

## NOTICE OF MEETING

|                      |                                      |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Meeting</b>       | Regulatory Committee                 |
| <b>Date and Time</b> | Wednesday 15th May, 2024 at 10.00 am |
| <b>Place</b>         | Ashburton Hall - HCC                 |
| <b>Enquiries to</b>  | members.services@hants.gov.uk        |

Carolyn Williamson FCPFA  
Chief Executive  
The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UJ

## FILMING AND BROADCAST NOTIFICATION

**This meeting will be recorded and broadcast live on the County Council's website and available for repeat viewing.**

It may also be recorded and filmed by the press and public. Filming or recording is only permitted in the meeting room whilst the meeting is taking place so must stop when the meeting is either adjourned or closed. Filming is not permitted elsewhere in the building at any time. Please see the Filming Protocol available on the County Council's website.

## AGENDA

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence received.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members who believe they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting must declare that interest and, having regard to Part 3 Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore all Members with a Personal Interest in a matter being considered at the meeting should consider, having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 4 of the Code, whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 5 of the Code, consider whether it is appropriate to leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

### 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 3 - 6)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting that took place on 20 March 2024.

**4. DEPUTATIONS**

Deputations are taken at the relevant item in which they apply.

**5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

To receive any announcements the Chairman may wish to make.

**6. HAMBLE AIRFIELD (Pages 7 - 352)**

To consider a report from the Assistant Director of Waste and Environment Services regarding an application for proposed extraction of sand and gravel, with restoration to grazing land and recreation using imported inert restoration materials, the erection of associated plant and infrastructure and the creation of a new footpath and access onto Hamble Lane, Hamble Airfield.

**ABOUT THIS MEETING:**

**The press and public are welcome to attend the public sessions of the meeting. If you have any particular requirements, for example if you require wheelchair access, please contact [members.services@hants.gov.uk](mailto:members.services@hants.gov.uk) for assistance.**

County Councillors attending as appointed members of this Committee or by virtue of Standing Order 18.5; or with the concurrence of the Chairman in connection with their duties as members of the Council or as a local County Councillor qualify for travelling expenses.

# Agenda Item 3

AT A MEETING of the Regulatory Committee of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL held at the castle, Winchester on Wednesday, 20th March, 2024

Chairman:

\* Councillor Peter Latham

- |                                |                               |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Lance Quantrill   | * Councillor Adam Jackman     |
| Councillor Lulu Bowerman       | * Councillor Lesley Meenaghan |
| * Councillor Steven Broomfield | * Councillor Sarah Pankhurst  |
| * Councillor Mark Cooper       | * Councillor Stephen Parker   |
| * Councillor Rod Cooper        | Councillor Roger Price        |
| Councillor Michael Ford        | * Councillor Kim Taylor       |
| Councillor Pal Hayre           | * Councillor Tim Groves       |
| * Councillor Keith House       | * Councillor Stephen Philpott |
| * Councillor Adam Jackman      |                               |
| * Councillor Lesley Meenaghan  | * Present                     |
| * Councillor Sarah Pankhurst   |                               |

## 159. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Lulu Bowerman, Mike Ford, Pal Hayre and Roger Price. Councillors Stephen Philpott and Tim Groves attended as deputies.

## 160. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3, Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 5 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

## 161. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed.

## 162. DEPUTATIONS

It was confirmed that one deputation had been received for the meeting.

163. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman confirmed that remote refresher training for Members was scheduled for Monday 25 March at 14:00.

164. **WELLESLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL, ALDERSHOT**

***Construction of a new 2 Form Entry, 420 pupil place Primary School with SEN Resource Provision for 8 pupils, including associated parking and external works at Site reserved for the Eastern Primary School within the Wellesley housing development, Aldershot Urban Extension (No. 23/00729/HCC) (Site Ref: RME039)***

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director of Waste and Environmental Services (item 6 in the minute book) on an application for a new Primary School near Aldershot.

The officer summarised the report, sharing a location plan with Committee that conveyed the positioning of the school within the Aldershot Urban Expansion (AUE) and the access and parking arrangements proposed on site. Elevation photos were shown to the Committee alongside plans of the school depicting the planned layout and design.

It was confirmed that no objections had been received from statutory consultees, but there had been reservations made by Sport England due to the lack of community use offered at the school, which did not form part of the planning application.

A deputation was received from the applicant, who detailed the design principles of the school and during questions of clarification it was confirmed that it was a gas-fired boiler to be installed and not a heat pump as incorrectly stated in the report. The deputation reassured the Committee that the pond area within the school grounds would be fenced for safeguarding and managed by the Academy. One Member queried the risk of highway pollutants with the school being so close to a dual carriageway and roundabout but there were plans to reduce the speed limit closer to the site (as part of the wider outline planning permission) as well as filtered ventilation being installed, which would be managed by the Academy outside of the planning process.

During questions of the officers, the following points were clarified:

- Any extension to the school would be subject to a new planning application.
- The climate change assessment tool had been undertaken on the basis of the installation of a gas boiler, which hadn't triggered the requirement for a full assessment due to the efficiency of the one proposed.
- Sport England had originally objected to the application due to the lack of sport provision and community use as a non-statutory consultee. This objection was subsequently removed.

- Condition 17 detailed the use of the grounds by the Academy Trust and it was confirmed that the condition only applied to school use.

In debate, Members appreciated the financial restraints and felt that a portion of the Section 106 money received for such a large wider development should be used to help improve the physical design of the school. Some Members also felt that a drop-off and pick-up areas should be provided to give flexibility and take the pressure off of the local roads.

Disappointment was also shared that a gas boiler was being installed rather than a ground source heat pump.

Officers acknowledged a desire of Members to see more of the surrounding area of applications where proposals were located in areas which were still being developed and it was agreed that more virtual site visits would be investigated to help provide this context going forward for similar applications.

#### RESOLVED

Planning permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A to the report.

#### Voting

Favour: 9

Against: 0

Abstentions: 4

#### 165. **MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT UPDATE**

The Committee received a report from the Director of Universal Services (item 7 in the minute book), which provided information on the Monitoring and Enforcement work undertaken by the Development Management team (including monitoring and enforcement) during the period October 2023 – January 2024.

It was highlighted that officers were preparing appeals statements and documentation for the Avery B, Shedfield appeal.

More information was expected in relation to the planning application at Jacksons Farm (page 89 of the pack). The application was currently not valid. It was confirmed that the application would be considered by the County Council as the current proposal included wastes uses.

It was clarified that the burning of waste at Comley Hill in Rowlands Castle (page 90 of the pack) had been reported to the Monitoring and Enforcement team by Councillor Marge Harvey as well as other residents.

The report was noted by the Committee.

---

Chairman,



## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Decision Report

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| <b>Decision Maker:</b> | Regulatory Committee  |
| <b>Date:</b>           | 15 May 2024   |
| <b>Title:</b>          | Proposed extraction of sand and gravel, with restoration to grazing land and recreation using imported inert restoration materials, the erection of associated plant and infrastructure and the creation of a new footpath and access onto Hamble Lane at Hamble Airfield (No. CS/22/92277) - EA112<br><br>Our ref: HCC/2021/0787 |
| <b>Report From:</b>    | Assistant Director of Waste and Environment Services  |

**Contact name:** Lisa Kirby-Hawkes  
**Email:** [planning@hants.gov.uk](mailto:planning@hants.gov.uk)

### Recommendation

1. Subject to confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call-in the planning application for determination, that planning permission be REFUSED for the below reasons and as outlined in **Appendix A**:
  - a) On the basis of the information submitted and notwithstanding the proposed mitigation, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable flooding impacts contrary to the requirements of Part h of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022);
  - b) On the basis of the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022) and paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in so far as it does not encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have not been taken up as part of the development.
2. On the basis of the above reasons, the proposal, in its current form, is considered to be contrary to Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) (HMWP)

(2013)). Therefore, the proposal does not constitute a sustainable minerals development.

## **Executive Summary**

3. The proposal is for the extraction of sharp sand and gravel with restoration to grazing land and recreation using imported inert restoration materials as well as the erection of associated plant and infrastructure and the creation of a new footpath and an access onto Hamble Lane at the former Hamble Airfield.
4. Hamble Airfield is a former grassland airfield built in the middle of the last century and was operational until the mid-1980s.
5. The proposal relates to a site allocation for mineral extraction as set out in Part 3 of Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The site also features as a site allocation for mineral extraction in part 3 of Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) in the [emerging Partial Update of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan – Draft Plan 2022](#). However, weight cannot be applied to the continuation of the site allocation at this stage.
6. The proposed development is a Schedule 1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#).
7. This committee report is structured as follows:
  - [The Site](#): This section provides the context for the site;
  - [Planning History](#): This section provides a planning history of the airfield;
  - [The Proposal](#): This section sets out the details of the proposal;
  - [Environmental Impact Assessment](#): This section covers the EIA process including a summary of the requests made for further information and evidence pursuant to Regulation 25;
  - [Development Plan and Guidance](#): This section sets out the relevant policies of the development plan and other policies and guidance that are relevant to the assessment of the proposal;
  - [Consultations](#): This section summarises the consultation responses received during the processing of the planning application;
  - [Representations](#): This section summarises all representations received during the processing of the planning application;
  - [Habitats Regulation Assessment \(HRA\)](#): This section sets out the HRA process;
  - [Climate Change](#): This section summarises the consideration of the planning application in relation to climate change;



- [Commentary](#): This section provides more information on the key issues associated with the proposal;
  - [Conclusions](#): This section summarises and concludes the consideration of the planning application;
  - [Recommendation](#): This section sets out the recommendation for the Regulatory Committee to consider.
8. Key issues associated with the proposal include:
- Need for the development;
  - Highways/transport impacts and safety;
  - Ecological impact;
  - Ground and surface water and flooding;
  - Landscape and visual impacts;
  - Loss of trees;
  - Impact on agricultural land and soils;
  - Impact on public health;
  - Impacts on public safety;
  - Impact on public amenity including noise, dust, air quality;
  - Restoration design and aftercare; and the
  - Economic impact of the proposal.
9. The planning application is being considered by the Regulatory Committee as a major minerals EIA application. The application has also generated significant public interest.
10. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority appointed RSK Environment Ltd to independently assess air quality matters and provide advice as part of the planning application determination process. The outcome of this assessment is documented in this report.
11. A committee site visit by Members took place on 29 April 2024, in advance of the proposal being considered by the Regulatory Committee.
12. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) Planning Casework Unit received a third-party request for the Secretary of State to ‘call-in’ the planning application for determination. Should the Regulatory Committee be minded to resolve to grant permission for the proposal, the Planning Casework Unit will be notified of the decision and planning permission will not be granted until such time as it has been confirmed whether or not the Secretary of State wishes to call in the application for determination.

