

Public Document Pack

AT A MEETING of the Regulatory Committee of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL held at the Castle, Winchester on Wednesday, 14th December, 2022

Chairman:

* Councillor Peter Latham

* Councillor Lance Quantrill
* Councillor Lulu Bowerman
* Councillor Steven Broomfield
* Councillor Mark Cooper
Councillor Rod Cooper
* Councillor Michael Ford
* Councillor Keith House
* Councillor Gary Hughes

Councillor Adam Jackman
* Councillor Hugh Lumby
* Councillor Alexis McEvoy
* Councillor Lesley Meenaghan
* Councillor Stephen Parker
* Councillor Louise Parker-Jones
* Councillor Roger Price
* Councillor Kim Taylor

*Present

36. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Rod Cooper and Adam Jackman. Cllr Hugh Lumby was present as a substitute.

Cllr Lesley Meenaghan was present to observe the meeting.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3, Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

No declarations were made.

38. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed.

39. **DEPUTATIONS**

The Chairman confirmed that there were deputations for item number 6, which would be called at the relevant point in the agenda.

40. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman confirmed that there were deputations for item number 6, which would be called at the relevant point in the agenda.

41. **ROKE MANOR QUARRY - STANBRIDGE RANVILLES EXTENSION, SALISBURY ROAD, SHOOTASH**

An extension of mineral working at Roke Manor Quarry, to extract circa 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel from the Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, including continuation of on-site mineral processing, backfilling with inert material and progressive restoration to agriculture with increased nature conservation and biodiversity enhancements at Roke Manor Quarry - Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, Salisbury Road, Shootash SO51 6GA (No. 21/01274/CMAS) TV226.

The Development Planning Manager introduced the report, drawing the Committee's attention to:

- Paragraphs 116-130, which detailed the demonstration of the need and requirements for sharp sand and gravel as a mineral resource, to which the proposal would contribute.
- The existing quarry being identified in Policy 20 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan as an existing mineral extraction site. It is also safeguarded under Policies 15, 16 and 26).
- The existing site Liaison Panel for the quarry which had recently met.
- The fact that the report and the decision need to apply to the adopted Hampshire Mineral and Waste Plan. The Committee was reminded that no weight can be given to the draft update to the Minerals and Waste Plan due to the early stage in plan preparation.

The Project Officer gave a presentation to the Committee for context, which included a location plan, cross sections, sight lines, phasing diagrams, aerial views and photos including:

- The site, including the weighbridge
- The A27
- The proximity of Awbridge and Romsey
- The public right of way
- Squabb Wood
- The nearby residential properties – Homeview, Croylands and Troy House

- The existing haul road
- The central hedgerow
- Old Salisbury Lane, with the view from the southern footpath
- The proposed bunding.

The Project Officer explained the consultation undertaken and responses received. She confirmed that the Environmental Health Officer had not objected, subject to conditions. There had been 100 public representations. This number had been revised from 99 in the Update Report, which had been published on 12 December 2022.

The Project Officer went on to confirm the key issues, which were:

- Ecological impacts
- Impacts on neighbouring amenity
- Noise
- Air quality and dust
- Landscape and visual impacts
- Arboricultural impacts, the initial issues of which had now been resolved.

The Committee received deputations from the following residents:

- Sarah Leach, Lizzi Brazier, Sue Brophy and Richard Rudkin.

Their principal areas of concern were:

- That they had lived with mineral extraction for some years and were concerned about the cumulative effect of the quarries.
- That they felt the previous extraction sites had not been restored satisfactorily, within timescales and lacked confidence in the proposed completion and restoration times.
- The effect of the existing quarry and proposed extension on their health and wellbeing (including Air pollution, noise and dust impacts).
- The proximity and visual impact of the site to their properties including the impact of the proposed 5 metre bunds.
- The lack of active vegetation management on existing bunds.
- The length of time, daily, that the quarry is worked for.
- A poor history of the implementation of mitigation measures.
- The proposal to fell mature trees and to be replacement by saplings, which have a minimum time of 25-30 years to grow.
- A lack of evidence that the applicant exercises their duty of care in relation to trees, some of which had died.
- Impact on the use of the footpath.
- The removal of an outlook from Homeview.
- Lorries entering and leaving the site queuing in the layby and the turning of vehicles in the entrance to the site.
- The poor state of the road surface.
- The effectiveness of the existing Liaison Panel.
- Complaints about a flood light shining into a property.

- An independent noise survey had been commissioned by residents, the outcomes of which had differed to that of the applicants.

In response to questions from Members to the deputies, the Committee heard that:

- The trees that died had not been replaced, 'they are just twigs,' and this had been raised at a Liaison Panel meeting.
- The resident's noise survey had not been shared with the County Council or any other agency such as the Environmental Health Officer.
- Complaints from one of the closest residents have not been referred to the County Council.

Robert Westell made a deputation on behalf of the applicant, Raymond Brown Quarry Products. He explained that restoration would be phased and that no one property would be affected in the longer term.

