

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Minerals and Waste Core Strategy - applicable to the area of New Forest National Park within Wiltshire

Consultation Statement

October 2006



Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Core Strategy Submission Document – Consultation Statement - as applicable to the area of New Forest National Park within Wiltshire

Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Consultation under Regulation 25
3. Consultation under Regulation 26: Issues and Preferred Options
4. Summary of consultation process

Appendices:

- Annex A: Regulation 25 Consultees
- Annex B: Main issues raised in Regulation 25 consultation
- Annex C: Regulation 26 consultees
- Annex D: Regulation 26 Proposals Matters and Public Advertisement
- Annex E: Regulation 26 consultation – issues raised and responses made

1. Introduction

1.1 At the meeting of the New Forest National Park Authority on 17 January 2006 it was agreed that the joint Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy being prepared by Hampshire County Council, and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils, should be applied to the part of the National Park that lies within Wiltshire. The principle of this approach was agreed with the Government Office for the South East in January 2006. The approach was deemed appropriate because it is considered prudent to have a single consistent policy framework for minerals and waste for the whole of the New Forest National Park, not just the area within Hampshire.

1.2 In considering the principle of extending the Hampshire Core Strategy into the Wiltshire areas of the New Forest National Park, it is worth noting several characteristics of the Wiltshire area of the National Park.

- The Wiltshire area of the National Park is very similar in character to the remainder of the National Park, reflecting its inclusion in the designated area. The designation process for the New Forest National Park took a number of years, with the final boundary only including land with a coherent and identifiable character.
- The area is relatively small, only comprising the equivalent of about 0.2% of Hampshire's population and less than 1% of Hampshire's total area. Consequently, it is considered unlikely that the extension of the Core Strategy into the Wiltshire part of the National Park would raise significant issues in terms of resource demand.
- The majority of stakeholders and interested parties consulted by the National Park Authority on the extension of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy into the Wiltshire area of the National Park had already been consulted on the Core Strategy by Hampshire County Council, and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils during their consultation for Hampshire during 2005.

Although these characteristics might mean it is unlikely that any new strategic issues will be raised (that have not been already raised elsewhere in the National Park or in the rest of Hampshire), a robust consultation process was undertaken.

1.3 On 1 April 2006 the New Forest National Park Authority gained its planning powers and became the Minerals and Waste planning authority for the whole of the National Park. At this stage the Core Strategy had completed its Regulation 26 (issues and Preferred Options) consultation for Hampshire, and the final submission was being prepared. The

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State in May 2006.

- 1.4 Given the progress of the Core Strategy document in Hampshire, it was necessary for the inclusion of the Wiltshire area of the National Park to 'catch up' with its progress before the final Examination in Public, which is scheduled for January 2007. The Wiltshire area of the National Park is currently covered by the adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals Local Plan and the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Local Plan. It is important that the National Park Authority establishes a strategic vision for this area, as in the absence of an effective minerals and waste plan, the Wiltshire area of the National Park would be exposed to applications for development of facilities and activities that could damage the integrity of the National Park and its communities.
- 1.5 The National Park Authority is keen to ensure that the New Forest is planned in a coherent and consistent manner following its designation as a National Park. The Authority has inherited a situation that means the National Park is covered by a range of Local Plans and Minerals & Waste Local Plans, which creates less consistency for the area, than otherwise would be the case.

Relevant aspects of the current consultation

- 1.6 Under Regulation 28 planning authorities are required to prepare and submit a Consultation Statement, setting out, amongst other things, the consultation and public involvement work to date and how it has influenced the development of the submission document.
- 1.7 This document is the Consultation Statement that accompanies the Core Strategy, and Wiltshire addendum, of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Framework, as it applies to the area of the New Forest National Park within Wiltshire. This document is in compliance with Regulation 28, when the Core Strategy, and Wiltshire addendum, is submitted to the First Secretary of State.
- 1.8 Representations made at the Regulation 28 (Submission Stage) will subsequently be presented to the same Examination in Public at which the Submitted Draft of the Joint Minerals and Waste Core Strategy is due to be considered by an independent planning inspector. It is hoped that both parts of the Joint Core Strategy will be aligned through the process of the public examination and adopted as a single document for the whole of Hampshire and the New Forest National Park.

2. Consultation under Regulation 25

- 2.1 Given the approach taken to 'catch up' with the production of the Core Strategy in Hampshire, it is important to identify whether there are any issues that arise by extending the Core Strategy to the Wiltshire area of the National Park that would affect the overall strategic policies, either because they are unique to this area or could have a significant impact on the Strategy.
- 2.2 Regulation 25 refers to the need for early community involvement, including informal consultation. The New Forest National Park Authority met this requirement through the consultation letter that was sent to all consultees listed in **Annex A**, for comment over a four week period from 12 July to 9 August 2006.
- 2.3 The consultation letter was sent to all properties – residences and businesses – within the Wiltshire area of the National Park. This amounted to approximately 1100 properties. This was important in identifying any new issues for the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (as it had already been submitted for the Hampshire area) The Regulation 25 consultation letter explained the process of the 'catch up' consultation process, set out the key dates for the next stages in the process, and invited comments on what were considered to be key issues pertaining to mineral extraction and waste management within that area of the National Park. Recipients of the letter had the option of returning a form if they wished to be involved in the rest of the consultation.
- 2.4 A total of 42 responses were received from both individuals and organisations. The main issues raised by consultees are set out in **Annex B**, together with an indication of how these are addressed in the *Issues and Preferred Option* document.
- 2.5 Most of the consultees contacted by the New Forest National Park Authority during this Regulation 25 Consultation had been already consulted by Hampshire County Council, and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils as part of their Regulation 25 Consultation in April 2005. For instance, the three parish councils in the Wiltshire area of the National Park, Salisbury District Council and Wiltshire County Council were all consulted as 'neighbouring' authorities that could be affected by the Hampshire Core Strategy.

3. Consultation under Regulation 26: Issues and Preferred Options

- 3.1 Consultation on the *Issues and Preferred Options* document was carried out under Regulation 26 for a six week period from Monday 28 August 2006 until 5pm on Monday 9 October 2006. The *Issues and Preferred Options* document that formed the basis of this consultation was the same document that Hampshire County Council previously consulted on in autumn 2005 for Hampshire, including the rest of the National Park within Hampshire. However, an addendum to that document was also prepared that updated the information with particular regard to the area of the National Park in Wiltshire. The addendum was sent out to consultees together with the *Issues and Preferred Options* document.
- 3.2 The *Issues and Preferred Options* document, along with the addendum, a statement of the proposal's matters, an Interim Sustainability Report for Hampshire and a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Wiltshire area, a background Technical Document and addendum for the Wiltshire area was made available at the following locations for inspection:
- New Forest National Park Authority's office, Lymington, Hampshire
 - Salisbury District Council's Planning office, Salisbury, Wiltshire
- 3.3 **Annex C** lists the groups who were consulted at the Regulation 26 stage which included the consultation bodies identified in Government guidance. Each consultee received:
- the *Issues and Preferred Options* document;
 - the *Issues and Preferred Options* Addendum;
 - A statement of the proposal's matters; and
 - A response form using the pro-forma established by Hampshire County Council.
- 3.4 Where relevant some of these bodies also received a copy of the Technical Document and Technical Document Addendum, setting out detailed background information. The Interim Sustainability Report (for Hampshire) and the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Wiltshire area of the New Forest National Park were also sent to the Government Office for the South East, Countryside Agency, Environment Agency, English Heritage and English Nature.
- 3.5 All the documents mentioned in paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 were also available on the website of New Forest National Park Authority, with a statement explaining where and when paper copies of the document were available.

- 3.6 A copy of the proposals matters was placed as an advertisement in the Romsey Advertiser on Friday 25 August 2006. This is a weekly publication that covers the northern areas of the New Forest national Park. This is set out in **Annex D**.
- 3.7 A total of 17 respondents made representations on the *Issues and Preferred Options* and *Addendum* consultation paper during the six week statutory consultation period. These respondents made a total of 118 representations. **Annex E** contains a summary of every issue raised and the way these have been addressed in the *Core Strategy*. The National Park Authority considers it to be appropriate, in this consultation process, to show all representations and the full consideration they were given by the National Park Authority, to provide as much transparency as possible.
- 3.8 It is again worth remembering that the majority of the consultees contacted by the New Forest National Park Authority during this Regulation 26 Consultation had already been consulted by Hampshire County Council, and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils as part of their Regulation 26 Consultation in October and November 2005.

4. Summary of Consultation process

- 4.1 The Regulation 25 and 26 stages of the consultation processes for extending the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy into the Wiltshire area of the New Forest National Park have been completed. The process used exceeds the minimum requirements set out in the 2004 Regulations.
- 4.2 In considering the principle of extending the Hampshire Core Strategy into the Wiltshire areas of the New Forest National Park, it is worth noting that the Wiltshire area of the National Park covers an area:
- with less than 1% of the area of Hampshire, and only 0.2% of the population of Hampshire.
 - with similar characteristics to the area in the National Park already covered by the submitted Core Strategy
 - where the majority of those consulted have already had an opportunity to comment on the Core Strategy previously.

Although it is unlikely that any new strategic issues will be raised that have not already been considered, a robust consultation process has been undertaken to test the applicability of the Hampshire Core Strategy to the whole of the New Forest National Park. This has been informed by an Integrated Sustainability Appraisal for each stage.

- 4.3 The Wiltshire area of the New Forest National Park is very similar in character to the remainder of the National Park, reflecting its inclusion in the designated area. It comprises open forest, grasslands, areas of national and international importance for nature conservation, and small villages. All of these environmental characteristics could potentially be affected by minerals extraction or waste processing. The conclusion of the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal identifies that the Minerals and Waste Joint Core Strategy fully recognizes these environmental characteristics.
- 4.4 The result of the consultation undertaken to date is that none of the representations received so far have raised new strategic issues specific to the Wiltshire area of the National Park, or that would require any material alteration of the Core Strategy policies. It is therefore considered that the proposal to extend the Core Strategy to cover the whole of the New Forest National Park is sound.

