

**HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**Decision Report**

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| <b>Decision Maker:</b> | Regulatory Committee  |
| <b>Date:</b>           | 15 September 2021   |
| <b>Title:</b>          | Processing and storage of wood waste and gypsum at Four Dells Farm, Poles Lane, Otterbourne SO21 2DY (No. 20/01546/HCS) (Site Ref: WR215) |
| <b>Report From:</b>    | Assistant Director of Waste, Planning and Environment   |

**Contact name:** David Smith

**Tel:** 07810 162684

**Email:** [david.smith@hants.gov.uk](mailto:david.smith@hants.gov.uk)

### **Recommendation**

1. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A.**

### **Executive Summary**

2. The planning application is for processing and storage of wood waste and gypsum at Four Dells Farm, Poles Lane, Otterbourne SO21 2DY.
3. This application is being considered by the Regulatory Committee as there is significant public interest in the operation of the site and at the request of County Councillor Warwick.
4. Key issues raised are:
  - Need;
  - Countryside location;
  - Noise; and
  - Landscape impact and visual amenity.
5. The proposed development is not an Environmental Impact Assessment development under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#).
6. It is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the adopted [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) and [Winchester City Council Local Plan \(2013\)](#). Although the site is located within the countryside, (Policies 5 and MTRA4) the nature of the development requires a location adjacent to the existing waste site and the site's good transport connections mean that it is deemed an acceptable site location (Policy 29). A condition will ensure that the site is restored if the waste use ceases (Policy 9). The proposal provides a sustainable waste management solution with a useable end product that diverts waste up the

hierarchy and reduces the reliance on imported soil improver or artificial fertilisers (Policy 25). The site is not considered to be significantly visually intrusive as it is not located within a designated landscape, is already well screened to the south and west and the development proposes further screening (Policies 5, 10, 13 and CP13). The proposal will not give rise to significant adverse amenity impacts as the noise and dust levels will be acceptable (Policy 10) and mitigated by conditions and regulated where necessary through Environmental Permitting. The nature of the development would not give rise to an adverse impact on protected species or local ecological designations, and in fact will lead to a net gain in Biodiversity (Policies 3 and CP16). There is no significant flood risk or surface water increase because of the proposal (Policies 11 and CP17). Taking all of this into account, on balance the proposal is considered to constitute a sustainable waste development in line with Policy 1.

7. It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A**.

### **The Site**

8. The proposed development is located in the open countryside north of Poles Lane, approximately 0.7 kilometres (km) southwest of Compton Down, 0.8km west of Otterbourne, 2.4km east of Hursley and 2km north of Chandler's Ford (see **Appendix B**).
9. The application site comprises a triangular area covering 0.37 hectares (Ha), lying immediately to the north of the existing landscaped bund for the industrial estate and to the east of an existing farm track and line of woodland. To the north and east are open fields.
10. The site itself has generally flat topography, with the surrounding land gradually rising from Poles Lane to the south up to Shepherds Lane to the north, which results in Shepherds Lane overlooking the existing waste site, although the slight change in slope to the north does create a slightly ridged landform which does provide some screening of the application site to users of Shepherds Lane. The land is generally open with runs of mature woodland and hedges dividing up arable fields, particularly to the north of the site.
11. The application site is adjacent to an existing waste recycling development within Four Dells Farm occupied by Brooke Energy currently operating with the same external plant and equipment and associated activities.
12. The 'farmyard curtilage' of Four Dells Farm has been developed to include a number of industrial and waste uses. The existing industrial estate comprises the following:
  - An existing waste operation for the recycling of waste wood, plasterboard, and green waste, including the shredding of waste (permitted by planning permission 10/01128/HCS);

- the installation of 2 biomass boilers within the existing waste building for drying wood chip and the generation and export of electricity (permitted by planning permission 17/01081/HCS);
- manufacturing of 'AdBlue' utilising waste heat from the biomass boilers involving one production/storage building and seven external storage tanks (permitted under permission 20/00187/HCS);
- An existing agricultural building to the centre of the site, constructed in 2002 and now permitted for waste use;
- A hardpacked earth external work area surrounding the building;
- An existing bund with planting to the site's north perimeter, originally 4metres high, with planting upon its outside facing slope;
- The western area of the proposed site is currently permitted for industrial B2 and B8 use (permitted under planning permission 06/02429/FUL); and
- The site is accessed via a 240 metre (m) long shared haulage road onto Poles Lane.

13. The current planning permissions for the wider industrial estate, 10/01128/HCS, 17/01081/HCS and 20/00187/HCS, allow for the following:
- Permission to import up to 32,000 tonnes of wood, plasterboard and green waste, of which no more than 10,000 tonnes shall be plasterboard;
  - Planning permission 17/01081/HCS gives ancillary planning permission, for the installation of 2 biomass boilers within the existing waste building for drying wood chip and the generation and export of electricity;
  - Planning permission 20/00187/HCS gives permission for manufacturing of 'AdBlue' utilising waste heat from the biomass boiler, with installation of 1 production/storage building and 7 external storage tanks;
  - A limit of 4m high external stockpiles;
  - Plasterboard, gypsum and similar to be only processed and stored inside the waste building;
  - Shredding, processing and recycling of wood and green waste to the area east of the waste building;
  - Vehicular access via Poles Lane only. There is no condition limiting number of HGV movements to and from the site;
  - Hours of operation where HGVs, plant and machinery shall only enter, leave or operate between 0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0700-1300 on Saturday, with no working on Sunday or recognised Public Holidays;
  - Conditioned timing for all mechanical chipping and pelleting operations, and plasterboard processing, to be between 0800-1700 Monday to Friday with no work on Saturday, Sunday or recognised Public Holidays;
  - Permission for out of hours unmanned operation of the biomass boilers and associated chip dryer, limited to inside the building;

