actively support an increase in recycling capacity, by being able to respond quickly to changes without the need to wait for Plan updates.
- 5.44 Policy 28 will contribute to the Government's drive for cutting carbon emissions from energy from waste facilities as well as producing better heat networks and improving air quality, while ensuring that ambitions of zero-landfill are supported as much as possible. These measures should have direct benefits to Hampshire and the addressing of climate change.
- 5.45 The changes to Policy 29 will enable appropriate waste management development to be delivered in suitable locations.
- 5.46 The assessments that were completed on the proposed allocations should give further information to both communities and developers as to which sites are potentially suitable for development in the future and what potential issues will need to be resolved should they come forward for planning permission.
- 5.47 Policy 30 continues to support the use of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste in developments but now specifies the context in terms of how much material this involves and how this can be achieved.
- 5.48 Policy 31 continues to support appropriate development for liquid waste and wastewater management to provide for Hampshire's needs whilst minimising environmental impacts.
- 5.49 Policy 32 sets out how new landfill can come forward, in order for Hampshire to provide for its own waste.
- 5.50 Policy 33 continues to support appropriate development hazardous and low level radioactive waste development.
- 5.51 Policy 34 continues to support safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure to provide for Hampshire's needs whilst specifying clearly where the future potential could be located. This will enable the Hampshire Authorities to be part of the discussion on the future use of these sites should they become available.

## 6. Plan Appendices

### Appendix A: Site Allocations

- 6.1 A significant number of responses were received to the Draft Plan regarding the proposed allocations. Several of the sites are not allocated in the Proposed Submission Plan. The sites and their reasons for not being allocated are set out in the table below:

Site	Reason for exclusion
A303 (east and west extensions)	These sites have been removed as proposed allocations as they are extensions to existing operations/permissions which benefit from safeguarding. Existing sites will already be known to communities and developers, so allocating them does not add certainty, particularly when there is limited information on the specific proposals for those extensions. Any future proposal would need to address issues regarding (but not limited to) landscape, ecology (including ecohydrology), archaeology, flooding and amenity impacts.
Basingstoke Sidings	There is insufficient evidence that this site will be delivered during the Plan period. Therefore, the site is now listed under Policy 34 as a potential site for the future should circumstances change. However, any future proposal would need to address issues regarding (but not limited to) amenity of neighbouring properties.
Bramshill Quarry Extension	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation due to the objection from Natural England and the potential for significant ecological impacts which cannot be suitably mitigated.
Cobley Wood	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation as the need for sand and gravel can be met from alternatives sites and could not be worked in addition to adjacent sites due to cumulative impacts. The site is small with a number of issues in relation to (but not limited to) ecology, landscape and heritage which would require mitigation such as buffers which impacts on the viability of the site to be deliverable.
Cutty Brow	This site was withdrawn from allocation in the Plan by the landowner.
Dunwood Fruit Farm	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation as the need for soft sand can be met from alternatives sites. The site is small with a number of issues in relation to (but not limited to) ecology, public access, heritage and amenity which would require mitigation such as buffers. There is also uncertainty over the



	viability of the site due to the need to include exclusions required and the presence of suitable material for extraction.
Hamer Warren	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation due to the objection from the Environment Agency and the potential for significant groundwater impacts which cannot be suitably mitigated.
Holybourne Rail Depot	This site has been granted planning permission (subject to legal agreements) and is now listed in Policy 19 part 1 as an existing site.
Land off Boarhunt Road	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation due to the potential for significant impact on landscape (impact on the Area of Special Landscape Value) and heritage (impact on the setting of a Scheduled Monument) which cannot be suitably mitigated.
Lee Lane, Nursling	This site has been granted planning permission (subject to legal agreements) and will be considered as additional capacity to help address the capacity gap.
Micheldever Sidings	There is insufficient evidence that this site will be delivered during the Plan period. Therefore, the site is now listed under Policy 34 as a potential site for the future should circumstances change. However, any future proposal would need to address issues regarding (but not limited to) access to the site, ecology (including Schedule 8 plants), heritage and amenity.
Roke Manor Quarry Extension (Stanbridge Ranvilles)	This site has been granted planning permission (subject to legal agreements) and will be considered part of the permitted reserves (the amount available for extraction) of sand and gravel.
Rookery Farm	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation as it is an extension to or remodelling of existing operations/permissions which benefit from safeguarding. Existing sites will already be known to communities and developers, so allocating them does not add certainty, particularly when there is limited information on the specific proposals for those extensions. Any future proposal would need to address issues regarding (but not limited to) ecology, hydrology, heritage and amenity.
The Triangle	This site has been removed as a proposed allocation as the need for sand and gravel can be met from alternative sites. The site has a number of issues regarding (but not limited to) ecology, hydrology, heritage and amenity. Provision of suitable and safe

	site access is likely to result in significant adverse ecological and landscape impacts.
Totton Sidings	There is insufficient evidence that this site will be delivered during the Plan period. Therefore, the site is now listed under Policy 34 as a potential site for the future should circumstances change. However, any future proposal would need to address issues regarding access to the site, impact on ecology, amenity and regeneration ambitions for the area.
Yeaton Farm	This site was withdrawn from allocation in the Plan by the landowner.