He stated that the applicant had taken care and attention to consult with the neighbours. He explained that:

- The restoration scheme would provide a net gain in the hedgerows.
- There were acceptable habitat management actions and significant biodiversity net gains (BNG) as demonstrated in the BNG assessment.
- Roke Manor quarry is the closest source of land-won sand and gravel to the Southampton conurbation.
- The minerals were safeguarded through policies in the existing Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
- Inert material was available to restore the site.
- Use of existing infrastructure would be made, which is preferable to building a new quarry.
- The material received for infill is nonrecyclable.
- The quarry provides employment in a rural area and benefits the local economy.

In response to questions from Members, the Committee heard that:

- The end of 2024 is the deadline for the existing quarry to be restored. It was indicated that the site is ready for the replacement of soil in summer 2023 so is on scheduled to be completed within timescales.
- The Section 106 agreement covers tree planting and maintenance which is monitored by County Council officers. There is an annual report with County Council officers which looks at planting that will continue after completion.
- The tipping on inert waste is being alternated with tipping at Brickworks Quarry at a rate of 30k tonnes per month. It was noted that tipping at Roke would be much higher if it was operational.
- Stripped topsoil would be used for the bunding.
- If it was felt necessary, more mature trees could be used rather than saplings.

- The gates open at 7am and there is no need for any lorries to arrive any earlier.
- The topography slopes down away from Homeview gradually and is 51m away and the extraction side will be 84m away.
- Lapwing habitats have been considered in the ecological assessment and the proposed restoration scheme.
- The applicant records all complaints received via an established complaints management system. All complaints logged and investigated.
- Complaints are discussed at the Liaison Panel, but not presented in a report format. This can be provided if required.

A deputation was then made by Cllr Adams-King, the local County Councillor.

He reported that:

- A list of complaints would be useful for the Liaison Panel.
- This was a small community which are significantly impacted.
- The biodiversity issue was the main concern, with little compensation in the plan related to established hedgerows and the bunds, stating that 'better should be strived for'.
- Roosting sites for bats should not be abandoned.
- Reinstatement and restoration of the site is a concern.
- Lorry movements are a regular feature on the Liaison Panel and were a concern of the Parish Councils.
- Bunds and noise were a concern and in particular, the impact on Mr Rudkin.

Cllr Adams-King referred to the provisions of Policy 10- of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan as well as paragraph 210(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to unacceptable impacts.

He reported that his concern here was the cumulative effect on the community and he went on to say that if the proposal is accepted, noise and Highways conditions (routing) should be looked at, which would be supported by the Parishes.

In response to Members' questions to Cllr Adams-King, the Committee heard that he felt the noise assessment should be looked at again and the reinstatement of the bunds does not look that great.

In response to question of officers, the Committee heard that:

- The damage to oak trees had been assessed by County Arboriculture and agreed be category B. The four trees that are in situ cannot be left where they are. Officers indicated that the replacement of these trees with more mature trees can be considered as part of the proposed Section 106 agreement.
- In respect to hydrogeology, the applicant would not legally be able to proceed without a permit from the Environment Agency.
- Test Valley Borough Council Environmental Health had found the noise assessment to be acceptable.

- Conditions are in place regarding restoration rather than a bond. The S106 also provides greater support here due to the EMP.
- A Monitoring Officer visited the site (on the day of the decision) and has been asked to look at the issues reported to the committee. The outcomes of this visit will be reported to the Liaison Panel and in the next committee Monitoring and Enforcement update.
- In relation to ecology, the County Ecologist and Natural England have deemed the proposal acceptable subject to conditions and the proposed legal agreement.
- Signage could be added to the entrance of the haul road for 'no turning' and routing could be worked into the Section 106 agreement and Highways could advise on routing regarding local roads.

The Committee was shown some photos taken by the deputees (residents) which had been emailed the previous afternoon.

Members debated the report and considered the following:

- The visual impacts and cumulative effect of the site.
- The proximity to residential properties.
- Effects on biodiversity.
- The protection of wildlife.
- Effects of noise and dust.
- Impacts on the local roads.
- The bunds and how they are looked after.
- The responses to consultations from County Arboriculture and the Environmental Health Officer.
- The reporting and resolution of complaints.
- The balance of adverse impacts against need and demand.
- The mitigation of any adverse impacts and what measures could be taken.
- The infill waste would otherwise go into landfill.

The Development Planning Manager confirmed that:

- there were no policy reasons to refuse the application and that it met Policies 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17 and 20, subject to conditions and the proposed legal agreement.
- The need for the proposal was clearly set out in the report.
- Planting is covered by the existing section 106 agreement for the existing quarry.

The Development Planning Manager requested delegated authority to amend or add the following conditions:

- Amendments to proposed condition 5.
- New condition on signage at the entrance to the site.

The Development Planning Manager requested delegated authority to add the following informatives:

- To include the consideration of the provision of mature trees/hedgerows.
- That the Committee request a full assessment by enforcement officers on the success of planting on the existing Roke Manor Quarry site.
- To ensure that complaints are reported to the Liaison Panel.

The Development Planning Manager requested delegated authority to add lorry routing into the section 106 agreement.

Voting

For: 8

Against: 4

Abstain: 1

Resolved

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in Appendix A, the Update Report, amended conditions, new conditions, additional informatives and completion of a section 106 agreement in relation to submission and approval of an Environmental Management and Mitigation Plan and HGV routing.

Chairman, Regulatory Committee

This page is intentionally left blank