- Permission to burn fuel in the biomass boilers, no other burning on the site; and
  - Operation of the site in accordance with the approved environmental management scheme for the control of noise, dust and odour as per the conditions of planning permission 10/01128/HCS.
14. The application site is within the buffer of the transfer station. The site is adjacent to Four Dell Waste Facility (Hampshire County Council Site Reference WR205) which is a safeguarded aggregate recycling waste site through Policy 26 (Safeguarding – waste infrastructure) of the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) (HMWP). The site is also located 600m south of Otterbourne Waste Transfer Station, Poles Lane (Hampshire County Council Site Reference WR018). This is a safeguarded waste site through Policy 26 (Safeguarding – waste infrastructure) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
  15. The site is located 730m from the M3 motorway, part of the Hampshire [Strategic Road Network](#) (nearest junction is 12, 3.6km south).
  16. The site is located 190m southeast of Dean Copse ancient woodland. The Ampfield – Baddesley – Chilworth – Lordswood Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) lies 200m to the south of the site.
  17. The right of way Footpath no. 3 lies 70m north-west of the site. The Shepherds Lane public bridleway right of way also lies 480m to the north.
  18. The site is within the Southampton Airport Airfield Safeguarding Zone.
  19. There is no requirement for external lighting in association with this proposal.
  20. The applicant has indicated that the proposed activity is directly comparable to those industrial activities currently operated in the adjacent waste facility in respect of vehicle and machine movements in and around the site.
  21. Silkstead farm comprises roughly 850 acres of arable and sheep.
  22. The nearest residential properties to the site are:
    - 65m south-west; Four Dells Farmhouse;
    - 425m south-east; Dean Croft, numerous dwellings;
    - 530m north-east; Shepherds Lane, numerous dwellings;
    - 650m west; Silkstead Lane, numerous dwellings; and
    - 680m east; Windrush Cottage.
  23. The application is supported by a report which explains the organic benefits of compost and gypsum to the soil. The application accepts that the family farm is known for its organic approach to commercial farming, the use of green mulch is still a financial acceptance if one takes into consideration

the longer term benefits to the soil. The applicant has indicated that cost hurdle is in the vast bulk movements needed when compared to the organic chemical fertilizers. On this basis, the must be adjoining a source of green waste.

24. The application is for the processing of 1,000 tonnes of gypsum per annum. The application indicates that the gypsum recovered from waste plasterboard is a superior source of sulphur compound to chemical fertilizers, and has the benefit of supplying calcium to the soil. Gypsum is (CaSO<sub>4</sub> 2H<sub>2</sub>O) Calcium Sulphate Dihydrate. However, Gypsum is also bulky compared to organic chemical fertilizer. An example is provided in the supporting statement for the application that the sulphur required for a crop may be 125kg per hectare (ha) of ammonium sulphate (chemical fertilizer), 1000 kg of gypsum per ha. This demonstrates how bulky organic and natural nutrients are compared to in-organic chemical fertilizers.

### Planning History

25. The planning history of the site is as follows:

| <b>Application No</b>        | <b>Proposal</b>   | <b>Decision</b> | <b>Date Issued</b> |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">20/00187/HCS</a> | 1 no production / storage building for manufacturing of 'AdBlue' - with installation of 7no. external storage tanks and bund  | Granted         | 23.06.2020         |
| <a href="#">17/01081/HCS</a> | Retrospective application to regularise the biomass boiler and associated development and the waste operations  | Granted         | 15.02.2018         |
| <a href="#">15/02770/HCS</a> | The installation of 2 biomass boilers to provide heat for the drying of wood chip to produce a more marketable product, and the generation and export of electricity, with the erection of 2 flues to the existing building | Granted         | 10.02.2016         |
| <a href="#">10/01128/HCS</a> | Variation of conditions 2 and 3 of Planning permission 08/02657/HCS to allow processing of gypsum from waste plasterboard   | Granted         | 8.10.2010          |
| <a href="#">08/02657/HCS</a> | Development & operation of the facility for the recycling of waste wood and other recycled materials  | Granted         | 16.03.2009         |

26. A number of other uses have been granted planning permission on the industrial estate by Winchester City Council. These include dog kennels, dog groomers, HGV driver training centre plus other light and general industrial uses and warehouse and distribution businesses.

### **The Proposal**

27. The proposal is for the processing and storage of wood waste and gypsum at Four Dells Farm, Poles Lane, Otterbourne SO21 2DY.
28. The proposal involves the importation of up to 10,000 tonnes of green waste and 1,000 tonnes of plasterboard/gypsum waste from the existing neighbouring Four Dells waste recycling site.
29. The existing site already has permission to import up to 32,000 tonnes of wood, plasterboard and green waste, of which no more than 10,000 tonnes shall be plasterboard. None of the processed material will be removed off site. The processing of gypsum from waste plasterboard has previously been granted permission through planning permission [10/01128/HCS](#) but has not been operational for some time. Operations on site have subsequently changed which means that there is not the space on the current site for this operation.
30. The proposal is solely for the production of soil improver and natural fertiliser for the benefit of the farm.
31. The applications agricultural statement indicates that ‘the production of local compost on farm allows this by increasing soil organic matter levels, when applied to fields. Higher soil organic matter produces healthy, resilient soils with huge benefits to agriculture and the environment. They naturally form better soil structures, hold more water and nutrients, and support soil Microflora (bacteria and Fungi) and Fauna (e.g. earthworms). To make financial sense, the applicant has indicated that they need to be able to store, transport, and then spread compost to fields for around £3/t. Logistically this is difficult, and it relies heavily on avoiding unnecessary handling and transport of materials. If handled incorrectly, compost will be expensive, and financially unviable”. The location of a site adjacent to a source of green waste has therefore been selected.
32. Gypsum is a waste product which can be applied to land to provide crops with Sulphur and calcium, it also contributes to soil structure. Sulphur and calcium are also important to help plants properly utilise nitrogen and support plant cells and aid enzyme activity. The product is pH neutral and is very useful provided it can be stored and spread at little cost.