6.2 Appendix A: Site Allocations has been updated with the allocations set out in the Proposed Submission Plan. This includes some but not all of the original allocations. The allocations include the following:

- Andover Sidings, Andover (Rail depot - Policy 19);
- Ashley Manor Farm (Sand and gravel extraction – Policy 20);
- Hamble Airfield (Sand & gravel extraction- Policy 20);
- Midgham Farm (Sand & gravel extraction - Policy 20); and
- Purple Haze (Sand & gravel extraction - Policy 20).

6.3 The Development Considerations for each proposed allocation have been updated. These are specific to the allocation but would need to be addressed alongside all the other relevant policies in the Plan.

6.4 Whilst the sites are allocations in the Plan, they would still require planning permission.

6.5 The Mineral Safeguarding Area – Whitehill & Bordon which is specifically referenced under Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources) has been retained in the Plan.

6.6 As noted in relation to Policy 17, the level of sand and gravel provision within the Plan has been reduced and the remaining sites will ensure that the annual provision rate can be met throughout the Plan period.

6.7 Andover Sidings is being actively promoted for rail aggregate use by Network Rail and therefore, has greater certainty that the development will come forward in the Plan period.

6.8 Issues raised in relation to the remaining allocations are set out below and how these have been addressed. The development requirements for maintaining the integrity of European protected sites are identified with an asterisk (\*).

## Andover Sidings

What you said	What we changed
Concerns regarding impact on neighbouring properties (noise, dust and light pollution).	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on local business and amenity and well-being of residential properties.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being).</li> </ul>
The site is in a prominent location.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site design should take into account the prominence of the location to the town and regeneration ambitions.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development).</li> </ul>
Further clarity is required regarding the impact on heritage.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals will need to include mitigation measures to protect the setting of the Grade II Listed Andover Station and minimise harm to its significance.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets).</li> </ul>

## Ashley Manor Farm

What you said	What we changed
The site has been previously refused planning permission.	The proposal is different to what has previously been considered. In addition, circumstances can change over time. Therefore, the proposal is considered on its merits at the time it is submitted.
The development will impact tourism and local businesses.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on local business and amenity and well-being of residential properties.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being).</li> </ul>
The site will impact public rights of way (and the 'Green Loop').	The following Development Consideration has been included:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpaths New Milton 168/721 and 168/720 will require protection and enhancement with greater connectivity to wider network.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul>
Concern regarding additional HGV movements.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new approach to the existing Caird Avenue/ Lymington Road roundabout will be required to provide access to the site.</li> <li>• A Transport Assessment is required.</li> <li>• A Routeing Agreement is required. Routeing of HGV traffic will be limited to Caird Avenue between the roundabout and the New Milton Sand and Ballast plant.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13 (Managing traffic).</li> </ul> <p>The site is to be worked once Downton Manor Farm Quarry is extracted. Therefore, the traffic will be a continuation of existing movements rather than in addition.</p>
Concerns regarding mud on the road.	<p>This issue would be addressed through the management of the site and specific conditions, if required, at the planning application stage.</p>
Concerns regarding noise and dust.	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on local business and amenity and well-being of residential properties.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Specific conditions can be required as part of a planning application to ensure mitigation of these issues.</p>
Concerns regarding landscape impacts.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration should be to existing ground levels and should include Crooked Lane replacing the double hedgerow feature along the whole route. Restoration should provide a suitable setting for the Listed Buildings and respect their significance.</li> <li>• The site is Best and Most Versatile (Grade 2 and 3). Soil handling and management is required and</li> </ul>

	<p>restoration to original (or improved) agricultural land classification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new planting around the site should be managed to allow it to reach maturity.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul>
Loss of agricultural land.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is Best and Most Versatile (Grade 2 and 3). Soil handling and management is required and restoration to original (or improved) agricultural land classification.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils).</li> </ul>
Impact on Green Belt.	<p>The proposal is for sand and gravel extraction. Mineral extraction is not considered inappropriate in the Green Belt.</p> <p>This issue would be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 6 (South West Hampshire Green Belt).</li> </ul>
The site is not required for sand and gravel supply.	<p>The site will ensure a continued supply of sand and gravel once Downton Manor Farm Quarry has been worked. It will contribute towards meeting the need for 0.74 million tonnes per annum of sand and gravel and a landbank of at least 7 years of permitted reserves.</p>
Concern regarding impact on groundwater / hydrology.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hydrological/Hydrogeological Assessment and monitoring is required, taking into account the adjacent Historic Landfill, to ensure that any impacts on groundwater flows and water quality are considered and mitigated where needed.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 8 (Water management).</li> </ul>
Concern regarding flood risk.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Risk Assessment required. Site must be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood, result in no net loss of floodplain storage, not impede waterflows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention).</li> </ul>