ANNEX A: Regulation 25 consultees

Government Office for the South East
Government Office for the South West
South East England Regional Assembly
South West England Regional Assembly
Forestry Commission
Hampshire County Council
Wiltshire County Council
New Forest District Council
Salisbury District Council
Test Valley Borough Council
Breamore Parish Council
Godshill Parish Council
Hale Parish Council
Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council
Romsey Extra Parish Council
Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish
Council
Whiteparish Parish Council
Coombe Bissett and Homington Parish
Council
Downton Parish Council
Landford Parish Council
Redlynch Parish Council

The Countryside Agency
The Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Crown Estate
Historic Buildings and Monuments
Commission for England (English
Heritage)
English Nature
The Strategic Rail Authority
South East England Regional
Development Agency
British Telecommunications plc
Mobile Operators Association
NTL
British Gas

National Grid
Npower Direct Ltd
Powergen
Southern Electric
Transco
Bournemouth and West Hants Water
Southern Water
Wessex Water Services Ltd

British Geological Society
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Wiltshire
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Hampshire
Confederation of British Industry South
East
Council for National Parks
Country Landowners Association
Freight Transport Association
Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Council
Gypsy Council
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Strategic
Health Authority
National Farmers Union
National Trust – Southern Region
Network Rail
New Forest Commoners Defence
Association
New Forest Friends of the Earth
Railtrack Property
Romsey and District Society
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
The Downton Society
The Rail Freight Group
Verderers of the New Forest
+ approximately 1100 residences and
businesses

ANNEX B: Main issues raised under Regulation 25 consultation

Issue raised	How this issue has been addressed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take account of the effect of heavy traffic, particularly lorries carrying waste, using roads through New Forest villages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The spatial planning objectives of the <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document seek to locate minerals and waste facilities close to local communities they serve and minimising harm from transport and impacts on land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lorry traffic should be restricted to strategic and local lorry route network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The spatial planning objectives of the <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document seek to locate minerals and waste facilities close to local communities they serve and minimising harm from transport and impacts on land
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no increase in traffic in the National Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The spatial planning objectives of the <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document seek to locate minerals and waste facilities close to local communities they serve and minimising harm from transport and impacts on land
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments about the kerbside recycling collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer comments to Salisbury District Council as the waste collection authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want to see existing landfill site at Pound Bottom extended or increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document does not consider site specific allocations, nor will the <i>Core Strategy</i>. It proposes that landfill in New Forest National Park should be restricted to small scale predominantly inert landfill sites servicing a demonstrable local need and reducing transport movements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't want to see any more waste disposal sites in this area of the National Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document proposes that landfill in New Forest National Park should be restricted to small scale predominantly inert landfill sites, and limits other waste management activities to small scale activities where there's a local need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should take account of the impact on the environment of waste lorries – damage to road verges; litter; noise; animal deaths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The spatial planning objectives of the <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document seek to locate minerals and waste facilities close to local communities they serve and minimising harm from transport and impacts on land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerate decommissioning of existing landfill site in National Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • The <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i> document does not consider site specific allocations, nor will the <i>Core Strategy</i>. The <i>Issues and Preferred Options</i>

	document proposes that landfill in New Forest National Park should be restricted to small scale predominantly inert landfill sites, and limits other waste management activities to small scale activities where there's a local need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency reiterated comments made at Regulation 28 consultation stage on submitted Hampshire Minerals & Waste Core Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any outstanding comments on the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Core Strategy will be considered at the Public Examination.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support a criteria-based policy approach to provision of future wastewater treatment infrastructure, including extensions to existing treatment works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support that the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Core Strategy will be applied to this area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of minerals & waste development in adjoining authorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not within the scope of the Strategy but would be assessed when planning applications are submitted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query whether the proposal to extend the scope of the Core Strategy to cover the Wiltshire area of the National Park is within the ambit of the Regulations 2004 and is procedurally acceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Park Authority has received confirmation from the Government Offices for the South East and South West that it this approach is procedurally acceptable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the use of the void-space at existing waste management facility at Pound Bottom. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Strategy will not be considering individual site specific allocations.

ANNEX C: Regulation 26 consultees

South East England Regional Assembly
South West England Regional Assembly
Government Office for the South East
Government Office for the South West
Hampshire County Council
Wiltshire County Council
Dorset County Council
New Forest District Council
Test Valley Borough Council
Salisbury District Council
Southampton City Council
Christchurch Borough Council
East Dorset District Council
Isle of Wight Council
Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council
Beaulieu Parish Council
Boldre Parish Council
Bramshaw Parish Council
Bransgore Parish Council
Breamore Parish Council
Brockenhurst Parish Council
Burley Parish Council
Copythorne Parish Council
Damerham Parish Council
Denny Lodge Parish Council
East Boldre Parish Council
Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council
Exbury and Lepe Parish Council
Fawley Parish Council
Fordingbridge Town Council
Godshill Parish Council
Hale Parish Council
Hordle Parish Council
Hyde Parish Council
Hythe and Dibden Parish Council
Lymington and Pennington Town Council
Lyndhurst Parish Council
Marchwood Parish Council
Martin Parish Council
Milford-on-Sea Parish Council
Minstead Parish Council
Netley Marsh Parish Council
New Milton Town Council
Ringwood Town Council
Rockbourne Parish Council 45

Sandleheath Parish Council
Sopley Parish Council
Sway Parish Council
Totton and Eling Town Council
Whitsbury Parish Council
Woodgreen Parish Council
Alderholt Parish Council
Cranborne & Edmondsham Parish Council
Sixpenny Handley with Pentridge Parish Council
St Leonards and St Ives Parish Council
Verwood Town Council
Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council
Wellow Parish Council
Romsey Extra Parish Council
Sherfield English Parish Council
Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish Council
Whiteparish Parish Council
Alderbury Parish Council
Coombe Bissett and Homington Parish Council
Downton Parish Council
Landford Parish Council
Redlynch Parish Council
Odstock Parish Council
Burton Parish Council
Hurn Parish Council
Stratford Toney Parish Council
West Dean Parish Council

The Countryside Agency
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage)
English Nature
Department for Transport
South East England Development Agency
Mobile Operators Association
British Telecommunications plc
NTL
The Hampshire and Isle of Wight Strategic Health Authority 38

British Gas
Transco
National Grid
Npower Direct Ltd
Powergen
Southern Electric
Southern Water
Wessex Water Services Ltd

British Geological Survey
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Hampshire
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Wiltshire
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
CBI South East
Commission for Architecture and the
Built Environment
Council for National Parks
Country Landowners Association
Crown Estate
Forest Enterprise England
Freight Transport Association
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife
Trust
Institute of Waste Management
National Farmers Union
Network Rail
New Forest Association
New Forest Commoners Defence
Association
Planning Inspectorate
Railtrack Property
Romsey and District Society
Sherfield English Environmental
Protection Society
South West Trains Ltd
The Composting Association
The Downton Society

The Forestry Commission
The Rail Freight Group
Verderers of the New Forest

Cleansing Service Group Ltd.
Mrs S L Goddard
Mrs M A Smith
Mr Ralph Smith
A Naish
Mr R F Lines
Mr A R Cousins
Mr M Lewis
Mr J H Fall
E Mills
Mr and Mrs F Stark
Mrs M Coombs
Mrs J Reid
Ms J Clarke
Peter and Maureen Darling
Mr and Mrs D R Davis
P M A and Mrs M Craddock
Mr and Dr K Waltham
Mrs S Edwards
Mr C J Scott
Ms Jane Steeds
M J Martin
Kelvin Mew
Joyce Winters
David Charles
Alan Jones
David Octon
Dr David Kerridge
Malcolm Webb
J C R Upton
Francesca Mettam
Graham Roddie
Mr and Mrs J Burnett
J C Langlands

ANNEX D: Regulation 26 Proposals Matters and Public Advertisement

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Notice of Pre-Submission Public Participation with regard to the
Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Core Strategy: Issues and Preferred Option

The Core Strategy for the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework will set out the vision, objectives and spatial development strategy for the planning and management of minerals and waste in Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton. The Issues and Preferred Option document sets out some of the important issues relating to minerals and waste development in Hampshire up to 2020 and sets out a preferred option that can be expanded into a minerals and waste planning strategy.

This consultation period relates exclusively to the area of the New Forest National Park that lies within Wiltshire (Salisbury District).

The six week consultation period starts on Monday 28 August and ends at 5pm on Monday 9 October 2006.

Copies of the Issues and Preferred Options paper and supporting documents are available for inspection at:

- New Forest National Park Authority, South Efford House, Milford Road, Everton, Lymington during normal office hours Monday – Friday 8:45 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- Salisbury District Council at 61 Wyndham Road, Salisbury during normal office hours Monday – Thursday 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Friday 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The consultation documents are also available for viewing and download on the internet at: www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/index/planning/pl-planpolicy

Representations on the Issues and Preferred Options are invited and a response form is available at the above locations and on the website. All representations should be made in writing and sent to:

Policy and Plans Team
New Forest National Park Authority
South Efford House
Milford Road
Lymington
Hampshire SO41 0JD

Or by email to policyandplans@newforestnpa.gov.uk

Representations may be accompanied with a request to be notified at a specified address when the Core Strategy is submitted to the Secretary of State.