13. The proposal is considered to meet a need for sharp sand and gravel in the South Hampshire market area. It is recognised that the 7 year landbank requirement for Hampshire is currently met by capacity at already permitted quarry sites. However, it is important to note that the landbank is only a minimum requirement and that the majority of permitted sand and gravel supply is currently located in the New Forest market area. There is also concern that the landbank of permitted reserves is currently made up of a number of permissions which are currently not active or yet to be implemented. This is identified as an area of concern in the most recent [Hampshire Local Aggregate Assessment](#) (LAA). The site provides an opportunity to feed aggregate directly into the South Hampshire market where there is a known demand. The proposal, with mitigation, is considered to be acceptable from a landscape, ecological, archaeological and visual impact perspective. Permissive access can also be secured through the development and proposed legal agreement where currently no formal access is available.
14. It is recognised that the perceived impacts on public health, safety and amenity are significant areas of local concern. With mitigation and the application of planning conditions, impacts on public health, safety and amenity are considered to be acceptable.
15. The proposed principle of the restoration and aftercare scheme is considered to be largely satisfactory, meeting the requirements of Policy 9 (Restoration of quarries and waste sites) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). However, the changes proposed to the Restoration Scheme and associated drainage schemes at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage have resulted in further concerns being raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and its holding objection remains in place. The current proposals for the restored site are shown to have a different profile to the existing site, which means that adjacent ditch networks would receive disproportionate amounts of runoff from the restored site. This lack of certainty at this stage is not considered to be acceptable by the LLFA. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in an unacceptable flooding impact contrary to the requirements of Part h of Policy 10 (Protecting health, safety and amenity) nor Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#).
16. It is recognised that the perceived potential highway impact is one of the main areas of local concern. It is clear that to make the development acceptable from a highways perspective, a highway contribution will be required. The proposed obligation is considered to not meet the tests of regulation 122(2) of the [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#). Without compliance with regulation 122 (2), the planning obligation cannot be considered as

mitigation against the identified impact of the application. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) and paragraph 114 of the [National Planning Policy Framework \(2023\)](#) (NPPF) in so far as it does not encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have not been taken up as part of the development.

17. Taking all matters into account and based on the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this time, on balance, in its current form, the proposal is not considered to be a sustainable minerals development in accordance with Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to flooding and highway matters. On this basis, subject to confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call-in the planning application for determination, it is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reasons outlined in **Appendix A**.

### **The Site**

18. The application site is a former airfield, located in the village of Hamble-le-Rice, within the county of Hampshire and borough of Eastleigh (see **Appendix B – Committee Plan**). The site is 60.04 hectares. The site is in private ownership.
19. The southern boundary of the site is located approximately 0.5 kilometres (km) from the village centre. The site borders Hamble Lane to the west, Satchell Lane to the east, the railway line to the north, and various residential roads and the Roy Underdown Pavilion and green to the south. Hamble station lies to the north-west, approximately 50 metres (m) from the site boundary on the opposite side of Hamble Lane.
20. The existing site mainly comprises an extensive area of semi-improved grassland and scrub mosaic. In addition to this, there are small areas of regenerating broadleaved woodland adjacent to the north-western boundaries of the site, sections of native hedgerow alongside the north-eastern boundaries and scattered trees (which are located mostly in the southern half of the site).
21. The site is generally flat and covered with scrub vegetation, with some mature trees and hedgerows on the boundaries, particularly to the west and north. The southern edge of the site has a belt of maturing mixed native and non-native tree and shrub planting alongside the recent housing development. The northern edge of the application area is bounded by a railway cutting, with

associated security fencing and mature oak, ash, sycamore, and birch trees. The south-western boundary abuts the rear gardens of properties along Hamble Lane. Further north-west and north-east, the boundaries to Hamble Lane and Satchell Lane are delineated by chain-link fencing.

22. The south-eastern edge of the application area adjoins a public footpath (Hamble-le-Rice 1) which runs to the rear of properties along Satchell Lane. The Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 runs north to south along the site's eastern boundary for approximately 700m. Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 16 and Hound Footpath 5 and 6 are to the north west of the site. Hamble-le-Rice Bridleway 709 runs from Satchell Lane to the northeast of the site. There is no formal or permissive access across the airfield although the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is aware that the site is used informally and according to the applicant, in an unauthorised capacity. The proposed access to the site crosses the Dani King Cycle path.
23. The application site lies on a level undulating plateau at the edge of the Hamble Estuary, the river flowing south-westwards into the Solent. Ground levels adjacent to the railway are in the order of 23m above Ordnance Datum (mAOD). From here the topography slopes southwards towards the main village centre and the coastal plain. The ground levels within the settlement of Hamble to the south-east are at around 21mAOD in the northern areas falling away to sea level eastwards alongside the Hamble estuary, and southwards towards the Solent coastal plain. The topography of the surrounding landscape presents a gradation along the level plateau, rising to the north over similarly undulating ground around the settlement of Old Netley, at around 41m AOD.
24. The site is located within the Netley, Hamble and Bursledon Coastal Plain Landscape Character Area (LCA), and interfaces with the Hamble River Valley LCA to the east of the site.
25. To the south and south-west of the site is the wider estuary of the Solent which separates Hamble-le-Rice from Fawley, along the New Forest eastern margin. To the south-east, the Hamble River separates Hamble-le-Rice from Warsash and Swanwick.
26. An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey of the site identifies it as comprised of Grade 1 land in broadly the western part of the site, with a mixture of Grade 2 and subgrade 3a land in broadly the eastern part of the site. However, the land has not been in full agricultural production for approximately 100 years. There is some evidence of small-scale market garden uses in this time on parts of the site.

27. The whole of the site is considered to be in a countryside location as defined by the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). The northern part of the site is also located in the Hamble, Netley and Bursledon Settlement Gap.
28. Eastleigh Borough Council issued a Tree Preservation Order for the entire site (872-E) following the submission of this planning application. Mature trees are most prominent on the northern, eastern, and part of the western boundaries which provide important amenity screening to the site. The site currently includes of rough grassland and scrub, with a mosaic of field boundary trees, ranging in age from young through to mature trees. No over mature or veteran trees are apparent within the site. There are no historic hedgerows located within the site.
29. The site is not subject to any landscape or ecological designations. The nearest ecological designation is the Badnam Copse/Mallards Moor Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) which is located approximately 65 metres to the north-east of the site. Other SINC nearby include:
- West Wood (Royal Victoria Country Park SINC and Ancient Woodland/Ancient Replanted Woodland (located approximately 190m to the west of the site boundary);
  - Netley Lodge SINC (located approximately 850m to the north-west of the site boundary);
  - Priors Hill Copse/Hound Grove SINC (located approximately 780m north-west of the site boundary);
  - St Mary's Road Wood and Spear Pond Gully SINC (located approximately 780m to the north-west of the site boundary);
  - Hamble Common West SINC (located approximately 630m to the south); and
  - Mercury Marina Saltmarsh North and South SINC (South is closest and located approximately 225m to the east of the site boundary).
30. The closest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are located at Lincegrove and Hacketts Marshes (located approximately 340m of the north-east of the site boundary) and Lee-on-Solent to Itchen Estuary (located approximately 350m to the east of the site).
31. The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar Site, Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are located approximately 340m to the east, adjacent to the River Hamble.
32. The [Hamble Catchment Biodiversity Opportunity Area](#) (BOA) (21) is located approximately 380m with the site's north east boundary, at the top section of

Satchell Lane. The BOA lies on a north-south axis at a maximum distance of 400m from the site's eastern boundary and at least 150m to the south-east of the site. The [Solent BOA](#) (20) is located approximately 40m from the site, on the opposite side of Hamble Lane.

33. The site is located in Flood Zone 1. The River Hamble is approximately 410m to the east of the site. The Solent is located approximately 1km to the south west of the site.
34. A record of a 'Type 26' pillbox is located on the adjacent footpath. Two World War II pillboxes are located on the eastern side of the site outside of the site boundary (closest is 20m from the site).
35. The Grade II-listed Royal Victoria Country Park Registered Park and Garden containing Grade II Victoria House at Victoria Hospital is located within 160m to of the site.
36. There are number of listed buildings to the west, south-west and south-east, all of which are located 500m – 1.5km from the site boundary.
37. The nearest Conservation Area is Old Bursledon, the south-west edge of which lies 0.05km from the site's north-east boundary. The northern edge of the Hamble Conservation Area lies 0.15km from the site's southern boundary. Further afield, Netley Abbey, Swanwick Shore and Warsash Conservation Areas are located 1.7km, 1.85km and 1.3km from the site respectively.
38. St Andrew's Castle Scheduled Monument and additional remains on Hamble Common' are located 0.85km to the south of the site. The next nearest monument is 'Netley Abbey' which is 2.15km to the west of the site.
39. The closest residential properties to the site are those in Hamble Lane, Satchell Lane and those to the south of the site in areas such as Astral Gardens and Tutor Close.
40. There are two schools in close proximity to the site. The Hamble School and associated Hamble Sports Complex is located approximately 45m to the north of the site boundary (separated by the railway line). Hamble Primary school site is located approximately 120m to the west of the site. The Hamble Early Years Centre is approximately 120m north of the site boundary (separated by the railway line) closes to the Hamble School and Sports Complex campus. The Hamble Play School is located approximately 385m south of the site boundary.

41. The Blackthorne Health Centre is located approximately 950m to the north of the site boundary, off Satchell Lane.
42. A rail line is located approximately 17m to the north of the site. This is the Southampton to Fareham rail line and is part of the West Coastway Line.
43. There are utility pipelines running along the eastern side of the site, outside of the proposed extraction area. The Exolum pipeline runs close to the north-east and along the eastern boundary of the site, adjacent to the rear of existing residential properties. The Esso pipeline runs along the eastern boundary of the site, approximately following the site boundary and along a short distance of the southern boundary north of the Pavilion. The gas main pipeline runs along the eastern boundary in a similar location.
44. The site is located within the Southampton International Airport Safeguarding Zone.
45. There is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) located approximately 1.5km to the north of the site. The AQMA covers the area from Windhover Roundabout south on Hamble Lane to the junction with Portsmouth Road (A3025) and east along Providence Hill (A27).