<p>Concern regarding health of residents.</p>	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on local business and amenity and well-being of residential properties.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Policy 11 requires the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Please note the response in relation to Silicosis to Policy 11.</p>
<p>Impact on ecology (SPA, SSSI etc).</p>	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar and the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA*.</li> <li>• Ecological and hydrological assessment of all watercourses, ditches and aquatic habitats will be required including an understanding of the hydrological regime and interaction between and importance of any functional connection to offsite habitats and features including the nearby SINCs, SSSIs, SPAs and Ramsar*.</li> <li>• The impact on all roosting, foraging and breeding areas used by qualifying bird species of the nearby SPAs and Ramsar, and on their functional linkage*.</li> <li>• Mitigation should comply with the Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy<sup>3</sup>.</li> <li>• Early establishment of replacement and enhanced hedgerows bounding the site with an ecological receptor for reptiles and other species is required.</li> <li>• Long term management of species-rich meadows, ponds and other habitats is required.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 3 (Protecting habitats and species).</li> </ul>
<p>Impact on listed buildings and archaeology / heritage.</p>	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration should provide a suitable setting for the Listed Buildings and respect their significance.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> [swbgs-mitigation-guidance-oct-2018.pdf \(wordpress.com\)](#)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should protect the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings (Ashley Manor Farmhouse and Sampson Cottage).</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets).</li> </ul>
Concern regarding amenity of residents, care home and impact on the cemetery.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on local business and amenity and well-being of residential properties.</li> <li>Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being).</li> </ul>
Concern regarding sufficient material to restore the site.	<p>Policy 25 highlights that 2.6 million tonnes per annum of inert material is forecasted to be produced during the Plan period. A shortage of fill material has not been reported by operators as an issue.</p>

## Hamble Airfield

What you said	What we changed
Concern regarding impact on house prices.	This is not a material consideration in decision-making.
Circumstances are different from when the site was previously allocated.	This is noted and a planning application would be judged on its merits (i.e. how it complies with the policies in the Plan) at the time it is submitted. This is a separate but related process. As such, the issues raised as part of the planning application process and the ability for these to be addressed has influenced the retention of the site as an allocation.
Concerns regarding impact of public rights of way.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection and enhancement of adjacent public rights of way (Footpath Hamble-le-Rice 103/1) and connectivity to the wider network.</li> <li>Maintain and manage existing informal recreational use of the site and provision of enhanced public recreational after-use.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding recreational displacement.	Recreational displacement would be addressed through the Habitats Regulations Assessment process. This issue

	is considered in the Screening Report for the Proposed Submission Plan but would also need to be addressed as part of a planning application.
Concern regarding suitability of the roads and increase in vehicle movements (and impact on emergency vehicle access).	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe and satisfactory access to ensure provision is made for vulnerable highway users and the impact on peak flows is managed.</li> <li>• A Transport Assessment is required.</li> <li>• A Routeing Agreement is required.</li> <li>• Traffic issues including consideration of people walking, cycling and school traffic, particularly at The Hamble School and Hamble Primary, and management of traffic and congestion on Hamble Lane.</li> <li>• Traffic issues including consideration of school traffic and pedestrians, particularly at The Hamble School and Hamble Primary, and management of traffic and congestion on Hamble Lane.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13 (Managing traffic).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding structural stability of rail bridge.	This issue has not been raised as a concern by the Local Highway Authority.
Impacts on air quality, dust, and health.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> <li>• Phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity and well-being of local residents.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Policy 11 requires the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Please note the response in relation to Silicosis to Policy 11.</p>
Impacts on groundwater.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Hydrological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect adjacent National Site Network, Ramsar site and SSSIs, especially with regards to any changes to freshwater flows into the Hythe to Calshot Marshes SSSI and Solent &amp;</li> </ul>



	<p>Southampton Water SPA/SAC/Ramsar and the issue of nutrient enrichment*.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hydrological/Hydrogeological Assessment is required to ensure protection of the water quality and recharge of the groundwater and surface water*.</li> <li>The testing of the soil for contaminants and the potential impact on groundwater requires assessment. If contaminants are found to be present at any location on the site, then affected material would need careful management/remediation.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 8 (Water management).</li> </ul>
Impacts on flood risk.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood Risk Assessment required. Site must be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood, result in no net loss of floodplain storage, not impede waterflows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention).</li> </ul>
Restoration should include recreation and improved public access.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain and manage existing informal recreational use of the site and provision of enhanced public recreational after-use.</li> <li>Protection and enhancement of adjacent public rights of way (Footpath Hamble-le-Rice 103/1) and connectivity to the wider network.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> <li>Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments)</li> </ul>
Impact on agricultural land and soils.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soil testing, handling and management is required including for the potential for associated impact on groundwater and to determine soil quality. If PFAS are found to be present at any location on the site, then affected material would need careful management/remediation.</li> <li>The testing of the soil for contaminants and the potential impact on groundwater requires assessment. If contaminants are found to be present</li> </ul>

	<p>at any location on the site, then affected material would need careful management/remediation.</p> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils).</li> </ul>
<p>Impact on ecology (SSSI, SPA/SAC/Ramsar – protected species).</p>	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar, Solent and Dorset Coast SPA and Solent Maritime SAC*.</li> <li>• A Hydrological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect adjacent National Site Network, Ramsar site and SSSIs, especially with regards to any changes to freshwater flows into the Hythe to Calshot Marshes SSSI and Solent &amp; Southampton Water SPA/SAC/Ramsar and the issue of nutrient enrichment*.</li> <li>• The impact on all roosting, foraging and breeding areas used by qualifying bird species of nearby SPAs and Ramsar, and on their functional linkage*. Mitigation and possible compensation likely to be required.</li> <li>• Protection of the Lee on Solent to Itchen Valley Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest*.</li> <li>• The impact on Badnam Copse and West Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</li> <li>• Early habitats creation through progressive restoration and/or edge buffer zones is required and a range of suitable habitats as the site provides a network opportunity. This should include provision of woodland (and wet woodland) habitat linkages.</li> <li>• Protection of mature trees around the site boundary*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 3 (Protecting habitats and species).</li> </ul>
<p>Impact on landscape.</p>	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early habitats creation through progressive restoration and/or edge buffer zones is required and a range of suitable habitats as the site provides a network opportunity. This should include provision of woodland (and wet woodland) habitat linkages.</li> <li>• Protection of mature trees around the site boundary*.</li> <li>• Large areas for mitigation, either as buffer around site, a single large area, or several smaller areas</li> </ul>