ANNEX E: Main issues raised under Regulation 26 Consultation

Issue	Respondent	Summary of Representation	National Park Authority response
General	Government Office of the South West	<p>The HMW Development Scheme does not mention that the Wiltshire area will be dealt on a different timescale and under different arrangements. The dates shown in the LDS have already passed, so this current consultation is unsound.</p> <p>The NFNP draft LDS shows that the Issues and Option and Submission stages have already been completed. There is no reference to Wiltshire and that it will have a different consultation timeframe and different arrangements. Therefore this document is unsound.</p>	<p>The extension of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy into the Wiltshire part of the New Forest National Park is co-ordinated by the New Forest National Park Authority, who are the minerals and waste planning authority for this area. The Authority discussed their draft LDS with the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) in August 2006 and they did not raise the need to include the Wiltshire consultation within the document. However, the NPA has an amended draft LDS to be submitted to GOSE shortly that does refer to the Wiltshire consultation.</p> <p>The consultation undertaken exceeds the minimum requirements in the 2004 Regulations.</p>
General		<p>The document fails to give the community in Wiltshire sufficient time to engage in the process. Six weeks is not long enough for a properly front loaded approach. How can any new issues that are raised be properly incorporated into the HMWCS when this has already been submitted?</p> <p>The document is not transparent. There is no explanation of why the consultation is on a document which is not in conformity with planning regulations, national planning policy and the Hampshire MW Development Scheme</p>	<p>Every residential and commercial address within the Wiltshire area of the National Park has been contacted and invited to be involved in the consultation process. Communities were given the statutory six week period to comment as set out in the 2004 Regulations. This follows the procedure adopted by Hampshire County Council in their consultation. It is also worth remembering that all 3 of the parishes, Salisbury District Council and Wiltshire County Council were consulted by Hampshire County Council during the earlier consultation as 'adjacent authorities', so will already have seen the document.</p> <p>The question of how any new issues that are raised be properly incorporated into the HMWCS when this has already been submitted is at this stage hypothetical. This will need to be addressed if, after a full consideration of the issues raised, it is felt necessary to amend the document in light of any new issues being identified.</p>

			<p>The covering letter, addendum and Sustainability Appraisal sent at each consultation stage have explained the exercise of extending the Hampshire Core Strategy to cover the Wiltshire part of the Park.</p>
General		<p>Has the Sustainability Appraisal been properly applied to this document? Have all the 4 environmental agencies had an opportunity to influence the SA, in accordance to the statutory time periods? Has a scoping exercise been done to assess whether an Appropriate Assessment is required?</p>	<p>The NPA has produced and consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report at the Regulation 26 consultation stage has produced a full Sustainability Appraisal at the Regulation 28 stage. The 4 statutory bodies had an opportunity to comment on the Appraisal for 6 weeks – longer than the statutory 5 weeks.</p> <p>Appropriate Assessment</p> <p>In terms of scoping the need for an Appropriate Assessment of the Core Strategy, this was undertaken as part of the Hampshire County Council led consultation undertaken in 2005. Appendix 4 of the Submission draft Core Strategy Technical Document relates to the assessment of the Core Strategy in accordance with the EC Directive 92/43. The conclusion is that policy DC2 has been written to protect sites designated due to their nature conservation importance at the international scale (Natura 2000 sites). This policy, in conjunction with other policies which ensure waste minimisation and reduce landfill thus minimising the need for landfill sites, safeguard sites designated for their international importance for nature conservation importance to biodiversity in Hampshire. With these safeguards in place it is not thought that this Core Strategy will have a significant effect on Hampshire's Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>In their response to the Hampshire consultation in 2005 (41/37) English Nature – who were the relevant Government agency - welcomed the intention of the Core Strategy to avoid a likely significant effect Natura 2000 sites, and stress the need for more detailed</p>

			<p>consideration to be given to potential impacts on Natura 2000 sites <u>during the selection of sites for proposed mineral and waste development.</u></p> <p>The application of the Habitats Directive to the selection of preferred sites will need to be dealt with as part of the Sites Development Plan Documents. Paragraph 2.24 of the <i>Hampshire Minerals Plan and Hampshire Waste Management Plan Issues and Options – Sites Discussion Paper (September 2006)</i> states that Appropriate Assessments will be required at the Preferred Options stage to assess sites in “...<i>locations close to...</i>” close to European nature conservation sites.</p> <p>It is not considered that the extension of the Core Strategy into the small area of the New Forest National Park affects this conclusion. The Submission draft Core Strategy protects sites with international and national designations through Policy DC2, and any sites considered for development will be fully considered through the preferred options stage in the production of the Hampshire Minerals Plan and the Hampshire Waste Management Plan. It is therefore considered that no changes are required in response to this representation.</p>
General		<p>GOSE’s reasons why this document is unsound is contained in their response on the Lead Core Strategy. GOSW share this view.</p> <p>It is not clear how this document relates to other plans and strategies, particularly those with cross-border influences. E.g. Wiltshire Local Transport Plan and the RSS for the South West.</p> <p>It is not clear how policies in these plans have influenced the options in this document, and whether any issues raised are different to those identified in the Lead Core Strategy. E.g. are there any Local Plans that could result in large scale developments which would have waste implications</p>	<p>The issues raised by GOSE in their response to the ‘lead’ Core Strategy are being addressed principally by Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>For regional planning purposes the New Forest National Park is deemed to lie wholly with the South East region. Therefore, although there is a requirement to have regard to the emerging South West Plan, it is the South East Plan that the Core Strategy must be in general conformity with. The Submission draft Core Strategy acknowledges cross-boundary influences. Section 20.0 on <i>Minerals</i> for example, recognises that the quarries to</p>

		(Bournemouth growth plans?)	<p>the south and west of the New Forest National Park largely serve the local market (including Dorset), rather than South Hampshire.</p> <p>The Salisbury District area of the National Park has a population of less than 2,500 people. Therefore, on the scale of Hampshire (1.24 million residents), the impact on resource demand from including this area within the Core Strategy is minimal. The Wiltshire part of the National Park makes up approximately 1% of the area covered by the Core Strategy, so in resource demand terms it is considered to be <i>de minimis</i>.</p>
General		The Wiltshire Community Strategy is referred to in the Technical Report Addendum. Has this informed the Core Strategy?	<p>The Wiltshire Community Strategy (February 2006 Consultation draft) seeks to minimise waste and increase re-use and recycling. It also aims for all minerals extraction sites to have restorations plans in place. The transport section seeks to reduce the impact of traffic.</p> <p>The Submission draft Hampshire Core Strategy includes a policy on restoration and aftercare, including the creation of habitats to improve biodiversity. The Strategy also seeks to minimise the impact of transporting minerals and waste materials. No changes required.</p>
General		The document fails to identify issues and options affecting the Wiltshire area. The assumption that the Issues and Options identified for the Hampshire MW Core Strategy are appropriate for Wiltshire may be unsound	<p>The Wiltshire area of the New Forest National Park is very similar in character to the rest of the New Forest National Park, reflecting its inclusion in the designated area. The area is covered by the same national planning policy guidance as the Hampshire part of the Park and it is not considered that different issues arise. The Integrated Sustainability Appraisal concludes that no additional alternatives would have been generated through including the Wiltshire area at the outset of the Plan process. In terms of population and area, the Wiltshire area is insignificant on the scale of Hampshire in terms of resource needs. No change required.</p>
General	Government	Has the necessary front loading been completed in the	Consultation with all of the residents within the Wiltshire

	Office for the South East	preparation of this document ?	area of the National Park has been undertaken in accordance with the 2004 Regulations. It is also worth remembering that all 3 of the parishes, Salisbury District Council and Wiltshire County Council were all consulted by Hampshire County Council during the earlier consultation as 'adjacent authorities', so will already have seen the document. No changes required.
General		Will the NFNPA be able to demonstrate that the Sustainability Appraisal has been fully integrated and has informed the preparation of the core strategy in a systematic way ?	The NPA has produced and consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report at the Regulation 26 consultation stage has produced a full Integrated Sustainability Appraisal at the Regulation 28 stage. The 4 statutory bodies had an opportunity to comment on the Sustainability Appraisal for 6 weeks – longer than the statutory 5 weeks. The results of the Appraisal have been considered by the NPA prior to the consultation at the Regulation 28 stage.
General		How can comments on the preferred options and the submission of the Wiltshire area be incorporated into the Hampshire Core Strategy before the examination	The issue of how any new comments that are raised be properly incorporated into the HMWCS when this has already been submitted is at this stage hypothetical. This will need to be addressed if, after a full consideration of the issues raised, it is felt necessary to amend the document in light of new issues being raised.
General		Given that part of the New Forest National Park lies in Wiltshire, has consideration been given to the Regional Spatial Strategy for this area ?	For regional planning purposes the New Forest National Park is deemed to lie wholly with the South East region. Therefore, although there is a requirement to have regard to the emerging South West Plan, it is the South East Plan that the Core Strategy must be in general conformity with. No changes required.
General		Has NFNPA considered Appropriate Assessment ? How does the NPA approach fir with that of Hampshire CC ?	See response to GOSW on page 2.
General		Will the NPA be setting out the approach to the Wiltshire area in the forthcoming NFNPA LDS, which is due for submission	The extension of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy into the Wiltshire part of the New Forest National Park is co-ordinated by the New Forest National Park Authority, who are the minerals and waste planning authority for this area. The Authority discussed their draft LDS with the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) in August 2006 and they did not raise the need

			to include the Wiltshire consultation within the document. However, the draft National Park Authority LDS has been amended to set out the approach to the Wiltshire area of the National Park. This is due to be submitted shortly to the Government Office for the South East.
General		The structure of the SA Report checklist in ' Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents ' does not appear to have been used. Was consideration given to the inclusion of a non technical summary of the SA report ?	The Integrated Sustainability Appraisal circulated with the Submission draft Core Strategy for consultation contains a non-technical summary.
General	Wiltshire County Council	The proposed approach to include the Wiltshire area in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy is supported in principle.	Support welcomed.
General		<p>Concern is raised that comments provided at the Reg 25 Issues and Options stage have not been fully considered. The main issues raised were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the NFNPA received confirmation from the relevant Government Offices, Regional Planning Bodies, and the Planning Inspectorate that the proposal to re-consult on a strategy that has now been submitted is procedurally acceptable ? 2. There are issues relating to the Pound Bottom Waste Management Facility, which need to be addressed in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework 3. As it stands the Core Strategy does not provide a policy basis for decision making in the Wiltshire area of the National Park. A re-examination of the assumptions used for the apportionment of the supply of minerals and waste capacity in Hampshire to incorporate the whole revised Plan area (Hampshire and the Wiltshire area of the National Park) is necessary. 	<p>The NPA received support from the Government Office for the South East to the principle of extending the Hampshire Core Strategy to provide a consistent Park-wide planning framework for the National Park. The communities within the Wiltshire area of the National Park have been consulted in accordance with the 2004 Regulations. It is also worth remembering that all 3 of the parishes were consulted by Hampshire County Council during the earlier consultation as 'adjacent authorities', so will already have seen the document prior to this consultation.</p> <p>Issues relating to the Pound Bottom site will be addressed specifically through the Hampshire Waste Management Sites DPD. The NPA aims to ensure the Core Strategy policies provide a suitable overall framework for considering the Pound Bottom site.</p>
General		How can comments on the preferred options and the submission of the Wiltshire area be incorporated into the Hampshire Core Strategy, since this has already been submitted ?	The issue of how any new issues that are raised be properly incorporated into the HMWCS when this has already been submitted is at this stage hypothetical. This will need to be addressed if, after a full consideration of

