

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Regulatory Committee Meeting - 23 February 2022

#### Update Report from Assistant Director of Waste, Planning and Environment

**Item No:**

Development of an Energy Recovery Facility and Associated Infrastructure at Alton Materials Recovery Facility, A31, Alton GU34 4JD (Application No. 33619/007 Site Ref. EH141)

**1) General amendments to the report and clarification:**

Paragraph 4 should read - **330,000** tonnes not 330,00 tonnes.

Paragraph 21 - ADO should read **AOD**.

Paragraph 25 – Amend to say the following: Vehicular access and egress are achieved from the nearby westbound A31 dual carriageway via an existing slip road. [*continue as before until*]. The applicant has indicated that on average, 128 two-way movements (**64 in and 64 out**). [*continues as before*].

Paragraph 78 - Amend to say the following: An illustrative Landscape Design is set out in ES Volume 2. Figure 4.6 (see Appendix F). [*continue as before until*]. The existing woodland **and grassland** areas would be supplemented with additional planting where there are opportunities to reinforce the existing planting. A larger area of grassland **habitat** is proposed in the eastern part the Site **and around the majority of the boundary of the site. This area** which also includes the surface water infiltration basin. **This is set out on the Illustrative Landscape Design Plan.**

Paragraph 85 – Amend to say the following: The majority of waste will be transported to the Site from other Waste Transfer Stations via HGV. **The type of vehicles used will be consistent with the vehicles currently accessing the MRF / WTS although it is envisaged that a higher level of articulated HGVs will be used than at present and there will be a reduction in small vehicles, such as refuse vehicles, using the site** [*continues as before*].

Paragraph 106 – Correction - replace with the following which is already set out in the socio-economic section of the report: **Once operational, the plant would provide employment for approximately 40-45 people with a peak day-time staffing level of approximately 27, supplemented by shift workers to maintain 24-hour plant operation.**

Paragraph 109 - To be updated as follows: The entry and exit door to the tipping hall would be equipped with **automatically** operated [continues as before].

## 2) Representations:

Paragraph 228 - Amend to say the following: As of 21 February 2022, a total of **5,594** representations (in response to the original planning consultation and all subsequent Regulation 25 consultations) (from **4,045** individuals/ interested parties/ groups/ organisations) to the proposal have been received (outside of the consultees responses noted in the Consultations section). [continues as before].

The issues raised by these new representations are covered in the existing lists set out in the representation section of the report.

## 3) Amendments and updates to the Commentary section

### Need

Paragraph 296 - To be updated as follows: Building on the national picture, the South East Waste Planning Authorities Group (SEWPAG) have undertaken analysis of potential waste arisings across the South East as set out in the reports on Report on Residual Waste Capacity in South East (See **Appendix M**) and Wider South East Residual Waste Capacity Report 2021 (See **Appendix N**). Table 5 shows the data presented **in the Wider South East Residual Waste Capacity Report 2021** for actual C&I arisings in the south-east and current permitted capacity data from the Report on Residual Waste Capacity in South East. **The growth projections presented in the table have been applied by the Waste Planning Authority. The C&I residual figures are illustrative and show growth at 0.5% with recycling at 50%.**

Amend the text after Table 5, for clarification, to say the following:

**\*Data from Wider South East Residual Waste Capacity Report 2021 (SEWPAG, 2020)**

**\*\* Illustrative and show growth at 0.5% with recycling at 50%.**

**\*\*\*For Hampshire this includes only the three existing EfW facilities.**

**\*\*\*\*C&I arisings actual (total) - Current permitted C&I recovery capacity**

**Source of data: Wider South East Residual Waste Capacity Report 2021 (SEWPAG, 2020), Report on Residual Waste Capacity in South East and Waste Planning Authority analysis**

Paragraph 298 - Correction – amend the following: The **Wider South East Residual Waste Capacity Report** highlights.... [continues as before].

Paragraph 299 - Amend to say the following: In the response to Regulation 25 request 5, the No Wey Incinerator Action Group indicated that as of 'May 2021 there were three applications for 'other recovery' facilities that were awaiting determination'. [continue as before until]. In any case, the Waste Planning

Authority can only base its assessment on those sites which have permission and have been implemented **and are operational**.*[continues as before]*.

Amend Table 7 - Amend to say the following, following the late analysis of some capacity data on currently permitted non-hazardous recovery capacity:

*Table 7: Further review of recovery capacity and the shortfall in capacity for Hampshire*

	<b>Total Recovery Capacity (tpa)</b>	<b>Shortfall Recovery Capacity (tpa)</b>	<b>How the proposal would contribute to shortfall ('-' is surplus)</b>
Currently permitted non-hazardous recovery capacity (Sept 2021)**	<b>921,742</b>	<b>-17,742</b>	<b>-331,742</b>
Further adjusted capacity ***	621,234	298,766	-31,234
<i>**Based on a regionally agreed methodology as set out in South East Waste Planning Advisory Group, primarily using Operator Waste Surveys and Environment Agency's data.</i>			
<i>***Reviewed to exclude uncertain data on liquid waste inert waste, wood waste, non-hazardous C,D&amp;E waste and tonnages where the WDI shows the majority of accepted waste is inert.</i>			

**Source of data: Operator Waste Surveys, Waste Data Interrogator and Waste Planning Authority analysis**

Paragraph 317 – Add the following: **Waste site capacity data is publicly available via the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator. The Waste Planning Authority cannot share the exact data used to undertake this assessment work due to commercial confidentiality. However, Appendix O provides a list of the sites assessed as part of this work and an indication of the adjustments that have been made.**

Site location and alternatives:

Paragraph 399 – Replace paragraph with the following: **Paragraph: 041 of the NPPG states that 'the 2017 Regulations do not require an applicant to consider alternatives. However, where alternatives have been considered, paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 requires the applicant to include in their Environmental Statement a description of the reasonable alternatives studied (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects'.**

Visual impacts:

Paragraph 504 – Amend paragraph for clarification: Concerns were also raised regarding the viability of the facility, based on its relatively remote location, to be

able to provide any heat to users or a heat supply area locally. Objectors argued that the lack of any detail on **heat** connection is a major omission. It was considered that this was contrary to NPS (EN-1). Furthermore, it was considered to be unclear how the applicant **will acquire the rights to install a connection**.