### **Planning History**

46. The site was used as an airfield until the mid-1980s. Prior to this use, the site was used by the military. There have been no other known planning applications at the site since the completion of airfield operations.
47. Hamble Airfield is a site allocation for mineral extraction in Part 3 of Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). Development considerations relating to the site are set out in Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The mineral resources are also safeguarded through Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

### **The Proposal**

48. The proposed development is for the extraction of approximately 1.7million tonnes (mt) of sand and gravel at a rate of approximately 250,000 tonnes per annum (tpa). Accordingly, such extraction is likely to last up to 7 years. A [Geological Report](#) was submitted to support the application.

*Plant and associated equipment:*

49. **Appendix C – Layout Plan** provides more information on the proposed layout. The development (see [Site Plan](#)) would comprise of:

- aggregate processing plant (see [Plant Site Area](#)).
- stocking conveyor;
- water treatment plant;
- double weighbridge;
- weighbridge office;
- site offices/welfare units;
- wheelwash;
- car parking area;
- cycle parking; and
- overnight parking area.

50. [Elevation](#) plans of the proposed aggregate processing, conveyor, site officers and haul bridge have also been included.

*Operations and phasing:*

51. The application site area is approximately 60.04ha, with each working phase ranging in size from 3.6 to 7.6ha. The site would be worked in 7 Phases (see **Appendix D – Phasing Plan**, [Method of Working](#) subsequent updates provided under Regulation 25), with the first phase being at the northern end of the site.

52. Before mineral working commences, a number of operations will take place. The preliminary operations would involve firstly clearing reptiles from the land to be used for the site access. Then, when conditions are suitable to move soils, the site access will be created and tree protection and reptile fencing will be installed. Once the area is clear, the haul road would be constructed and the soils would be stripped for Phase 1 and the plant site and placed around the site creating the bunds on all sides.

53. Bunding is proposed. The heights of the bunds would be between 3m and 5m in height (see [Method of Working](#)). An excavator, dump truck and bulldozer would be used to create the bunds. Topsoil would be stored at 3m high. The 5m bunds would comprise subsoils with a small layer of topsoil, in order that the bunds can be seeded with a low maintenance grass seed mix or neutral grassland wildflower mix. The topsoil and subsoil would be separated with membranes. The proximity of the bund to residential properties varies around the site. At its closest, on the northern edge of the site, the bund is approximately 48m from the side elevation of the nearest property along Hamble Lane with the railway line located between the property and the site.



The closest facing elevation of the Hamble Sports Complex is approximately 44m, again across the railway line. On the eastern site boundary, the bund is approximately 67m from the facing elevation to the closest property at The Close (off Satchell Lane). On the south-west site boundary, the bund is approximately 71m at its closest to the facing elevation of properties at Tutor Close, separated by existing screening. To the west of the site, the closest facing elevation to the bund is approximately 62m. The side elevation of the property immediately south of the site's entrance is approximately 59m.

54. The land in Phase 1 would be used for freshwater and silt lagoons once extraction is complete in this phase, with the overburden used to create screening bunds around the edges of the site. No dewatering would occur and the mineral deposit would be worked dry or wet, depending on the water table level. The applicant has indicated that there may be some pumping of rainwater or groundwater at the excavation face to locations within the site, without any off-site discharge.
55. The plant site would be set up once Phase 1 is completed and the Phase 1 mineral would then be processed.
56. The routine mineral extraction operations would involve an excavator and loading shovel at the face of the mineral, and hopper to feed the conveyors. The machinery required at the plant site is shown on the Plant Site Area plan and includes a processing plant to screen and wash the mineral, a radial stocking conveyor, water treatment plant, two weighbridges and a wheel wash.
57. A conveyor would be used to bring the mineral from the extraction area back to the processing plant with the exception of Phase 1 where mineral would be brought back to the plant site by Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV). Some of the mineral from Phase 1 would be used to surcharge the plant site back to ground level, following soil removal.
58. Silt from the excavation would be disposed of in the silt lagoons shown on the **Appendix D – Phasing Plan** and [Method of Working](#) plans. The silt would be pumped from the processing plant to the lagoons via a pipeline. Water from the freshwater pond will be pumped back to the plant for aggregate washing, meaning that around 95% of the water on site is recycled. Silt is on average 10% of the mineral, as identified by the trial boreholes.
59. The maximum depth of the excavation would be around 7m, with the average depth around 4.5m.

60. It is proposed to establish a permissive footpath at the start of the development, from the south-east corner to the north-west corner, which would connect the houses on Satchell Lane to Hamble station and the Hamble School and Sports Complex. The path would have several entrance/exit points around the site, as shown on the [Landscape Layout Operational Phase Plan](#). This would also enable walkers to access the Hamble Rail Walking Trail on the opposite side of Hamble Lane and connect with surrounding footpaths. The proposed path would be on the outside of the bunds and a fence would separate the path from the bunds and quarry. The path is intended to remain in the long-term, for the duration of mineral working and infilling, and once working has been completed at the site.
61. Once Phase 1 has been completed, operations would move into Phase 2 to the south. The footpath around the outside of the site would be created once the bunds and tree protection are in place. Phase 2 would then be soil stripped and extracted, with the mineral brought back to the plant site via conveyor. A temporary overburden stockpile would be placed within the phase, and the soils from the stockpile would then be used to restore this phase, as well as inert restoration materials which would begin to be imported once the mineral from Phase 2 land has been extracted.
62. Phase 3 would then be extracted and processed in the same way, with a temporary stockpile of overburden used to restore the land for Phases 2 and 3, along with the imported restoration materials. The remaining site would then be worked in an anti-clockwise motion, ending with the plant site area, which would be the final Phase (Phase 7).
63. Reptiles would be cleared from the next phase of extraction as the site is worked, and moved into the receptor area, which would also change as the extraction progresses (see [ES, Vol 2 Appendix 4.7](#)).
64. Working and progressive restoration would then continue in a circular motion with the final phase would be Phase 7. It is likely that material from final phase) would not be processed on site as the plant would be dismantled, and instead would be exported in unprocessed form.
65. Once extraction is complete, the perimeter bunds would be dismantled and the material would be used to restore the plant site and Phase 1 land.
66. Once the importation of restoration materials has ceased, it is estimated that a further year would be required to finalise planting across the site. The site access would remain in situ upon restoration for access to the site.

*Operations:*

67. The applicant has proposed the following hours of operation:

- 0700-1700 hours Monday to Friday; and
- 0700-1200 hours on Saturdays.

68. Soil stripping and sand extraction is not proposed to commence until 0800 hours. The applicant proposes that the maintenance of plant and vehicles will take place until 1900 hours (Monday to Friday) and 1800 (Saturdays).

*HGV movements:*

69. The application is supported by [Transport Vol 2 Chapter 13 Transport](#) and associated addendums / appendices, a [Transport Safety Audit](#).

70. The site is not located on the [Strategic Road Network](#) as defined by the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) but has access to it via junction 8 of the M27.

71. It is estimated that there would be an average of 45 loads of aggregate leaving the site per day (90 movements) based on five and a half days' working per week from year 1 - year 7. There would be around 27 loads (54 movements) of inert restoration materials imported to the site per day from year 3– year 7 and once extraction has ceased, from year 8 this would increase to 45 loads (90 movements) per day of imported restoration materials. The detailed calculations of the predicted HGV movements is provided in the [Transport Assessment](#) and associated appendices provided with the planning application.

72. Access to the site is set out on **Appendix E – Access Plan**.

73. There are 20 parking spaces proposed as part of the development which includes overnight parking areas.

74. The applicant proposed pedestrian and cycle facilities / parking within the site. The site is within walking and cycling distance of a large area of Hamble-le-Rice itself as well as the adjacent area of Netley and Bursledon. Therefore, the applicant states that there are opportunities for staff and visitors to access the site on foot or by bike. There are also public transport opportunities with bus and train services, both of which can be accessed by foot or bicycle.

75. The access to the site would be created from Hamble Lane and has been designed so that all vehicles would arrive from and depart to the north of the site.

76. The site access would remain in situ after restoration to continue to provide access to the site and for long-term site maintenance purposes.

77. No use of Satchell Lane for access is proposed.

*Landscaping, soils, arboriculture, archaeology and lighting:*

78. [ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment](#) (and associated appendices), [Landscape Detail Sections \(Operational Phase\)](#) and [Landscape Layout Plan Operational Phase](#) are included as part of the application alongside [Landscape & Visual Reg 25 Addendum](#). The proposal includes:

- Fencing - Will be comprised of treated timber, galvanised steel plain wire, galvanised steel barbed wire to discourage climbing over (see [Timber Posts & Stockproof Wire Fence Plan](#));
- Vegetation clearance / Tree, hedgerow and other planting (see **Appendix F – Landscaping Plan**;
- Reptile fencing; and a
- New permissive grass footpath.

79. An [Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement](#) was also submitted alongside a number of other documents including a [Tree Survey Constraints & Protection Plan](#) and a [CAVAT Valuation Rev A](#).

80. [Soils Vol 2 Chapter 14 - Soils and ALC \(Reg 25 28 November 2022\)](#) and associated appendices [9.1](#) and [9.2](#) were also prepared. Soil [Boreholes](#) and [Soil Analysis](#) was also undertaken.

81. [Lighting Layout - Aggregate Processing Plant](#) and [Lighting Layout - Haul Road Car Park & Weighbridge](#) have been submitted as part of the application. The site will only require lighting during the evenings in winter, until 5pm. Lighting is proposed on the access road to the plant site and within the plant site itself, both of which are away from sensitive receptors. No flood lighting would be used, and all lighting would be angled downwards with low lux levels and be sensitive to ecological corridors. In the extraction areas, the only lighting would be that of vehicles.

82. [Archaeology Vol 2 Chapter 11 Updated Archaeology and Heritage](#) was submitted to address aspects of the historical environment as well as an [Archaeological Desk Based Assessment](#).

*Air quality, noise and health:*

83. The application includes an [Air Quality](#) assessment and associated appendices. Various documents were submitted in relation to noise including [Environmental statement Chapter 7 Noise](#) and [Noise Reg 25 Addendum](#)

[updated Baseline Noise Survey](#). A [Health Impact Assessment](#) was also prepared.

