

Hampshire Minerals Plan - Preferred Options



1 Introduction

Introduction

1.1 The Hampshire Minerals Plan is a Development Plan Document (DPD) and will form part of the development plan for Hampshire.

1.2 The Hampshire Minerals Plan is being prepared by the minerals and waste planning authorities in Hampshire (and part of Wiltshire) - Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils and the New Forest National Park Authority. The Plan is part of a series of Mineral and Waste Local Development Documents (MWLDDs) that will form the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (HMWDF). These MWLDDs also include:

- Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy - adopted July 2007
- Hampshire Waste Management Plan - being prepared
- Proposals Map - being prepared

1.3 The HMWDF overall will supercede the Hampshire Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1998) and will cover the period to 2020.

1.4 The contents of the Hampshire Minerals Plan are set out in the Core Strategy (para 13.2) and include the following requirements:

- Policies and plans for specific sites and locations and 'areas of search' for mineral development including clay, sand and gravel extraction, wharves and depots.
- Sites for the manufacture of recycled and secondary aggregates and landfill.
- Safeguarding areas around and including existing and proposed development.
- Detailed plans showing the Mineral Resource Area, Landfill Potential Areas, Areas of Search for the Strategic Reserve (2016 - 2020).
- Mineral Safeguarding Areas for brick-making clay, sand and gravel.
- Buffer zones around internationally designated habitats.

1.5 The detailed requirements of the Core Strategy that need to be delivered through the Hampshire Minerals Plan are set out in section 2 of this document.

Purpose Of This Document

1.6 This document is a 'Preferred Options' consultation and sets out the planning authorities' latest thinking in relation to delivering the minerals elements of the Core Strategy. The document should be considered as a 'work in progress' indicating in broad terms the likely direction of travel. Key statements are identified in bold text or within coloured boxes.

1.7 The final version of the Hampshire Minerals Plan will be drafted following this consultation. It is intended to submit it to Government in October 2008 and a Public Examination programmed for hearings in spring 2009 will be carried out by an independent Planning Inspector.

Consultation

1.8 Quarrying, landfill and construction waste recycling provide essential services to society. They can also provide an excellent opportunity to meet wider community or environmental objectives through careful design of facilities and well planned and managed restoration. However these developments are controversial and consultation is an essential element of their planning.

Introduction 1

1.9 Stakeholders were consulted during a review of the minerals components of the old Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan. They were keen to see quarries selected that would give maximum benefits through restoration - in effect a 'restoration-led' approach to site selection. These views were reflected in Core Strategy policy (DC12).

1.10 Consultation undertaken at the 'Issues and Options' preparation stage of the Hampshire Minerals Plan - principally between September 2006 and June 2007 - sought information to help identify sites for further consideration as potential 'preferred options'. Full details of the Site Selection Process - including the role of consultation - can be found in section 3 of this document.

1.11 Comments are now invited on the Hampshire Minerals Plan - Preferred Options document.

1.12 This formal consultation process and your comments will assist in refining both the approach and proposals for future minerals development in Hampshire. It is important that views are put forward at this stage so that they can be properly considered before finalising the Hampshire Minerals Plan. Notwithstanding this, there will be another opportunity to make representations when the Plan is submitted to Government at the submission stage to make representations on the Hampshire Minerals Plan. These representations will then be considered by a Planning Inspector as part of the Public Examination.

1.13 Readers may wish to refer back to the Core Strategy, which can be seen and downloaded from Hampshire County Council's website at: www.hants.gov.uk/planning-development

1.14 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of this document have been carried out and readers may wish to refer to the formal Sustainability Report which can also be seen and downloaded from Hampshire County Council's website at: www.hants.gov.uk/planning-development. Comments on the Sustainability Report are also welcomed as part of this consultation.

1.15 Responses are requested by 12 December 2007. To assist a form is provided or alternatively responses can be made electronically either by email to planning@hants.gov.uk or by logging onto the dedicated consultation website at: www.hants.gov.uk/planning-development.

Glossary

1.16 A Glossary is appended to provide a plain English explanation of the technical terms and phrases used in this document.

1 Introduction

Policy Context 2

Introduction

2.1 The Hampshire Minerals Plan is a Development Plan Document (DPD) and will form part of the development plan for Hampshire.

2.2 The Hampshire Minerals Plan is being prepared by the mineral and waste planning authorities in Hampshire (and part of Wiltshire) - Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils and the New Forest National Park Authority. The Plan is part of a series of Mineral and Waste Local Development Documents (MWLDDs) that will form the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (HMWDF). These MWLDDs also include:

- Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) - adopted July 2007.
- Hampshire Waste Management Plan - being prepared.
- Proposals Map - being prepared.

2.3 The HMWDF overall will supercede the Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1998) and will cover the period to 2020.

National and Regional Policy

2.4 The public examination into the Core Strategy confirmed that it was generally consistent with national and regional planning policy, with a few locally justified exceptions. Therefore, provided the Hampshire Minerals Plan delivers and is in conformity with the Core Strategy, it will be consistent with national and regional planning policy. Notwithstanding this, the principal requirements of national and regional policy are:

- An apportionment of 2.63 million tonnes per annum of land-won sand and gravel to be supplied.
- An apportionment of 1.7 million tonnes per annum of recycled and secondary aggregate to be supplied.
- Maintenance of a 7 year landbank of permitted reserves of sand and gravel.

2.5 The sub-regional land-won sand and gravel apportionment is under review and it is anticipated that this will be submitted to Government as an amendment to the South East Plan and approved in late 2009. The impact of this is addressed in para **XXX** below.

Other Relevant Plans and Programmes

2.6 A detailed review of relevant plans, policies and programmes is set out in the Joint Baseline Report, which accompanies the Sustainability Report.

2.7 The following key plans, projects and programmes are likely to have the greatest effect on the ongoing development of the Hampshire Minerals Plan and have been taken into account - as far as possible given in many cases their ongoing nature - in preparing this document. and These will also need to be taken into account when preparing the final version for submission to Government. Many of the plans, projects and proposals are being prepared in parallel with the Hampshire Minerals Plan.

2.8 Local Development Frameworks are being prepared by district and unitary councils and the New Forest National Park Authority within Hampshire. Particularly relevant are Core Strategies, Site Allocation and Area Action Plan DPDs as these have an impact on safeguarded mineral resources and existing developments.

2 Policy Context

2.9 Minerals and Waste Development Frameworks are being prepared by neighbouring minerals and waste planning authorities and their constituent DPDs could contain policies and proposals that may have an effect by themselves or in combination with those in the Hampshire Minerals Plan. Proposals close to the Hampshire boundary may have particular environmental or economic impacts.

2.10 Sustainable Community Strategies are being prepared by Hampshire and neighbouring local authorities and although they do not address minerals issues directly, they can have implications for the Hampshire Minerals Plan. Particularly relevant are the elements of the strategies that address resource management and environmental well being.

2.11 The New Forest Management Plan which is being prepared by the New Forest National Park Authority may have implications for potential minerals developments and their restoration around the edges of the national park.

2.12 The ongoing designation process for the South Downs National Park may ultimately result in a new national park covering a large swathe of Hampshire to the east of Winchester and could have implications on the options for minerals development in this area.

Core Strategy

2.13 The Core Strategy sets out the Spatial Vision for the overall HMWDF. However, the following elements of the Vision need to be delivered either wholly or in part through the Hampshire Minerals Plan:

- By 2020, Hampshire will have a world class and sustainable material resources system that maximises both the efficient use of primary materials and the reuse and recycling of wastes, and minimises the need for disposal.
- The manufacture, to high standards suitable for reuse without wastage, of recycled and secondary raw materials will be commonplace throughout the county.
- The amount of waste going to landfill will be very limited in quantity and biodegradable content.
- Hampshire's apportioned share of the national and regional need for minerals will be met, without avoidable delay or disruption to supply, and with the minimum of environmental damage.
- Minerals and waste activities will be sized and located sensitively, such that they reduce the impact of road transport and meet the present and future needs of communities, business and the environment.

2.14 The Core Strategy also contained a number of Spatial Objectives of which the following are relevant to the Hampshire Minerals Plan:

- Ensure that infrastructure for the management of waste and the extraction of minerals are developed with due regard to the principles of sustainable development.
- Provide for a supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local requirements including the regional apportionments for recycled and secondary aggregates and land-won sand and gravel, with due regard to geological, environmental and market considerations.
- Encourage and safeguard facilities for the use of rail and sea transport for the movement of minerals and waste.
- Ensure that new mineral, waste and resources development are sized appropriately and designed to reduce pollution, maximise energy efficiency, promote renewable energy, encourage recycling and reduce the use of primary aggregates.

Policy Context 2

- Safeguard mineral resources and existing / potential facilities for mineral, waste and resource management.
- Ensure the high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral working and landfill taking into account public access, biodiversity, agricultural and forestry objectives, climate change considerations and aerodrome safeguarding.
- Protect land with international and national biodiversity designations, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and historic heritage sites and building of national importance from the impact of mineral and waste development.
- Protect local communities and areas of environmental interest from the adverse impact of mineral, waste and resources developments.

2.15 Hampshire has to make provision for the production of land-won sand and gravel, other minerals, recycled and secondary aggregates and some landfill capacity. This chapter sets out the detailed requirements of the Core Strategy that the Hampshire Minerals Plan has to deliver. However, since the Core Strategy was drafted in spring 2006, some changes have occurred - a number of sites have either closed, started or gained planning permission. Consequently, updated versions of some of the 'illustrative' tables in the Core Strategy are included to provide an up to date description of requirements.

Land-won Sand and Gravel Supply

Local Supply Rates

2.16 The Core Strategy (S8) sets out a local apportionment for four geographic areas of Hampshire - 0.433 million tonnes (north east Hampshire), 1.163 million tonnes (Forest), 0.643 million tonnes (Downland) and 0.391 million tonnes (south Hampshire) - which sets the context for provision for sand and gravel production in the period to 2016. This means that the Hampshire Minerals Plan should identify land - consisting of both existing sites and suitable 'new' proposals - in each of the four areas, capable of supplying sand and gravel at the annual rates specified and that the total amount supplied should be capable of exceeding 2.63 million tonnes in any one year.

2.17 It is expected that the majority of these proposals will be principally within the Mineral Resource Area shown on the Core Strategy's Key Diagram.

Land for Extraction

2.18 Locations to meet these requirements can be identified as sites, preferred areas or areas of search. In reality, there is not much difference between sites and preferred areas. Sites have boundaries that define the proposed development more precisely - reflecting the boundary which may be expected to be put forward in a planning application. Preferred areas will have a boundary coinciding with field boundaries, roads and other physical features and ownership, from within which planning applications could be expected.