			the issues raised, it is felt necessary to amend the document.
General		Concern is raised that the process of amending the Plan area to incorporate the Wiltshire area of the National Park does not fully accord with the spirit or intent of PPS12 and the principal Regulations.	The communities of the Wiltshire area of the New Forest National Park have been consulted in accordance with the 2004 Regulations in terms of the length of each public consultation period, the advertising, the availability of documents on the Authority's website and the distribution of documents. Every household was written to at the Regulation 25 stage to inform them of the proposals, with the option of full involvement in the remaining stages offered. The three Parish Councils, Salisbury District Council and Wiltshire County Council were also consulted under the 2004 Regulations by HCC as part of the earlier consultation exercises as 'adjacent authorities', so will have considered the document previously.
General		The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme did not reflect the production of separate documents for the Wiltshire area of the National Park in the Core Strategy. Does the Core Strategy need to be properly re-considered to incorporate the revised Plan area (to include the Wiltshire area of the National Park) to conform with soundness test 1 ? This does not appear possible given that the Core Strategy has already been submitted.	The extension of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy into the Wiltshire part of the New Forest National Park is co-ordinated by the New Forest National Park Authority. The NPA discussed their draft LDS with GOSE in August 2006 and they did not raise any issues with the Authority's draft LDS, although they were aware of the Wiltshire consultation. The NPA has an amended draft LDS to be submitted to GOSE shortly that does refer to the Wiltshire consultation.
General		As the Wiltshire area of the National Park is currently situated in the South West Region, the views of the Government Office for the South West should be sought to examine the degree to which the strategic policy framework for the south west region will be affected by the proposals in this document and the 'loss' of the Pound Bottom landfill facility	The Government Office for the South West has been consulted. It should be noted that for regional planning purpose, the New Forest national Park (including the area of the National within Wiltshire) is deemed to lie wholly within the South East region.
General	Environment Agency	Wish to commend the New Forest NPA on the documents. Consider them to be well presented and concise. The significant environmental concerns of interest to the Environment Agency have been generally addressed well within the document.	Comments noted and support welcomed.

		Stakeholders should be invited to identify potential minerals and waste sites allocations for the added area to inform the HCC assessment of potential sites.	This process forms part of the sites development plan documents, and should be addressed through this separate consultation. No changes required.
General	Natural England	<p>Whilst understanding that specific minerals and waste sites are still to be identified (Section 13 of the Strategy), the broad geographic locations for waste management facilities and mineral workings (as set out in Section 9 Waste Management Capacity; Section 12 Supply of Minerals; Section 14 Locational Issues; and Section 16 Policies) should be identified in the Spatial Vision.</p> <p>Once identified it would be possible to assess the biodiversity implications of this DPD in terms of the potential effects on nature conservation and on the New Forest National Park. Development beyond the boundaries of the National Park could still impact upon it, particularly given the proximity of the urban conurbation of Southampton, which requires considerable waste facilities.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy identifies a Mineral Resource Area where new extraction will take place (Policy S6 and S8); a safeguarded sand and gravel deposits (Policy S15); a Strategic Facilities area of search (Policy S16); and a non-hazardous landfill potential area (Policy S6).</p> <p>It is noted that development outside the National Parks can have impacts on the designated areas, and the site selection methodology takes this into account. It is considered that policy DC2 in the Submission draft Core Strategy covers this concern.</p> <p>Recommend changes to the Key Diagram at the back of the Core Strategy to cover the Wiltshire area of the National Park.</p>
		The Strategy should better address the protection of environmental resources in the development of waste management facilities and mineral workings. The Strategy should seek to minimise the loss of habitats and natural features, avoid adverse impacts on sites of nature conservation importance, prevent hazardous substances from entry into the environment as waste, and restore land affected by waste disposal or mineral workings where possible to enhance and recreate wildlife habitats	<p>It is considered that policy DC2 in the Submission draft Core Strategy satisfactorily addresses the protection afforded to natural resources of international and national designations in the development of waste management facilities and minerals workings. The impact on these sites of any proposed minerals and waste sites will be considered as part of the sites selection process.</p> <p>Policy DC7 in the Submission draft Core Strategy seeks to afford appropriate protection to areas of importance for biodiversity and, where possible, conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>It is considered that the Submission draft Core Strategy satisfactorily covers the concerns raised.</p>
		Where possible the Strategy should seek to mitigate any adverse impacts on the environment	Section 11.0 sets out the Strategy Objectives, including the protection of areas of environmental interest from the adverse impacts of mineral and waste developments.

			This is carried forward into Policy DC2 (which protects International and National designations), Policy DC3 (impact on townscape and landscape) and Policy DC7 (Biodiversity). It is considered that the Submission draft Core Strategy satisfactorily covers the concerns raised.
		Suggests a restoration-led approach to guide site selection, to allow the benefits from mineral workings to be capitalised upon.	Section 11.0 sets out the Strategy Objectives, which include ensuring high quality restoration and aftercare. This objective is carried forward into Policy DC12 in the Submission draft Core Strategy which provides guidance on restoration and aftercare. The policy seeks to ensure that restoration is consistent with the general planning objectives of the area, and this can include improvements to public access to the countryside, the improvement of biodiversity or use as back up grazing for the New Forest. No changes required.
		An Appropriate Assessment should be undertaken for the Strategy, given the fact that mineral resource areas and urban conurbations requiring waste facilities are located in close proximity to the New Forest National Park. Recommends that a screening study of the DPD is undertaken to determine whether a full Appropriate Assessment would be required. A recent ruling confirmed that plans as well as specific development proposals are subject to the requirement of Appropriate Assessment. Mineral workings and waste facilities could impact the New Forest National Park through transport movements, cross-boundary pollution etc and these must be considered prior to determining preferred options. The Hampshire Avon is designated a SAC and as such it too must be considered through an Appropriate Assessment.	See response to GOSW on page 2.
		In determining alternative options to landfill for sustainable management of waste, the Strategy should be based on an evaluation of alternatives considering BPEO.	The concept of the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) is eliminated by PPS10 (Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, 2005). PPS10 replaced PPG10 (Planning and Waste Management, 1999). PPS10 states that Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) should be applied so as to shape planning strategies that

			support the Government's planning objectives for waste management set out in PPS10. This requirement supersedes the BPEO concept. No changes required.
		Additional criteria should be included in the Strategy to encourage the sensitive location of waste management facilities and mineral workings. These are set out in the response to Q30.	It is considered that the site selection methodology set out in Appendix 2 to the Submission draft Core Strategy adequately address this issue. The factors to be taken into account include ecology and biodiversity and impact on designated landscapes. No changes required.
		The proposed supply of land-won sand and gravel should be kept to a minimum to avoid the negative environmental implications of extraction. Encourages the use of recycled and secondary aggregates wherever possible.	The supply level of land-won sand and gravel is established through the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East. The emerging South East Plan requires that Hampshire supply 2.63 million tonnes a year of local land-won aggregate. The Core Strategy aims to, in the longer term, stabilise demand by 2016 and extract less aggregate as demand falls in response to more sustainable construction. The Submission draft Core Strategy only apportions sand and gravel production for the period to 2016. The remainder of production is allocated as a 'strategic reserve', with sites to be identified following reviews of likely future demand. By 2020, there is a regional target of 60% of construction, demolition and excavation waste to be recycled. This would supply 1.7 million tonnes a year or recycled and secondary aggregates. Policy S9 in the Submission draft Core Strategy supports the production of recycled and secondary aggregates.
		Supports the need to reduce the traffic impacts associated with the management of minerals and waste as set out in Section 14 of the Strategy. However, more emphasis should be placed on the use of sustainable modes of transport (such as rail and barge) to move minerals, waste and recyclables	Support for reducing the traffic impacts welcomed. The Strategy Objectives set out in section 11.0 of the Submission draft Core Strategy includes the safeguarding of facilities for the use of rail and sea transport for the movement of minerals and waste. Policy S13 (Wharves and Rail Depots) supports the provision for rail depots, sidings and wharves for the reception and movement of aggregates, recyclables and waste by rail and short-sea shipping as far as possible.