	<p>should be provided. This will need to tie in with the long-term aims for the site (housing development) and will need liaison with Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul>
Impact on amenity of residents, schools (primary and secondary), and sports facilities.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity and well-being of local residents.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding noise.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> <li>• Phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity and well-being of local residents.</li> </ul> <p>This issue would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Specific conditions can be required as part of a planning application to ensure mitigation of these issues.</p>
Impacts on Climate Change.	<p>Consideration of climate change has been strengthened in the Plan. However, there is currently still a requirement for primary land-won sand and gravel and its main method of movement is by Heavy Good Vehicle.</p> <p>This issue would be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation).</li> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils).</li> <li>• Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding the need for the site.	<p>The site will ensure a continued supply of sand and gravel in South Hampshire. It will contribute towards meeting the need for 0.74 million tonnes per annum of sand and gravel and a landbank of at least 7 years of permitted reserves.</p>

## Midgham Farm

What you said	What we changed
Concerns regarding the need for the site.	The site will ensure a continued supply of sand and gravel once Bleak Hill Quarry has been worked. It will contribute towards meeting the need for 0.74 million tonnes per annum of sand and gravel and a landbank of at least 7 years of permitted reserves.
Impacts on public rights of way.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection and enhancement of rights of way (Fordingbridge footpath 090/8a, Fordingbridge footpath 090/2, Fordingbridge footpath 090/3) and connectivity to the wider network.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding air quality and health.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer is required in the north-west corner of the site to protect the amenity and well-being of Alderholt Village. Buffers are also required to protect the adjacent residential properties along the site boundary.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Policy 11 requires the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Please note the response in relation to Silicosis to Policy 11.</p>
Impacts on amenity of local residents.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer is required in the north-west corner and western edge of the site to protect the amenity and well-being of Alderholt Village and any urban expansion. Buffers are also required to protect the adjacent residential properties along the site boundary.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding the suitability of the roads and impact on road users.	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new priority junction will be required onto Hillbury Road and a conveyor belt to cross Lomer Lane for the second phase of extraction.</li> <li>• A Transport Assessment is required. This should consider cumulative traffic impacts taking into account that the site is a continuation of existing extraction operations at Bleak Hill which would cease prior to commencement at Midgham Farm. The safety of other road users (walkers, cyclists and horse riders) will also need to be considered on Hillbury Road and Harbridge Drove (due to the lack of footpath).</li> <li>• A Routeing Agreement is required. Routeing to the SRN (A31) will be south along Hillbury Road/Harbridge Drove before joining briefly the B3081 to its junction with the A31. Both Harbridge Drove and the B3081 are suitable routes for HGV traffic. The SRN is located some 5.5 miles south from the site.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13 (Managing traffic).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding cumulative impacts.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Transport Assessment is required. This should consider cumulative traffic impacts taking into account that the site is a continuation of existing extraction operations at Bleak Hill which would cease prior to commencement at Midgham Farm.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13 (Managing traffic).</li> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>
Concern regarding landscape impacts including impact on AONBs.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-commencement planting and restoration proposals require phasing and development design to ensure connectivity is retained or replaced as a priority, most notably in the southern boundary.</li> <li>• Restoration proposals will need to relate to the wider landscape and enhance ecological networks including provision of deciduous woodland along the boundaries of the site*.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A buffer is required in the north-west corner of the site to protect the amenity and well-being of Alderholt Village. Buffers are also required to protect the adjacent residential properties along the site boundary.</li> <li>• Replacement of hedgerows, where removed, and additional native tree planting along Hillbury Road.</li> <li>• Restoration should include no large open water bodies, for landscape and airport safeguarding reasons. However, small ponds may be acceptable to contribute towards biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul> <p>The site is not within or within the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>
<p>Impact on ecology (SSSI, hydrological links to Avon Valley, protected habitats and species).</p>	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the Avon Valley SPA/Ramsar, River Avon SAC, Dorset Heaths SAC and the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Ramsar*.</li> <li>• The impact on the offsite roosting, foraging and breeding areas of the qualifying bird species of nearby SPAs/Ramsars, and on their functional linkage*.</li> <li>• A Hydrological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars and SSSIs, including the issue of nutrient enrichment*.</li> <li>• Buffering of the offsite woodland are required.</li> <li>• Pre-commencement planting and restoration proposals require phasing and development design to ensure connectivity is retained or replaced as a priority, most notably in the southern boundary.</li> <li>• Restoration proposals will need to relate to the wider landscape and enhance ecological networks including provision of deciduous woodland along the boundaries of the site*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 3 (Protecting habitats and species).</li> </ul>
<p>Concerns regarding noise and dust.</p>	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> <li>• A buffer is required in the north-west corner and western edge of the site to protect the amenity and</li> </ul>