2.19 The Core Strategy (para 21.12) sets out what Policy S8 means in terms of 'indicative 'new' provision' - the quantity of sand and gravel to be found from 'new' sites in each area. However, since the Strategy was drafted in spring 2006 there has been ongoing production, a reassessment of mineral reserves and a number of new planning permissions have been granted. Taking on board these changes the indicative 'new' provision for the period to 2016 (estimated for 1 January 2007) is 1.91 million tonnes (north east Hampshire), 5.27 million tonnes (Downland), 6.08 million tonnes (Forest) and 3.69 million tonnes (south Hampshire).

2 Policy Context

2.20 For illustrative purposes, the table **XXX** shows the revised indicative 'new' provision and the strategic reserve - provisionally apportioned on the same basis as in the Core Strategy - for each of Hampshire's mineral producing areas, taking account of the estimated position at 1 January 2007:

| Area | Indicative 'New' Provision (2007 - 2016) (million tonnes) | Indicative 'Strategic Reserve' Provision (2017 - 2020) (million tonnes) |
|---|---|---|
| North East Hampshire | 1.91 | 1.732 |
| Downland | 5.27 | 2.572 |
| Forest (excluding the New Forest National Park) | 6.08 | 4.652 |
| South Hampshire | 3.69 | 1.564 |
| Total | 16.95 | 10.52 |

Table 2.1 Indicative New Provision and Strategic Reserve (2007 - 2020)

Strategic Reserve

2.21 The Core Strategy also includes an indicative Strategic Reserve requirement of 10.52 million tonnes - four years at 2.63 million tonnes a year - covering the period 2017 - 2020, which was deliberately not apportioned between the four geographic areas. The Core Strategy (para 21.14) explains that provision will be made for the Strategic Reserve by means of 'areas of search' and policies to be included in the Hampshire Minerals Plan until a clearer picture of the post-2016 need for sand and gravel is gained.

2.22 However, taking on board the 0.95 million tonnes of production anticipated from existing sites in the 2017 - 2020 period the Strategic Reserve requirement remaining to be found is expected to be 9.57 million tonnes. However, proposed preferred areas will have operational life spans beyond the strategic reserve period. Consequently, provision for the remaining 9.57 million tonnes of Strategic Reserve will be met through both new proposals which have operational life spans beyond 2016 and areas of search.

Soft Sand Supply

2.23 The Core Strategy (likewise the South East Plan and Government guidance) does not make a distinction between soft sand and sharp sand and gravel. The previous local plan - which has been replaced by the Core Strategy - did make such a distinction and it sought to ensure that 18.8% of the provision for sand and gravel was met from soft sand deposits. Making a distinction between the two is not as easy as it once was because of changes in processing and production reporting techniques. However, the Hampshire Minerals Plan, will make provision for both materials, in appropriate proportions, in different areas to serve slightly different markets for each material. Production monitoring data indicates that historic sales of soft sand averaged approximately 23.8% of the total sand and gravel production in the period 1995 - 2004. Given the lack of direction elsewhere the Hampshire Minerals Plan should demonstrate that provision is made for both materials and that the overall relative proportion from soft sand deposits is in the range 20 - 25%.

Policy Context 2

Question 1

Is it appropriate for the Hampshire Minerals Plan to make a distinction between soft sand and sharp sand and gravel and to seek to make provision such that soft sand production remains between 20 - 25% of total sand and gravel production?

Landfill

2.24 New landfills should according to the Core Strategy (para 19.14) only be provided for the restoration of mineral extraction sites - in some circumstances this might include surcharging existing sites. Not all sand and gravel sites are suitable for restoration by landfill because of hydro-geological conditions, access and other environment reasons.

2.25 The Core Strategy (S7) requires the provision of upto 5.3 million tonnes of landfill for residual non-hazardous municipal, industrial and commercial waste, in the period to 2020. Accordingly the Hampshire Minerals Plan will need to identify this by a combination of existing landfill sites with remaining void - such as Blue Haze Landfill site at Ringwood - and new landfill proposals. It is proposed that these will be located principally within the Landfill Potential Area shown on the Core Strategy's Key Diagram.

2.26 In 2005 it was estimated that Hampshire had 3.6 million tonnes of un-engineered non-hazardous landfill void remaining. This means that additional non-hazardous landfill capacity will need to be found for about 2.2 million tonnes (allowing for 30% being inert materials for use as cover and landfill engineering). It is now estimated that the amount of un-engineered landfill void is 3.9 million tonnes. This means that the Hampshire Minerals Plan needs to identify suitable sites for new landfill sufficient to dispose of 1.4 million tonnes of municipal, commercial and industrial waste. Existing and new sites need to be able to accept waste at a rate of between 310,000 to 360,000 tonnes per annum as set out in the Core Strategy (para 19.9).

Restoration of Mineral Voids and Engineering

2.27 The Core Strategy (S7) sets out that 18.5 million tonnes of inert waste will be managed through the restoration of mineral excavations and in landfill engineering, and in civil engineering projects and beneficially at the site of production.

2.28 The approach is more flexible than that taken for non-hazardous residual waste because inert waste poses little pollution risk, it can have valid engineering uses and the void capacity created by existing and proposed quarries is anticipated to significantly exceed the 18.5 million tonnes of non-recyclable inert waste requiring management.

2.29 The Core Strategy (para 19.12) states that 17 million tonnes of this non-recyclable inert waste will be used to restore mineral workings.

2.30 It is unrealistic to expect the Hampshire Minerals Plan to identify every instance where inert waste will be used in engineering operations or beneficially at the site of production. However, it is reasonable for the Hampshire Minerals Plan to provide an overview of the total amount of inert material which is expected to be used in the restoration of proposed mineral sites, and to show how this amount contributes towards the 17 million tonnes set out in the Core Strategy.

2 Policy Context

Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

2.31 The Core Strategy (S9) requires that, by 2016, production capacity will be provided for the supply of recycled and secondary aggregates at a rate of 1.7 million tonnes a year, including provision for the reprocessing of 100,000 tonnes of incinerator bottom ash.

2.32 Further clarification the role of the Hampshire Minerals Plan in making provision is provided by the supporting text of the Core Strategy. In particular, The Hampshire Minerals Plan will detail what proportion of the 1.7 million tonnes a year apportionment will be delivered by 'strategic' aggregates recycling facilities, which will be identified, and what proportion will be suitable for generic sites or fall under the Development Control Policies of the Strategy. Sites, locations and 'areas of search' and policies will be identified in the Hampshire Minerals Plan, for the 'strategic' manufacture of recycled and secondary aggregates by processing of Incinerator Bottom Ash and processing of construction, demolition and excavation wastes at aggregate recycling facilities.

2.33 The Core Strategy (para 21.20) expects that the 1.7 million tonnes a year apportionment will be delivered in large part by 'strategic' aggregate recycling facilities, although smaller sites, re-use at demolition or road maintenance sites, recycling of rail ballast, mobile plant and the recycling of incinerator ash will contribute significantly.

2.34 Therefore the Hampshire Minerals Plan needs to demonstrate how 1.7 million tonnes a year of recycled and secondary aggregates will be provided for by construction, demolition and excavation waste processing capacity and Incinerator Bottom Ash processing capacity and what proportions are expected to be provided by 'strategic' sites.

2.35 It is clear that the Core Strategy only expects sites, locations and 'areas of search' to be identified for 'strategic' aggregate recycling facilities. These are defined by the Core Strategy (para 21.19) as sites which are large-scale producing more than 75,000 tonnes of recycled or secondary aggregate a year, and which are suitable for permanent or long life operation. The siting requirements of such facilities are somewhat specific as they often need large land area, generally open-air, good access to suitable roads and urban areas (main sources of supply), and a location away from residential areas is preferable.

2.36 The Core Strategy (para 24.7) states 'strategic' aggregate recycling facilities need not to be located in just the growth areas of north east and south Hampshire.

2.37 It is expected that the Hampshire Minerals Plan will allocate sites for 'strategic' aggregate recycling facilities sufficient to contribute 1.7 million tonnes per annum of recycled and secondary aggregates.

Wharves and Rail Aggregate Depots

2.38 The Core Strategy (S13) makes a commitment to make provision for rail depots, sidings and wharves to receive and move aggregates, recyclables and wastes by rail and sea. Whilst there are no targets set out in the Core Strategy, adequate provision needs to be made and such provision should seek to maintain or increase capacity.

2.39 There are currently nine operational aggregate wharves in Hampshire and three operational aggregate rail depots, and all are currently safeguarded by the Core Strategy (S14) pending the review detailed in paragraph 23.4. The Hampshire Minerals Plan should identify which of these wharves and depots are needed for future requirements and will retain their safeguarded status. In addition, suitable new proposals should also be included.

Policy Context 2

2.40 Crushed rock has historically entered Hampshire by both rail and sea. The Core Strategy (para 22.2) makes reference to this stating 'In the absence of regional guidance, it is not proposed to actively seek deep-water crushed rock wharves, however should suitable opportunities arise... they will be included in the Hampshire Minerals Plan.' Therefore the Hampshire Minerals Plan needs to address this.

Other Minerals

2.41 Other minerals referred to in the 'core' Planning Strategy include chalk, clay and oil and gas.

Chalk

2.42 There are currently 11 permitted chalk quarries supplying approximately 20,000 tonnes per year, primarily for agricultural use. The Core Strategy identifies that the demand for chalk is unlikely to change in the near future and it is not expected that new chalk quarries will be required during the plan period.

2.43 The Hampshire Minerals Plan will not identify any new sites for chalk extraction, however, existing operational chalk quarries and suitable dormant chalk quarries which are not worked out, should be safeguarded.

Brick-Making Clay

2.44 There are three permitted clay extraction sites in Hampshire, two of which are linked to craft brickworks. Policy S11 of the Core Strategy states that the Hampshire Minerals Plan will identify and maintain a reserve of brick making clay sufficient to last 25 years at current rates of supply. Selborne brickworks had a permitted reserve in excess of 25 years but this permission has lapsed. Michelmersh brickworks currently have approximately 18 years worth of reserves. The Core Strategy identifies a need to identify sites and locations for brick-making clay for Michelmersh brickworks.

2.45 Given this, the Hampshire Minerals Plan should identify locations - which could be sites, preferred areas or areas of search - for brick-making clay sufficient to enable a 25 year supply for Michelmersh brickworks. In addition existing sites and suitable dormant brick-making clay extraction sites which are not worked out, should be listed in the Hampshire Minerals Plan to safeguard them. Furthermore, where appropriate these sites should be included as part of the Mineral Consultation Area.

Oil and Gas

2.46 The Core Strategy does not provide any requirement to identify locations for oil and gas exploration or extraction. Accordingly the Hampshire Minerals Plan should only list existing operational oil and gas sites to safeguard them. Furthermore, where appropriate these sites should be included as part of the Mineral Consultation Area.