			This policy links with Policy DC18 which supports the sustainable transport of minerals and waste. The policy framework supports additional infrastructure for sustainable transport. The site allocations documents will review and if necessary identify new sites. No changes required.
General	Godshill Parish Council	It is difficult to tell if the text refers to Municipal waste only or all other types	<p>It is noted that in their responses to the Hampshire County Council consultation undertaken in 2005, Godshill Parish Council were seeking assurance that the Core strategy will be extended to cover the Wiltshire part of the New Forest National Park (580/316). This consultation is seeking to do that.</p> <p>All wastes are covered by the Core Strategy – the approach taken within Hampshire deliberately combines municipal and commercial wastes.</p>
		More control is needed over non-municipal waste. PARA 10.34 says this is not possible, but it could be done with more liaison with the planning authorities. This is very important as municipal waste accounts for only about a third of total waste	The Core Strategy seeks to address this issue where possible. For example, Appendix 4 to the Submission draft Core Strategy contains the Implementation Plan. Policy S17 (Co-Location, Systems and Infrastructure) outlines local authorities as the 'lead actors'. No changes required.
		<p>More effort is required to develop alternative means of waste treatment. Could Hampshire catch up with the advancement in Europe of technology for alternative treatments such as biomass or wood-burning to generate heat? Waste wood should never go to landfill.</p> <p>There is a profit to be made from recycling/anaerobic digestion/gasification, which the Councils could set up, and not leave to the environment sector.</p>	The Core Strategy approach will drive alternative means of waste treatment. The Strategy seeks to decrease landfill, increasing recycling rates and encouraging alternative treatments. This is reflected in policy S7 in the Submission draft Core Strategy, which supports specialist facilities including biomass. No changes required.
General	John Martin, Resident	If Hampshire's processing facilities have spare capacity, it could take London's waste profitably. Can Hampshire vary the charge it makes for taking this waste, depending on how much London wish to send? Hampshire should not become a dumping ground for London's waste, but if it can process it efficiently, then Hampshire should do so on a	<p>Overall net self-sufficiency for Hampshire is required within the draft Core Strategy, in line with the emerging South East Plan.</p> <p>The Core Strategy does not plan for the landfilling of any of London's waste within Hampshire as there is no</p>

		profitable basis.	surplus capacity.
Q1	Natural England	Welcome Option 2's focus on managing waste locally and emphasis on recovering value through re-use, recycling and composting. Supports co-locating facilities and activities that help sustainable management of resources	Support welcomed.
Q2	Natural England	<p>Would like to see broad geographic locations for waste facilities and mineral workings (not specific sites) to enable comment on the biodiversity implications of the spatial strategy. This is important because the mineral resource areas adjacent to the National Park could have an impact on the Park.</p> <p>The criteria for selecting sites should include various environmental criteria including nature conservation, impact on habitats, and positive restoration of land.</p> <p>The spatial vision should set out how environmental constraints will be taken into account when identifying sites</p> <p>Would like the spatial vision to make reference to the restoration of mineral reserves. A restoration – led approach could be used to guide minerals development site selection</p> <p>Would like to see disposal of waste only when the alternatives have been exhausted (subject to BPEO)</p>	<p>The broad locations for minerals and waste development (the Minerals Resource Area, the Non Hazardous Landfill Potential Area and the Strategic Facilities – Area of Search) are all illustrated in Appendix 5 – Key Diagram to the Submission draft Core Strategy. This diagram also illustrates national and international environmental constraints.</p> <p>Policy S18 and Appendix 2 to the Submission draft Core Strategy set out the Site Selection Methodology and Factors. Factors to be assessed include consideration of international, national and locally designated nature conservation sites, and the opportunities for beneficial restoration.</p> <p>Policy DC12 in the Submission draft Core Strategy outlines the authorities' position on restoration and aftercare. Restoration schemes can contribute towards a number of planning objectives, including use as back-up grazing land which could directly benefit the New Forest National Park.</p> <p>The concept of the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) is eliminated by PPS10 (Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, 2005). PPS10 states that Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) should be applied so as to shape planning strategies that support the Government's planning objectives for waste management set out in PPS10. This requirement supersedes the BPEO concept, so no changes are recommended.</p>

			It is considered that the Submission draft Core Strategy satisfactorily covers the points raised.
Q3	Christchurch Borough Council	In objective 1 would prefer to refer to 'good practice' on these matters, rather than use the phrase 'designed with environmental, economic and social considerations in mind'	The Strategy Objectives are set out in section 11.0 of the Submission draft Core Strategy. Objective 1 has been amended to read "...developed with due regard to the principles of sustainable development...", rather than, "...designed with environmental, economic and social considerations in mind." It is felt that reference to 'good practice' would be unclear. It is considered that this amendment aids in the clarity of the objective, and no further change is required.
	Hurn Parish Council	Would not want Hampshire CC to transport waste to the proposed MBT plant at Hurn, Dorset	Overall net self-sufficiency for Hampshire is required within the draft Core Strategy, in line with the emerging South East Plan. Any movements of waste into Dorset would need to be counter-balanced by movements in the other direction. Currently Dorset is a net exporter of waste to Hampshire. No changes required.
	Natural England	<p>Would like to see amended / additional spatial planning objectives in Section 6 of the Strategy to reflect national and regional policies on minerals and waste.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would like the 'environmental considerations' referred to in objective 1 expanded to fully take account of PPS10 – particularly that site selection for waste facilities should include the physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and neighbouring uses 2. Would like a spatial objective to ensure appropriate weight is given to designated sites of international, national and local importance, protected species, biodiversity and geological interests (key principle 2, para 1 of PPS9) 3. Would like a spatial objective to promote opportunities for incorporating beneficial biodiversity and geological features within the design of development (key principle 4, para 1 PPS9). The Issues and Options fail to adequately address the restoration of workings. 	<p>PPS10 (Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, 2005) forms the overarching national waste management planning policy guidance and forms part of the of the national waste management plan for the UK. There is no need to duplicate it's guidance within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Section 11.0 of the Submission draft Core Strategy sets out the Strategy objectives. These include the protection of land with international and national biodiversity designations (objective ix) and protection of local communities and areas of environmental interest from the adverse impact of minerals, waste and resource developments (objective x). It is considered that these meet the concerns raised.</p> <p>Strategy Objective (viii) in the Submission draft Core Strategy ensures high quality restoration and aftercare, taking into account biodiversity objectives. There is no need to amend this.</p>

Q4	Hurn Parish Council	To avoid transporting Hampshire waste to the proposed MBT plant in Hurn, Dorset	Overall net self-sufficiency for Hampshire is required within the draft Core Strategy, in line with the emerging South East Plan. Any movements of waste into Dorset would need to be counter-balanced by movements in the other direction. Currently Dorset is a net exporter of waste to Hampshire. No changes required.
	Christchurch Borough Council	We would like to see reference to considering the wider impacts of development (i.e. not just on-site or site access). Our particular concern here is regarding wider transport impacts. Also concerned about the cumulative effects on communities, landscapes and roads of having several minerals facilities located close together. In particular the effects of the lorries travelling to and from them. An objective could be to consider the spatial distribution of facilities across Hampshire/Wiltshire in relation to communities and suitable transport routes?	Appendix 2 to the Submission draft Core Strategy sets out Site Selection Methodology and Factors. The methodology will be used to identify locations and sites for inclusion in the Hampshire Minerals DPD and the Hampshire Waste DPD. The factors to be taken into account include distance from waste source and the minerals and waste lorry routes. Consideration of the cumulative effects of minerals and waste development on local communities is a requirement set down in PPS10 (paragraph 21) and will therefore be incorporated within the site selection methodology. No changes required.
	Natural England	It is important that nature conservation and biodiversity is adequately covered as per the Community Strategy	The South Wiltshire Community Strategy (covering the period 2004 – 2009) which covers Salisbury and South Wiltshire and was produced by the South Wiltshire Strategic Alliance seeks to minimise household waste and increase recycling rates. The Community Strategy acknowledges that part of the New Forest National Park lies within Wiltshire, and 'looking after the environment' was one of the top priorities identified by residents. It is considered that the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy adequately covers these points, with policies seeking to increase recycling rates and potential of the environment central to the Strategy.
Q5	Christchurch Borough Council	While the target is not necessarily realistically achievable, we do support the zero targets. Even as an aspiration rather than a realistic aim, all LPAs should aim for zero targets.	Support welcomed.
	Natural England	Welcomes the long-term aspiration of zero waste growth	Support welcomed.

Q6	Natural England	Welcomes the emerging regional target for limiting waste growth.	Support welcomed.
Q7	Natural England	Answers already covered	Noted.
Q8	Natural England	<p>Welcomes policies on design construction and demolition in the Strategy. However, where these set requirements must be delivered through the wider planning system, it is important that this is communicated to the local planning authorities developing the local DPDs.</p> <p>We welcome the sustainable design elements in para 8.15 of the Strategy and the new permanent minerals and waste developments should include in para 8.16.</p> <p>However, additional value could be added to the use of sustainable design and construction techniques by including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. conserving and enhancing the natural environment b. re-using land and buildings c. conserving materials, water, other resources and energy d. reducing noise, pollution, flooding, and micro-climate effects 	<p>The delivery of sustainable design, construction and demolition through the wider planning system by local authorities is not directly a matter for the Core Strategy. The Implementation Plan (Appendix 4 of the Submission draft Core Strategy) outlines the local planning authorities within Hampshire as the key actors in the delivery of sustainable design and construction by developers.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should be read as a whole. Policy DC1 in the Submission draft Core Strategy ensures that sustainable design and construction techniques are incorporated within minerals and waste developments.</p> <p>No changes recommended as a result of this representation.</p>
	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	Policies on sustainable design, construction and demolition should be subject to planning policy and building regulations	<p>Policy S1 in the Submission draft Core Strategy seeks to facilitate the efficient use of resources through sustainable design, construction and demolition. This policy is linked to Policy DC1 (Sustainable Minerals and Waste Development) which promotes energy efficient design and the recycling of demolition waste.</p> <p>It is considered that these policies and related supporting text contained within the Submission draft Core Strategy address the concerns raised.</p>
Q10	Natural England	Supports the principle that where waste creation is unavoidable, preference should be for re-use, then recycling, energy recovery and composting. However, there are many risks associated with waste disposal to landfill. Depending on their location landfill sites could impact the New Forest National Park.	Comments noted. Policy DC2 in the Submission draft Core Strategy and supporting text states that non hazardous landfill within, or likely to impact on the New Forest National Park, will not usually be granted. This reflects the national guidance on major development within protected areas. Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995 also ensures that relevant authorities consider