Paragraph 567 – Add the following wording at the end of the paragraph: ***In relation to the visibility of the plume, the nature of its visibility is dependent on the technology used and the climatic conditions that induce a plume to be formed. Plumes often have characteristics in common with the surrounding air environment (i.e. on a cloudy or overcast day they would tend to blend in with the background, as they comprise primarily of water vapour). Paragraphs 5.5.73 to 5.5.80 of the ES sets out how often a plume may be visible throughout the year. Based on the technical modelling undertaken it is concluded that the plume would not be visible for the vast majority of daylight hours within any given year. The modelling indicates that a visible plume would only be apparent for between 8.9% and 13.5% of the total daylight hours available in a year. The climatic conditions most likely to generate a visible plume occur in winter when there are cool temperature and low humidity. However, this also coincides with periods where cloud cover is likely to be at its greatest and as set out in paragraph 5.5.70 of the ES this significantly reduces the visibility of any plume. It is considered that plume visibility would be only a transient landscape and visual effects that would not be significant. This is recognised in the assessments in Appendix 5.6 of the ES and Appendix 10.1 of the Volume 5 of the ES.***

Paragraph 586: It is acknowledged that the development proposals rely on existing vegetation that is to be found outside the Site boundary to mitigate against the landscape and visual impacts, as there is no room within the Site to carry out planting of the size and extent required. *[continue as before until]*. **A landscape condition is included to address landscape issues on site.** Furthermore, a landscape management plan is proposed as part of the proposed section 106 agreement **to secure on site landscaping**.

#### **4) Amendments to the Recommendation section (following):**

After paragraph 1073 – Add reference to: **Appendix O – Sites assessed as part of need assessment**

#### **5) Revisions to condition wording**

Slight tweak to wording of condition 4 as follows:

No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Environmental and Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Waste Planning Authority.

The Plan shall provide for: *[continue as before until]*.

p) Confirmation of the construction working hours **and external and internal construction activities** as set out under condition 10; [*continue as before until*].  
u) **Details of safety, maintenance and security measures during construction.**[continues as before].

Amendments to wording of condition 30 as follows:

All goods vehicles entering and leaving the ERF shall be sheeted **or fully contained.**

6) Appendix O - Appendix O – Sites assessed as part of need assessment and showing adjustments made

Site Name	Local Authority	Site Type	Non Haz (HIC) / Inert / Haz	Waste Route	Domestic Waste Disposal Site	Non-haz (HIC)	Energy Recovery Facility	HCC Further Adjustments	Waste Transfer Capacity	Comments on adjustment
Chineham Energy Recovery Facility Whitmarsh Lane, Basingstoke	Basingstoke	EfW	Non-haz	Recovery	Yes	XXX	Yes	0	0	
Basingstoke AD, Farleigh Lane, Farleigh Wallop	Basingstoke	AD	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	Yes	0	0	
Bushywarren Lane, Herriard, Hampshire	Basingstoke	AD	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	Yes	0	0	
CS Botley, Grange Road, Hedge End Hedge End	Eastleigh	Liquid Waste Processing	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	Yes	0	Removed as the site only takes liquid waste only
Waterbrook Road, Alton	East Hampshire	Recycling	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	Yes	0	Removed as the site only takes CD&E
Warren Farm, Fareham	Fareham	Recovery	Non-haz	Recovery	Yes	XXX	No	Yes	0	Applicant have confirmed that SRF is not being produced
Starhill Sawmills, Hartley Wintney	Hart	WTS	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	0	Yes	
Down Farm, Odiham	Hart	Compost	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	Yes	0	Removed as the site takes wood waste

Farlington Redoubt, Portsdown Hill Road	Havant	WTS	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	0	Yes	
Marchwood Energy Recovery Facility, Marchwood Industrial Park	New Forest	EfW	Non-haz	Recovery	Yes	XXX	Yes	0	0	
Double H Nurseries Ltd Gore Road, New Milton	New Forest	EfW	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	Yes	Yes	0	Removed as the site takes wood waste
Portsmouth Energy Recovery Facility, MRF and WTS, Anchorage Park	Portsmouth	EfW	Non-haz	Recovery	Yes	XXX	Yes	0	0	
Unit 3 & 4 Stubbs Industrial Estate, Hollybush Lane	Rushmoor	Recovery	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	0	Yes	Removed as site is a Waste Transfer Station
Lynchford Lane WTS, Fareham	Rushmoor	MRF	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	0	Yes	Other recovery transferred to other sites
Earth 109 / King George V Dock Berth No's 132 - 146, Western Docks	Southampton	Recycling (metal)	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	Partially	0	Removed portion of the site which takes wood, RDF still included
Bunny Lane, Timsbury, Romsey	Test Valley	Recovery	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	Yes	0	Removed as the site takes CD&E
Unit T1 Pegham Industrial Park, Laveys Lane, Fareham	Winchester	WTS	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	No	Yes	-	Removed as the site takes CD&E
Four Dell Farm, Otterbourne	Winchester	CHP	Non-haz	Recovery	No	XXX	Yes	0	0	

**END**

This page is intentionally left blank