2 Policy Context

Site Selection 3

This chapter explains the site selection process and associated supporting work, taking into account the needs for the development described in previous chapters. The site selection process combines evidence arising from public involvement exercises and the sustainability appraisal.

Preliminary assessment

A long list of potential options consisting of nominations and proposals from industry and landowners, previously promoted proposals and other potentially available land was generated. Reasonable options - consisting of those options which were not obviously unsuitable for development (by an initial assessment against a number of sustainability factors) - were identified for Issues and Options consultation and further evaluation to determine their suitability for mineral extraction and landfill set out in the Core Strategy (appendix 2).

Issues and Options Consultation

The 'Issues and Options' stage of the plan-making process commenced in September 2006 with consultation on an Issues and Options – Sites Discussion Paper. Although statutory consultation is not required at the issues and options stage the planning authorities consulted a wide range of interested stakeholders including district and parish councils, environmental groups, industry and local interest groups such as residents associations, as well as statutory consultees. The consultation was also available to the general public.

Between September and November 2006, a series of local workshops were carried out across Hampshire to which local interest groups and representatives were invited. These workshops included presentations on the site selection process and the Core Strategy's requirements as well as discussion on proposals received.

Following this consultation a number of additional sites were put forward for consideration by landowners and industry. Additional work was also carried out to review the suitability of existing operations, wharves and rail depots and industrial estates and employment land.

An Addendum to the Issues and Options – Sites Discussion Paper was produced and consulted upon between May and June 2007. The Addendum set out the findings of the reviews and the additional sites that had been nominated. It also presented a number of issues for comment.

Further Assessment

The proposals within this document have been developed to fulfil the requirements of the Core Strategy taking into account the outcomes of the Issues and Options consultation, and Sustainability Appraisal, which includes statutory requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment, Habitats Risk Assessment and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Full details of the Sustainability Appraisal process and how it has affected the proposals within this document are included within the accompanying Sustainability Report.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, local planning authorities are required to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of DPDs such as the Hampshire Minerals Plan. Similarly, when preparing or revising DPDs, it is also a statutory requirement to conduct an environmental assessment in accordance with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.

3 Site Selection

Government guidance allows these two processes to be combined as an 'Integrated Sustainability Appraisal' (ISA). The ISA is being carried out in accordance with the latest Government guidance and in tandem with the consultation elements of the plan-making process. The ISA process includes evaluation of site proposals against the sustainability factors in the Core Strategy (appendix 2), and an assessment of the cumulative impact of proposals against sustainability objectives - which broadly reflect the sustainability factors in the Core Strategy - as well as two further assessments called Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Habitats Risk Assessment which are described below. Land Use Consultants have been appointed to quality assure the ISA process and to produce the Sustainability Report, which accompanies this document and on which comments are also invited.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25) requires that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is carried out as a tool to inform site selection.

Halcrow Group Limited were appointed to undertake the SFRA for the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Management Plans. Each of the proposals were assessed to determine flood risk. It has been concluded that there were no proposals that could be readily rejected on grounds of flood risk, although some minor changes to boundaries were suggested and some locations would have limitations on activity to avoid for example landfilling on the flood plain.

The SFRA is a 'living document' and will be updated as necessary to reflect the latest information.

Habitat Regulations Assessment

Under the Regulation 48 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), it is necessary to undertake an appropriate assessment of any plan or project which either alone or in combination with other plans or projects would be likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site, but is not directly connected with the management of the site for nature conservation. Land Use Consultants were appointed to undertake an assessment of the reasonable options to determine whether development on the sites would be likely to have a significant effect on any European sites including Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar⁽⁹⁾) (the first stage in the Habitats Regulations Assessment).

Further work was then undertaken to assess whether development of the potential allocation sites would have an adverse effect on the integrity of any European sites. Where it was identified that an adverse effect may occur, alternative locations were considered and mitigation measures were recommended. The findings and recommendations are set out in the Habitat Regulation Assessment Report which accompanies this Preferred Options document.

i Designated under the Ramsar Convention.

Proposals and Policies 4

Sand and Gravel

4.1 The provision of land for sand and gravel extraction to deliver the 'apportionment' as set out in the Core Strategy (S8) will be through a combination of production from existing sites, preferred areas and areas of search.

4.2 No specific sites have been identified because there is insufficient information available to confidently define the detailed boundaries of an area of land to be used for future mineral development. It is hoped that greater clarification of boundaries can take place as a result of this consultation. The Preferred Areas are proposed to provide land for sand and gravel production for the period to 2016. Some of these have sufficient resources to produce throughout the plan period and beyond, indeed production by the preferred areas in the Forest area are sufficient to fulfil the requirements for this area in their entirety until 2020. Areas of Search have been identified in each of the geographic areas of Hampshire with the exception of the Forest area to provide for the Strategic Reserve as outlined in the Core Strategy (paras 21.12 - 21.14) pending the review of the apportionment.

4.3 The planning requirements for future sand and gravel production are currently under review. Whilst these reviews may ultimately lead to a revised apportionment for aggregate production in Hampshire, and hence altered requirements for quarries, any changes are unlikely to be embedded in regional policy - in the form of a revision to the South East Plan - until late 2009. In the meantime the Hampshire Minerals Plan has to address the apportionment that is in the adopted Core Strategy. However, the Core Strategy does provide for changes to regional Policy and in the event there is a reduced demand on Hampshire for aggregate land it will only be released to meet this requirement.

4.4 In line with the Core Strategy (DC15), permission will only be granted for sand and gravel extraction in Preferred Areas and/or Areas of Search - as illustrated on the Proposals Map - if the land bank of planning permissions for the geographic area in question, taking account of differing requirements for soft sand and sharp sand and gravel, is less than seven years. In the case of applications in Areas of Search, permission will only be granted:

- In the event there is a shortfall in land available to provide the apportionment for the period 2017 - 2020.
- Extraction is programmed to commence between 2017 and 2020.
- There is a demonstrable need for sand and gravel that cannot reasonably be met at undeveloped Preferred Areas within the respective geographical area.

When considering applications, the land bank for the relevant geographic area will be considered taking into account the local apportionments in the Core Strategy (S8), amended as considered appropriate to reflect changes to the sub-regional apportionment.

Question 2

Will the suggested approach prevent over development of sand and gravel resources in the event Hampshire has a changed 'apportionment' for sand and gravel while ensuring there will be sufficient provision for sand and gravel production to meet future requirements?

4 Proposals and Policies

Preferred Areas

4.5 Preferred Areas have been identified to provide for a production of sand and gravel for the respective geographic areas of Hampshire to meet the local apportionment as set out in the Core Strategy (S8). However in the Downland geographic area, there is an under provision of Preferred Areas. However, there is a slight over provision in both the North East and South Hampshire areas - essentially headroom in meeting targets - which offsets this without requiring additional sand and gravel extraction in the Forest area which does not really serve the same market as the Downland area.

4.6 Much of the information needed to show Hampshire's requirements will be met depends on assumptions about the likely timing of development (i.e. when do they begin working and how long will their working last), possible production rates and size of the available resource. Where possible such information has been based on the details provided by the landowner or prospective mineral operator. Some of the information on current production is commercially confidential. Given this, the estimated timings and production rates set out should be considered to be illustrative and may change depending on market demand and other factors - these are detailed in appendix 5.

4.7 All areas worked for sand and gravel will be required to be restored to an appropriate after-use. It is the intention of the mineral planning authorities, as detailed in the Core Strategy, that the restoration of worked mineral sites will provide real and tangible benefits to local communities, in the form of enhanced public access, recreational benefits, improved habitats and nature conservation, water storage and flood alleviation, or grazing.

4.8 It is estimated that approximately seven million tonnes of uncontaminated construction spoil could be required for restoring mineral excavations.

Downland

Land-won sand and gravel requirements for the Downland area to 2016, will be met from the following existing sites and preferred areas:

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--|
| Existing sites: | | | | |
| Kimbridge Farm, Mottisfont, Romsey (EXA1) | | 0.11 | 2007 - 2009 | Agriculture. Some of the materials are supplied by conveyor to a distribution point at XX. |
| Frithend Quarry, Sleaford, Bordon (EXA2) | | 0.13 | 2007 - 2016 | Agriculture with water feature and biodiversity elements. |
| Kingsley Quarry, Kingsley, Bordon (EXA3) | | 0.21 | 2007 - 2010 | Water feature with limited biodiversity elements |
| Preferred Areas: | | | | |

Proposals and Policies 4

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| Cutty Brow, Longparish, Andover (pPA1) | 1 | 0.1 | 2009-18 | Agricultural and woodland with biodiversity elements - restored to lower levels with 0.42 mt. of construction spoil |
| Roke, Shootash, Romsey (pPA2) | 1.24 | 0.135 | 2008 - 2016 | Agriculture and biodiversity elements - restored to original levels with 0.9mt of inert materials. Includes existing Preferred Area. Subject to consideration of a joint access with Squabb Wood Landfill (EX17). |
| Frithend Quarry Extension, Sleaford, Bordon (pPA3) | 1.4 | 0.122 | 2016 -20+ | Agriculture and water features with biodiversity potential. |
| Malthouse and Osbornes Farms, Sleaford, Bordon (pPA4) | 1.8 | 0.1 | 2012 - 2020+ | Agriculture with potential for public access. |
| Alternative options | | | | |
| Kingsley Quarry Extension, Kingsley, Bordon (pAPA1) | 4.5 mt. | 0.15 | 2011 - 20+ | Water feature with biodiversity elements Land on the extremity of the proposed South Downs National Park, low impact operation with restoration compatible with National Park . Could makeup the shortfall for Downland areas. |

Table 4.1 Land-won sand and gravel proposals - Downland area

4.9 Of the existing sites, Frith End quarry (EXA2) produces soft sand, as does Kingsley Quarry (EXA3). Kimbridge Farm (EXA1) produces a mixture of soft sand and sharp sand and gravel. The existing sites are capable - based on historic production records - of producing a total of 2.47 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period 2007 - 2016 at an initial supply rate of 450,000 tonnes per annum until 2009, which declines progressively until production ceases in 2016.

4.10 Of the proposed preferred areas, Frithend Quarry Extension (pPA3) and Malthouse and Osbornes Farms (pPA4) will both supply soft sand, while the other sites are expected to supply sharp sand and gravel. The preferred areas are expected to produce 3.37 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period to 2016 - a shortfall of 1.9 million tonnes on the indicative 'new' requirement of 5.27 million tonne. The preferred areas are anticipated to supply at an initial rate of 135,000 tonnes per annum in 2008 going up to 457,000 tonnes between 2012 and 2016.