	<p>well-being of Alderholt Village and any urban expansion. Buffers are also required to protect the adjacent residential properties along the site boundary.</p> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Specific conditions can be required as part of a planning application to ensure mitigation of these issues.</p>
Impacts on climate change.	<p>Consideration of climate change has been strengthened in the Plan. However, there is currently still a requirement for primary land-won sand and gravel and its main method of movement is by Heavy Good Vehicle.</p> <p>This issue would be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation).</li> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils).</li> <li>• Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments).</li> </ul>
Impact on agricultural land and soils.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is Best and Most Versatile (Grade 3a and 3b). Soil handling and management is required and restoration to original (or improved) agricultural land classification.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils).</li> </ul>
Impacts on groundwater.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Hydrological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars and SSSIs, including the issue of nutrient enrichment*.</li> <li>• Protection of water quality and quantity of the River Avon*.</li> <li>• Hydrogeological/Hydrological Assessment required to ensure that any impacts on groundwater flows and water quality are considered and mitigated where needed.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 8 (Water management).</li> </ul>

Impacts on flood risk.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Risk Assessment required. Site must be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood, result in no net loss of floodplain storage, not impede waterflows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding phasing and suitability of restoration.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration proposals will need to relate to the wider landscape and enhance ecological networks including provision of deciduous woodland along the boundaries of the site*.</li> <li>• Restoration should include no large open water bodies, for landscape and airport safeguarding reasons. However, small ponds may be acceptable to contribute towards biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 10 (Restoration of mineral and waste developments).</li> </ul>
Impacts on archaeology and heritage assets.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archaeological issues are likely to be significant at this site. Archaeological surveys are required, and the presence of the historic settlement may (on balance of archaeological merit or on balance of value of deposits compared to cost of mitigation) require preservation and possible exclusion from development, which may reduce capacity.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets).</li> </ul> <p>Whilst the potential for archaeological issues is likely to be significant, it is considered that the site is of suitable size that the site could remain viable if the area is excluded. Further archaeological surveys are being undertaken by the site promoter.</p>



## Purple Haze

What you said	What we changed
Concerns regarding cumulative impacts.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic issues including cumulative impact with other mineral and waste operations and the protection of Verwood from minerals traffic.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13 (Managing traffic).</li> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>
There are no benefits to the local community.	<p>The Hampshire Authorities cannot impose this on the operators but can promote engagement with local communities.</p>
Impact on public rights of way, recreation (cycleways and footpaths) and access.	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection and enhancement of the amenity and users of the Moors Valley Country Park and other local residents.</li> <li>• Maintenance and management of levels of permissive access and recreational use of the Moors Valley Country Park via the B3081*.</li> <li>• Protection of the nearby cycle paths, bridleways, and footpaths.</li> <li>• Recreational displacement must be carefully managed. Management arrangements to secure short and long term objectives for amenity and biodiversity.</li> <li>• Phasing programme and working to protect the amenity of local residents and permissive access to the site.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside and valued landscapes).</li> </ul>
Impact on ecology (SSSI, SAC, SPA and protected habitats and species including heathland and reptiles).	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, Avon Valley SPA and Ramsar, and the River Avon SAC (and the New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar in relation to recreational displacement)*.</li> <li>• The impact on the offsite roosting, foraging, and breeding areas of the qualifying bird species of nearby SPAs/Ramsars, and on their functional linkage*.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Hydrological/hydrogeological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars and SSSIs, including the issue of nutrient enrichment, and including the protection of the water quality and recharge of the underlying aquifer, groundwater and surface water and safeguard the ecohydrological regimes of Ebblake Bog and Moors River Sites of Special Scientific Interest*.</li> <li>• Protection of populations and conservation status of rare and notable species including Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Coral Necklace*.</li> <li>• The impact on Ringwood Forest and Home Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</li> <li>• Restoration must include habitats to expand those within the designated sites and relate to the wider landscape and enhance ecological networks*.</li> <li>• Recreational displacement must be carefully managed. Management arrangements to secure short and long term objectives for amenity and biodiversity including heathland, woodland, acid grassland and protected species.</li> <li>• Associated legal agreements must ensure no further irreversible habitat loss or risk to the conservation status of species.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 3 (Protecting habitats and species).</li> </ul>
Impacts on climate change.	<p>Consideration of climate change has been strengthened in the Plan. However, there is currently still a requirement for primary land-won sand and gravel and its main method of movement is by Heavy Goods Vehicle.</p> <p>This issue would be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation).</li> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils).</li> <li>• Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding the suitability of the roads (including B3081 and A31), increase in vehicles and cumulative impact	<p>The following Development Considerations have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Transport Assessment is required.</li> <li>• A Routeing Agreement is required. Routeing to the SRN (A31) will be along the B3081, which is a suitable route for HGV traffic. The SRN is located some 1.4 miles south from the site. A new priority junction will be required to the B3801 to ensure</li> </ul>

