

NFNPA 561/18

NEW FOREST NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

AUTHORITY MEETING – 11 OCTOBER 2018

REVIEW OF HAMPSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN

Report by: Sarah Applegate, Senior Policy Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The New Forest National Park Authority, as a Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA), has a statutory duty to prepare a plan to guide minerals and waste development for the National Park. The Authority has been working jointly over many years with partners Hampshire County Council, Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils and the South Downs National Park Authority on the preparation and subsequent revision of a set of planning policies for the consideration of planning applications on minerals and waste development. After a rigorous examination process, including a number of public hearing sessions, the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) was adopted in October 2013. This forms part of the National Park Authority's Development Plan with the adopted Core Strategy (2010), and covers the entirety of the National Park (including the area of the Park within Wiltshire).
- 1.2 The Plan provides policy guidance on planning for minerals and waste development in Hampshire and the New Forest National Park to 2030 by protecting the environment, maintaining its communities, and supporting the economy of Hampshire and the New Forest. It contains a number of site allocations for the extraction of sand and gravel, and the provision of waste management facilities including landfill. Within the National Park there are no new site allocations for minerals or waste development, and two long established sites are close to the end of their operational life – Pound Bottom landfill site is currently being restored, and the mineral extraction site at Badminton Farm, Fawley is due to be fully worked and restored over the next few years. The general approach set out in the Plan is not to permit minerals and waste development in the National Park unless there are exceptional circumstances, negative impacts can be avoided or minimised and there are no other suitable locations for the development.
- 1.3 Although the Plan covers development up to 2030, it is recommended to undertake reviews to ensure the Plan's policies remain up to date and effective. This has been strengthened in the Government's latest revision to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in July 2018 and associated updates to the accompanying National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) issued on 13 September 2018, which clarify that a review should be undertaken within five years of adoption. Although details of the new national policy requirement were only published in the NPPG in mid-September, they came into effect immediately. The Authority and partners are assessing the need to review the plan and members are asked to consider the general approach set out in this Authority report.

2. The requirement to review the Plan

- 2.1 Following a period of consultation the NPPF was revised in July this year, with a number of consequential changes to the more detailed NPPG in mid-September. One of the new policy changes is the requirement for an assessment of whether a Local Plan is still effective or whether some or all policies need to be revised. This requirement covers all Local Plans – including minerals and waste plans - and the review is to be undertaken within five years of the adoption of the Local Plan. The reasons for reviewing or not reviewing the Plan are also to be published within five years of the Plan's adoption. Having been adopted five years ago in October 2013, the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan is caught almost immediately by this new requirement for a review to assess if the policies are still in line with national planning policy, and remain effective in the delivery of the Plan's objectives.
- 2.2 Colleagues at Hampshire County Council are preparing a report, on behalf of the partners, to give a high level review of the effectiveness of the policies of the Plan and an assessment on the delivery of allocated sites to date. It also reviews and considers how changes to national and regional policy, since the adoption of the Plan in 2013, may have an impact on the delivery of the Plan and summarises what actions, if any, may be required for a more extensive review and revision to any of the Plan policies.
- 2.3 The table at **Annex 1** summarises the initial assessment of each of the Plan's policies. The effectiveness of the policies in the Plan have also been reviewed through Monitoring Reports on an annual basis. This has been complemented by Local Area Aggregates Assessments which set out detailed monitoring of the demand and supply of sand and gravel across the Plan area.

3. Headline Indicators

- 3.1 The table at **Annex 1** indicates that many of the policies are continuing to perform effectively over the last five years (and highlighted 'green'). This includes Policy 4 (Protection of the designated landscape) which states that major minerals and waste development will not be permitted in the New Forest National Park (and other designated landscapes) except in exceptional circumstances. The Review document indicates that no planning applications for minerals or waste development have been permitted in a designated landscape against the advice of Natural England. This has been consistent over the last five years.

Mineral extraction

- 3.2 Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and resource) states that an adequate and steady supply of sand and gravel will be provided for Hampshire until 2030 at a rate of 1.56 million tonnes per annum (mtpa). This is higher than the average sales over the last 10 years, and officers consider the rate in Policy 17 no longer reflects the current market. However, retaining this figure in Policy 17 does not prevent a steady and sufficient supply of sand and gravel, which is a key objective of the Plan. The initial conclusions of officers is that this policy does not need to be reviewed.
- 3.3 Minerals Authorities are required to maintain a landbank of different mineral resources, which comprises a stock of planning permissions. The latest monitoring data indicates that the landbank of sand and gravel, as at 2016, is currently below the NPPF

requirement for a landbank of 7 years of permissions. However, a number of the allocated sites in the Plan have come forward during the last five years, together with some unplanned opportunities (see tables below).

Plan site allocation status in 2018

Site	Proposal	Other information
Bleak Hill Quarry extension (North east of Ringwood Forest, NFDC)	Sand & gravel extraction	Application expected 2018
Bramshill Quarry extension (Hart Borough Council)	Sand & gravel extraction	
Cutty Brow (Test Valley Borough Council)	Sand & gravel extraction	
Forest Lodge Home Farm (South of Hythe, NFDC)	Sand & gravel extraction	Extraction due to commence in 2018.
Hamble Airfield (Eastleigh Borough Council)	Sand & gravel extraction	Application expected 2018/2019
Purple Haze (Ringwood Forest, NFDC)	Sand & gravel extraction and reserve landfill	The allocation is still being actively promoted and an application is expected in the near future
Roeshot (West of Burton Common, NFDC – with access through the Park)	Sand & gravel extraction	Planning application submitted but is yet to be determined.