4 Proposals and Policies

4.11 Combined production from both existing sites and new preferred areas is capable of supplying sand and gravel at a rate of between 450,000 and 697,000 tonnes per annum, with an average rate in the period 2007 - 2016 of 584,000 tonnes per annum. Only in 2009 and 2010 are these preferred areas are capable of supplying at a rate which exceeds the local apportionment. The average supply rate is lower than the local apportionment in the Core Strategy (S8) and will have to be made up either through increased production in adjacent parts of the county or by the inclusion of additional land in the Downland area.

4.12 The Downland preferred areas will supply a further 1.09 million tonnes of new sand and gravel production during the period 2017 - 2020 and this will contribute towards meeting the overall strategic reserve requirement of 9.57 million tonnes.

4.13 Further details of the assumptions and calculations behind these projections are included in appendix 5.

Alternative options

4.14 Potential locations in the main mineral producing areas to the north and west of Bordon and to the west of Romsey have not been taken forward to avoid unnecessary cumulative impact in these locations. Concerns have also been raised regarding the ability of the transport network in the Bordon area - primarily to the north through Wrecclesham and to the south through Bordon and on the junction between the A325 and the A3 - to absorb any increase in minerals traffic over and above current levels.

4.15 In the case of the proposed Kingsley Quarry Extension (pAPA1) it is within the proposed South Downs National Park and its inclusion would be an exception to the policy approach set out in the Core Strategy. This is a proposed extension to an existing soft sand producing quarry and working would be relatively low impact as extraction would take place primarily below the water table by suction dredge, with processing at existing plant at the existing quarry (which is outside the proposed National Park). This is a very deep resource of soft sand, and is estimated to contain some 4.5 million tonnes of soft sand. This area would follow on from the existing Kingsley Quarry (EXA3) and working would probably begin in 2011. Estimated annual production would be approximately 150,000 tonnes per annum, producing approximately 900,000 tonnes by 2016, with a further 600,000 tonnes by 2020. Restoration would be to a water body, with no importation of waste, which it is felt could feature biodiversity improvements and be used for recreation if sensitively designed in line with national park objectives.

4.16 In many ways, if the site was not in the proposed national park, it would be a better alternative than Malthouse and Osbornes Farm (pPA4). When balanced with the need for soft sand in this area, a case could be made for the inclusion of Kingsley Quarry Extension (pAPA1) either instead of Malthouse and Osbornes Farms (pPA4) or potentially - subject to detailed analysis of the highways issues - as an additional preferred area to make up for the shortfall in supply in the Downland area. It is not considered that Kingsley Quarry Extension is an alternative to Frithend Extension (pPA3).

Question 3

Should the Kingsley Quarry Extension (pAPA1) be considered as a Preferred Area for the extraction of land-won sand and gravel - in spite of its location just within the proposed South Downs National Park - either as an alternative to Malthouse and Osbornes Farms (pPA4), or in addition to it?

Proposals and Policies 4

4.17 Policy S15 of the Core Strategy requires the prior extraction of potentially viable mineral resources ahead of development which would otherwise needlessly sterilise it. It is understood that the Ministry of Defence will be moving out of land at Bordon / Whitehill in 2011 creating an opportunity for upto 4,000 houses on land, much of which is not already sterilised by development, and which is underlain by minerals. This is known as the Whitehill / Bordon Opportunity (pAPA2) and is shown in appendix 3.

4.18 Prior extraction could supplement sand and gravel production in the Downland area in the event that additional housing development takes place in Bordon / Whitehill. Further work will be required by East Hampshire District Council and their partners in developing the housing proposals, to quantify the extent of the mineral resource and to establish the viability and extent of prior extraction. It is possible that these studies could be carried out prior to submission of the final Hampshire Minerals Plan, and subject to the findings, a quantifiable mineral resource and rate of prior extraction could be established and the land identified as a preferred area either in addition to or instead of other proposals elsewhere.

Question 4

If possible, should prior extraction at the Whitehill / Bordon Opportunity (pAPA2) - ahead of housing development which would otherwise sterilise the mineral resource - be identified as a preferred area for extraction of land-won sand and gravel and contribute towards meeting the Downland area's local apportionment?

South Hampshire

Land-won sand and gravel requirements for the South Hampshire area to 2016, will be met from the following existing sites and preferred areas:

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|---|
| Existing sites | | | | |
| Bury farm, Marchwood, Southampton (EXB1) | | 0.14 | 2007 - 2008 | Agriculture with biodiversity and landscape features compatible with adjacent New forest National Park Restored to new levels with xxx mt. of construction spoil |
| Preferred areas | | | | |
| Pickwell Farm, Old Netley, Southampton (pPA5) | 1.3 | 0.22 | 2010 - 2016 | Agriculture with woodland and access features Restored to original levels with 1.2 mt of construction spoil |
| Hamble Airfield, Hamble (pPA6) | 2 | 0.15 | 2010 - 2019 | Restored to not prejudice long term housing with water features including balancing ponds etc with biodiversity elements. |

4 Proposals and Policies

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---|
| Forest Lodge Farm, Hythe (pPA7) | 1.7 | 0.14 | 2011 - 2020+ | Agriculture with biodiversity elements Restored to original levels with 0.54mt of construction spoil |
| Alternative options | | | | |
| Daedulus Airfield, Lee -on-Solent (pAPA3) | 0.9 | - | - | Part of site committed to development with amenity features. |
| Bronwich and Chilling Farms, Warsash (pAPA4) | 8 | - | - | Agriculture with biodiversity elements - possible part of 'managed retreat shoreline strategy |

Table 4.2 Land-won sand and gravel proposals - South Hampshire area

4.19 Of the proposed preferred areas, Pickwell Farm (pPA5) and Hamble Airfield (pPA6) are expected to produce sharp sand and gravel while Forest Lodge Farm (pPA7) will produce a mixture of sharp sand and gravel (27%) and soft sand (73%). The proposed preferred areas are expected to produce approximately 3.43 million tonnes of aggregate in the period to 2016. This represents a shortfall of 260,000 thousand tonnes on the indicative 'new' requirement of 3.69 million tonnes. However, this shortfall is largely due to the shortness of the landbank in this area and the 'lag-time' before new proposals start operation.

4.20 The proposed preferred areas are expected to supply aggregate at the rate of 370,000 tonnes per annum starting in 2010, going up to 510,000 tonnes in 2011 through to 2016.

4.21 Combined production from both existing sites and proposed preferred areas is capable of supplying aggregate at an initial rate of 140,000 going up quickly to a peak rate of 510,000 tonnes per annum between 2011 and 2016, with an average rate in the period 2007-2016 of 385,000 tonnes per annum. Between 2011 and 2016 these preferred areas are capable of supplying at a rate which exceeds the local apportionment. Whilst the average for the plan period is slightly lower than the local apportionment of 391,000 tonnes per annum set out in the Core Strategy (S8), it is considered acceptable because the shortfall will be in the early period of the plan - between 2007 and 2011 - which is the 'lag-time' before new proposals start operation.

4.22 The South Hampshire preferred areas will supply a further 1.01 million tonnes of new production during the period 2017 - 2020 and this will contribute towards meeting the overall strategic reserve requirement of 9.57 million tonnes.

4.23 Further details of the assumptions and calculations behind these projections are included in appendix 5.

Proposals and Policies 4

Alternative options

4.24 Prior extraction could supplement sand and gravel production in the South Hampshire area in the event that additional housing or other development takes place on areas underlain by sand and gravel. One area where detailed knowledge of underlying resources is known is Daedalus Airfield (pAPA3) in the strategic gap to the west of Lee-on-the-Solent.

4.25 It is possible that a quantifiable mineral resource and rate of prior extraction could be established for this location and it could be identified as preferred areas, to help meet South Hampshire's requirements, either in addition to or instead of the proposals listed.

4.26 Daedalus Airfield (pAPA3) was considered for sand and gravel extraction under the previous plan, and some of this land has been bought for redevelopment by the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) and a largely undeveloped area of approximately 40 hectares to the east of their land ownership is estimated to contain approximately 900,000 tonnes of sand and gravel. Redevelopment proposals have not yet been finalised but extraction as part of the redevelopment is possible.

Question 5

To what extent should the prior extraction opportunity at Daedalus Airfield (pAPA3) be reflected in the Hampshire Minerals Plan, in particular should it be identified as a Preferred Area for land-won sand and gravel extraction contributing towards meeting South Hampshire's local apportionment, either as a alternative to Pickwell Farm (pPA5), Hamble Airfield (pPA6) or Forest Lodge Farm (pPA7), or in addition to them?

4.27 Additionally, Hampshire County Council owns a large area of farmland at Brownwich and Chilling Farms (pAPA6) at Warsash which is underlain by sand and gravel, and although it is currently high quality agricultural land, could be extracted and restored either to agriculture or to a large coastal wetland habitat with public access. Creation of such a large wetland habitat could compensate for waterside development elsewhere in Hampshire, although it would need to be very carefully planned to avoid unacceptable impacts.

Question 6

Should Hampshire County Council's land at Brownwich and Chilling Farms (pAPA6) be identified as a preferred area for land-won sand and gravel extraction and contribute towards meeting South Hampshire's local apportionment, either as an alternative to Pickwell Farm (pPA5), Hamble Airfield (pPA6) or Forest Lodge Farm (pPA7), or in addition to them?

North-East Hampshire

Land-won sand and gravel requirements for the North East Hampshire area to 2016, will be met from the following existing sites and preferred areas:

4 Proposals and Policies

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| Existing sites | | | | |
| Bramshill Quarry, Blackbushe (EXC1) | | | | Low-level commercial forestry. |
| Eversley Common Quarry, Eversley (EXC2) | | | | Low-level commercial forestry with some heathland. |
| Mortimer Quarry, Mortimer West End (EXC3) | | | | Low-level commercial forestry. |
| Eversley Quarry, Eversley (EXC4) | | | | Current extraction of reserves in Berkshire but processing plant in Hampshire. |
| Preferred areas | | | | |
| Mortimer Quarry Extension, Mortimer West End (pPA8) | 2.4 | 0.18 | 2012 - 2020+ | Low level commercial forestry. Some areas of heathland will be re-established and public access will continue |
| Eversley Common Quarry Extension, Eversley (pPA9) | 0.75 | 0.9 | 2009 - 2016 | Combination of commercial forestry and agriculture with some public access, predominantly be at a lower level, and creation of additional heathland and mire habitat |
| Eversley Quarry Extension, Eversley (pPA10) | 0.32 | 0.15 | 2014 - 2016 | Creation of wetland habitats either in isolation, or as part of a wider scheme including neighbouring land. Importation of approximately 75,000 tonnes of restoration materials. |

Table 4.3 Land-won sand and gravel proposals - North East Hampshire

4.28 All of the existing sites produce sharp sand and gravel. They are capable, based on historic production records, of producing a total of 2.7 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period 2007 – 2016, at an initial supply rate of 530,000 tonnes per annum which declines to 190,000 tonnes per annum in 2014, when production is expected to cease.