*Ecology:*

84. [Ecology Vol 2 Chapter 10](#) was prepared as part of the application and is supported by other assessments such as an [ES Appendix 4.1 Ecological Appraisal & Desk Study](#) and [Appendix 4.2 Habitats Regulations Assessment](#) as well as a variety of surveys ([Appendix 4.3 Bat Surveys](#), [Appendix 4.4 Breeding & Wintering Bird Surveys](#), [Appendix 4.5 Hazel Dormouse Surveys](#) [Appendix 4.6 Invertebrate Survey](#)) and [Environmental statement Appendix 4.7 Reptile Surveys and Mitigation Strategy](#)). Additional information was submitted under Regulation 25. This included amendments to [Ecology Vol 2 Appendix 4.4 Breeding & Wintering Bird Surveys](#), [Ecology Vol 2 Appendix 4.7 Reptile Surveys & Mitigation Strategy](#), [Ecology Vol 2 Appendix 4.8 BNG Calculations](#), [Environmental Statement Appendix 4.9 Condition Assessment Sheet \(Reg 25 - 3 November 2023\)](#) and [Ecology Vol 2 Appendix 4.2 Shadow Habitat Regs Assessment](#). An assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain was also included as part of the application ([Environmental Statement Appendix 4.8 Biodiversity Metric RevA](#)). The proposal results in a 9.89% uplift for habitats units and a 109.17% uplift for hedgerow units.

*Drainage and flooding:*

85. [ES Chapter 8 Water Environment & Flood Risk](#) was prepared as part of the submission. This was also supported by [Borehole Logs](#) (Appendix 2.1), [Flood Risk Assessment](#), [Flood Risk Map](#), [Estimation of Hydraulic Conductivity](#), [Saturated Thickness Chart](#) and Ground Condition Assessments [Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#). Additional information was also submitted under Regulation 25 (Parts 1 and 2) in relation to [Hydro Reg Response to NE, Ecology and LLFA](#), [Hydro Reg 25 Response to Network Rail and EA](#), [Hydro Vol 2 Appendix 2.7 Infiltration Testing Report \(Exc Appendix B\)](#), [Hydro Vol 2 Appendix 2.7 \(New\) Infiltration Testing Report Appendix B Part 1](#), [Part 2](#), [Part 3](#), [Part 4](#), [Part 5](#), [Part 6](#), [Part 7](#), [Hydro Vol 2 Appendix 2.6 \(New\) Borehole Logs](#), [Hydro Reg 25 Response - Drainage and Infiltration Testing](#) and a [Technical Note - Updated Drainage Design](#). A [Technical Note Groundwater Flow](#) was also submitted alongside a [Ground Movement Assessment](#). **Appendix G – Drainage Design** provides more details of the drainage design.

*Restoration and aftercare:*

86. It is proposed to restore the site to a mixture of lowland acid grassland, lowland mixed deciduous woodland and mixed scrub with some smaller areas comprising shallow drainage ponds and fens. Key features include:

- Dry acid grassland creation with scrub and woodland planting;
- Retained and advanced planting for screening;

- New native scrub hedgerows;
- A new community access area;
- New permissive footpath link to the existing rights of way network;
- Grazing land; and
- Ponds.

87. More information on the proposed restoration is set out in **Appendix H – Concept Restoration Plan** and **I – Phased restoration plans** as well as in [Appendix 9.4 Restoration Plan, Landscape & Restoration Vol 1 Appendix 2 Restoration Plan Rev A, Landscape & Restoration Vol 1 Appendix 2 Landscape Layout Operational Phase RevA, Landscape & Restoration Vol 1 Appendix 2 \(New\) Phased Restoration Plan](#) and [Landscape & Restoration Vol 1 Appendix 2 \(New\) Phased Restoration Plan Part 2](#).

88. Following extraction, the site would be progressively restored using in situ soils and overburden from the site, together with approximately 1.8mt of imported inert restoration materials. The inert restoration materials will be imported at a rate of 150,000tpa whilst extraction is ongoing, increasing to 250,000tpa once extraction has ceased. These inert materials will be imported to restore the site to existing ground levels for the majority of the site, with some existing naturally lower areas to remain as water features for drainage purposes. Restoration will be progressive. The rate at which restoration is completed will depend on the amount of inert restoration materials that can be brought to the site for that purpose. It is estimated that infilling would take a further 6 years with a further year to finalise planting once importation has ceased. This gives a total of 15 years to work and restore the site.

89. The north-eastern corner of the site would be restored to an area for permissive community access, with a hedge separating it from the rest of the site. Trees would be planted in this area and the grassland would be managed by cutting. The remaining northern half of the site would be restored to dry acid grassland with new field edge woodland and scrub blocks. It is anticipated that this area will be managed through infrequent grazing. The southern part of the site would also be restored to grassland and grazing land, with habitat particularly for reptiles and ground nesting birds, managed by regular grazing. Retained and new planting would help to screen existing properties.

90. As well as the permissive public access created, the footpath from the south-eastern corner adjoining Satchell Lane would remain and be extended further south along Hamble Lane, just north of no 108.

91. The applicant will be responsible for the initial restoration and subsequent aftercare management. Phased restoration plans (see [Phased Restoration Part 1](#) and [Phased Restoration Part 2](#)). The [LVIA & Restoration Sections](#) have

also been submitted to accompany the working scheme and restoration plans. A [Concept Restoration Plan](#) and [LVIA & Restoration Sections \(LVIA2C\)](#) have also been submitted.

92. The Applicant proposes a 5-year aftercare period for each phase of the development. The submitted **Aftercare Scheme** shows an example of a 5-year period, pending a more detailed scheme being submitted by condition or pursuant to a section 106 (s106) legal agreement. More information can be found in [Landscape & Restoration Vol 1 Appendix 2 Aftercare & Management Areas](#) and [Landscape & Restoration Vol 2 Appendix 3.2 Outline Landscape Restoration & Aftercare Scheme](#).

*Other matters:*

93. The applicant prepared a [Statement of Community Involvement and associated Appendices](#) as part of the planning application.
94. All documents and plans associated with the planning application can be found on the planning application [webpage](#).

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

95. The proposed development has been assessed under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#). Due to its size, nature and scale, the proposal constitutes Schedule 1 development under the Regulations. The Applicant was therefore required to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and submit with the planning application an Environmental Statement (ES). The ES should identify any significant environmental effects likely to arise from the development and the mitigation measures proposed to deal with these.
96. Following the submission of the planning application and the initial round of public consultation (19th January 2022 and 19th February 2022), the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority concluded that further information was required to determine the application. In accordance with Regulation 25 of the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#), the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority issued a Regulation 25 request on 4th April 2022 (hereafter referred to as Regulation 25 (part 1)). The additional information requested was considered to be necessary to enable the full and proper consideration of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development. Full copies of all requests are available to view on the County Council's online planning portal. The request for further information can be summarised as follows:

1. *Ecology:*
  - Request for Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) and soil resources survey;
  - Updates to, and clarification of, the Landscaping, Restoration and Outline 5 year Aftercare Scheme document;
  - Update to the shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA);
  - Further assessment of the Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI;
  - Full results of the 2021 - 2022 wintering bird surveys;
  - Revised impact assessment and mitigation measures (if necessary);
  - More information on potential contamination risks;
  - Further protected species assessments;
  - Further information on light spread from lighting and the potential impacts on species of bat identified during the surveys; and
  - Further information on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
2. *Highways:*
  - More detailed information on the access junction;
  - More information on tree loss value;
  - More clarification on submitted speed data and visibility;
  - Updates to the Road Safety Audit;
  - A Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding assessment and review;
  - Information on tracking and associated road speeds; and
  - Response to the objection from Hamble Parish Council.
3. *Hydrology and Hydrogeology:*
  - More information which demonstrates that infiltration is feasible at the application site;
  - Infiltration testing be undertaken in accordance with the BRE365 (2016 publication) methodology at a depth and location commensurate with the proposed infiltration features; and
  - More information about the impacts of introducing possibly less permeable material to replace the extracted sand and gravel.
4. *Noise:*
  - Revised background noise monitoring information requested.
5. *Dust and Air Quality:*
  - Quantitative dust and particulate modelling information requested.
6. *Rights of Way:*
  - Additional drawing requested on the proposed permissive path.
7. *Archaeology:*
  - Additional details requested about the military structures at the site and its Palaeolithic archaeological potential.
8. *Landscape and Arboriculture:*
  - Revised phasing scheme;
  - Clarification sought on the suggested use of lime when the end goal includes an acid grassland;
  - The retention of in situ of trees and the proposed planting of Aspen instead of willow; and



- Revisions to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
9. *Restoration and Aftercare:*
- Requests for clarification;
  - Minor amendments requested to the restoration scheme and its phasing;
  - More information sought about groundwater flows post-restoration;
  - Improved rights of way and habitat creation; and
  - Preparation of an indicative 30-year management plan.

97. A follow up Regulation 25 letter was issued by the Minerals Waste Planning Authority on 17 August 2022 (see [Regulation 25 Further Request Highways \(17 August 2022\)](#)) specifically on highway matters following an additional response received from the Highway Authority. This request for further information (which was treated as a supplement to the original Regulation 25 (part 1) request) is summarised as follows:

1. *Highway safety:*

- Updated Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data;
- Baseline traffic flows: Provision of raw traffic count data;
- Trip Generation: Further information requested to evidence the proposed HGV trip generation / the hourly profile of trips;
- Traffic Impact: Clarification / check on Phases 1 and 3 when percentage increases are lower;
- Junction Impact Assessment: An assessment of the remaining junctions between the site and the M27 (Hamble Lane junctions with Satchell Lane, Portsmouth Road, Jurd Way, Tesco, the Windhover Roundabout and M27 Junction 8) to consider whether the addition of the development traffic would result in a significant impact on the capacity of these junctions.

98. The information requested in these two Regulation 25 requests was submitted by the applicant (see [Regulation 25 Submission List of Documents](#)) and subject to a public consultation between 5 December 2022 and 16 January 2023 in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation period was extended by 2 weeks due to the Christmas break.