33. The proposal is estimated to result in an increase of one Heavy Goods vehicle (HGV) movement per week to the existing facility. As already noted, there is no condition limiting number of HGV movements to and from the existing facility, limits on annual tonnages being processed being imposed to provide some control on the level on activity.
34. A triangular concrete hard standing is proposed in the south western corner of the field immediately to the north of the existing waste site (see **Appendix C**). The processing and storage of the waste materials will take place on the concrete hard standing. The green waste will be shredded and stored in windrows to allow the creation of mulch using a composting process. The plasterboard/gypsum is to be reduced to a powder and stockpiled until required. The mulch and gypsum are to be used to fertilise the surrounding farmland, replacing imported fertilisers. The pad size allows appropriate storage of Compost and Gypsum until field heap sites are ready prior to field application. This allows transport of products to field sites when ground conditions are suitable, avoiding transport to field heaps in wet conditions when potential environmental damage is more likely. The 0.37ha required for hardstanding would facilitate the improvement of around 850 acres of farmland.
35. The north-west boundary will be screened by a 3 metre (m) high landscaped bund (see **Appendix D**).
36. The plant on-site will consist of a small, mobile twin shaft slow speed shredder with a magnet and 'eddy' current capability (removing ferrous and non-ferrous metals) and screener to process the green waste. Also, a small two deck screener to separate paper, fine gypsum and granular gypsum. The screening of the plasterboard/gypsum will take place within a container to minimise any dust emissions. The container is to be single skin, metal construction, approximately 15m long and 4m high. More information on the plant specifications can be found within the supporting documentation of the application.
37. Access from the highway to the existing facility will remain unchanged from the existing arrangements, being well served by existing turning areas and visibility splays.
38. Access to the application area from the existing waste operation will be via a gap created in the existing landscaped bund to allow the supply of the green waste and plasterboard/gypsum. Access points at each end of the bund will allow farm machinery access to the adjacent field.
39. The applicant has indicated that the site has been selected for a number of very good reasons. Fundamentally, the site is next to the processing plant.

The applicant has indicated that alternative sites set away from the processing plant would require unnecessary transport to and from the site, increasing transport cost and transport movements around the farm. The farm could utilise 10,000t of compost / annum. A tractor and large trailer unit can transport 15tonnes in one movement. This equates to 666 tractor and trailer movements, within the farm estate, to move the proposed 10,000t. Positioning a hardstanding away from the plant would require 666 movements to the pad, and then a further 666 movements away from the pad to field sites, ready for spreading. This effectively doubles tractor and trailer transport movements and any associated environmental implications e.g extra diesel / CO2, track deterioration etc. Keeping movements to a minimum within the estate, reduces the impact on nearby rights of way users.

40. The proposed site is located in the most easterly corner of the field in an attempt to utilise the shelter belt of trees to the north as cover, to reduce any visual impact from the northern aspect.
41. The proposed development has been assessed under [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#); 13(b) Changes and extensions and does not require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Screening under the EIA Regulations has been carried out on the proposed development as supplied. However, whilst being identified under the Regulations, it is not deemed an EIA development requiring an Environmental Statement.

### **Development Plan and Guidance**

42. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF) requires 'applications for planning permission (to) be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. Therefore, consideration of the relevant plans, guidance and policies and whether the proposal is in accordance with these is of relevance to decision making.
43. The following plans and associated policies are considered relevant to the proposal:

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF) (2021)**

44. The following paragraphs are relevant to this proposal:
  - Paragraph 11: Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
  - Paragraph 84: Support of sustainable economic growth;
  - Paragraph 110-111: Sustainable Transport; and
  - Paragraph 174: Contributions and enhancement of natural and local environment.

#### **National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) (NPPW)**

45. The following paragraphs are relevant to the proposal:
- Paragraph 1: Delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency; and
  - Paragraph 7: Determining planning applications.

**National Waste Planning Practice Guidance (NWPPG)** (last updated 15/04/2015)

46. The following paragraphs are relevant to the proposal:
- Paragraph 007 (Self-sufficiency and proximity principle);
  - Paragraph 0046 (Need); and
  - Paragraph 0050: (Planning and regulation).

**Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013)** (HMWP)

47. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:
- Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development);
  - Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation);
  - Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species);
  - Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside);
  - Policy 8 (Protection of soils);
  - Policy 9 (Restoration of quarries and waste developments);
  - Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity);
  - Policy 12 (Managing traffic);
  - Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development);
  - Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management);
  - Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development); and
  - Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management).

**Winchester City Council (Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (2013))  
(WCCCS (2013))**

48. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:
- Policy DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles;
  - Policy MTRA4 – Development in the Countryside;
  - Policy CP10 – Transport;
  - Policy CP12 – Renewable and Decentralised Energy;
  - Policy CP13 – High Quality Design; and
  - Policy CP16 – Biodiversity.

**Winchester City Council (Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and  
Site Allocations (2013))**

- Policy DM1 – Location of New Development;
- Policy DM10 – Essential Facilities and Services in the Countryside;
- Policy DM15 – Local Distinctiveness;
- Policy DM16 – Site Design Criteria;
- Policy DM17 – Site Development Principles;
- Policy DM18 – Access and Parking;
- Policy DM19 – Development and Pollution;
- Policy DM20 – Development and Noise; and
- Policy DM23 – Rural Character.

**Consultations**

49. **County Councillor Warwick:** Has no objection subject to robust conditions.
50. **Winchester City Council:** Objection due to landscape and encroachment into the countryside and concerns over local amenity and ecology.
51. **Winchester City Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO):** Has no objection subject to conditions.
52. **Otterbourne Parish Council:** Has no objection subject to conditions.
53. **Compton & Shawford Parish Council:** Objection due to landscape and encroachment into the countryside, impact on local amenity and highways.
54. **Hursley Parish Council:** Was notified.
55. **Environment Agency:** Has no objection.
56. **Local Highway Authority:** Has no objection.
57. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** Has no comment.