4.29 All of the proposed preferred areas are expected to produce sharp sand and gravel. They are projected to produce 1.88 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period up to 2016, an inconsequential shortfall of 30,000 tonnes over the 'indicative' new requirement of 1.91 million tonnes for this period. The preferred areas are expected to supply at a rate of 50,000 tonnes per annum starting in 2009 increasing to a maximum of 500,000 tonnes per annum in 2010 before declining to 430,000 in 2016.

Proposals and Policies 4

4.30 Combined production from both existing sites and proposed preferred areas is capable of supplying sand and gravel at an initial rate of 530,000 tonnes per annum declining to 430,000 tonnes per annum, with an average during the period 2007 - 2016 of 458,000 tonnes per annum. This is above the local apportionment figure of 433,000 tonnes per annum given in the Core Strategy (S8) and to some extent helps to compensate for shortfalls in the Downland area.

4.31 The North-East Hampshire preferred areas will supply a further 720,000 tonnes of new production during the period 2017 - 2020 and this will contribute towards meeting the overall strategic reserve requirement of 9.57 million tonnes.

4.32 Further details of the assumptions and calculations behind these projections are included in appendix 5.

Forest

Land-won sand and gravel requirements for the Forest area to 2016, will be met from the following existing sites and preferred areas:

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| Existing sites | | | | |
| Bleak Hill, Harbridge (EXD1) | | | | |
| Nea Farm, Somerley (EXD2) | | | | |
| Ibsley Quarry, Ringwood (EXD3) | | | | Wetlands with amenity. |
| Avon Tyrrell, Ringwood (EXD4) | | | | Agricultural reservoir. |
| Badminton Farm, Fawley (EXD5) | | | | Mixture of agriculture, wetlands and New Forest heathland. |
| Preferred areas | | | | |
| Plumley Wood, Harbridge (pPA11) | 6 | 0.4 | 2011 - 2020+ | Forestry, heathland, amenity woodland and agriculture, with surface water ponds. The eastern section will be agricultural and the western section will be heath, wet heath and woodland - providing biodiversity improvements and public access. Restoration is expected to require limited importation of inert material. |
| Roeshot Hill, Christchurch (pPA12) | 3 | 0.25 | 2010 - 2020+ | Agriculture and biodiversity, complementary to the adjacent New Forest National Park, with areas for |

4 Proposals and Policies

| | Available resource (mt.) | Production rate (mtpa.) | Life | Restoration and comment |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | conservation / biodiversity, wetlands and river corridors, agriculture and public access. Restoration may require the importation of up to 2.25 million tonnes of inert material. |
| Downton, Downton (pPA13) <u>or</u> Ashley Manor Farm, New Milton (pPA14) | 3.9 - 4 | 0.2 0.2 | 2008 - 2020+ 2010 - 2020+ | Lakes, woodland and small fields, separated by species rich hedgerows - complementary to the New Forest landscape and to increase biodiversity. Restoration requires up to 285,000 tonnes of imported inert material and stored overburden. New footpath to lakes. Potential for the relocation of processing plant from Caird Avenue, New Milton. <u>or</u> Lower level restoration to predominantly agricultural use with some new footpaths and habitat enhancements. |
| Purple Haze, Ringwood (pPA15) | 8 | 0.25 | 2013 - 2020+ | Landfill to bring the land back to original ground levels, with restoration to enhanced recreational areas and public open space linked to the adjacent Moors Valley Country Park. Biodiversity benefits from deciduous woodland planting and the creation of wet and dry heathland habitats. |

Table 4.4 Land-won sand and gravel proposals - Forest area

4.33 With the exception of Nea Farm, Somerley (EXD2) all of the existing sites produce sharp sand and gravel. Nea Farm produces a mixture of sharp sand and gravel, and soft sand. Together these sites are capable, based on historic production records, of producing a total of 4.4 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period 2007 – 2016, at an initial supply rate of 820,000 tonnes per annum in 2007 declining to 220,000 tonnes per annum by 2016. Production remains at 220,000 tonnes per annum beyond 2020.

4.34 Of the proposed preferred areas, all are expected to produce sharp sand and gravel with the exception of Purple Haze, Ringwood (pPA15). They are capable of producing 6.95 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period up to 2016, a surplus of 870,000 tonnes over the 'indicative' new requirement of 6.08 million tonnes for the period to 2016. The preferred areas

Proposals and Policies 4

are expected to be capable of producing sand and gravel at a rate of 200,000 tonnes per annum starting in 2008 increasing to a maximum of 1.1 million tonnes per annum by 2013, and maintaining this level of production through to 2016.

4.35 Combined production from both existing sites and proposed preferred areas is capable of supplying sand and gravel at an initial rate of 820,000, increasing to a peak rate of 1.32 million tonnes per annum, with an average during the period 2007-2016 of 1.135 million tonnes per annum. Between 2011 and 2016 these preferred areas are capable of supplying at a rate which exceeds the local apportionment. Whilst the average for the plan period is slightly lower than the local apportionment of 1.163 million tonnes per annum set out in the Core Strategy (S8), it is considered acceptable because the shortfall will be in the early period of the plan - between 2007 and 2011 - which is the 'lag-time' before new proposals start operation.

4.36 The Forest preferred areas will supply an estimated further 4.4 million tonnes of new production during the period 2017 - 2020, which is more than adequate to meet the area's contribution to the overall strategic reserve requirement of 9.57 million tonnes. Accordingly, it is considered that an Area of Search is not required for the Strategic Reserve period 2017 - 2020 in the Forest area.

4.37 Further details of the assumptions and calculations behind these projections are included in appendix 5.

Alternative options

4.38 Much of the sand and gravel produced in the Forest area supplies concrete plants and the 'collect' trade in the Bournemouth and east Dorset areas. Both Dorset County Council and Christchurch Borough Council have indicated a preference in highways terms for supplies into their area to use the A31- in preference to the A35 and A337 - with the least favoured route being the A337 through Highcliffe. However, the A31 in Ringwood is not without its own transport problems, and the Dorset market is not the only market for products produced in the Forest area, and transport issues are not the only sustainability issues under consideration - all the competing sustainability issues need to be considered and a balanced judgement made. It is not realistic to cease quarrying in the area south of Ringwood unless the local apportionment can be delivered entirely from the area north of Ringwood without unacceptable impacts. The mineral planning authorities do not consider this can be achieved.

4.39 There is little between Downton (pPA13) and Ashley Manor Farm (pPA14) in sustainability terms, although Downton is considered to be better screened and has marginally fewer neighbours. Both locations offer the possibility of relocating the processing plant away from Caird Avenue. At this stage the mineral planning authorities do not have a preference between these two locations. Ashley Manor Farm has an adverse planning history - an appeal against the County Council's refusal to grant planning permission was dismissed in 1998 - however, a similar planning appeal is pending for Downton Manor Farm and the outcome remains uncertain. Nonetheless, there is not a need to develop both locations.

Question 7

Which location is preferable - Downton (pPA13) or Ashley Manor Farm (pPA14)?

4 Proposals and Policies

Hampshire-wide overview

4.40 Most of the preferred areas replace existing operations as they become worked out and it is expected that they will be phased to follow on from existing operations. However, because of the big difference between Hampshire's existing level of production - approximately 1.3 million tonnes of sand and gravel produced in 2005/6 - and the sub-regional apportionment of 2.63 million tonnes per annum, and the short length of Hampshire's landbank of planning permissions, some of the proposals are not replacements for existing operations.

4.41 Together all of the existing production sites in the county are capable, based on historic production records, of producing a total of 9.99 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period 2007 – 2016, at an initial supply rate of 1.94 million tonnes per annum in 2007, which declines to 350,000 tonnes per annum by 2016, and 220,000 tonnes per annum in 2020.

4.42 The preferred areas are capable of supplying sand and gravel at a rate of 350,000 tonnes per annum in 2009, increasing to 2.5 million tonnes per annum in 2016. The average supply rate in the period 2007 - 2016 is 1.56 million tonnes per annum. The proposed preferred areas are projected to produce 15.63 million tonnes of sand and gravel in the period to 2016, a shortfall of 1.32 million tonnes against the 'indicative' new requirement of 16.95 million tonnes for this period.

4.43 Combined production from both existing sites and proposed preferred areas is capable of supplying sand and gravel at an initial rate of 1.94 million tonnes per annum in 2007, increasing to a peak of 2.85 million tonnes per annum, with an average during the period 2007 - 2016 of 2.56 million tonnes per annum. Between 2011 and 2016 the preferred areas are capable of supplying at a rate which exceeds the sub-regional apportionment of 2.63 million tonnes per annum. Whilst the average for the plan period is slightly lower than the sub-regional apportionment set out in Policy S8 of the Core Strategy, it is considered acceptable because the shortfall will be in the early period of the plan - between 2007 and 2011 - which is the 'lag-time' before new proposals start operation.

4.44 Production from the proposed preferred areas is capable of supplying a further 7.22 million tonnes of new production during the period 2017 - 2020, which contributes towards meeting the strategic reserve requirement of 9.57 million tonnes. The shortfall of 2.35 million tonnes will need to be met from Areas of Search, as described below, in the North East Hampshire, South Hampshire and Downland areas.

4.45 Soft sand production rates from preferred areas will vary between 16 and 28% of the overall supply of sand and gravel from preferred areas, and that the soft sand resource provided by preferred areas will be 22% of the total resource from all preferred areas.

Areas of Search

4.46 It is estimated that there will be a shortfall in land to provide sufficient sand and gravel in the period between 2017 and 2020. However, the shortfall is unevenly divided between the geographic areas because in some areas - such as the Forest area - both existing sites and preferred areas continue throughout the plan period potentially supplying at a rate marginally above that required, whereas in the other areas, to a greater or lesser extent, there is 'tailing off' of production between 2017 and 2020 leading to a shortfall.

4.47 Using the local apportionment in the Core Strategy (S8) as a guide - and pending the review of the regional apportionment - the following indicative amounts of land-won sand and gravel will need to be supplied from within the proposed Areas of Search:

Proposals and Policies 4

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Downland | 1.21 million tonnes |
| North East Hampshire | 0.83 million tonnes |
| South Hampshire | 0.39 million tonnes |
| Forest | not required |

In the event there is a shortfall in land capable of providing the local apportionment as set out in the Core Strategy (S8) - or as subsequently adjusted following changes to the sub-regional apportionment -

Areas of Search, as illustrated on the Proposals Map, will provide up to 2.42 million tonnes of sand and gravel for the period 2017 - 2020.

4.48 The methodology for identifying Areas of Search for soft sand (pAS1) and sharp sand and gravel (pAS2) is set out in appendix 6. These Areas of Search are shown in appendix 2. The 'release mechanism' for the approval of applications within the Areas of Search is set out in paragraph **XX** above.