			National Park purposes in reaching decisions that may affect land within the National Park, even if the development is outside its boundaries. This is enshrined within the Environment Act 1995 and does not need to be repeated within the Core Strategy. No changes required.
Q11	Natural England	Supports proposals than encourage self-sufficiency.	Support welcomed.
Q12	Natural England	Recognises that the three geographic areas are the least environmentally constrained, thereby avoiding the New Forest National Park and the proposed South Downs National Park. It is, however, important that Section 9 of the Strategy explains where waste from the National Park will be treated. Any waste facilities on the edge of these geographic areas, especially close to the New Forest National Park should be sensitively located. Criteria for identifying these locations should take account of potential visual impacts, transport impacts, potential air and water pollution on the National Park.	The three geographical areas identified within the Issues and Preferred Options Paper (Urban South Hampshire, the Western Corridor, and Forest and Downland) have been amended to four areas – South Hampshire, North East Hampshire, Forest, and Downland in the Submission draft Core Strategy. This reflects the importance attached to the landscapes of the New Forest National Park and the proposed South Downs National Park. The two growth areas of South Hampshire and North East Hampshire are expected to provide the bulk of the strategic waste management capacity for Hampshire. Paragraph 24.4 in the Submission draft Core Strategy states that minerals and waste development in the New Forest National Park will be restricted to small scale activities servicing local needs. Recommend no change.
	John Martin, Resident	Should not aspire to be self-sufficient in the National Park. Better to target self sufficiency for the region as a whole	The approach set out in the Core Strategy will result in net self-sufficiency in terms of <u>Hampshire's</u> waste management capacity (Policy S3). Planning for minerals and waste development will operate within strict criteria to protect the New Forest National Park. Paragraph 24.3 in the Submission draft Core Strategy accepts that the New Forest National Park will contribute less minerals and waste infrastructure than others. No changes required.
Q13	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	Hampshire should only take London's waste at a premium, and it should be transported by water	The Core Strategy does not plan for the landfilling of any of London's waste within Hampshire – see policy S3 (Net Self-Sufficiency) in the Submission draft Core Strategy.
	Natural England	Provision should be made to manage a proportion of	The Mayor of London's goal is to achieve 85% self

		London's waste in the short-term to support the Mayor of London's goal to achieve 80% self sufficiency. This proportion should be progressively reduced in the future.	sufficiency by 2020. The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy does not plan for the landfilling of any of London's waste within Hampshire – see policy S3 (Net Self-Sufficiency) in the Submission draft Core Strategy. A Topic paper has also been prepared on this issue for the Examination. Recommend no change.
	Julian Fall, Resident	Concerned that these parts of Hampshire and Wiltshire are being burdened with an unfair proportion of waste disposal facilities for the urban areas. Opposed to taking any of London's waste.	The Submission draft Core Strategy acknowledges that landfill will play a reduced role in waste disposal in the future. The Core Strategy does not plan for the landfilling of any of London's waste within Hampshire – see policy S3 (Net Self-Sufficiency) in the Submission draft Core Strategy.
Q14	Natural England	Supports the management of waste according to the waste hierarchy. Because of the risks to nature conservation with disposal or landfill, would not support landfilling of London's waste without pre-treatment before alternative options have been evaluated	Policy S3 in the Submission draft Core Strategy states that “...no provision will be made for London's waste.” Providing landfill capacity for London's waste within Hampshire is resisted.
Q16	Hurn Parish Council	Locating a larger proportion of large strategic facilities is not appropriate in South Hampshire, because it is a 'holiday' area	The South Hampshire sub-area is identified for major growth within the emerging South East Plan and has 60% of Hampshire's population (including Portsmouth and Southampton – the largest urban centres in the South East outside London). While it is accepted that parts of the area also attract a large number of visitors, the location of waste activities alongside or within areas of new development is supported by both national policy and the emerging South East Plan. Recommend no changes to the Core Strategy in response to this objection.
	Natural England	Recognises the sustainability benefits associated with reduced transport if waste is dealt with in proximity to the place of production. Also recognises the factors outlined in para 9.21 of the Strategy which sets out the reasons why a few large strategic facilities may be more appropriate than many small ones. Before being able to comment on this we would like more information in terms of the catchment area that the sites would serve, the proximity to the New Forest	The specific locations for minerals and waste development will be identified through the Hampshire Minerals Plan and Hampshire Waste Management Plan – as set out in Policy S18 of the Submission Draft Core Strategy. Impacts on the New Forest National Park will be considered as part of this site selection methodology – as set out in Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy.

		<p>National Park and the proposed transport strategy to serve the strategic sites. This would allow Natural England to evaluate the potential effects on the New Forest National Park.</p> <p>Welcomes the use of windfall brownfield land with immediate access to the Strategic Transport Network in the Forest and Downland area. However, where this land exists in close proximity to the National Park, criteria should be used to establish its appropriateness. This would include the potential visual impacts, transport impacts and potential air and water pollution on the New Forest National Park, or the proposed South Downs National Park</p>	<p>In terms of windfall brownfield land in close proximity to the New Forest National Park, Policy DC2 in the Submission draft Core Strategy offers protection to sites with international and national designations from developments which could prejudice the purposes of their designation. Section 62(2) of the Environment 1995 also ensures that any decisions would have full regard to the purposes of the New Forest National Park in reaching a decision.</p> <p>No changes required.</p>
	Christchurch Borough Council	<p>Large strategic facilities should be located close to the dense urban centres and should be located so as to minimize travel distances between source and destination.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy S16 in the Submission draft Core Strategy states that strategic facilities shall be located within the North East Hampshire (Basingstoke and Blackwater Valley towns) or South Hampshire (focused on Southampton and Portsmouth). It is considered that this approach reflects Christchurch Borough Council's comments.</p>
	Sherfield English Parish Council	<p>Recent information on recycling on construction and demolition sites puts a question mark over the CD and E figures and if large strategic facilities are the answer for this waste stream.</p> <p>Suggest that further research is carried out</p>	<p>The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy is based on providing capacity at a number of large strategic facilities, supported by a network of smaller more dispersed sites. It is considered that this strategy is best suited to meeting the needs of the county, while also providing flexibility to respond to changes.</p>
Q17	Natural England	<p>To accord with para 17 of PPS10 Natural England would like to see sites and areas suitable for new and enhanced waste management facilities identified in the Strategy regardless of whether the South East Plan provides clear guidance of preferred sites at a regional level.</p>	<p>Paragraph 17 of PPS10 states that "...waste planning authorities should identify in development plan documents sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities for the waste management needs of their areas." The place for site allocations is the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Sites Development Plan Documents, not the Core Strategy. No change.</p>
Q18	Natural England	<p>PPS10 does not set out a specific requirement to identify an interim Area of Search for non-hazardous landfill. Supports the management of waste according to the waste hierarchy. However, if additional landfill is necessary, it would like to see the potential sites and areas of search to allow an</p>	<p>Policy DC14 states that planning permission will not normally be granted for new non-hazardous landfill other than for those sites identified on the Key Diagram or as part of the Hampshire Minerals Plan.</p>

		evaluation of the potential impact on biodiversity and nature conservation.	In assessing unacceptable environmental risk, the views of the statutory consultees will be given due weight. Potential specific sites are identified through the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Sites DPDs, not through the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy simply provides the framework through policy S18 and Appendix 2. No changes required.
Q19	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	Landraise should be considered subject to blending with natural land contours	The option of land raise is not included within the Submission draft Core Strategy. It is the least favoured choice due to unacceptable sustainability impacts on landscape, the efficient use of land and additional engineering requirements. Recommend no change.
	Natural England	Landraise should only be considered as a last resort. Supports the waste hierarchy for waste management	Comments noted – agree.
Q20	Natural England	Sites offering opportunities for environmental improvements could, subject to other criteria, be prioritised over those with less scope for beneficial restoration	The objectives for site restoration in Policy DC12 include the improvement of biodiversity. Biodiversity benefits will be considered alongside benefits for public access to the countryside, back-up grazing land, or agricultural use. It is considered that the wording of this policy meet the concerns raised.
Q25	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	Target information is required to decide	The targets for landfill and other residual waste treatment options are based in the principles of the waste hierarchy and are described in policies S2 – S7.
Q27	Godshill Parish Council	Suggests that tax and other incentives could be used to help research into new technologies	The proceeds from landfill tax are used to fund recycling initiatives. Landfill tax is designed to make landfill progressively less financially attractive. Policy related to reinvestment of landfill tax is a matter for Government. Recommend no change.
	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	There should be sufficient incentives to encourage new technology. Suggests a change in charging for waste collection (to finance in a similar fashion to police and fire services)	District Councils are responsible for domestic waste collection, but are not responsible for minerals and waste planning. National waste policy, and the possibility of charging for waste collection, is an issue for central Government. Recommend no change.
Q29	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	More neighbourhood disposal facilities required. Should include disposal of batteries and glass.	Smaller facilities in areas with lower rates of future development (such as the Waterside area of New Forest District) depend on economies of scale. Recommend no change.

Q30	Natural England	<p>Supports the location of strategic facilities near to the local source of waste (to reduce transport impact)</p> <p>Supports the consideration of environmental issues in locating strategic facilities</p> <p>Suggests additional criteria for locating strategic facilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental constraints, including nature conservation designations – as found in the New Forest National Park 2. Minimise the loss of habitats and natural features 3. Special criteria should be used for locations close to the New Forest National Park to take account of potential visual, transport impacts and air and water pollution impacts on the Park 4. Strongly suggests that there is a need to carry out an Appropriate Assessment of the Issues and Options and subsequent Strategy. This would provide more certainty of the location of facilities close to European designations. These should be avoided or mitigated. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site selection policy S18 in the Submission draft Core Strategy suggests that other than in exceptional circumstances, minerals and waste development in the New Forest National Park will be restricted to small scale activities servicing local needs. Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy describes the factors that will be used to evaluate potential sites. International, national, and locally designated sites are included as factors. Moreover policy DC2 covers any minerals and waste development that would affect the purposes of designated sites. 2. Policy DC7 and DC3 in the Submission draft Core Strategy provide guidance on the impact upon biodiversity and landscape. These are supported by policy DC8 covering Pollution; DC10 on Water Resources; DC11 on Flooding; and DC5 on Green Belts. 3. Paragraph 25.10 (which supports Policy DC2 in the Submission draft Core Strategy) suggests that planning permission for major proposals <i>within or likely to affect</i> the New Forest National Park will not usually be granted. Furthermore, national policy (Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995) means that all public bodies (including minerals and waste authorities when considering any application close to the New Forest National Park) shall have regard to the National Park purposes when performing functions in relation to, <i>or so as to affect</i>, land in a National Park. 4. See response to GOSW on page 2.
-----	-----------------	--	--