58. **Landscape Planning and Heritage (Landscape) (Hampshire County Council):** Has no objection subject to conditions on screening, planting and stockpile heights.
59. **Landscape Planning and Heritage (Archaeology) (Hampshire County Council):** Has no objection subject to conditions.
60. **County Ecologist (Hampshire County Council):** Has no objection subject to conditions.
61. **Planning Policy (Hampshire County Council):** Has no objection subject to the development demonstrating accordance with the policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan [HMWP] (2013).
62. **Rights of Way Manager:** Has no objection.

### **Representations**

63. Hampshire County Council's [Statement of Community Involvement \(2017\)](#) (SCI) sets out the adopted consultation and publicity procedures associated with determining planning applications.
64. In complying with the requirements of the SCI, Hampshire County Council:
  - Published a notice of the application in the [Hampshire Independent](#);
  - Placed notices of the application at the application site;
  - Consulted all statutory and non-statutory consultees in accordance with [The Town and Country Planning \(Development Management Procedure\) \(England\) Order 2015](#); and
  - Notified by letter the nearest residential properties which are between 425 and 680 metres of the boundary of the site.
65. As of 23 August 2021, a total of nine representations to the proposal have been received. There was one representation in support of the proposal and eight objected to the proposal. The main areas of concern raised in the objections related to the following areas:
  - Noise;
  - Visual impact;
  - Development in the countryside;
  - Lighting;
  - Dust;
  - Traffic;
  - Damage to the environment.
66. The above issues will be addressed within the following commentary, (except where identified as not being relevant or material to the decision).

## Habitats Regulation Assessment [HRA]

67. The [Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017](#) (otherwise known as the 'Habitats Regulations') transpose European Directives into UK law. In accordance with the Habitats Regulations, Hampshire County Council (as a 'competent authority') must undertake a formal assessment of the implications of any new projects we may be granting planning permission for e.g. proposals that may be capable of affecting the qualifying interest features of the following European designated sites:
- Special Protection Areas [SPAs];
  - Special Areas of Conservation [SACs]; and
  - Ramsars.
68. Collectively this assessment is described as 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA). The HRA will need to be carried out unless the project is wholly connected with or necessary to the conservation management of such sites' qualifying features.
69. The HRA screening hereby carried out by the MWPA considers the proposed development to have **no likely significant effect** on any identified European designated sites due to:
- It is not located at a distance to be considered to have proximity to directly impact on the European designated sites;
  - The site is not considered to have any functional impact pathways connecting the proposed works with any European designated sites; and
  - The proposal does not have any significant increase on any adverse impacts the wider site may have.

## Climate Change

70. Hampshire County Council declared a [climate change emergency](#) on 17 June 2019. A [Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan](#) has since been adopted by the Council. When it comes to planning decisions, consideration of the relevant national or local climate change planning policy is of relevance. The Strategy and Action Plan does not form part of the development plan so is not material to decision making.
71. This proposed development has been subject to consideration of Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adoption) of the HMWP (2013) and Paragraph 152 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF). The development proposes the reuse of waste product imported to the adjacent waste recycling facility to provide mulch and natural fertiliser for use on the agricultural unit. This not only negates the need to import soil improver and fertiliser, reducing lorry movements to the site, but greatly reduces the transport impacts of exporting the green waste and plasterboard from the waste site to other more distant markets. It is acknowledged that the use of machinery to undertake the process will lead to some emissions

but this has not been raised as a concern through the consultation process. The plant to be used is comparable the plant used on the adjacent the site.

72. On balance, the sustainable reuse of green waste and gypsum and the reduction of transport impacts are therefore considered to meet the aims of Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adoption) of the HMWP (2013) and Paragraph 152 of the NPPF (2021).

## **Commentary**

### Principle of the development

73. Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the HMWP (2013) states that the Hampshire Authorities will take a positive approach to minerals and waste development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF (2021).
74. Policy 2 (Climate Change – mitigation and adaptation) of the HMWP (2013) states that minerals and waste developments should minimise their impact on the causes of climate change. Where applicable, minerals and waste developments should reduce vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts of climate change by being located and designed to help the more sustainable use of resources.
75. Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management) of the HMWP (2013) supports development which encourages sustainable waste management and drives waste to be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy. It should also be located near to the sources of waste or market for its use and maximise opportunities to share infrastructure at appropriate existing minerals or waste sites.
76. The proposal would use waste materials which are being brought to the site as part of the wider AD facility, for wider agricultural benefits. The proposal is to use green waste and plasterboard from the adjacent existing waste site for processing. The waste operation results in the creation of organic fertiliser for use on surrounding agricultural land as the applicant wishes to improve the quality of the soil for production and environmental benefits on the wider agricultural estate.
77. The proposed site is immediately adjacent to the source of the material and all the processed material is to be used within the Silkstead Farm estate. The proposal is therefore considered to satisfy the requirement for a more sustainable use of resources and drive waste to be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy. It also leads to a reduction in traffic movements, to either find alternative sources of fertiliser or materials or to remove the waste from the existing facility to other markets. The

proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 (Climate Change – mitigation and adaptation) and 25 (Sustainable waste management) of the HMWP (2013).

78. Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013) considers the siting of different waste activities. This is considered in more detail in the **need** section of the commentary. These are generally sited in urban areas in the north-east and south Hampshire, along strategic road corridors or areas of major new or planned development. Parts 1 and 2 of the Policy are not relevant to this proposal. Part 3 of Policy 29 states that development in other locations will be supported where it is demonstrated that the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed and a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified. The location of the existing waste operations at the site have demonstrated that the site has good transport connections to the source of the waste and the market for its use, and the applicant has argued that the site is the most viable location on the farm as it lies adjacent to the waste source. The transport connections and the need for the proposal are considered in more detail in the relevant sections of this commentary.
79. It is noted that concerns have been raised about development in the countryside and the effective extension of the industrial estate and these issues will be addressed in the **countryside section** of this commentary.