Question 8

Will the proposed Areas of Search (pAS1 and pAS2), coupled with the 'release mechanism' outlined in paragraph **xxx provide sufficient resources in the period 2017 - 2020, without jeopardising the planning principles set out in the Core Strategy?**

Landfill

Landfill requirements will be met from the following existing sites:

- 1. Blue Haze, Ringwood (EXE1) - including additional surcharging**
- 2. Bunny Lane, Romsey (EXE2) - suitable for a wider range of wastes**
- 3. Pound Bottom, Redlynch (EXE3)**
- 4. Squabb Wood, Romsey (EXE4) - including additional surcharging**

4.49 The sites listed above are all existing sites which are considered suitable for landfill with non-hazardous wastes. Further details of these including detailed site boundaries and restoration proposals are set out in appendix 1. Brief details are included in the following table. Further details of unsuitable sites and the reasons for their exclusion are included in appendix 4.

4.50 The Bunny Lane (EXE2) site has existing planning permissions for a restricted range of generally inert wastes but is geologically suitable to accept non-hazardous wastes and has been nominated for consideration as such. However, it is not accepted that it is a suitable location for permanent pre-treatment operations - such as mechanical biological treatment (MBT), in-vessel composting etc.. - because this would sterilise void suitable for landfill and would not be consistent with restoration to countryside.

4 Proposals and Policies

| Site | Available void at 1/1/07 (million tonnes) | Life | Restoration | Comments |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Blue Haze, Ringwood (EXE1) | 2.90 | 2007 - 2020 | Heathland | Existing operational landfill site with approximately 2.5 million tonnes of permitted void capacity plus surcharging of approximately 400,000 tonnes of waste over the existing site and the adjacent restored Somerley landfill. |
| Bunny Lane, Romsey (EXE2) | 0.96 | Completion before 2020 | Agriculture | Former mineral extraction site with planning permission for inert fill which is 'in principle' suitable for non-hazardous waste. |
| Pound Bottom, Redlynch (EXE3) | 0.45 | Completion before 2020 | no agreed restoration scheme | Existing operational landfill site. |
| Squabb Wood, Romsey (EXE4) | 1.11 | Completion before 2020 | Agriculture | Existing operational landfill site with approximately 0.7 million tonnes of permitted void capacity plus surcharging of approximately 400,000 tonnes of waste - subject to consideration of a joint access with the proposed Roke quarry (pPA2). |

Table 4.5 Summary of Non-Hazardous Landfill Provision

4.51 Collectively, the preferred landfills listed above are capable of providing approximately 5.42 million tonnes of landfill capacity all of which is likely to be available before 2020. This meets the headline 5.3 million tonne requirement set out in the Core Strategy. The 1.76 million tonnes of 'new' void falls short of the indicative requirement set out in the Core Strategy (para 19.9) to find an additional 2.2 million tonnes of new void, however, this is because more up to date information on remaining landfill capacity has been received effectively changing the requirements. Historic data indicates that these sites are capable of input rates in excess of those set out in the Core Strategy (para 19.7).

4.52 Whilst these proposals meet the Core Strategy's requirements the site locations are not perfectly situated in relation to the bulk of Hampshire's population which is in South and North East Hampshire. However, Pound Bottom (EXE3) and Squabb Wood (EXE4) currently take waste from the Southampton area and it can be expected that Bunny Lane (EXE2) will do likewise.

Alternative options

4.53 Purple Haze (pPA15) has also been promoted for landfill following on from sand extraction. Whilst in principle it is suitable for landfill. Realistically it will be a successor to Blue Haze (EXE1) and is unlikely to be available until after 2020 - which is beyond the plan period - due to the

Proposals and Policies 4

need to work sufficient sand to create void space and to avoid undue cumulative impacts in the locality which would be caused by two landfill sites operating concurrently. Accordingly, it has not been included as a proposed preferred area for landfill.

Question 9

Should a landfill site at Purple Haze (pPA15) be identified in the Hampshire Minerals Plan if its void is unlikely to be available within the plan period (i.e. before 2020)?

Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

4.54 Sufficient 'strategic' aggregate recycling facilities will be identified in the Hampshire Minerals Plan to supply at least 1.6 million tonnes a year of recycled and secondary aggregate. An additional 100,000 tonnes per annum is expected to be produced from the recycling of road planings during highways improvement works. The economies of scale and certainty provided by these 'strategic' sites will enable greater investment in processing equipment and therefore a better quality product which is more marketable to the construction industry.

4.55 Whilst it is not proposed to identify new land for smaller construction, demolition and excavation waste recycling facilities in the Hampshire Minerals Plan, these facilities will continue to provide a useful purpose both for the reception and sorting of locally produced wastes, and as a network of 'feeder' sites for the larger strategic sites. Applications for such sites should be determined on their merits against the policies set out in the Core Strategy, likewise the Core Strategy (DC13) enables approval of applications on previously developed land, redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages - which are interpreted as being hard-standing areas adjacent to the buildings and can be developed for minerals and waste uses independently of the buildings - employment land and land within planned areas of large-scale development.

Question 10

Do the proposals for identification of locations for strategic aggregate recycling facilities, supplemented by a network of 'feeder' sites which are not to be identified, satisfy the requirements of the Core Strategy?

Strategic aggregate recycling facilities

4.56 Provision for strategic aggregate recycling facilities will be made by identifying a combination of existing and new sites.

4.57 The following sites are considered suitable for the production of recycled and secondary aggregates from construction wastes and incinerator bottom ash, including the location of ancillary infrastructure:

4.58 Existing 'strategic' Aggregate Recycling Facilities:

4.59 1. Eastleigh Rail Sidings, Eastleigh (EXF1)

4 Proposals and Policies

4.60 2. Manor Farm, Pennington (EXF2)

4.61 3. Empress Road, Southampton (EXF3)

4.62 4. Hollybush Lane, Aldershot (EXF4)

4.63 5. Wallington Depot, Fareham (EXF5)

4.64 6. Willments Shipyard, Southampton (EXF6)

4.65 7. Yokesford Hill, Romsey (EXF7)

4.66 8. Kingsley Quarry, Kingsley (EXF8) - *Planning permission to 2018*

4.67 9. Rookery Farm, Swanwick (EXF9) - *Planning permission to 2021*

4.68 10. Bramshill Recycling Facility, Eversley (EXF10) - *Planning permission to XXX*

4.69 Preferred areas for new 'strategic' Aggregate Recycling Facilities:

4.70 1. Alton Wastewater Treatment Works, Alton (pPA16)

4.71 2. Little Park Farm, Segensworth (pPA17)

4.72 Research undertaken by TRL Ltd on behalf of Hampshire County Council examined the use of recycled aggregates and aimed to determine what barriers there may be to increasing their use in construction in Hampshire. Discussion with operators indicated that it was felt that many sites could produce significantly more recycled aggregates if sites could operate at their full capacity. The operators believed that the target to supply 1.7 million tonnes per year of recycled and secondary aggregate, as set out in the Core Strategy, could be met without the need for many new sites.

4.73 The research illustrates the current cycle in which the industry finds itself. Creating a better product will help increase demand by giving clients confidence that recycled materials are technically satisfactory, however investment is required in order to produce a better quality product and investment is more likely where there is a demand. Without a quality product, demand and hence the use of recycled and secondary aggregate will decrease. Case studies showing the successful use of recycled and secondary aggregates in construction, coupled with the promotion of such case studies to the construction industry, will over time, lead to a general increase in demand which should stimulate investment to increase both the quality and quantity of recycled and secondary aggregate - leading in turn to greater confidence in the product and further increased demand - a positive feedback process. Funding of grading and washing plant by organisations such as WRAP will only help.

4.74 There are currently seven permanent strategic aggregate recycling facilities - handling over 75,000 tonnes a year - and two strategic sites which have planning permission that extends beyond 2016. These existing facilities are capable of handling over 1.47 million tonnes a year of construction, demolition and excavation waste (based on existing planning permission capacity). In addition, whilst Bramshill Recycling Facility (EXF10) currently handles less than 75,000 tonnes per annum and has a relatively short planning permission, it is considered suitable for longer life operation and handling greater throughput. A further strategic aggregate recycling facility at Bleak Hill, Harbridge has planning permission until 2010 but in view of highways concerns about the suitability of Harbridge Drove is not considered suitable for permanent or long-life operation.

Proposals and Policies 4

4.75 The small shortfall between existing capacity and the Core Strategy's targets will be more than met by the proposed strategic aggregate recycling facilities, both of which are greater than two hectares in area and meet the locational criteria set out in the Core Strategy (para 21.19). These two proposed sites are capable of handling in excess of 150,000 tonnes of construction, demolition and excavation waste.

4.76 Further details of the suitable sites including detailed site boundaries are set out in appendices 1 and 2. Further details of eliminated sites and the reasons for their exclusion are included in appendix 4.

4.77 Strategic aggregate recycling facilities - provided there is appropriate investment in grading, crushing and washing plant and careful selection of waste materials - are capable of producing marketable products from almost all of their input materials. Accordingly the proposals set out above are considered more than capable of supplying the 1.7 million tonnes a year of recycled and secondary aggregate required.

4.78 The existing operational IBA recycling facility located at Blue Haze landfill site (EXE1) has temporary planning permission until 2012, and a permanent site will need to be found to replace this. In the absence of any nominations specifically for this purpose, it is considered that the sites listed above are suitable for this activity.

Alternative locations

4.79 Ridge Quarry, Romsey (pAPA5) is being promoted as a permanent strategic aggregate recycling facility. Sustainability appraisal indicates that this is a suitable site and it fits well with the locational criteria set out in paragraph 21.19 of the Core Strategy, in that it is of sufficient size, in an open-air location, has good access to suitable roads and urban areas and is relatively distant from residential areas. The proposal has considerable planning history and a recent appeal upheld Hampshire County Council's refusal to grant planning permission for aggregate recycling, however, the appeal was dismissed 'on balance' - indicating the decision was not entirely clear cut - principally because the proposals were contrary to the existing policy at that time. The Inspector considered that the granting of permission for a strategic site ahead of considering the location of other strategic sites could be prejudicial to the outcome of the plan-making process. There were added concerns that granting permission for a greenfield site in the countryside would limit the authority's abilities to resist other such proposals either during the plan-making process or in the interim. However the Inspector then went on to describe the location as 'inherently unsustainable' which is not borne out by the sustainability appraisal other than the fact that the site is in the countryside.

4.80 There are no other proposals for strategic sites within the countryside which are as suitable or as well located as the Ridge Quarry site, indeed it could be argued that the site is better located than many existing sites.