Unplanned opportunities

Site	Proposal	Other information
Kingsley Quarry Extension (East Hampshire District)	Soft sand and silica sand extraction	Planning application is yet to be determined.
Downton Manor Farm Extension (New Forest District)	Sand & gravel extraction	Planning permission granted subject to the completion of a S106 agreement. Extraction area extended by 18.4 ha.
Roke Manor Farm Extension (Test Valley Borough)	Sand & gravel extraction	Planning application is yet to be determined.
Whitehill & Bordon Relief Road (East Hampshire District)	Soft sand prior extraction and processing at Frith End.	

- 3.4 Consequently, it is the initial view of officers that the policy remains effective as the site allocations are coming forward, with others in the pipeline, and does not appear to be preventing new unplanned opportunities. This indicates that the current landbank of less than 7 years is likely to be only a short term issue that would be resolved with the granting of the applications either submitted or expected in the near future.
- 3.5 Permitted reserves of silica sand are below the NPPF requirement of 10 years of permitted reserves. There are only two sites in Hampshire with silica sand reserves, and these are on the edge of the South Downs National Park. However, the requirement would be met if a current planning application at Kingsley is permitted.
- 3.6 Permitted reserves of brickmaking clay are below the NPPF requirements of a stock of 25 years of reserves, despite increase in supply in recent years. There are two existing brickworks in Michelmersh, near Romsey, and Selborne, in the South Downs National Park. Alternative site options are limited. However, the plan does not preclude potential new resources coming forward.

Landfill

- 3.7 Policy 32 supports landfill development to enable the capacity necessary to deal with Hampshire's waste to 2030. Although the majority of waste (93%) is diverted from landfill, there remains a requirement for landfill facilities. Monitoring of trends at landfill sites indicates there is likely to be less two years capacity in 2018.
- 3.8 One existing site closed earlier than expected, and there is a question mark over the implementation of a proposed site. However, the lack of landfill capacity remains an issue throughout the South East region, and is to be addressed by the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) through the preparation of a Landfill Joint Position Statement.

Regional issues

- 3.9 On behalf of the partners, officers from Hampshire County Council attend regional meetings with officers from across the South East to address minerals and waste issues with cross boundary implications, and availability and capacity of resources across the region. Consequently, some of the issues raised by the review of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan are being considered on a regional basis, including landfill provision, and soft sand.

Other considerations

- 3.10 It is also recognised that there are a number of current uncertainties which may have an impact on future supply and capacity requirements of minerals and waste. This includes China's recent ban on imported plastics, as the UK exports almost two-thirds of its waste to China, and waste management companies lack the capacity in the UK to dispose of recyclable materials appropriately. There are also uncertainties regarding Britain's exit from the European Union as there are significant mineral and waste movements between Britain and Europe and any future alterations could impact local indigenous supply.

4. Conclusions and Next Steps

- 4.1 Initial conclusions of Hampshire County Council officers regarding the review of the Minerals and Waste Plan is that, although there are areas of deficiency of supply or landbanks of mineral resources, there are mitigating factors. In addition, there are a number of issues that are better addressed on a regional basis, such as regional landfill capacity. Officers from the National Park Authority and the other minerals and waste partners in Hampshire are to meet in October to discuss the initial findings of the report, and agree whether a review of the Plan is necessary at this time. If not, then it is likely that a further review will be undertaken in two years time to again assess whether the Plan should be revised at that time, or if policies remain effective.
- 4.2 This paper therefore recommends that members endorse the conclusion that a full review of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan is not currently necessary. The alternative options would be to undertake a full review of the Plan, or to undertake a partial review, looking at just one or more policies. National Park Authority officers will continue dialogue with the other partners of Hampshire County Council, Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils and the South Downs National Park Authority. If following further discussions between the partnership it is ultimately concluded that a review of the Minerals and Waste Plan is necessary then officers will bring a further report to the Authority meeting in January 2019 to ensure members have full sight of this decision.

RECOMMENDATION

Members endorse the approach set out in the draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Review (summarised in this report) that a review is not necessary at this time, subject to the views of the minerals and waste partner authorities.

Contact: Sarah Applegate, Senior Policy Officer
sarah.applegate@newforestnpa.gov.uk
Tel: 01590 646673

Papers: NFNPA 561/18
Annex 1 – Summary of Minerals and Waste Plan Review

Equality Impact Assessment: No issues arising

ANNEX 1

Summary of Minerals and Waste Plan Review

Individual Policies

The table below provides an overview of the consideration of each of the Plan's policies against the monitoring indicators and triggers set out in the Plan, and the performance over the last five years.

Monitoring shows no issues	Green
Monitoring shows some issues to be reviewed	Amber
Monitoring shows issues to be reviewed and may need to be addressed	Red

Policy Number & Title	RAG status
Policy 1: Sustainable minerals & waste development	Green
Policy 2: Climate change –mitigation and adaptation	Green
Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species	Green
Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape	Green
Policy 5: Protection of the countryside	Amber
Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt	Green
Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets	Green
Policy 8: Protection of soils	Green
Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste sites	Green
Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity	Green
Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention	Green
Policy 12: Managing traffic	Green
Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development	Green
Policy 14: Community Benefits	Red
Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources	Amber
Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure	Green
Policy 17: Aggregate supply -capacity and source	Red
Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development	Amber
Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots	Red
Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates	Red

Policy 21: Silica sand development	Red
Policy 22: Brick-making clay	Red
Policy 23: Chalk Development	Amber
Policy 24: Oil and gas Development	Green
Policy 25: Sustainable waste management	Amber
Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure	Green
Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development	Green
Policy 28: Energy recovery development	Amber
Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management	Amber
Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste	Green
Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management	Green
Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill	Red
Policy 33: Hazardous and low level waste development	Green
Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure	Green