			Recommend no change in light of these representations.
	Hurn Parish Council	Re 11.14 – Should increase to 500 m because of the impact of emissions, dust, noise and smell.	Policy S6 in the Submission draft Core Strategy suggests a 250m buffer zone around urban areas in the Non-Hazardous Landfill Potential Area, in line with accepted national practice. Larger buffer areas would effectively be unworkable and would not reflect the risks from well-run sites. Recommend no changes.
Q31	Natural England	Suggests the same criteria for locating sites for Soil Hospitals as for strategic facilities in Q30.	See response to Q30.
	Christchurch Borough Council	Due to the (assumed) difference in scales, visual impact, noise and smell emitted from soil hospitals and landfill sites we feel a different selection process is required. We expect that landfill sites would need to be sited at greater distance from residential settlements.	Disagree – soil hospitals take contaminated soils which can be odorous and dusty. They are therefore similar to landfill sites in terms of potential impacts. The site selection criteria used in Policy S18 includes the impact on sensitive human receptors, including housing, hospitals and schools. Recommend no change.
	Godshill Parish Council	Contaminated soil can contain hazardous substances. May not be appropriate to dispose of in non-hazardous landfills.	Comments accepted. In situ treatment of soils, however, is not always possible. Therefore, 35,000 tonnes of off-site treatment capacity (less than the amount produced) has been proposed in the Strategy. No changes required.
Q32	Whitsbury Parish Council	Should include end of life disposal for vehicles	End-of-Life Vehicles Regulation 2003 applies. The draft South East plan contains a policy on facilities for end-of-life vehicles. The Materials Resources Strategy (MRS) process looked at the possibilities for increased recycling versus current capacity and concluded that no additional capacity was required.
	Natural England	Criteria suggested in Q30 should be taken into account in siting regionally significant facilities	See response to Q30.
Q33	Natural England	Supports the principle of resource efficiency. However, principle should be strengthened so that industry uses recycled and secondary aggregates <i>wherever possible</i> . Land won sand and gravel should be limited given the environmental implications with extraction.	Policy S1 in the Submission draft Core Strategy (Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition) should be reflected within Local Development Frameworks. It is not within the remit of the minerals and waste authorities to dictate the precise levels of sand and gravel, as these requirements are set down through the Regional Spatial Strategies.

Q34	Godshill Parish Council	Extraction sites should be near the development areas to reduce HGV transport	Policy DC6 refers to the Strategic Transport Network for the transport of minerals and waste. Although some of these roads pass through the New Forest National Park, the requirement to locate sites close to the sources of waste and markets for minerals should limit disruption. It should also be acknowledged that minerals can only be worked where they naturally occur. Restrictions on development in National Parks are included within the Strategy. The impact on National Parks, including vehicles traveling through the Park, will be considered as part of the site selection process. Recommend no changes.
	Christchurch Borough Council	The poor state of major road infrastructure around many of the potential sites in the south west of Hampshire rule out significant multiple minerals workings due to the negative impact on roads and on historic character. The density of existing and likely future sites on the south wets of Hampshire is too high. A shift towards the north east is therefore appropriate.	Policy DC6 refers to the Strategic Transport Network for the transport of minerals and waste. The aim is to minimize the impact of the road transport of mineral and waste. The proximity of minerals and waste development to the minerals and waste lorry route (as described in the Key Diagram) will be given due weight in order to reduce the chance of extraneous heavy vehicles traveling on unsuitable local roads. The site selection criteria are outlined in Policy S18 and the methodology is outlined in Appendix 2 of the Submission draft Core Strategy. Recommend no changes.
	John Martin, Resident	Current rate of extraction in New Forest not sustainable. The industrial after effects scar the countryside and change its appearance and habitats.	Minerals extraction is inherently unsustainable. However, the need for minerals remains and the Hampshire Core Strategy seeks to make the most sustainable choices through limiting demand and increasing alternative sources. The Strategy ensures no extraction of sand and gravel in the New Forest National Park. The site selection methodology in Policy S18 of the Strategy also considers the likely impact of proposed development on the National Park. Recommend no changes.

Q35	Natural England	Want assurance in Section 12 of the Strategy that development of mineral workings beyond the New Forest National Park would not be permitted if they would impact upon it. The requirement of an Appropriate Assessment should be determined to ensure that there is no impact upon SAC or SPA in Hampshire or the New Forest.	<p>See response to GOSW on page 2 regarding Appropriate Assessments.</p> <p>Policy S8 (Sand and gravel) in the Submission draft Core Strategy states that production of land won sand and gravel from the Forest area (excluding the New Forest National Park) is subject to there being no unacceptable impacts on the New Forest National Park. This reflects Section 62(2) Environment Act 1995.</p> <p>Policy S18 (Site Selection) in the Submission draft Core Strategy suggests that other than in exceptional circumstances, minerals and waste development in the New Forest National Park will be restricted to small scale activities servicing local needs. Moreover, Policy DC2 suggests that planning permission for major proposals <i>within or likely to affect</i> the New Forest National Park will not usually be granted. This Policy also provides protection to sites with international and national designations and is reflected in Appendix 2 (Site Selection Methodology and Factors).</p> <p>Recommend no changes.</p>
-----	-----------------	--	--

Q36	Natural England	<p>Mineral workings and waste facilities could impact the New Forest National Park through transport movements, cross-border pollution etc. Therefore an Appropriate Assessment of the Strategy should be undertaken, as the effects on any designated sites must be rigorously considered prior to determining preferred options.</p> <p>Moreover, the Hampshire Avon is designated as a SAC and therefore must be considered through an Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>Only once the process of Appropriate Assessment in undertaken can one determine whether the current level of sand and gravel extraction is harmful in the Avon Valley or to the New Forest. Given the sensitivity of these areas there is a strong possibility that it will be necessary to reduce extraction levels.</p>	<p>See response to GOSW on page 2 regarding Appropriate Assessments.</p> <p>The Submission draft Core Strategy ensures no extraction of sand and gravel in the New Forest National Park. The site selection methodology in Policy S18 of the Strategy and Appendix 2 (Site Selection Methodology and Factors) also considers the likely impact of proposed development on the National Park.</p> <p>Recommend no changes.</p>
Q38	Hurn Parish Council	No oil and gas development should be allowed in the New Forest National Park	Oil and gas development has been excluded from the New Forest National Park through the Submission draft Core Strategy's policy approach (Policy DC19).
	J. Stark, Resident	No oil and gas development should be allowed in the New Forest National Park	Oil and gas development has been excluded from the New Forest National Park through the Submission draft Core Strategy's policy approach (Policy DC19).
	Natural England	<p>Strong concern about the potentially significant impacts of oil and gas exploration and production on sites of nature conservation in the New Forest National Park. Oil and gas exploration and production and use is harmful to the environment in terms of biodiversity, air quality, and landscape and visual impacts and poses risks in terms of spills.</p> <p>Strongly suggest an Appropriate Assessment of the Issues and Options and the Subsequent Strategy. This requires a level of certainty in the location of oil and gas exploration sites to identify where there could be possible adverse effects on European designations, which should be avoided, or at last resort, mitigated.</p>	<p>Oil and gas development has been excluded from the New Forest National Park through the Submission draft Core Strategy's policy approach (Policy DC19).</p> <p>See GOSW response on page two regarding Appropriate Assessments.</p> <p>Recommend no changes.</p>
	Godshill Parish Council	Only the very outer edges of the New Forest should be considered, as oil and gas exploration in other parts would adversely affect the commoning system.	Oil and gas development has been excluded from the New Forest National Park through the Submission draft Core Strategy's policy approach (Policy DC19).

Q39	Natural England	<p>Suggests that national and regional planning guidance (in particular MPG1,PPS10, and PPS12) is reviewed to ensure that the three stage process set out in Section 13 of the Strategy is in conformity</p> <p>Suggest that the criteria listed in response to Q30 are referred to in the process of identifying locations and sites.</p> <p>Strongly suggests the need for n Appropriate Assessment to inform the identification of appropriate sites</p>	See GOSW response on page two regarding Appropriate Assessments.
	Christchurch Borough Council	Insufficient opportunity for the public to comment at early stages.	It is considered that the public consultation is in accordance with the 2004 Regulations. Appendix 2 of the Submission draft Core Strategy and Policy S14 describe the methodology and factors to be used in the selection of sites. Interested stakeholders will be asked for their views at Stage 1 and 2 of the selection process, including an 'Issues and Options' consultation.
Q40	Natural England	Would like to see widespread consultation with all sectors of the community in the identification of sites at each stage – not just Stages 1 and 3. Natural England would like to be consulted at each stage of the site identification process.	It is considered that the public consultation is in accordance with the 2004 Regulations. Appendix 2 of the Submission draft Core Strategy and Policy S14 describes the methodology and factors to be used in the selection of sites. Interested stakeholders and the statutory consultees will be asked for their views in an 'Issues and Options' consultation.
	Christchurch Borough Council	<p>At present the method of consultation does not give sufficient opportunity for the public to voice concerns over sites at Stage 1 or 2.</p> <p>Public consultation at the earlier stages could result in responses which lead to the omission of a site which would not otherwise have been ruled out through the appraisal process.</p>	It is considered that the public consultation is in accordance with the 2004 Regulations. Appendix 2 of the Submission draft Core Strategy and Policy S14 describes the methodology and factors to be used in the selection of sites. Interested stakeholders will and the statutory consultees will be asked for their views in an Issues and Options consultation.
Q41	Natural England	<p>Welcomes the need to reduce the traffic impacts.</p> <p>Want to see more emphasis on the use of sustainable modes of transport (i.e. rail and barge). Targets should be included for the volume/percentages of minerals and waste transported by these modes of transport</p>	Support welcomed. The Strategy seeks where possible to reduce the level of road transport, and promote other sustainable transport methods. A review of wharves and depots will be carried out as part of the site selection process