4.81 Inclusion of the Ridge Quarry site as a preferred area is a question of judgement between the relative need for the facility, and its obvious locational merits, against its countryside location and planning history. It is considered that on balance - at this stage - while the proposal has its merits there is insufficient evidence that its inclusion is essential to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy's 1.7 million tonne per annum apportionment, accordingly it is not identified as a preferred area above. Nonetheless, the authorities are open to persuasion either way and it is expected that this consultation will provide sufficient evidence to resolve the matter.

4 Proposals and Policies

Question 11

Is a permanent strategic aggregate recycling facility at Ridge Quarry, Romsey (pAPA5) necessary to help deliver the Core Strategy's apportionment of recycled and secondary aggregates supply, and if so is this - coupled with the sites other locational merits - sufficient to warrant location on greenfield land in the countryside?

4.82 Kingsclere Lime Quarry (pAPA6) - a dormant chalk extraction site at Wolverton on the A339 between Basingstoke and Newbury - has also been nominated as a strategic aggregate recycling facility. The site is certainly big enough at 3.9 hectares, however, whilst it is fairly well screened, it is within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is not favoured because of this. Nonetheless, there are few proposals for strategic scale aggregate recycling facilities in the North East Hampshire area and given the amount of growth expected in the vicinity, would be well located to contribute recycled aggregates.

Question 12

Is Kingsclere Lime Quarry (pAPA6) suitable for aggregate recycling and does the need for such facilities - especially in North East Hampshire - outweigh its location in the North Wessex Downs AONB?

Industrial / employment land

4.83 Work undertaken by White Young Green consultants on behalf of the mineral planning authorities indicated a number of industrial / employment land locations which are considered suitable for 'general' waste operations. General waste operations are large scale operations excluding landfill, with significant environmental impacts from dust or noise, prominent structures and plant, high numbers of lorry movements and include recycling of construction, demolition and excavation wastes. Details of industrial / employment land locations considered suitable for general waste operations will be detailed in the Hampshire Waste Management Plan.

Proposals and Policies 4

Wharves and Rail Depots

Aggregate Wharves

4.84 A review of existing wharves and aggregate rail depots was undertaken to assess whether existing, permitted or operational aggregate wharves and depots are appropriate for both safeguarding to meet future requirements and/or expansion.

Dredged sand and gravel requirements will be met from the following aggregate wharves:

- 1. Bakers Wharf, Southampton (EXG1)**
- 2. Bedhampton Wharf, Havant (EXG2)**
- 3. Burnley Wharf, Southampton (EXG3)**
- 4. Dibles Wharf, Southampton (EXG4)**
- 5. Kendalls Wharf and extension, Portsmouth (EXG5)**
- 6. Leamouth Wharf, Southampton (EXG6)**
- 7. Marchwood Wharf and extension, Marchwood (EXG7)**
- 8. Supermarine Wharf, Southampton (EXG8)**
- 9. Upper Quay, Fareham (EXG9)**

4.85 Hampshire's existing wharves are capable of supplying considerably more sand and gravel should demand increase, in general, expansion of throughput is limited by lack of demand rather than constraints on supply.

4.86 The review concluded that all operational wharves are suitable for retention with the exception of Tipner Wharf in Portsmouth, which has been allocated for redevelopment as part of regeneration proposals by Portsmouth City Council (Policy NL1 - Portsmouth City Local Plan Review (2001-2011) - adopted 21 July 2006). Tipner Wharf is also a relatively small site which is accessed by road through narrow residential streets and this is considered unsatisfactory.

4.87 Removal of the safeguarded status of Tipner does not mean there is a presumption for re-development or that Tipner would necessarily close in the short-term - only that the mineral planning authorities are unlikely to object to redevelopment proposals on minerals grounds. It is considered that there would not necessarily be a shortfall in capacity were Tipner to close as capacity exists elsewhere to meet any shortfall, in particular, at Kendall's Wharf which is pursuing proposals for expansion. There are outstanding issues in relation to the expansion at Kendall's Wharf, including the requirement to identify additional land to compensate for a loss in habitat, nonetheless, the proposal is supported provided these issues can be overcome.

4.88 Redevelopment of the wharves in Southampton for other uses will aid central regeneration and will only be permitted if the same area of replacement wharves is provided, is capable of being safeguarded, and is located elsewhere in South Hampshire.

4 Proposals and Policies

4.89 There is land available behind Marchwood Wharf which could be used for the additional storage of aggregates, including imported recycled and secondary aggregates.

4.90 It is proposed that Willments Shipyard / Whites Wharf - which is currently safeguarded in the existing local plan - should not be safeguarded as an aggregate wharf as it is currently inactive and the river would require dredging for it to become operational. However the site is now operating as a strategic aggregate recycling facility and should be safeguarded for that purpose. Bakers wharf, although non-operational, should be safeguarded for both minerals and waste uses to retain flexibility in the Southampton area. However, there are small areas of inter-tidal mudflat recognised by the UK's Biodiversity Action Plan adjacent to Bakers wharf. If this wharf is to be reactivated, replacement mudflat will have had to been formed elsewhere since 2007, or will need to be created.

Question 13

Are the proposals for wharves, including safeguarding and the expansion of Kendall's (EXG5) and Marchwood Wharves (EXG7), supported?

4.91 Historically, crushed rock has been imported to Southampton Port and moved from there principally by rail. This activity has now ceased and operations have relocated to the Isle of Grain in Kent. Arguments have been made that an alternative location is required and Dibden Bay has been promoted as a potential site. No other suitable locations have been promoted.

4.92 It is not proposed to identify Dibden Bay or any other locations for the importation of crushed rock. Dibden Bay is not considered suitable for this use and no other suitable sites have been identified or promoted for this purpose. There is no convincing evidence showing specifically that Hampshire requires a deep water wharf for the importation of crushed rock and that such a facility has to be in Hampshire rather than anywhere else.

Question 14

Does Hampshire require a deep-water wharf for the importation of crushed rock and if so are there any potential sites which should be considered?

Aggregate Rail Depots

Rail imported aggregate requirements will be met from the following aggregate rail depots:

- 1. Botley Rail Aggregates Depot, Botley (EXH1)**
- 2. Eastleigh Rail Aggregates Terminal, Eastleigh (EXH2)**
- 3. Fareham Rail Aggregates Depot, Fareham (EXH3)**

4.93 At this stage, it is proposed that safeguarding of all existing operational aggregate rail depots be retained.

Proposals and Policies 4

4.94 However, Fareham Borough Council have indicated a desire to re-locate the Fareham aggregates rail depot - possibly to Little Park Farm, Segensworth (pPA17) - and then allow re-development of the existing site, which is in a town centre location. Little Park Farm is well located for the distribution of minerals and is sufficiently large to enable the location of other 'value-added' operations such as coating plants etc. However, there are a number of obstacles to development which would need to be addressed including improvements to the bridge under the railway line, raising ground levels with inert fill material, and construction of a new siding and signals. A plan showing the location of Little Park Farm can be viewed in appendix 2.

Question 15

Is the relocation of Fareham rail aggregates depot supported and is Little Park Farm, Segensworth a suitable replacement site?

4.95 The rail depot at Micheldever (pAPA7) has been repeatedly identified as a potential aggregates rail depot in previous plans, however, it has never become operational, indicating anecdotally that there is little requirement for additional aggregate rail depots in Hampshire. Its location is not ideal being in a predominantly rural area and requiring extensive engineering works to provide acceptable road access. Given this there is some doubt about whether the site will ever be developed as a rail aggregates depot and hence whether it should continue to be identified and safeguarded in the Hampshire Minerals Plan. A plan showing the site can be viewed in appendix 3.

4.96 A proposal has very recently been received identifying the rail sidings to the north of the railway line at Basingstoke (pAPA8) as a potential location for a rail aggregates depot with potential associated 'added value' operations such as coating or concrete batching plants. A location plan can be viewed in appendix 3.

Question 16

Is there a need for additional rail aggregates depot in Hampshire - if so is Micheldever (pAPA7) the best location or is Basingstoke (pAPA8) or somewhere else better?

Other Minerals

Chalk

Requirements for the production of chalk for agricultural and industrial uses will be met from the following existing sites:

Existing sites

1. **Manor Farm Chalk Pit, Monk Sherborne (EXI1)**
2. **Somborne Chalk Quarry, Michelmersh (EXI2)**
3. **Warren Farm, Fareham (EXI3) - *Currently inactive***
4. **Renown Quarry, Upper Froyle (EXI4) - *Currently inactive***

4 Proposals and Policies

4.97 The Core Strategy does not make provision for further chalk sites and therefore no new land for chalk extraction has been taken forward through the site selection process. Further details of these existing sites can be found in appendix 1. The majority of existing sites with planning permission are dormant. Further evaluation of dormant chalk pits will take place with a view to serving Prohibition Orders where necessary.

Clay

Requirements for the production of clay for brick-making will be met from the following existing sites and areas of search:

Existing sites:

1. **Michelmersh Brickworks, Michelmersh (EXJ1)**

Areas of Search:

The following 'areas of search' for brick-making clay, in order of preference, have been identified:

1. **Michelmersh Brickworks (b) (pAS3)**
2. **Michelmersh Brickworks (a) (pAS4)**
3. **Michelmersh Brickworks (c) (pAS5)**

4.98 Only two sites were nominated for the extraction of brick-making clay, one of which was given permission during the plan-making period. The remaining site has been included as an 'Area of Search' for future provision along with a further two areas - all in the vicinity of Michelmersh Brickworks - identified by the brickworks.

4.99 The existing permitted clay extraction site at Selbourne Brickworks has not been included because the planning permission expired before it was implemented, and the brickworks is no longer operational. However, the 'status' of the site may change as a result of a pending appeal, if this happens the site would need to be included in the Hampshire Minerals Plan. Searchfield Farm, Downton on the border with Wiltshire has not been included for similar reasons.

4.100 The three areas of search have been subject to sustainability appraisal, which concludes that all three areas are potentially suitable but Michelmersh Brickworks (b) is preferred as it is less constrained. However, detailed geological analysis of the clay reserves at each site has yet to be undertaken and this will have an influence over which site is the most suitable. As such, depending on the results of the geological analysis and based solely on the sustainability criteria, the preference for extraction is Michelmersh Brickworks (b), followed by (a) and lastly (c).

4.101 Further details of these proposals are included in appendices 1 and 2.

Question 17

Do you agree with the proposals for brick-making clay?