### Need

80. Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the HMWP (2013) requires that waste developments in the open countryside will not be permitted unless the nature of the development is related to countryside activities, meets local needs or requires a countryside or isolated location.
81. As already noted, the proposal is to use waste wood and plasterboard from the existing waste facility located adjacent to the site for storage and processing. This will create mulch and powdered gypsum for use on the surrounding farmland as soil improver and fertiliser. The use of clean, powdered gypsum is recognised as a valuable source of calcium and sulphur as an agricultural fertiliser.
82. The proposal is solely for the production of soil improver and natural fertiliser for the benefit of the farm.
83. As already noted, the applications Agricultural Statement indicates that 'the production of local compost on farm allows this by increasing soil organic matter levels, when applied to fields. Higher soil organic matter produces healthy, resilient soils with huge benefits to agriculture and the environment.

They naturally form better soil structures, hold more water and nutrients, and support soil Microflora (bacteria and Fungi) and Fauna (e.g. earthworms). An increase of just 1% soil organic matter is the equivalent to soils holding an extra 200t water /ha. Increased water holding capacity and water infiltration rates increases soil resilience from extreme weather events with less potential for soil erosion and flooding, and ultimately produces better crops with reduced dependence on inorganic inputs. Organic matter also serves to feed the soil biome, increasing biodiversity. Whilst compost has many obvious benefits, it is important to remember it is a nutritionally dilute, bulky organic fertiliser that has to be applied in huge quantities to meet at least some of a crops nutritional requirement. Typical application rates would be around 30t/ha. Taking figures from the industry standard RB209 handbook, nitrogen supply from compost is negligible, but it does supply around 1.5Kg/t of crop available Phosphate and 3.4Kg/t of crop available Potash. This equates to only £2.94/t worth of nutrition available to the crop. To make financial sense, we need to be able to store, transport, and then spread compost to fields for around £3/t. Logistically this is difficult, and it relies heavily on avoiding unnecessary handling and transport of materials. If handled incorrectly, compost will be expensive, and financially unviable”.

84. Gypsum is a waste product which can be applied to land to provide crops with Sulphur and calcium, it also contributes to soil structure. Sulphur and calcium are also important to help plants properly utilise nitrogen and support plant cells and aid enzyme activity. The product is pH neutral and is very useful provided it can be stored and spread at little cost.
85. Parts 1 and 2 of the Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013) are not relevant to this proposal. Part 3 of Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013) states that development in other locations will be supported where it is demonstrated that the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed and a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified.
86. The recycling of plasterboard is a sustainable re-use of waste material to move it up the waste hierarchy and prevent disposal to landfill. It also has wider soil improvement benefits as discussed later in this commentary. The applicant has demonstrated the need and sustainability principles behind the proposal. On this basis, the application has demonstrated that there is a source of waste and an end market. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies 5 and 29 of the HMWP (2013) with regards to need.

#### Development in the countryside

87. The site lies outside the settlement boundary defined within the Winchester City Council Local Plan (2013) (WCCLP) and as such is located in the

countryside. It is recognised that the proposal effectively extends the industrial estate into the countryside.

88. Policy MTRA4 (Development in the Countryside) of the WCCLP (2013) will only permit development that has an operational need for such a location. The policy lists types of development which are acceptable in the countryside, provided they do not cause harm to the character and landscape of the area or create inappropriate noise/light and traffic generation. One of the forms of development allowed is that which has an operational need for a countryside location, such as for agriculture. The supporting information indicates that the waste operation results in the creation of organic fertiliser for use on surrounding agricultural land as the applicant wishes to improve the quality of the soil for production and environmental benefits. On these grounds, the application would comply with Policy MTRA4 as a countryside location is required to store product for use on the surrounding fields without excessive transportation. Conditions are proposed to reduce the impact of the proposal and to limit its use solely for the benefit of the farm as noted in the next section of this commentary.
89. However, this application is also for an extension of the industrial use of Four Dells Farm for waste processing. It is acknowledged that the expansion of the site is not supported by Policy MTRA4 of the WCCLP (2013). The applicant has justified the siting of the proposed development adjacent to the existing industrial estate on the grounds that alternative areas of the farm set away from the processing plant would require unnecessary transport to and from the site, increasing transport cost and transport movements around the farm and associated emissions. The applicant has chosen the south-west corner of the field in an attempt to utilise the shelter belt of trees to the north-west and the local topography as cover, to reduce any visual impact from the northern aspect. The applicant has stated that they do not now have an interest in the existing waste site and so siting their own operation within the existing industrial estate is not viable. So, to be financially viable, and reduce impacts on the environment, the logistics of product storage, movement and application is fundamental. Double handling of material could potentially reduce an environmental opportunity, to a financial burden. It is for these reasons it is argued that the location of the hardstanding pad must be located next to the existing processing plant. The expansion of the industrial estate into the countryside is not supported by Policy MTRA4 of the WCCLP (2013). Winchester City Council have objected to the proposal on these grounds.
90. The proposal is for a permanent development to supply the farm estate. This means that to meet Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the HMWP (2013), the nature of the development must require a countryside or isolated location. It has already been shown that Policy MTRA4 of the WCCLP (2013) considers that a development for agricultural purposes is considered as having an operational need for a countryside location.

91. It should also be noted that the laying of a hardstanding and the storage of product for agricultural use does not need permission from the Waste Planning Authority, so could be undertaken without any conditions or restrictions under permitted development in the proposed location.
92. Part 3 of Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013) is relevant to the proposal. The Policy states that development in other locations will be supported where it is demonstrated that the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed alongside a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified as already set out. The location of the existing waste operations at the site have demonstrated that the site has good transport connections and the applicant has argued that the site is the most viable location on the farm as it lies adjacent to the waste source. The agricultural need for the development has also been demonstrated as already noted. The applicant has argued that the site is the most viable location on the farm. The transport connections and the need for the proposal are considered in more detail in the relevant sections of this commentary. Conditions are included in **Appendix A** that the site be restored if it is no longer required for waste use, as well as restricting the development to be used solely for the benefit of the farm and not as part of the industrial estate activities,
93. Subject to the conditions proposed. the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 5 (Protection of the countryside) and 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013) and Policy MTRA4 (Development in the countryside) of the WCCLP (2013). It is acknowledged that the expansion of the industrial estate into the countryside is not supported by Policy MTRA4 of the WCCLP (2013). However, this needs to be balanced against the need for the proposal amongst other considerations. In this instance, the need for the facility and its ability to provide in situ soil conditioner for the wider farm estate is recognised. Should permission be granted, conditions would need to be imposed to restrict the use solely for the benefit of the farm to separate the industrial estate from the farm development.