99. Following the completion of this Regulation 25 consultation, the applicant requested informal discussions with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and consultees in relation to matters such as ecology, flooding and drainage, restoration and arboriculture. These informal discussions led the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to conclude that the potential changes to the Environmental Statement could not be considered to be clarifications, and actually went to the heart of the Environmental Statement. Therefore, to ensure due process was followed, a further request for information was issued under Regulation 25 on 24 August 2023 (Regulation 25 (part 2)) (see

[Regulation 25 Request Letter \(24 August 2023\)](#) . This related to the following areas:

1. Ecology:
  - Amendments to Chapter 10 of the ES to include updated BNG calculations;
  - Clarification on the size of trees to be used;
  - Habitat condition assessment sheets pre and post development; more information to support how a medium distinctiveness habitat could be delivered (i.e. other acid grassland);
  - A review of the shadow HRA.
2. Restoration and Aftercare: Amendments to the Restoration Plan.
3. Dust and Air Quality:
  - Update the ES to include additional information on the proposed mitigation and their impacts on the AQMA;
  - Further consideration of the changes made by the Environment Act 2021 to the regulation of fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>);
  - Information on comparable existing sites;
  - Modelling of dust emission exposure patterns on local receptors;
  - A response to the UKHSA;
  - A standalone Dust Management Plan; and
  - Additional on-site meteorological data.
4. Landscape and visual impact:
  - Revised planting plan (if required) to consider any changes to the ecological and restoration plans; and
  - Amendments to the ES to include more information on what mitigation measures could be employed to protect impacted trees;
5. Consideration on whether the scheme access could be amended to protect some of the impacted trees (e.g. T8);
6. Soils:
  - Amendments to the ES to include a response to the issues raised by Natural England;
  - Agricultural Viability Report; and
  - Amendments to the ES appendices to include a calculated agricultural land classification.
7. Hydrology and Hydrogeology:
  - Update to the ES to include an Updated Drainage Design;
  - More information on the groundwater flow and exceedance plans;
  - A and a response on the specifications of fill material.  
Amendments to the ES to include a response to the concerns raised by Network Rail in relation to the Ground Movement Assessment for Network Rail Assets.

100. Some additional areas of clarification were also sought from the applicant in relation to ecology, human health and public rights of way. The potential for the applicant to provide a response on some representations received from bodies such as Hamble Parish Council, Eastleigh Borough Council and the Hamble Peninsula Residents Group was also set out in the letter.

101. The information requested above was submitted by the applicant and subject to a public consultation between 11 November 2023 and 15 December 2023 in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
102. Following Regulation 25 (pt 2), it became clear that a draft version of the Drainage Design had been incorrectly subject to consultation. Therefore, an **Updated Drainage Design ref: 331201108TN3 rev1** was subject to a targeted consultation between 19 January 2024 and 19 February 2024.
103. A discussion of the findings of the ES and the subsequent Regulation 25 consultation's is set out in the relevant commentary sections of this report.

### **Development Plan and Other Relevant Policies and Guidance**

104. Section 38(6) of the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#) requires that applications are determined in accordance with the statutory 'development plan' unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
105. The key policies in the development plan which are material to the determination of the application, are summarised below. In addition, reference is made to relevant national planning policy and other policies that guide the decision-making process which are material to the determination of the application.
106. For the purposes of this application, the statutory development plan comprises the following:

### **Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) (HMWP (2023))**

107. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:
- Policy 1: Sustainable minerals and waste development;
  - Policy 2: Climate change – mitigation and adaptation;
  - Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species;
  - Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape;
  - Policy 5: Protection of the countryside;
  - Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets;
  - Policy 8: Protection of soils;
  - Policy 9: Restoration of quarries and waste developments;
  - Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity;
  - Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention;
  - Policy 12: Managing traffic;
  - Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development;
  - Policy 14: Community benefits;
  - Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources;

- Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source;
- Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development;
- Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates;
- Policy 25: Sustainable waste management;
- Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development; and
- Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development.

### [Update to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(emerging\) \(draft\)](#)

108. Hampshire County Council and its partner authorities (Southampton City Council, Portsmouth City Council, New Forest National Park Authority and the South Downs National Park Authority) are working to produce a partial update to the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) which will guide minerals and waste decision making in the Plan Area up until 2040. The partial update to the Plan will build upon the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#), eventually providing new and updated policies based on up-to-date evidence of the current levels of provision for minerals and waste facilities in the Plan Area. The plan remains at the pre-submission stage.

109. Paragraph 48 of the [National Planning Policy Framework \(2023\)](#) (NPPF (2023)) states that '*Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:*

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and*
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).*

Furthermore, paragraph 49 states '*However, in the context of the Framework – and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances where both:*

- a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and*
- b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area'.*

110. The partial update to the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is at a very early stage of the plan-making process. Its draft policies cannot be given any weight in decision-making at this time.

**[Eastleigh Borough Local Plan \(2016-2036\)](#)** (EBLP (2022))

111. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- Strategic policy S1, Delivering sustainable development;
- Strategic policy S8, Historic Environment;
- Strategic policy S9, Green infrastructure;
- Strategic policy S11, Transport infrastructure;
- Strategic policy S12, Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links;
- Policy DM1, General criteria for new development;
- Policy DM2, Environmentally sustainable development;
- Policy DM3, Adaptation to climate change;
- Policy DM4, Zero or low carbon energy;
- Policy DM5, Managing flood risk;
- Policy DM6, Sustainable surface water management and watercourse management;
- Policy DM8, Pollution;
- Policy DM11, Nature conservation;
- Policy DM12, Heritage Assets;
- Policy DM13, General development criteria – transport;
- Policy DM14, Parking; and
- Policy HA3, Hamble Airfield.

112. Other areas of policy and guidance other than the development plan that are of relevance of to the proposal include:

**[Hampshire Local Transport Plan 4 \(2024\)](#)** (LTP4 (2024))

113. Hampshire County Council has a statutory requirement to have in place a Local Transport Plan (LTP). LTP4:

- describes the transport vision for 2050, the key transport outcomes we are seeking to achieve, and the guiding principles that will guide future investment and decision-making within the County Council in relation to transport and travel;
- sets out transport policies covering all aspects of transport planning, delivery, and operation; and
- presents the overall implementation approach, setting out a roadmap to 2050 and how we will prioritise, fund and deliver interventions, and monitor our progress.

114. In addition, it supports the County Council's wider strategies, plans and priorities.

115. The following vision has been developed, summarising what we want our transport system to look like by 2050: *“A carbon neutral, resilient and inclusive transport system designed around - and with - people, which: supports health, wellbeing and quality of life for all; supports a connected economy and creates successful and prosperous places; and respects and seeks to enhance Hampshire’s unique natural and built environment.”*

116. Eight outcomes are identified, grouped under four key themes:

A carbon neutral, resilient Hampshire:

- 1) Reduce transport-related carbon emissions to net zero (neutrality) by 2050;
- 2) A transport network that is resilient to climate change, extreme weather, incidents and major disruptive events;

Respect and protect Hampshire’s environment:

- 3) Improved air quality and less noise disturbance from transport;
- 4) A transport network that protects and enhances our natural and historic environments, resulting in an overall net environmental gain;

Thriving and prosperous place:

- 5) Supporting a connected economy, creating successful places and ensuring Hampshire continues to prosper whilst reducing its emissions;
- 6) Support sustainable housing and employment growth and regeneration that positively supports our LTP4 vision;

Healthy, happy, inclusive lives:

- 7) A network that supports and enables active travel and active lifestyles to improve our health and wellbeing;
- 8) A transport system that provides more equitable access to services, opportunities and life chances delivering improved quality of life for all in Hampshire.

117. LTP4 includes a number of relevant policies including:

- Policy C1: Putting people and places at the heart of our decisions;
- Policy C3: Transport strategies and schemes to be developed in accordance with consideration of all users (Road User Utility Framework);
- Policy C4: Place climate change at the heart of decision-making;
- Policy C5: Support local living and reduce demands on transport;
- Policy C6: Encourage sustainable travel behaviour;
- Policy C7: A Safe System approach for Hampshire;
- Policy C8: Managing the harmful health effects of poor air quality and noise disturbance due to transport;
- Policy C9: Protecting the environment;
- Policy HP1 – Deliver the infrastructure required to support a large-scale shift towards walking and cycling for everyday trips;

- Policy HP3 – Widen participation and broaden the appeal of walking and cycling as a natural travel choice;
- Policy FM2 – Accelerate the transition to low and zero emission vehicle use;
- Policy BT3 – New approaches for shifting the balance between private car use and other modes (demand management);
- Policy AM1 – Sustainable maintenance approach for new infrastructure;
- Policy AM2 – Managing and maintaining the existing highway asset; and
- Policy SI1: Work with partners to deliver targeted improvements to Hampshire's strategic rail, road and digital infrastructure.

**National Planning Policy Framework (2023)** (NPPF (2023))

118. The following paragraphs are relevant to this proposal:

- Paragraphs 10-12: Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- Paragraphs 38, 47: Decision making;
- Paragraphs 55 – 56: Planning conditions;
- Paragraph 57: Planning obligations;
- Paragraph 85: Support of sustainable economic growth
- Paragraph 92: Healthy, inclusive and safe places;
- Paragraphs 98 - 99: Access to high quality open spaces, sports and recreation;
- Paragraphs 108, 115-117: Sustainable transport
- Paragraph 120: Types of land;
- Paragraphs 131-140: Design
- Paragraphs 159-164 Planning and climate change
- Paragraphs 159-169: Planning and flood risk; and
- Paragraphs 180: Contributions and enhancement of natural and local environment;
- Paragraphs 186-188: Biodiversity and planning
- Paragraphs 183-188: Ground conditions and pollution;
- Paragraphs 194-208: Heritage assets;
- Paragraph 209, 211: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals; and
- Paragraphs 213: Steady and adequate supply of aggregates.

**National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

119. The following chapters of the PPG and associated paragraphs are relevant to the proposal:

- [Air quality](#) (1 November 2019) - Paragraphs 001, 005 – 007, 008;
- [Appropriate assessment](#) (22 July 2019) - Paragraphs 001 – 004, 006, 007;

- [Before submitting a planning application](#) (15 March 2019) - Paragraph 001, 003 - 005, 007, 008;
- [Climate change](#) (15 March 2019) - Paragraphs 001-007, 011;
- [Effective use of land](#) (22 July 2019) - Paragraph 001;
- [Environmental Impact Assessment](#) (13 May 2020) - Paragraphs 001 - 004, 035, 036, 040 - 042, 046, 047, 050 - 052, 063 - 065;
- [Flood risk and coastal change](#) (25 August 2022) - Paragraphs 001-005, 013, 020 - 022, 040, 055, 058 059, 062-067;
- [Healthy and safe communities](#) (7 August 2022) - Paragraphs 001, 003;
- [Historic Environment](#) (23 July 2019) - Paragraphs 001 - 003; 006 – 011, 013, 018 019 020 039 – 041, 058 – 065, 068;
- [Land affected by contamination](#) (22 July 2019) - Paragraphs 009 - 011;
- [Land stability](#) (22 July 2019) - Paragraph 001;
- [Light pollution](#) (1 November 2019) - Paragraphs 001 - 007;
- [Natural environment](#) (21 July 2019) - Paragraphs 004 - 006, 008-012, 014, 018 – 028, 036, 037;
- [Noise](#) (22 July 2019) - Paragraphs 001 – 010, 015;
- [Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space](#) (6 March 2014) - Paragraph 001;
- [Planning obligations](#) (1 September 2019) - Paragraphs 001 - 003, 013;
- [Travel plans, transport assessments and statements](#) (6 March 2014) - Paragraphs 001-007, 009-015; and
- [Use of planning conditions](#) (23 July 2019) - Paragraphs 001, 002, 008, 009, 012, 016, 018, 027; and
- [Waste](#) (16 October 2014) - Paragraph 050.