Proposals and Policies 4

Oil and Gas

Requirements for the production of oil and gas extraction, and associated infrastructure, will be met from the following existing sites:

1. Fullerton Wellsite, Goodworth Clatford (EXK1)
2. Folly Farm Wellsite, Crawley (EXK2)
3. Hill Farm Wellsite, Barton Stacey (EXK3)
4. Larkwhistle Farm Wellsite, South Wonston (EXK4)
5. Matterley Farm, Itchen Valley (EXK5)
6. Herriard 'A' Wellsite, Tunworth (EXK6)
7. Herriard 'X' Wellsite, Herriard (EXK7)
8. Weston Common Gathering Station, Weston Patrick (EXK8)
9. Humbly Grove 'C' Wellsite, Weston Patrick (EXK9)
10. Humbly Grove 'A' Wellsite, Upton Grey (EXK10)
11. Humbly Grove 'X' Wellsite, South Warnborough (EXK11)
12. Holybourne Rail Export Terminal, Alton (EXK12)
13. Horndean 'B' Wellsite, Horndean (EXK13)
14. Horndean 'X' Wellsite, Horndean (EXK14)
15. Horndean 'C' Wellsite, Rowlands Castle (EXK15)

4.102 These are all existing operational sites with planning permission. Further details of these sites are included in appendix 1.

Mineral Resource Areas

4.103 The Mineral Resource Area (MRA) is intended to show broad locations where the mineral planning authorities would prefer future land-won sand and gravel extraction to take place. It served a useful purpose at the Core Strategy stage, both in expressing the authorities' spatial preferences and in ensuring that subsequent planning applications or allocations in these areas do not come as a shock to local residents. To some extent the MRA becomes less useful, and its purpose less clear, as future locations for extraction are better defined in the Hampshire Minerals Plan, however, it may serve a useful purpose - albeit one which differs slightly from its original intention and which may not require inclusion in the Hampshire Minerals Plan - as a starting point for the identification of Areas of Search for the Strategic Reserve period (2017 - 20).

Question 18

Does the MRA serve a useful purpose given the Hampshire Minerals Plan will identify specific preferred areas and areas of search to meet Hampshire's land-won sand and gravel requirements?

4.104 Nonetheless, a commitment was made at the public examination into the Core Strategy that the boundary of the MRA would be defined in the Hampshire Minerals Plan. The Core Strategy (para 21.16) also sets out that a review of the 250m buffer zone around internationally designated habitats would be carried out.

4 Proposals and Policies

4.105 The commitment to this review arose from consultation comments received following submission of the Core Strategy. The review's purpose is to look at each internationally designated habitat site and establish if there is a more appropriate buffer distance, specific to the reasons for designation, within which land-won sand and gravel extraction should generally be avoided. This review has been carried out as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process and it is concluded that while it is possible to identify distances where adverse effects are possible, and hence detailed appropriate assessment should be carried out, it is not possible to establish buffer zones at the point where adverse effects are probable and therefore minerals development should be avoided. Furthermore, because the MRA only identifies areas where land-won sand and gravel extraction will 'principally' occur, it does not provide a total exclusion from development even within the buffer zones. Additionally, to some degree, buffer zones around internationally designated sites are not necessary because adequate protection is provided by the statutory assessment requirements of the Habitats Regulations 1994 which applies to many of the proposals within this document. Given this, and on balance, it is proposed to retain the existing 250m buffer zone in the Core Strategy (para 21.16) as this distance, arbitrary though it is, reflects the 'reality' that extraction immediately adjacent to internationally designated habitats is problematic and is likely only in exceptional circumstances.

Question 19

Should the buffer zone around internationally designated habitats be retained at 250m? (If not what buffer zones should be applied to the MRA and why?)

4.106 It is proposed that the MRA will be updated in the submission Hampshire Minerals Plan, and the following revisions (in addition to the requirements of the Core Strategy (para 21.16)) will be made to better indicate areas where land-won sand and gravel extraction is preferred and could take place:

- Presentation on an Ordnance Survey base map
- Update settlement boundaries and incorporate latest housing and employment land allocations, from adopted district and unitary plans, as Urban Areas

Question 20

Will the proposals for updating the MRA provide a more accurate boundary showing where land-won sand and gravel extraction is preferred and could take place?

The updated MRA is shown in appendix 7.

Landfill Potential Areas

4.107 The Landfill Potential Area (LPA) is intended to show broad locations where the mineral planning authorities would prefer future non-hazardous landfill to take place. It served a useful purpose at the Core Strategy stage, both in expressing the authorities' spatial preferences and in ensuring that subsequent planning applications or allocations in these areas do not come as a shock to local residents. To some extent the LPA becomes less useful, and its purpose less clear, as future locations for landfill are better defined in the Hampshire Minerals Plan.

Proposals and Policies 4

Question 21

Does the LPA serve a useful purpose given the Hampshire Minerals Plan will identify specific preferred areas to meet Hampshire's non-hazardous landfill requirements?

4.108 Nonetheless, a commitment was made at the public examination into the Core Strategy that the boundary of the LPA would be defined in the Hampshire Minerals Plan. The LPA is in effect a sub-area of the Mineral Resource Area (MRA) defined by the Core Strategy (para 21.16). The Core Strategy also requires that the MRA is to be reviewed.

4.109 It is proposed that the LPA will be updated in the submission Hampshire Minerals Plan, and the following revisions (in addition to the requirements of the Core Strategy (paras 21.16 and 19.13)) will be made to better indicate areas where landfill is preferred and could take place:

- Presentation on an Ordnance Survey base map
- Update settlement boundaries and incorporate latest housing and employment land allocations, from adopted district and unitary plans, as Urban Areas

Question 22

Will the proposals for updating the LPA provide a more accurate boundary showing where landfill is preferred and could take place?

The updated LPA is shown in appendix 8.

Mineral Safeguarding

4.110 It is essential that the Hampshire Minerals Plan protects essential minerals infrastructure and includes measures to protect valuable mineral resources from sterilisation by development. Such measures include:

- Defining safeguarded sites - including proposed preferred areas and existing sites - to be protected from encroachment and / or re-development.
- Defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas - for use by district councils in plan-making and considering planning applications.
- Setting out requirements detailing the circumstances when district councils should consult the mineral planning authorities on proposals that may effect minerals or minerals infrastructure.

4.111 In accordance with the Core Strategy (S14 and para 23.3) all existing sites and proposed Preferred Areas and areas of search - listed in this document and shown in its appendices - shall be safeguarded from inappropriate development. District councils should not grant planning permission or allocate land for development, on or near to these safeguarded sites, if the proposal is likely to impact upon the safeguarded mineral operation. The Mineral Planning Authority should be consulted on applications within the Mineral Consultation Area shown in appendix 10 in accordance with the consultation requirements set out in appendix 11.

4 Proposals and Policies

Question 23

Do the proposals for safeguarding and consultation provide an appropriate balance between the desire to avoid the needless sterilisation of mineral resources, and to protect minerals infrastructure, whilst avoiding un-necessary consultation?

Mineral Safeguarding Areas

4.112 The Core Strategy sets out the mineral planning authorities' approach to safeguarding of both existing and potential future infrastructure, and of mineral deposits. Unfortunately Minerals Policy Statement 1 (MPS1) came out after submission of the Core Strategy to Government and there is a slight difference in terminology between MPS1 and the Core Strategy.

4.113 MPS1 requires that Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) should be identified in Local Development Documents in order that proven resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development, although there is no presumption that resources defined in MSAs will be worked.

4.114 The Core Strategy only identifies 'safeguarded sand and gravel deposits' on the Key Diagram and therefore, at this stage, only they are protected from sterilisation by permanent development in accordance with Policy S15 of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy (paras 13.2 and 23.5) also makes reference to identifying Mineral Safeguarding Areas for brick-making clay, sand and gravel in the Hampshire Minerals Plan.

4.115 In the case of sand and gravel, the 'safeguarded sand and gravel deposits' shown on the Key Diagram are MSAs in all but name. Essentially these represent all 'commercially viable' sand and gravel resources outside urban areas in Hampshire, as shown on the British Geological Survey (BGS) map showing Hampshire's Mineral Resources. This BGS mapping also shows 'commercially viable' brick-making clay deposits across Hampshire.

4.116 Recent non-statutory guidance on mineral safeguarding produced in draft by BGS suggests that mineral planning authorities should consider including urban areas within MSAs because it is possible that prior extraction could be feasible at redevelopment sites. The mineral planning authorities do not consider that MSAs should be defined in urban areas. It is argued that they are not required in urban areas in Hampshire because special circumstances do not exist – such as unusually valuable or scarce minerals beneath urban areas - warranting their inclusion.

Question 24

Should Mineral Safeguarding Areas be included within Urban Areas?

4.117 It is proposed to produce MSAs for both sand and gravel - taking forward the 'safeguarded sand and gravel deposits' shown on the Key Diagram - and brick-making clay, based solely upon the BGS Mineral Resource maps. Urban areas would be excluded from both the MSAs for the reasons outlined above.

4.118 MSAs for brick-making clay and sand and gravel are shown in appendix 9.

Proposals and Policies 4

4.119 As appropriate, in line with MPS1, local planning authorities - including unitary planning authorities - should take MSAs into account when developing policies and proposals in their Local Development Frameworks.

Question 25

Do the proposals for Mineral Safeguarding Areas ensure that all proven sand, gravel and brick-making clay resources are identified?

Mineral Consultation Areas

4.120 The Core Strategy (S14 and para 23.3) provisionally safeguards all existing permitted or operational minerals facilities, pending review through the plan-making process. The purpose of this approach is to ensure essential minerals facilities are not lost to other development such as housing, and that encroachment by other development does not limit their ability to operate as expected. Accordingly the Core Strategy (para 23.3) sets out consultation distances of 250m around existing and planned quarries and landfills and 50m around other mineral sites, such as aggregate recycling facilities, wharves and rail aggregate depots.

4.121 The essential minerals infrastructure, which needs safeguarding, consists of all existing sites and 'saved' preferred areas, and all proposals - including those for sand and gravel, chalk, brick-making clay and oil and gas - outlined in this document and shown in appendices 1 and 2.

4.122 In effect, in two-tier areas, the relevant mineral planning authority should be consulted about development on or surrounding - within the consultation distances specified - these safeguarded mineral facilities.

4.123 Minerals Policy Statement 1 (MPS1) allows mineral planning authorities to define Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs) in two-tier planning areas, based on the Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA). MPS1 does not enable MCAs to be identified in Portsmouth and Southampton City Council and the New Forest National Park.

4.124 It is therefore proposed to identify MCAs for the geographical area of Hampshire County Council, on a district by district basis, showing on an Ordnance Survey base map the MSAs for brick-making clay and sand and gravel, and the essential minerals infrastructure identified in this document with 250m boundaries around quarries and landfills, and 50m boundaries.

4.125 MCAs are shown in appendix 10. Consultation requirements are set out in appendix 11.

4.126 As appropriate, local planning authorities - excluding unitary planning authorities - should take MCAs into account when developing policies and proposals in their Local Development Frameworks. Unitary planning authorities should ensure that their Local Development Frameworks include appropriate measures to safeguard and protect essential minerals infrastructure in their area.

4 Proposals and Policies

Question 26

Do the proposals for Mineral Consultation Areas ensure that essential existing and proposed minerals infrastructure is identified?