#### Visual impact and landscape

94. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2021) states planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the HMWP (2013) protects residents from significant adverse visual impact. In addition, Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the HMWP (2013) requires that waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape.

95. Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the HMWP (2013) also applies and requires that minerals and waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape and townscape.
96. Policy DM23 (Rural Character) of the Winchester Local Plan Part 2 (2013) states that development will be permitted where they do not have an unacceptable effect on the rural character of the area, by means of visual intrusion, the introduction of incongruous features, the destruction of locally characteristic rural assets, or by impacts on the tranquillity of the environment.
97. Concerns have been raised in representations relating to the potential landscape and visual impact of the development and these are noted. These include objections from Winchester City Council and Compton and Shawford Parish Council on the grounds of landscape impact, encroachment into the countryside and concerns over local amenity.
98. The site is currently an empty agricultural field with existing tree screening along the western boundary and the existing landscaped bund of the Industrial Estate to the south. The land is not degraded by previous development.
99. Following the initial period of public consultation, a subsequent Landscape Plan was submitted including a 3m high bund along the north-east boundary, to be planted with similar specification to the existing bund along the southern boundary. The bund has a gap at each end to allow farm machinery access to the stockpiles of product for spreading on the farm. A subsequent Phase 1 Ecological Assessment was also submitted which suggested a number of measures to mitigate any impact and enhance the ecological potential.
100. The proposal by virtue of the screening afforded to the development by the surrounding planting (and the lower level of the topography) and the ecological mitigation and enhancement proposed in the Ecological Report, can be said to enhance the environment and not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact.
101. County Landscape were consulted on the amended proposals and subject to the bund blocking the view of the access from Bridleway 4 to the north and the inclusion of conditions restricting stockpile heights to 4m and requiring the submission of planting details, have no objection to the development. These conditions are included in **Appendix A**. On the basis of the mitigation measures and conditions proposed, the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 5 (Protection of the countryside), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) and Policy DM23 (Rural Character) of the WCCLP (2013).

## Soil Protection

102. Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the HMWP (2013) requires minerals and waste development to protect and, wherever possible, enhance soils. It also states that development should not result in the net loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and gives provisions for the protection of soils during construction. The Agricultural Land Classification (ACL) system classifies land into five grades, with Grade 3 subdivided into Subgrades 3a and 3b. The best and most versatile land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a.
103. It is noted that the current use of the land is grazing/arable crop production/recreation. This site is noted as Grade 3 ACL. Natural England consider any site less than 20 hectares in size to not represent a significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site also intends to utilise the existing soils on site to create the bunds, and so, in the event that the use of the site ceases and is restored, there would be minimal loss of soils.
104. The proposal to process green waste and gypsum as a soil improver will have benefits to the estates soils.
105. The nature of the proposal in relation to soils is considered to be in accordance with Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the HMWP (2013). The ability to produce a soil improver as part of the development also gives the proposal additional benefits.

## Cultural and Archaeological Heritage

106. Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the HMWP (2013) requires minerals and waste development to protect and, wherever possible, enhance Hampshire's historic environment and heritage assets (designated and non-designated), including their settings unless it is demonstrated that the need for and benefits of the development decisively outweigh these interests.
107. The County Archaeologist was consulted on the application. Although no archaeological remains are currently recorded at that location the site has some archaeological potential, there being a prehistoric field system to the east, and substantial Roman settlement to the south, prehistoric stone artefacts recorded to the south east and an enclosure potentially associated with Roman occupation to the west. Consequently, The County Archaeologist therefore recommended that conditions are attached to any permission to secure an archaeological watching brief to ensure that any archaeological remains exposed by the topsoil stripping are recognised and recorded and that as far as possible they are protected during operations to rebury them with the hardcore surface. These conditions have been included in **Appendix A**.

108. On the basis of the proposed conditions, the proposal is considered in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the HMWP (2013).

### Ecology

109. Paragraph 174 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF (2021) states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.
110. Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the HMWP (2013) sets out a requirement for minerals and waste development to not have a significant adverse effect on, and where possible, should enhance, restore or create designated or important habitats and species. The policy sets out a list of sites, habitats and species which will be protected in accordance with the level of their relative importance. The policy states that development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon the identified sites, habitats and species will only be permitted where it is judged that the merits of the development outweigh any likely environmental damage. The policy also sets out a requirement for appropriate mitigation and compensation measures where development would cause harm to biodiversity interests.
111. The applicant initially argued that as the land is a small awkward corner of an arable field a habitat survey was not relevant to this application and that, if granted, the application would not hinder work done by the farm conservation schemes. However, this view was not supported by the County Ecologist and an Ecological Impact Assessment was subsequently submitted. This included a number of measures to mitigate any impact and enhance the ecological potential.
112. The County Ecologist was consulted on this Assessment and concluded that the report is robust and provides useful mitigation proposals which, if undertaken, will manage the potential impacts of the development. The proposal is considered a positive step for the environment, and the Ecologist is pleased that the ecology report can shape the implementation of the proposals to deliver net gain in biodiversity.
113. The summary of the report suggests that enhancements to demonstrate biodiversity net gain including new screen planting, two bird boxes and two informal hibernacula will be provided. The Ecologist agrees with the suggestions to achieve net gain within the proposal, so a condition for the provision of a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan should be required. This should include a plan setting out the location and extent of the landscape planting, as well as specifications for the planting and seed mixes to be used. This should also include the location and specification for the bird boxes and hibernacula, as well as setting out the methodology for

construction/soil preparation and timescales for delivery and future management. This will enable this aspect of the development to be monitored adequately and ensure that there is certainty around delivery of the mitigation/net gain. This condition is included in **Appendix A**.