120. Within the specific '[Minerals](#)' chapter of the [PPG](#), Specifically for minerals, the following paragraphs are of relevance:

- Paragraph 001: What are mineral resources and why is planning permission required?;
- Paragraph 007: How should mineral planning authorities identify locations for minerals development?;
- Paragraph 008: How should mineral planning authorities plan for minerals extraction?;
- Paragraph 010: Under what circumstances would it be preferable to focus on extensions to existing sites rather than plan for new sites?;
- Paragraph 011: How and when are the details of any significant environmental impacts best addressed?;
- Paragraph 012: What is the relationship between planning and other regulatory regimes?;
- Paragraph 013: What are the environmental issues of minerals working that should be addressed by mineral planning authorities?;



- Paragraph 014: What issues are for other regulatory regimes to address?;
- Paragraph 017: How should mineral planning authorities assess the cumulative impact of minerals development?;
- Paragraph 018: Are separation distances/buffer zones appropriate?;
- Paragraph 019-022: Noise emissions;
- Paragraph 023-032: Dust emissions;
- Paragraph 033: What factors should be considered in assessing quarry-slope stability?;
- Paragraph 036-058: Restoration and aftercare of minerals sites;
- Paragraph 059: What should be included in a landscape strategy?;
- Paragraph 061-071: Local Aggregate Assessments; and
- Paragraph 080-085: Aggregate landbanks.

121. The following paragraphs of the '[Waste](#)' chapter of the PPG are also relevant to the proposal:

- Paragraph 002: What matters come within the scope of 'waste development'?;
- Paragraph 050: What is the relationship between planning and other regulatory regimes?; and
- Paragraph 051: What is the main role of the environmental permit?

122. Other relevant documents also include:

- [Local Aggregate Assessment \(2023\)](#); and
- [Minerals and Waste in Hampshire Monitoring Report \(2021\)](#).

123. Legislation and guidance that are also material to the proposed development include:

- [Environment Act 2021](#);
- [Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017](#);
- [The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000](#);
- [Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act](#) ((NERC) Act 2006);
- [Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981](#);
- [Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development BS 42020:2013](#).

## **Consultations**

124. The following responses have been received from consultees. They are presented in alphabetical order. A summary of the comments received are provided below. A full record of all consultation responses is available to view on the [planning application webpages](#) under 'consultee responses'.

125. **Bursledon Parish Council:** Has objected due to:
- Excessive additional HGV movements on Hamble Lane over and above those anticipated in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and the displacement of traffic movements into other areas;
  - Hamble Lane and Windhover Roundabout road infrastructure cannot cater for the excessive increase in vehicle movements and there are no current implementation plans to address this;
  - The adverse impact on the AQMA caused by standing traffic as a result of the increase in traffic movements and congestion;
  - 25% increase in the number of homes in the area since [HMWP \(2013\)](#) was adopted; and
  - the closure of the Lowford Surgery means that there is now 4000 patients travelling along Hamble Lane to Satchell Lane from Bursledon to obtain health services.

126. **County Arboriculture (Hampshire County Council):** Initially stated that whilst the impact to trees appeared to be relatively low in terms of tree numbers but noted that were many elements that may well impact on trees that were not fully identified and quantified. Noted that the individual trees seem to be of significant value and retention of these is highly desirable therefore more information is required.

Concerns continued to be raised following Regulation 25 (part 1) in relation to the following issues:

- Need for more information on utilities, lighting, drainage, soakaways, attenuation tanks, CCTV lines, visibility splays etc to fully determine the potential impact on trees;
- Existing footpaths around the edge of the site go through the Root Protection Areas (RPA) of trees and are compacted and surfacing may cause damage;
- Potential loss of at least one County Council tree to create the new access will need to be agreed as part of the road agreement;
- Inconsistencies between inputted values and survey data;
- Concern that other trees may need to be removed to achieve the visibility splays;
- Various queries on Arbocultural Method Statement (AMS) construction methods, levels around exiting footway/carriageway, levels around T8 and the need for detailed levels and cross sections;
- Lack of detailed planting plans to demonstrate mitigation for the proposed tree loss; and
- Lack of information regarding which operations will have arboricultural supervision.

In response to Regulation 25 (part 2), noted that the change in access was an improvement although still results in the loss of tree T6. Also noted the improvement in the footway to the northern side of the site. However, still raised concerns relating to the following areas:

- The RPA has not been adjusted to represent the true constraints on the site and requires correction;
- The AMS rev C though improved with 'roots of over 25mm diameter' being given as a guide, it still has a lot of open-ended statements indicating that roots will be cut and could result in large amount of root mass being lost;
- The AMS also states that utilities might have to be placed in the RPA. This may be acceptable but it must be demonstrated that alternative solutions have been sought. Tree RPAs are to be considered sacrosanct. A street lighting column must be relocated and its location must be outside the RPA of retained trees and still meet the safety requirements – it must be checked that this is achievable in practice;
- Paragraph 9.1.2 of the AMS states a sand base may be used. The type of sand that must be used is clean sharp sand, not builders' sand as this has a high lime content and is toxic to tree roots;
- Paragraph 8.2 of the AMS states that it is observed that further tree protection fencing will be erected during the construction phase (construction of the bell mouth and access road) and a small segment of the RPA of English oak tree T8 will be affected. It will be necessary to ensure that acceptable mitigation is carried out to remove any risk of long-term damage to this tree. There is no detail as to what this mitigation is;
- The Arbocultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and AMS still refer to a footpath on the northern side within the RPA of T8. This needs to be updated in line with the changes and the reference to the footpath removed;
- T6 is a 1000mm diameter tree which will be of great age. Although it has been categorised as a cat C tree and described as 'in decline', there is potential for this to be a veteran oak which will warrant special consideration through planning. It is assumed, but not confirmed, that this is the tree for which the CAVAT valuation is offered. Confirmation is required on the number of trees to be added to the title of the CAVAT calculations submitted please so they can be checked at S278 stage; and
- The CAVAT calculations (unit value factor) are incorrect. It would be very helpful to know what the positive and negative amenity factors that have been applied. This information is not needed until such time as a

S278 is lodged, and at that time the most recent CAVAT version and values will apply.

If the authority is minded to grant consent the following conditions were recommended to counter some of the above concerns:

1. The AMS (once revised and agreed) is to be delivered in full and must include the statement: *'Due to the sensitivity of these works all the construction work located within the RPA segment of tree T8 must be over seen by the project Arboriculturist.'* The project arb is to be a named individual holding a minimum of a recognised level 4 arboricultural qualifications;
2. The reporting of any discovery of roots, damage to roots or new excavations within the RPA of T8 and any other highway trees, or of trees within falling distance of the highway, is to be recorded including position/scale photographs and such records to be promptly and shared with the County and LPA arboricultural officers. If necessary, ongoing monitoring to the health and condition of the trees can be put in place. Reasonable mitigation/amelioration measures may be needed and must be resourced by the applicant; and
3. The removal of three highway trees will have an adverse and negative effect on the county tree stock. No works to LA trees is to take place until compensation is agreed and has been paid in full.

127. **County Councillor House:** Was notified.

128. **County Ecologist (Hampshire County Council):** Initially requested further information to ensure no adverse impacts on designated sites, habitats and protected species. This included:

- Updated wintering bird surveys (together with a revised impact assessment and mitigation measures (if necessary), to be able to confirm that the proposals will not have an adverse impact on the qualifying features of the SPA and Ramsar sites by affecting a potential functionally linked SPA habitat;
- Need for a meaningful impact assessment of the operational and restoration phases of the development in the invertebrate survey;
- More information required on the offsets for reptiles, the management of buffers and lighting in relation to birds;
- More justification of the approach for restoration and aftercare;
- The need for additional BNG calculations to be submitted; and the
- Need for long-term management plan (for at least 30 years) for the site.

Concerns were also raised in relation to the initially submitted shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment specifically the hydrological impacts of the proposal

and requested that more detailed assessment be carried out. It was noted that there was insufficient information to demonstrate that adequate infiltration could be achieved due to the geology of the site, resulting in a variable water table across the site. More assessment of how the site meets / does not meet the development considerations in the adopted HWMP was also required, namely the protection of the SPA, Ramsar, SAC, SSSIs and the protection of the water quality and recharge of the groundwater and surface water.

Following the receipt of Regulation 25 (part 1) information, the County Ecologist responded as follows:

- Wintering bird surveys have been completed and it has been concluded the land is not functionally linked to the SPA or Ramsar;
- Further information has been submitted about hydrological impacts on international and national designated sites. It is for the hydrological technical discipline to ascertain the accuracy of the submitted information with respect to changes in the quality of water entering the nearby SSSIs. Provided that the information provided is correct and any surface runoff water and ground water during the construction and operational phase will not result in the deterioration of the water quality of the SPA and Ramsar, SAC, SSSIs and the Mercury Marshes LNR and Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI, no further concerns were raised;
- Further information provided on invertebrates is considered to be satisfactory;
- The submitted reptile mitigation strategy addresses comments previously raised;
- Breeding bird surveys have been completed but still not to the satisfaction of the County Ecologist, in particular as to why the inclusion of scattered scrub such as gorse within the southern part of the site has not been considered. In summary, replacement of a mosaic of scrub / open grassland with continuous scrub along the site boundaries is not supported and further amendments to the restoration plan are required;
- No information has been provided within the ecology reports on lighting;
- Restoration Plan has failed to consider the major loss of scrub on site and the baseline open grassland/scrub mosaic and therefore impact on birds such as Dartford warbler and invertebrates;
- Requirement for a 30 year management plan as opposed to a 5 year aftercare scheme. A 5 year period is not considered to be sufficient as the BNG calculations should be based on a 30 year management plan;
- The management plan is likely to be subject to a s106, and regular monitoring and reviews. The focus of the management should be on the more significant areas, such as woodland and scrub establishment and

long-term management, but given the requirement of the Environment Act, all areas being considered within the calculations should be included for management that is adequate to meet its objectives; and

- The requested BNG Excel spreadsheet has been submitted and reviewed and there were a number of outstanding queries and errors. The submitted BNG results cannot be considered accurate/robust.