	<p>provision for people walking, cycling and horse-riding and the impact on peak flows is managed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic issues including cumulative impact with other mineral and waste operations and the protection of Verwood from minerals traffic.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13 (Managing traffic).</li> </ul>
<p>Concerns regarding successful restoration to heathland and connectivity to wider landscape.</p>	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on the offsite roosting, foraging, and breeding areas of the qualifying bird species of nearby SPAs/Ramsars, and on their functional linkage*.</li> <li>• A Hydrological/hydrogeological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars and SSSIs, including the issue of nutrient enrichment, and including the protection of the water quality and recharge of the underlying aquifer, groundwater and surface water and safeguard the ecohydrological regimes of Ebblake Bog and Moors River Sites of Special Scientific Interest*.</li> <li>• Protection of populations and conservation status of rare and notable species including Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Coral Necklace*.</li> <li>• Restoration must include habitats to expand those within the designated sites and relate to the wider landscape and enhance ecological networks*.</li> <li>• Associated legal agreements must ensure no further irreversible habitat loss or risk to the conservation status of species.</li> <li>• Soil handling, management and monitoring is required.</li> <li>• Importation of material as part of the restoration would need appropriate supporting investigations and risk assessment.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 9 (Protection of soils)</li> <li>• Policy 10 (Restoration of mineral and waste developments).</li> </ul>
<p>Impacts on amenity of local residents.</p>	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection and enhancement of the amenity and users of the Moors Valley Country Park and other local residents.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusion from extraction and buffer of the northern end of the site to protect the amenity of local residents*.</li> <li>• Phasing programme and working to protect the amenity of local residents and permissive access to the site.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>
Impacts on groundwater and hydrology.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Hydrological/hydrogeological assessment is required to consider whether proposed works will affect nearby National Site Network sites, Ramsars and SSSIs, including the issue of nutrient enrichment, and including the protection of the water quality and recharge of the underlying aquifer, groundwater and surface water and safeguard the ecohydrological regimes of Ebblake Bog and Moors River Sites of Special Scientific Interest*.</li> <li>• Protection of the water quality and recharge of the underlying aquifer, groundwater and surface water and safeguard the hydrological regime of Ebblake Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest*.</li> <li>• Hydrogeological/Hydrogeological Assessment is required.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 8 (Water management).</li> </ul>
Impacts on flood risk.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Risk Assessment required. Site must be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood, result in no net loss of floodplain storage, not impede waterflows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 12 (Flood risk and prevention).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding air quality and health.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusion from extraction and buffer of the northern end of the site to protect the amenity of local residents*.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing programme and working to protect the amenity of local residents and permissive access to the site.</li> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul> <p>Policy 11 requires the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Please note the response in relation to Silicosis to Policy 11.</p>
Impacts on heritage assets.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on the Bronze Age burial mound and its preservation. A programme of archaeological mitigation will be required, including archaeological excavation of the putative burial mound and walk through survey prior to development and the monitoring of topsoil and over burden striping in a strip map and record excise during development.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets).</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding noise and light.	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust, noise and lighting management plan and monitoring is required*.</li> <li>• Protection of the amenity and well-being of Verwood residents, other residents in the vicinity and local businesses.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>
Concern regarding impact on tourism	<p>The following Development Consideration has been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the amenity and well-being of Verwood residents, other residents in the vicinity and local businesses.</li> </ul> <p>These issues would also be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity, and well-being).</li> </ul>

Concerns regarding the need for the site.	The site will ensure a continued supply of soft sand for the Plan area. It will contribute towards meeting the need for 0.16 million tonnes per annum of soft sand and a landbank of at least 7 years of permitted reserves.
---	--

### What does this mean for Hampshire?

- 6.9 The provision of allocations helps to give certainty to industry and local residents of what development is proposed, when it is likely to take place and what measures will need to be in place to protect communities and the environment.

## Appendix B: List of safeguarded minerals and waste sites

### What you said

- 6.10 The key issues raised are set out below:
- A number of corrections and updates were provided regarding the existing list.
  - There was disagreement that proposed sites should be included.
  - Southern Water requested that several water treatment works were added to the list.

### What we changed

- 6.11 The list of safeguarded minerals and waste sites has been updated to reflect the current version available on the Hampshire County Council website. This list is correct as of August 2023. The original list was in order of facility type but now is in order of district/borough. The updated list includes the corrections and additions highlighted through the consultation. The list also reflects the update to the proposed allocations in the Proposed Submission Plan.

### What does this mean for Hampshire?

- 6.12 Safeguarded sites are protected from encroachment by non-minerals and/or non-waste development and local districts and boroughs are required to consult the relevant minerals and waste planning authority if a proposal may impact on an existing or proposed operation.
- 6.13 The safeguarding of sites is important in maintaining a steady and adequate supply of minerals and a sustainable network of waste management facilities to meet Hampshire's needs.

## Appendix C: Implementation and Monitoring Plan

### What you said

- 6.14 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Data on Policy 27 needs to be updated.
  - Concerns regarding climate change.

- Additional interested stakeholders should be included.
- Updates to monitoring plan is required following updates to policies.
- Concern regarding the monitoring of the sites once permitted.

### What we changed

- 6.15 The Monitoring indicators have been reviewed to ensure they align with the revised policies and that the data is obtainable and measurable. The Triggers have also been reviewed and updated, where necessary.
- 6.16 The Implementation text has also been updated to reflect the changes made to the policies and to ensure that they are compliant with national policy.
- 6.17 The Monitoring Plan is to monitor the effectiveness of the policies. Monitoring of permitted sites is a separate regime, but the information gathered can be used to inform the Monitoring Report.