114. On the basis of a condition for a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, the County Ecologist raises no objection to the proposal and as such the development is in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the HMWP (2013) and Paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2021).

#### Impact on amenity and health

115. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the HMWP (2013) requires that any development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. This is echoed by Policy DM19 (Development and Pollution) of the WCCLP (2013). Also, any proposal should not cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between waste developments and other forms of development.
116. As previously mentioned, the impact on the local amenity, both in terms of effectively increasing the size of the industrial estate and the impact of noise and dust, is a recurring theme of the representations against the proposal.
117. The Environmental Health Officer (EHO) was consulted, and his initial response was that the applicant had not undertaken a full assessment of the potential noise and dust impacts or proposed any mitigation. Subsequent negotiation resulted in new proposals for the processing of the plasterboard, such that it would now be contained to minimise any dust emissions. Final details of the construction of the container and method of working would need to be conditioned as part of a dust management scheme. These conditions are included in **Appendix A**.
118. A Noise Impact Assessment was also submitted following discussions with the EHO. The operation of the proposed plant was assessed to establish if the development will have a demonstrable adverse effect in terms of noise that outweigh the benefits of the development. Measurements were undertaken in accordance with British Standard 4142:2014 and ISO 1996 – Part 2: 2007. The report established the existing background noise levels at the closest residential façade to the site and the assessment of the impact of the site operation on nearby residential properties. The report concluded that the resulting emissions from the site running on a worst case scenario show no conflict with 'low impact' criteria and give a strong indication that impact on the local amenity is unlikely provided the recommended acoustic works are implemented as detailed. The EHO has confirmed that they do not have any major issues with the conclusions of the Assessment, however they have required a number of conditions be attached should planning permission be granted, including hours of operation, detailed design and location of the screening bund, limits on plant and machinery in operation

and quantities of throughput to indirectly control plant usage. These conditions have all been included in **Appendix A**.

119. The Environment Agency have been consulted, and as the authority regulating pollution control and groundwater protection, have no comment on the impact on groundwater resources or public health. An Environmental Permit will be required which will satisfactorily address basic requirements.
120. On the basis of the proposed conditions, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting the health, safety and amenity) of the HMWP (2013) and Policies DM19 (Development and Pollution) and DM20 (Development and Noise) of the WCCLP (2013).

#### Potential pollution associated with the development

121. National Planning Practice Guidance states that Planning Authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively rather than seek to control any processes, health and safety issues or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under other regimes ([Paragraph 050 Reference ID: 28-050-20141016](#))
122. Planning and permitting decisions are separate but closely linked. Planning permission determines if a development is an acceptable use of the land. Permitting determines if an operation can be managed on an ongoing basis to prevent or minimise pollution.
123. Material imported to the site shall comprise of green waste and plasterboard. This material will be processed to produce soil improver and fertiliser. The site will require an Environmental Permit which will control the suitability of the waste material imported to the site.

#### Flooding

124. Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the HMWP (2013) relates to minerals and waste development in flood risk areas and sets criteria which developments should be consistent with relating to flood risk offsite, flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures, design of drainage, net surface water run-off and Sustainable Drainage Systems.
125. The Lead Local Flood Authority was consulted in relation to the proposal but as the site is less than one hectare it is considered a minor application and outside of its remit. The Environment Agency was also consulted and raised no objection. An Environmental Permit will also be required which will address surface water management if considered necessary.
126. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the HMWP (2013).

#### Highway impact

127. Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the HMWP (2013) requires minerals and waste development to have a safe and suitable access to the highway network and where possible minimise the impact of its generated traffic using alternative methods of transportation. It also requires highway improvements to mitigate any significant adverse effects on highway safety, pedestrian safety, highway capacity and environment and amenity.
128. Furthermore, as already noted, Part 3 of Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013) states that development in other locations will be supported where it is demonstrated that the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed along with a special need for that location. The proposed site clearly demonstrates good transport connections to the source of the waste and the market for its use, and the applicant has argued that the site is the most viable location on the farm.
129. As already noted, there is no condition limiting number of HGV movements to and from the existing facility, limits on annual tonnages being processed being imposed to provide some control on the level on activity. A condition to limit on the quantity of green waste and plasterboard, which is to be taken from the existing facility, is proposed to maintain this control. A condition has also been proposed to limit the use of this development solely for use on the farm and prevent any material being removed off the farm once transferred.
130. The Local Highway Authority was consulted and considered that as the products processed at the site will stay at the farm, the traffic impact to the highways will be minimal with less than one additional HGV vehicle movement per week and consequently have no objection to the proposal.
131. The proposal is therefore considered to satisfy Policies 12 (Managing traffic) and 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the HMWP (2013).

### Conclusion

132. It is considered that the proposal would, on balance, be in accordance with the relevant policies of the HMWP (2013) and WCCLP (2013) and will:
- recycle waste at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy, producing sustainable product for the wider farm, reducing the transport impacts of importing finished product and artificial fertilisers;
  - have good transport connections to the sources of and/or markets for the type of waste proposed to be managed at the site;
  - limit the development solely to the use of the farm and not allow further increase in the size or intensification of the existing industrial estate;
  - not cause an unacceptable adverse visual or landscape impact; and
  - not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and/or unacceptable adverse amenity impacts.