In response to information submitted under Regulation 25 (part 2), the County Ecologist confirmed that previously raised concerns have been addressed, in particular the concern in relation to the duration of the long-term management and monitoring, which has now been increased to 30 years. The following was also noted:

- The s106 will need to be clear that this period will be triggered by the completion of the aftercare period and the management plan associated with it;
- The restored/created acid grassland on site is proposed to achieve a 'moderate' condition through long-term management and monitoring, which is reasonable and will be supported. The restoration plan has been developed to address previous comments and therefore the County Ecologist was satisfied that post-development, a mosaic of better quality habitats will be created and retained on site;
- The submitted habitat condition assessment sheets and BNG Metric calculations now take into account the delays in habitat creation and demonstrates a 9.89% net gain in habitat units and a very large gain in hedgerow units. These are considered to be satisfactory;
- There is a minor discrepancy between the submitted 'Landscaping, restoration and outline five-year aftercare scheme (November 2023)' and the information provided in the various ecology reports, in relation to the management of the acid grassland. The management regime in the ES chapter and BNG documents, which is acceptable, states that once established, the management will be via annual mowing in late summer followed by autumn / winter 'aftermath' grazing by low densities of cattle and/or sheep and that there will be 2 metre wide margins of taller and rougher sward to allow for a varied structure which is a requirement to meet one of the BNG Condition Assessment Criteria for a moderate condition for the acid grassland. However, there is no reference to creating a varied sward height in the scheme and the cutting would need to be removed off site (they can be left on site for a limited time, e.g. a week, to allow further seed dispersal from the green hay). However, this is not considered to be a major concern as a detailed 30-year management and monitoring plan will be required to be secured via a s106 agreement; and

- Recommended that the implementation of the measures detailed within the approved Chapter 10 of the ES and BNG Metric and the principles set out in the 'Landscaping, restoration and outline 5-year aftercare scheme' are all incorporated into the management plan to be secured through the s106 to ensure that the mitigation and monitoring are all considered together and to enable it to be updated and monitored throughout the lifetime of the development.

129. **Defence Infrastructure Organisation:** No objection as the site is outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas.

130. **Eastleigh Borough Council:** Objected on the following grounds. This objection was maintained in both subsequent consultations on the additional Regulation 25 information (parts 1 and 2) on the following grounds:

- *Principle of the proposal* - Insufficient justification for mineral extraction given the significant environmental impacts and questioned whether the site is appropriate for mineral extraction as it would appear that the required level of mineral supply could be met from other identified sites with lesser constraints. Lack of full assessment of environmental impacts or could be mitigated appropriately. Proposal would not result in any significant economic benefits and local spend would be limited. The increased traffic congestion would negatively impact on local businesses;
- *Traffic* – Maintains significant concerns about highway safety implications of the development, particularly due to the proximity of two schools to the site. Inadequate assessment of highway impacts, notably in terms of predicted traffic growth and junction impacts, and resulting implications for highway and pedestrian safety, including school children, and the local economy. The proposed highway financial contributions and proposed mitigation will not reduce the impact of additional HGVs and associated emissions. Concerns that some of the mitigation measures and schemes to improve walking and cycling may not be deliverable, especially where they rely on third party land and the introduction of lower speed limits. Considered that any financial contributions should be secured on a more flexible basis to secure wider improvements to the highway network e.g. traffic management schemes or public transport infrastructure improvements;
- *Noise pollution:* Concerned that the applicant has not provided a robust assessment of the baseline noise conditions and has not demonstrated how noise would be minimised on site. The age of the assessment work alongside some relevant noise sensitive receptors not being surveyed were raised as concerns. The approach taken to establish the operational and short term noise limits is not appropriate and does not

support the aim of the relevant planning guidance to minimise noise impacts. There is also a lack of information to confirm how operational noise will be minimised at source, and a number of queries relating to certain sections of the Noise Assessment (e.g. consideration of reversing alarms, how noise will propagate across the balancing ponds, and identification of when short term noise limits would apply);

- *Air quality* – Concerns about the impact on the Hamble Lane AQMA and that HGV traffic has a disproportionate impact on air quality as they are the most polluting vehicle class which allows for the conclusion that the development will have a negative impact on the AQMA, for which no mitigation has been identified. Whilst a contribution towards walking and cycling improvements has been sought to mitigate the impact of additional movements on the network, this will not result in a proportionate improvement in air quality. Request a financial contribution towards air quality measures identified in the Air Quality Action Plan to enable a permanent monitoring station to be installed on Hamble Lane, allowing both NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> to be monitored. Requests that applicant uses EURO V or above for all HGVs to ensure that traffic emissions will have the smallest possible impact;
- *Dust*: Amendments to the Dust Management Plan have addressed some of the concerns previously raised, but there are still outstanding specific queries. Effective monitoring is vital to ensuring that impacts of air quality are minimised. In the event that the County Council were to recommend permission for the development, baseline monitoring would be required before commencement of development and the Dust Management Plan and associated monitoring would need to be secured through a robustly worded condition;
- *Ecology* - Lack of assessment of the impact of displaced recreational activity on protected coastal areas, loss of scrub, below 10% BNG provided and a lack of information regarding the potential hydrological impacts of the proposals on the Mallards Moor SINC, which was a matter raised by EBC in the previous consultation response. Wider comments also provided in relation to recreational displacement and the review of habitat creation proposals following development, with a view to increasing scrub habitat;
- *Landscape and trees* - Objection to the impact of the access works on protected trees, noting that at least 3 trees would need removing. It is noted that a further tree, T8, is indicated for retention with measures suggested for its protection. However, this tree will also be adversely impacted by the works and is unlikely to be successfully retained, therefore potentially resulting in further tree loss. The resulting loss of trees to facilitate the access would impact on amenity by altering the visual nature of Hamble Lane. Not clear that the points previously



raised by EBC's Landscape Officer have been acknowledged or addressed, e.g. in relation to the visual appearance of the landscape bunds, and permissive path details. Wider comments about the need for the LVIA to consider landscape impacts in relation to local residents, the softening of the screening proposed, the surfacing of the permissive path, and removal of goat willow from proposed planting;

- *Long term management*: It is noted that reference is made to a 30-year management period following the aftercare period, and this would need to be secured robustly through a s106 Agreement;
- *Proposed mitigation*: Notwithstanding the objections, in the event that Hampshire County Council were to recommend permission for the works, it is requested that the following matters are secured by way of robustly worded planning conditions or s106 Agreement:
  - Provision and monitoring of all measures required to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development;
  - Payment of highway improvement contributions (towards wider improvement schemes than currently proposed);
  - Financial contribution (amount to be agreed in liaison with EBC) towards air quality measures identified in the EBC Air Quality Action Plan;
  - Provision of access and visibility splays prior to commencement of development;
  - Construction Environmental Management Plan;
  - Adherence to Dust Management Plan and monitoring, including pre-commencement baseline monitoring;
  - Short term and operational noise limits;
  - Detailed site noise monitoring protocol;
  - A detailed plan for the management of noise on site, along with procedures to liaise with the local community on noise issues, including complaints;
  - Adherence to agreed management procedures to mitigate noise;
  - Provision of contaminated land site assessment and agreement of any necessary mitigation measures;
  - Restoration of the site in line with policy requirements with clear and enforceable timetable of works, and provision of long-term management (30 years);
  - Removal of landscape bunds upon completion of the works;
  - Full details of hard and soft landscaping;
  - Provision of a net gain in biodiversity including habitat for breeding birds;
  - Detailed timetable for habitat restoration works to ensure existing species populations are maintained and new habitat provided at appropriate times.

**131. Eastleigh Borough Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO):**

Initially objected because the noise limits and mitigation do not comply with Borough Council's Local Plan policy. The EHO commented that "*the operation noise limit is a Rating Level determined by BS4142:2014 at least 5 decibels below the lowest Background Sound Level during hourly intervals over the operating day. For the construction of noise bunding and barriers, the noise limit is to be according to the ABC method advised by BS5228: 2014. Noise limits for construction are higher, to allow for short-term works necessary to establish the site before operation commences.*"

Following Regulation 25 (part 2), the following comments were received:

- *Noise:* Concerns that the applicant has not established the background / ambient noise levels in a robust way, monitoring carried out over a short timeframe and therefore a robust baseline has not been established. Concerns that the nearest receptor on Hamble Lane to the site entrance / compound and the ecological receptors do not appear to have been surveyed. Concerns that the approach taken in the report appears to be one where 10dB is added to the measured L90 to derive the relevant 'noise limit' and that this is not consistent with the advice given in [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) to minimise impact. Given predictions are based on what are described in the report as 'worst case' scenarios, it is to be assumed that likely 'true' noise impacts would be lower than the predictions suggest. On this basis, it is difficult to understand why noise limits based on background (L90) plus 10dB are proposed, when 'worst case' predictions are lower, and which are also likely to overestimate noise impact. A similar approach has been taken to the setting of noise limits for 'short term' operations. Again, the approach should be to minimise noise impact, rather than to build in higher noise limits than their own report indicates are necessary. With respect to the likelihood of compliance with the ecological noise condition with respect to SSSI/SPA/SAC and Ramsar Sites the baseline survey does not appear to have been carried out at these locations, so cannot confirm that proposed requirement is likely to be met. The application does not provide information on how noise has or will be minimised at source as required by the [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) guidance. There also remain a number of other concerns and queries regarding the noise assessment e.g. consideration of reversing alarms at the plant site, how noise will propagate across the balancing ponds and identifying affected receptors and the times through the project when the use of the short term limits would apply;
- *Air quality:* Suggests the absence of complaints as referred to in para 2.1.8 of the assessment may be linked to the fact that these sites are

positioned away from human receptors and recommended the applicant contact sites that are broadly similar to Hamble Airfield. In relation to emission factors and dispersal modelling, it was appreciated that there was a lack of UK-derived emission factors for mineral sites and an associated uncertainty in dispersion modelling but advised, considering the sensitivity of the location, that EU guidance should be checked. Welcomed the submission of the Dust Management Plan (DMP) and mainly supported its methodology and measures but made the following additional comments:

- Would like the buffer extended to align with the 2016 IAQM/EP UK Guidance, which suggests considering receptors up to 250m or 400m, depending on rock type;
- Suggest prescribing timing of site preparation to ensure optimal conditions for associated works (e.g. seeding bunds) in respect of weather conditions;
- In relation to site restoration, it was recommended that an environmental permit should be sought as well as further clarification on the type and management of inert material when it arrives on site;
- Baseline validation and dispersion model: It appears that the DMP is based on an air quality assessment, which has used validation against national monitoring in 2018 (para 3.3.8) to extrapolate 2019 dispersion model data (3.3.9);
- Further information needed regarding the roles, responsibilities and decision making progress set out in the Dust Management Plan (DMP);
- Further clarification is needed on how the DMP defines the conditions under which dust poses a risk of disamenity at sensitive receptors, as suggested in the 2016 Guidance;
- Dust deposition measurement should specify what would be considered an unacceptable level for dust deposition;
- Requested inclusion of wind direction information where it has the potential to carry dust beyond the site boundary to sensitive receptors;
- Willing to review the suitable monitoring location and instruments and open to participating in discussions regarding the selection of appropriate monitoring instruments or techniques;
- Need for clarification on the duration of the Adverse Weather Conditions Period; and
- Would like the applicant to use EURO V and above engine standards for HGVs and seek appropriate site machinery, preferably EURO VI class.