### What does this mean for Hampshire?

- 6.18 Improving the monitoring and implementation of the Plan will help to identify if a review or update is required to ensure the Plan stays effective at delivering the right development in the right place at the right time.

## Appendix D: Supporting documents

### What you said

- 6.19 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Minerals Background Study: concerns regarding movement of minerals.
  - Waste Background Study: a need to update the data.
  - Sites Proposal Study: additional comments relating to proposed sites.
  - Sustainability Appraisal: commentary on criteria applied and the results of the assessment.
  - Habitats Regulation Assessment: specific comments on potential impacts of the proposed sites.
  - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: specific comments on potential impacts of the proposed sites.
  - Strategic Transport Assessment: specific comments on potential impacts of the proposed sites.
  - Strategic Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: specific comments on potential impacts of the proposed sites.
  - Ecological Statement: specific comments on potential impacts of the proposed sites.
  - Heritage Statement: specific comments on potential impacts of the proposed sites.
  - Climate Change Topic Paper: comments regarding Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation).

- Site Restoration Topic Paper: concerns regarding the success of restoration schemes.
- Wharves and Rail Depots Topic Paper: specific comments on proposed sites.
- Duty to Cooperate Statement: comments relating to the impact on communities outside of Hampshire.

### **What we changed**

6.20 Appendix D: Supporting documents has been updated.

6.21 Where applicable, the supporting documents have been updated to reflect latest available data, new information received through the Draft Plan consultation and changes contained within the Proposed Submission Plan.

### **What does this mean for Hampshire?**

6.22 Appendix D is a useful reference point.

### **Policies Map**

6.23 A Policies Map has been prepared to reflect the revised policies in the Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Plan.

6.24 The Policies Map needs to be representative of the policies in the Plan and a tool for developers, decision-makers and other interested parties such as the public.

### **What does this mean for Hampshire?**

6.25 The Policies Map gives a spatial reference to the policies in the Plan and will be a tool for decision-making. An interactive version will be made available on the website following adoption of the Plan which will help with accessibility.



## 7. Public Engagement

### What you said

- 7.1 The key issues raised are set out below:
- Lack of information to local residents (including those in Dorset e.g. Alderholt)
  - Difficult to draw information from the consultation documents / too much information.
  - The response form was difficult to use.
  - The Tests of Soundness were difficult to work through.
  - Poor quality maps at local events (e.g. footpaths missing).
  - More justification for the sites is required.
  - Insufficient detail of the site proposals / operations has been provided.
  - The developers have not sought the views of local residents.

### What we changed

- 7.2 How are looking to improve things going forward:
- We will be giving prior notice of the next consultation and of further stages of Plan-making.
  - Press releases and social media will be used to increase awareness.
  - This 'Have Your Say' document has been prepared to explain the changes made to the Proposed Submission Plan.
  - Documents should also contain 'Non-technical Summaries' where these are appropriate to help break down the information.
  - The Response Form is being reviewed and amended to try and simplify the requirements.
  - The Test of Soundness are a planning requirement and information is provided to explain what these relate to.
  - A Guidance note will be prepared to assist with responses.
  - The maps prepared for the event were to give a background for discussion not a complete view of the issues. However, further consideration will be given to the information to be contained on maps at future events.
  - Justification for why sites have been included in the Plan or ruled out from further consideration is set out in the Proposal Study (and in this 'Have Your Say' document). More detail has been provided following the information gathered during the Draft Plan consultation.
  - It is noted that the level of information provided on site proposals is varied. If a site has been submitted as a planning application, there is generally more detailed information provided. Where sites were submitted for consideration without clear proposals, further information has been sought and any lack of clear proposals are fed into the decision-making process.
  - The engagement of developers with local residents is outside of the control of the Hampshire Authorities, although this is encouraged prior to a planning application being submitted, during the planning application process and once a site gains planning permission (in the form of a Liaison Panel).

## Glossary

### **Adaptation**

In relation to climate change, adaptation relates to ensuring that minerals and waste development minimise their effect on climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions, sustainable use of resources, using low carbon technologies and avoiding areas vulnerable to climate change.

### **Agent of Change principle**

The Agent of Change principle places the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise-generating activities or uses on the proposed new noise-sensitive development. In other words, the person or business responsible for the change must also be responsible for managing the impact of the change.

### **Aggregate recycling site**

Facilities where hard, inert materials are crushed and screened (filtered) to produce recycled/secondary aggregate of various grades. Aggregates may be produced from construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste, or incinerator bottom ash (IBA) from energy recovery facilities.

### **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)**

Areas of countryside considered to have significant landscape value and protected to preserve that value.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

An approach to development, and/or land management, that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand.

### **Capacity**

In relation to Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source), capacity is the level of provision at existing sites which enables the delivery of aggregate supply.

### **Chalk**

A soft white rock primarily formed from the mineral calcite. One of the uses of this mineral is in agriculture.

### **Circular economy**

A circular economy is an alternative to a traditional linear economy (make, use, dispose) in which we keep resources in use for as long as possible, extract the maximum value from them whilst in use, then recover and regenerate products and materials at the end of each service life.

### **Clay**

A fine-grained, firm earthy material that is plastic when wet and hardens when heated. Consisting primarily of hydrated silicates of aluminium and widely used in making bricks, tiles and pottery.

### **Climate change**

A change in global or regional climate patterns, in particular a change apparent from the mid to late 20th century onwards and attributed largely to the increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide produced by the use of fossil fuels.