## **Recommendation**

133. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in Appendix A.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Conditions

Appendix B – Committee Plan

Appendix C – draft Layout Plan

Appendix D – draft Landscaping Plan

Other documents relating to this application:

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/Planning/Display/20/01546/HCS>

**REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:**

**Links to the Strategic Plan**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:</b>  | No |
| <b>People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:</b>   | No |
| <b>People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:</b>   | No |
| <b>People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:</b>  | No |
| <b>OR</b>  |    |
| <b>This proposal does not link to the Strategic Plan but, nevertheless, requires a decision because:</b><br>the proposal is an application for planning permission and requires determination by the County Council in its statutory role as the minerals and waste or local planning authority. |    |

*NB: If the 'Other significant links' section below is not applicable, please delete it.*

**Other Significant Links**

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Links to previous Member decisions:</b>                           |             |
| <u>Title</u>   | <u>Date</u> |
|  |             |
| <b>Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives</b> |             |
| <u>Title</u>   | <u>Date</u> |
|  |             |

**Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents**

**The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)**

Document

Location

20/01546/HCS

Hampshire County Council

WR215

Four Dells Farm, Poles Lane, Otterbourne  
SO21 2DY

(Processing and storage of wood waste  
and gypsum

## **EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:**

### **1. Equality Duty**

The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by or under the Act with regard to the protected characteristics as set out in section 4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation);
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (see above) and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

- The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

Officers considered the information provided by the applicant, together with the response from consultees and other parties, and determined that the proposal would have no material impact on individuals or identifiable groups with protected characteristics. Accordingly, no changes to the proposal were required to make it acceptable in this regard.

## CONDITIONS

### Layout

1. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed Layout Plan shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority and approved in writing. The Layout Plan shall show the location of all processing plant and stockpiles of raw material and processed product. It shall also show the screening bund and the access from the adjacent site. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenity of the local area in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered to clarify the exact layout of the development with regards the access, the screening, operating areas and stockpiles to ensure the concerns of consultees are addressed and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

2. Prior to the commencement of development, details of the construction of the access from the adjacent site shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority and approved in writing. No work to the access shall be undertaken until the screening bund approved under condition 8 is constructed.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to control the development and to minimise its impact on the community of the local area in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered to clarify the construction method and materials of the access to prevent removal of the screening of the existing facility until the screening bund is in place and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

### Tonnages

3. No more than 10,000 tonnes of green waste and 1,000 tonnes of plasterboard shall be imported to the site per annum. A written record of tonnage entering the site associated with the permission hereby granted shall be kept onsite and shall be made available to the Waste Planning Authority for inspection upon request.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Farm use**

4. This planning permission shall only benefit Silkstead Farm. No material associated with the permission hereby granted shall be sold or removed off Silkstead Farm.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Hours of working**

5. No heavy goods vehicles (HGVs are vehicles over 3.5 tonnes gross weight), except farm vehicles moving processed material around Silkstead Farm, shall enter or leave the site and no plant or machinery shall be operated except between the following hours: 08.00 - 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 - 13.00 Saturday. There shall be no working on Sundays or recognised Public Holidays. The movement of processed material within Silkstead Farm shall be restricted to between the hours of 0700 and 2300.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Plant**

6. There shall be only one shredder and screener for handling green waste and one screener for processing plasterboard on site. Only one piece of equipment shall be in operation at any one time.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Landscaping**

7. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall specify the design and

location of the screening bund; the types, size and species of all trees and shrubs to be planted; timescales for carrying out the works, and provision for future maintenance. Any trees or shrubs which, within a period of five years from the date of planting, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered to clarify the species, sizes and spacing of plants to be used to satisfy the requirement to adequately screen the site and blend with the existing landscape and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

8. Use of the development hereby permitted shall not take place unless and until the bund approved under condition 8 has been erected as approved. The bund shall be maintained as approved for the duration of the development.

Reason: To prevent noise disturbance to the residents of the nearest houses in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Dust management**

9. Prior to the commencement of development, an Environmental Management Scheme for the control of dust at the site shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority and approved in writing. The Scheme shall be implemented as approved for the duration of the permission.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered to clarify the measures to control dust emissions as required by the Environmental Health Officer and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

10. Prior to the importation or processing of any plasterboard a Plasterboard Containment Scheme for the control of gypsum production at the site shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority and approved in writing. The Scheme shall include details of the construction of the containment of the plasterboard shredding process, including dimensions, materials and

finishes, how the plasterboard is to be loaded and unloaded and measures to control dust from the process. The Scheme shall be implemented as approved for the duration of the permission.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Lighting**

11. There shall be no lighting of the development.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of fauna, landscape character and visual and local amenity in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Stockpiles**

12. Stockpiles of materials or finished product shall not exceed 4 metres in height

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Archaeology**

13. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of an Archaeological Watching Brief in accordance with a written specification that has been submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

### **Ecology**

14. Prior to commencement of the development, a detailed scheme of biodiversity enhancements as included in the Ecological Impact Assessment submitted May 2021 shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority and

approved in writing. This should include the location and specification for the bird boxes and hibernacula, setting out the methodology for construction/soil preparation and timescales for delivery and future management.

Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with any such approved details.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered to clarify the details of the biodiversity enhancements to secure net gain in line with the Ecological Impact Assessment and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

15. Clearance of any vegetation shall only take place between September and February (inclusive) and in the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works in accordance with Ecological Impact Assessment CRM.1906.001.EC.R.001 dated 26th May 2021.

Reason: To avoid impacts to nesting birds protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and in the interests of nature conservation in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

## **Restoration**

16. Should the development cease then the site will be reinstated to its original condition using the soils contained in the screening bund.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory restoration in accordance with Policies 5 (Protection of the countryside) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

## **Plans**

17. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: **Location Plan, Site Management Plan, Cross Sections, Landscape Plan**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

## **Note to Applicants**

1. In determining this planning application, the Waste Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner in accordance with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
2. This decision does not purport or convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or any other Acts, including Byelaws, orders or Regulations made under such acts.
3. Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 the operator of a waste site will require an environmental permit for the importation, storage and treatment of waste.