Q42	Godshill Parish Council	There should be planning restrictions of routes for HGV access to prevent short-cutting along unsuitable narrow forest roads.	Planning restrictions on HGV routes is not a matter for the Core Strategy as it is generally a site specific issue. It will therefore be tackled through the Sites DPDs. Policy DC6 refers to the Strategic Transport Network for the transport of minerals and waste. The impact of lorry routes on the National Park will also be considered as part of the site selection process. The proximity of minerals and waste development to the minerals and waste lorry route (as described in the Key Diagram) will be given due weight in order to reduce the chance of extraneous heavy vehicles traveling on unsuitable local roads. Recommend no changes.
	Natural England	Same response to Q41	The Strategy seeks where possible to reduce the level of road transport, and promote other sustainable transport methods. A review of wharves and depots will be carried out as part of the site selection process.
	Christchurch Borough Council	Any site appraisal process must consider the wider impacts of generating journeys, particularly by lorries, which will affect congestion and public safety. Financial contributions (section 106) should be sought from developers to improve highways impacted on by minerals traffic.	The site appraisal process as part of the Hampshire Minerals Plan and the Hampshire Waste Management Plan DPDs will consider the impacts of traffic generation. Where necessary and appropriate, it is likely that this site process will also identify the requirement for financial contributions to improve the highway network. Policy DC6 in the Submission draft Core strategy recognises that there will be cases where a site, that may initially appear unacceptable on highway grounds, can be made acceptable through highway or other improvements undertaken or funded by the developer. Recommend no changes.
	Hurn Parish Council	Waste should be treated where it is generated	This is not always practicable. However, the Strategy supports the concept as far as possible. For example, Policy S16 in the Submission draft Strategy states that all major new development should accommodate an appropriate proportion of the waste management capacity for recycling, composting or recovery and treatment. The Core Strategy is aiming for net self-sufficiency across Hampshire. Recommend no changes.

	John Langlands, Resident	Minerals and waste traffic should be better policed. Vehicles are badly driven and their traps are not secure.	This is not an issue for the Core Strategy. No change required.
Q43	Natural England	Does not support development for the management of wastes in the New Forest National Park. Special regard should be given to the nature conservation designations within the National Park. In considering any development in the National Park it is suggested to use the criteria used in answer to Q30. Strongly suggest the need for an Appropriate Assessment Would like assurances in Section 14 of the Strategy that any development of waste management facilities on the fringes of urban areas at the boundary of the New Forest National Park would not impact upon it.	Policy S18 in the Submission draft Core strategy states that other than in exceptional circumstances, minerals and waste development in the New Forest National Park will be restricted to small scale activities servicing local needs. Moreover, Policy DC2 suggests that planning permission for major proposals within or likely to affect the New Forest National Park will not usually be granted. Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995 ensures that the National Park purposes are taken into account in considering proposals outside the National Park, but which impact on it. This does not need to be duplicated within the Core Strategy. See GOSW response on page two regarding Appropriate Assessments.
Q44	Natural England	Welcomes proposals for Portsmouth and Southampton to manage as much of their waste within their boundaries as possible	Comments noted and support welcomed.
Q45	Southern Water	Southern Water will not accept municipal or commercial waste at any wastewater treatment site, as it has no quality control over their waste stream. The water industry recognises that the recycling route can only be sustained by ensuring that products from anaerobic digestion meet the strict quality requirements of the marketplace.	Comments noted. The implementation of this objective will only be achievable with the full agreement of the water authorities – it cannot be forced upon them. However, it is worth noting that Thames Water is in favour of co-location. In their response during the Hampshire consultation (287/116) they state, “ <i>Thames Water do not object to paragraph 23.8 (iii) in principle...Thames water are currently actively pursuing opportunities for the recycling of organic wastes...</i> ”
	Godshill Parish Council	It is not clear if these Resource Parks are for all types of waste streams. Will they serve C and I, and CD and E business as well as municipal?	The Submission draft Core Strategy moves moved from the term ‘Resource Parks’, but the principle is reflected in Policy S17. Sites will be identified through the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Management Plans and in the relevant Local Development Frameworks. These will set out the waste streams at each site.

	Natural England	Supports co-location of minerals and waste facilities together and alongside other activities which can use residues, recyclables, heat or other by-products instead of primary resources.	Support welcomed. Policy S17 and paragraph 23.8 of the Submission draft Core Strategy is considered to cover these issues.
	Whitsbury Parish Council	Only if economic	Noted.
Q46	Natural England	See response to Q45	See response to Q45
Q47	Southern Water	Support the proposal to safeguard existing waste sites at any wastewater treatment site	Support welcomed. The safeguarding of existing sites is, however, dependent upon a review of each site under policy S14 in the Submission draft Core Strategy. Recommend no changes.
	Natural England	Would like to see sites selected based on sound criteria and mineral extraction kept to a minimum.	Site selection criteria is set out in Policy S18 (Site Selection) and Appendix 2 (Site Selection Methodology and Factors). Recommend no changes.
Q48	Godshill Parish Council	Existing time-limited permissions should be reviewed provided the proximity principle can be applied. Waste should be sorted and recycled at source rather than increasing transport by taking it to be recycled in a remote landfill site and carrying the resultant recyclate back again, often along country lanes	The Submission draft Core Strategy suggests a comprehensive review of existing time-limited sites as part of the site selection process. Policy DC6 refers to the Strategic Transport Network for the transport of minerals and waste. Although some of these roads pass through the New Forest National Park, the requirement to locate sites close to the sources of waste and markets for minerals should limit disruption. Furthermore, restrictions on development in National Parks are included in the Strategy. The impact on National Parks, including vehicles traveling through the Park, will be considered as part of the site selection process. Recommend no changes.
Q49	Natural England	Would like any wharves which could facilitate the movement of minerals and waste by sustainable modes of transport safeguarded from other types of development	The Strategy seeks where possible to reduce the level of road transport, and promote other sustainable transport methods. A review of wharves and depots will be carried out as part of the site selection process – as set out in paragraph 22.4 of the Submission draft Core Strategy. Policy DC18 suggests that development control decisions should enable more minerals and waste to be transported by sustainable means. Recommend no changes.

	Hythe Dibden Parish Council	A review of the safeguarding of wharves and depots is necessary, but only if this would not result in an increase in road transport	The Strategy seeks where possible to reduce the level of road transport, and promote other sustainable transport methods. A review of wharves and depots will be carried out as part of the site selection process – as set out in paragraph 22.4 of the Submission draft Core Strategy. Policy DC18 suggests that development control decisions should enable more minerals and waste to be transported by sustainable means. Recommend no changes.
Q50	Natural England	Supports the proposed new water based facilities for the transport of wastes, providing that sites are selected which will not have a negative impact on nature conservation	Support welcomed. Site selection is covered in Policy S18. Policy DC2 and Policy DC7 provide protection against the impact on designated areas and biodiversity.
Q51	Natural England	Welcomes the use of Policy CS1, CS2, CS3, CS5, and CS8. Concerned about Policy CS12 which supports oil and gas exploration and development. Concerns about this are outlined in response to Q38	Support welcomed See NPA response to Q38
Q52	Southern Water	A policy is required to protect the quality and potential yield of water resources. This could be added to Policy CS14.	Policy DC10 in the Submission draft Core Strategy recognises the need to protect the flow and quality of surface, coastal waters, and groundwater resources. It also recognises the need to protect the quality and yield of potable water resources. It is considered that this policy adequately covers the issues raised.
	Natural England	Would like a policy on appropriate restoration on minerals workings. A restoration-led approach to guide site selections for minerals, as is being taken forward by Wiltshire Minerals DPD. This should be carried out in line with the national and Hampshire BAP, in consultation with Natural England.	The Submission draft Core strategy includes a specific policy on restoration (DC12). This states that mineral extraction, landfill and other developments will not be permitted unless there is satisfactory provision for the restoration of the site, for an after use consistent with the planning objectives of the area. This may include improved public access (a); biodiversity improvements (C); back up grazing land for the New Forest (d); or a return to agriculture or forestry. It is considered that this policy working covers the concerns raised. Biodiversity gains cannot automatically be prioritised over other restoration objectives. Recommend no changes.

Q53	Sherfield English Parish Council	Development control policy should also cover demolition and recycling on sites	Policy S1 in the Submission draft Core Strategy states that new built development should facilitate the efficient use of resources through construction and demolition methods that minimise waste production and re-use/recycle materials, as far as practicable on-site. Policy DC1 states that minerals and waste development will only be permitted if they meet the standards outlined in Policy S1. Recommend no changes.
	Natural England	Would like development control criteria to include the criteria listed in the response to Q30	It is considered that the issue of concern raised by Natural England are adequately addressed within the Development Control section of the Submission draft Core Strategy. Policy D2 (Sites with International and National Designations); DC3 (Impact on Landscape and Townscape); DC7 (Biodiversity); DC10 (Water Resources); and DC12 (Restoration and Aftercare) cover the issues raised. Recommend no changes.
Q54	Natural England	Concerned about the use of Local Development Orders. If they are used, planning authorities should ensure that the criteria set out in response to Q30 are given consideration in granting permission for minor developments	Policy DC23 in the Submission draft Core Strategy states that Local Development Orders will not apply in the New Forest National Park, and other nationally and internationally designated protected areas. For sites within these areas, Policies DC1 to 12 will apply.
SA Scoping Report	Environment Agency	Satisfied with the overall content of this document and feel that it links well with the main HCC minerals and waste framework. Table 2 covers the environmental issues of concern to the Environment Agency adequately.	Comments noted and support welcomed.
		The appraisal matrix framework outlined in Table 4 will provide a clear and concise process for appraisal at the next stage.	Comments noted and support welcomed.
		The Proposals Map/ Key Diagram will need to be updated to include the part of the New Forest National Park falling within Wiltshire.	Agree – Key Diagram to be updated to include the Wiltshire area of the New Forest National Park.
		With regards to flood risk management, the E.A. is satisfied with its content and in particular the link between ISA objective A3 and B9.	Comments noted and support welcomed.

		<p>Hampshire County Council saved policies from their Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1998). Are any policies from the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan to be saved?</p>	<p>The New Forest NPA intends to save the policies in the Wiltshire and Swindon Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan for the period until the Hampshire Minerals and waste Core Strategy is adopted. This will then provide a consistent Park-wide planning policy framework for minerals and waste development.</p>
--	--	---	--