**Climate Emergency**

A climate emergency declaration or declaring a climate emergency is an action taken by governments and scientists to acknowledge humanity is in a climate emergency.

**Combined heat and power (CHP)**

Heating technology which generates heat and electricity simultaneously from the same energy source.

**Construction, Demolition & Excavation Waste (CDE)**

Waste generated by the construction, repair, maintenance and demolition of buildings and structures. It mostly comprises brick, concrete, hardcore, subsoil, and topsoil but can also include timber, metals and plastics.

**Development Considerations**

These are issues that need to be met/addressed alongside the other policies in the Plan in the event that a planning application is submitted for development.

**Energy from Waste (EfW)**

The process of creating energy – usually in the form of electricity or heat but also potentially biofuels from the thermal treatment of a waste source via technologies such as Incineration, Anaerobic Digestion, Gasification or Pyrolysis.

**Green Belt**

An area designated to provide permanent separation between urban areas. The main aim is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important quality of Green Belt is its openness.

**Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV)**

A vehicle that is over 3,500kg unladen weight and used for carrying goods.

**Inert Waste**

Waste that does not go under any significant physical, chemical or biological changes.

**Landbank**

A measure of the stock of planning permissions in an area, showing the amount of unexploited mineral, with planning permissions and how long those supplies will last at the locally derived rate of supply.

**Local Transport Plan (LTP)**

A statutory plan detailing the future transport approach in a given area.

**Low-level Radioactive Waste (LLW)**

Low Level Waste (LLW) is the lowest activity category of radioactive waste. It is classified as waste containing radioactive materials other than those acceptable for disposal with ordinary refuse, but not exceeding 4GBq per tonne of alpha or 12GBq per tonne of beta/gamma activity. Low-level wastes include metals, soil, building rubble and organic materials, which arise principally as lightly contaminated miscellaneous scrap. Metals are mostly in the form of redundant equipment. Organic materials are mainly in the form of paper towels, clothing and laboratory equipment that have been used in areas where radioactive materials are used – such as hospitals, research establishments and industry. LLW contains radioactive materials other than those acceptable for disposal with municipal and general commercial or industrial waste. A sub-category of LLW is Very Low Level Waste (VLLW).

**Marine-won aggregates**

Sand and gravel that is dredged from the seabed.

**Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities (MWPA)**

The local planning authorities (County and Unitary Councils) responsible for minerals and waste planning.

**Mitigation**

The reduction of something harmful or the reduction of its harmful effects.

**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

**Net zero**

Refers to achieving carbon neutrality by balancing carbon emissions with carbon removal or simply eliminating carbon emissions altogether.

**National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW)**

This document sets out the government's detailed waste planning policies. It should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Non-hazardous waste**

Waste permitted for disposal at a non-hazardous landfill. It is not inert or hazardous and includes the majority of household and commercial wastes.

**Oil and gas**

Oil and gas are non-renewable resources.

**Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

A web-based resource which brings together planning guidance on various topics into one place. It was launched in March 2014 and coincided with the cancelling of the majority of Government Circulars which had previously given guidance on many aspects of planning.

**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.

**Recovery**

Any operation the principal result of which is waste serving a useful purpose by replacing other materials which would otherwise have been used to fulfil a particular function, or waste being prepared to fulfil that function, in the plant or in the wider economy.

**Recycling**

The series of activities by which discarded materials are collected, sorted, processed and converted into raw materials and used in the production of new products. Any recovery operation by which waste materials are reprocessed into products, materials or substances whether for the original or other purposes. It includes the reprocessing of organic material but does not include energy recovery and the reprocessing into materials that are to be used as fuels or for backfilling operations.

**Restoration**

The process of returning a site 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.

**Sharp sand and gravel**

Coarse sand and gravel suitable for use in making concrete.

**Silica sand**

Also known as industrial sand, contains a high proportion of silica in the form of quartz. It is produced from unconsolidated sands and crushed sandstones and is used for applications other than as construction aggregates.

**Site allocations**

Specific sites are identified for minerals and waste activities in the Plan where there are viable opportunities, have the support of landowners and are likely to be acceptable in planning terms.

**Soft sand**

Fine sand suitable for use in such products as mortar, asphalt and plaster.

**Statement of Community Involvement**

A Local Development Document which sets out the standards the Planning Authority intends to achieve when involving the community in preparing Local Development Documents, or when making a significant development management 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.

**Waste**

The Waste Framework Directive 75/442 (as amended) defines waste as 'any substance that the holder discards or intends or is required to discard'.

**Waste arisings**

Waste generated within a specified area.

**Waste hierarchy**

The aim of the waste hierarchy is to extract the maximum practical benefits from products and to generate the minimum amount of waste. The revised Waste Framework Directive introduces a changed hierarchy of options for managing waste. It gives top priority to preventing waste. When waste is created, it gives priority to preparing it for re-use, followed by recycling, then other recovery such as energy recovery, and finally disposal (for example landfill). The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 apply the requirements for the waste hierarchy.

**Wharf**

A landing place or pier where ships may tie up and load or unload.

A summary of this document can be made available in large print, in Braille or audio cassette. Copies in other languages may also be obtained. Please contact Hampshire County Council by email [HMWP.consult@hants.gov.uk](mailto:HMWP.consult@hants.gov.uk) or by calling 01962 846746.