132. **Environment Agency (EA):** Initially commented that there had been very limited investigation of potential contamination from historical structures on site associated with the airfield. Due to the nature of the contamination, there is likely to be severe limitation on any proposed activities relating to Per- and Polyfluorinated Substances impacted groundwater. Pre-commencement conditions were therefore suggested. At Regulation 25 (part 1), the Agency requested that further investigation/sampling needs to take place on this site in relation to contamination. Also requested that a robust sampling strategy for shallow soils should be devised and agreed and that groundwater sampling should also be scheduled for any areas of proposed dewatering by way of conditions. At Regulation 25 (part 2), the EA concluded that impacts are not likely to be particularly significant and would probably be best managed with standard controls under the permitting regimes.

A follow up response from the EA in relation to the review of the hydrological assessment noted that whilst the document could have gone into more details about some aspects, overall their conclusions were that the findings were fit for purpose and as the applicant plans to install attenuation ponds and infiltration swales, runoff will be directed to these. These should be developed in the appropriate places to mimic the current groundwater flow discharge to the springs. Surface runoff should be directed in the correct proportions to these attenuation ponds. If the attenuation ponds are located in the correct locations, the EA believe that the scale of impacts would be small and not sufficient to have any detrimental impacts on the designated sites although they defer to Natural England on this as the lead authority.

133. **Hamble Parish Council:** Objected to the proposal on the grounds of: traffic impacts; restoration plan and long term management; environmental impacts; flood risk; air quality; noise and dust; site layout and management.

Additional comments were made following the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage:

- Lack of meaningful engagement with residents, businesses or service providers who will be impacted by the development, contrary to PPG advice;
- Principle of development: consider there are flaws in the evidence on which the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) allocation was based including likely traffic volumes. [EBLP \(2022\)](#) excludes further development on the Hamble Peninsula as unsustainable due to impact on Hamble Lane;
- Highways: The submitted Transport Assessment Addendum confirms that the impact of the proposed development on the highway network would be severe and would create a clear and on-going risk to the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists;

- Application would reduce the likelihood of people making a modal shift to walking and cycling, in breach of Policy 12 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#);
- Design and location of the proposed junction clearly interferes with the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists;
- Impact on an already heavily congested Hamble Lane; and
- Dispute the data provided for pedestrian and cyclist movements along Hamble Lane.

Following the Regulation 25 (part 2), the following additional comments were provided:

- Unlike most sites allocated for sand or gravel extraction, Hamble Airfield is sited within a busy and thriving community, adjacent to places of education, business and residential property and accessed by a road which the County Council has agreed on multiple occasions is not fully fit for purpose.
- The quarrying operation would have a significant impact during its operation and for many years after that by way of its restoration and future use.
- Amount of community stress and uncertainty caused by the planning application and the length of time it has taken to determine.
- *Highways:*
  - Lack of detail provided on highways mitigation and it appears that the applicant will only react to the pressure applied by the Highway Authority.
  - Reiterates considerable concern at the way in which the Highway Authority has approached assessing the proposal and the mitigation requirements. Maintain that the effect of the defects in their approach is to compromise the planning authority's ability to properly determine the application.
  - The Highway Authority has not provided a response in which it sets out its assessment of the impact of the development on Hamble Lane. It has informed of a requirement for a mitigation payment of £500,000 without any explanation of why this amount is necessary, to fund works which are themselves unspecified. The information gathered through Freedom of Information requests has reinforced the absence of detail or justification. This gives rise to two issues:
    - Firstly, whilst the planning authority is entitled to rely on the advice from a statutory consultee to a reasonable degree, it has no evidence to hand of how the highways impact of the proposal has been determined and nothing other than an assertion that the sum of money requested

by the highway authority is the necessary and sufficient amount to fund the (unspecified) works of mitigation. Without this evidence it cannot reasonably be satisfied that the application is in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan as required by law;

- Secondly, the planning authority cannot conclude that the planning obligations being sought will meet the test set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 to the extent that they are necessary, and fair and reasonable in scale and kind. The fact that an applicant is willing to make a payment is clearly not sufficient to satisfy this test. The regulations are designed just as much to ensure that applicants cannot agree to 'overpay' contributions as a means of obtaining a favourable consultation response as to prevent them from being unfairly penalised;
- No evidence has been provided that the impact of the proposal on the operation of Hamble Lane and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists using highways infrastructure has been properly assessed by the Highway Authority. On the County Council's own published figures Hamble Lane was in need of investment vastly in excess of £500,000 before the impact of this development was factored in. Recognises that it is not possible to require an applicant for planning permission to make good previous deficiencies and failures to deliver highways improvements. But proposals must be assessed against the reality of the highway network, not its theoretical capacity or condition, and the reality is that nothing short of the full upgrade promised by the County Council over many years could have made this application acceptable;
- Disappointed by the way that the Highway Authority has provided no support to residents and businesses to explain its mitigation proposals or strategy for delivering those works.
- *Public Rights of Way/Active Travel Provision:*
  - The fact that Cemex is not the owner of the land makes no difference as to whether public access can or should be a requirement of any planning consent. It can be presumed that the applicant has the ability to satisfy this requirement if it is necessary to make the application acceptable. If this is not achievable, a requirement should be included in any Section 106 agreement that it be kept open and in good condition throughout the operational period and for the entire period of restoration management.

- Because the Highway Authority has not provided details of the works which are considered necessary to mitigate the development it is unclear whether bridleway status, and therefore use by cyclists, is considered essential as part of the active travel measures the highway authority has it in mind to promote.
- Strongly supports the creation of a new and permanent active travel route. If this is suitably constructed and maintained for shared use it would also support its provision as a bridleway (because this then could be used safely by cyclists alongside pedestrians). Note that the applicant does not consider that additional funding should be provided for the maintenance or upgrade of this path over and above their highway mitigation payment and disagree with this position.
- *Surface and ground water:*
  - The applicant has submitted further details to ensure that surface and ground water pose no flood risk to neighbouring properties or infrastructure. Expect to see the planning authority obtain independent verification that the assumptions made and engineering solutions proposed in this strategy will provide the level of assurance that residents reasonably require.
- *Health and amenity:*
  - Recognises that the Health Impact Assessment and the further information provided in relation to air quality and public health risks do try to engage with the questions raised in the Regulation 25 request and the concerns raised by the UKHSA in their consultation response. However, applicant acknowledges that they cannot supply much of the comparative data and monitoring information requested because in effect 'we have never been asked to do it anywhere else'. That will not reassure residents.
  - Hamble Airfield is different from many other sand and gravel quarries as sensitive receptors are located in much closer proximity than other cases. It is welcomed that the County Council is seeking independent advice on air quality.
- *Restoration and ecology:*
  - The information provided sets out some relatively small changes to the details of the proposed structure and content of the restoration process and the restored airfield site;
  - It is not entirely surprising (bearing in mind the future ambitions of the landowner) that commitments regarding long-term management are not clear, but this makes it all the more important that the planning authority is robust in its negotiations;
  - Natural England has pointed out that the restored site has potential to provide 'SPA supporting habitat' as part of the

functionally linked network of sites in and around the Solent SPAs. But that potential can only be realised if the site is protected in full during, and in the long-term after, restoration. The restoration proposals for the site should operate on a basis analogous to those which will be compulsory once the requirements for biodiversity net gain come into effect at the beginning of next year;

- Any consent should be subject to a Section 106 agreement which requires the parties to restore and then maintain the whole site in that restored condition preferably in perpetuity, but certainly for at least 30 years. Anything less would not provide the mitigation which is being claimed by the applicant. Although it is not possible to prevent by condition one of the parties from promoting another use of part of the site for other planning purposes or making a planning application in respect of some part of the site, it is possible (under contract) for the parties to be bound not to make any changes to the site which disturb or alter the works which were considered necessary as mitigation in respect of this planning application. If that is not acceptable to a party who will be required to sign the Section 106 agreement then planning consent should be refused. *Ecology:* It is disappointing to note that the biodiversity net gain would be less than 10%. This shows how important it is that every aspect of the proposed site restoration is achieved and retained. Natural England has pointed out that the restored site has potential to provide 'SPA supporting habitat' as part of the functionally linked network of sites in and around the Solent SPAs. But that potential can only be realised if the site is to protected in full during and in the long-term after restoration. The restoration proposals for the site should operate on a basis analogous to those which will be compulsory once the requirements for BNG come into effect at the beginning of next year.

- *Lack of community engagement:* The latest submissions have provided only very limited additional information, and for the most part focused on defending the approach they have taken to the application from the outset. No attempt made to engage directly with the Council or the community.

134. **Hound Parish Council:** Objection throughout the process on the grounds of ecology, traffic and pollution as well as concerns about validity of the information provided by the applicant.

- *Highways:*
  - Hamble Lane has a 40mph (not 30mph as referred to in the TA) speed limit with shared pedestrian/cycle footway which is very busy and congested at the start and end of the school day. Concerns about the impact of additional HGVs on pedestrian and cyclists;



- The highest volume of HGVs between 07.00-08.00 when largest number of people will be travelling along Hamble Lane (cars, cyclists, pedestrians);
- The pavement is poorly maintained / overgrown which results in it narrowing next to south bound traffic meaning the proposed development will have a material impact in terms of 'fear and safety';
- Parents will decide to drive children into Hamble School rather than allow them to walk/cycle next to high volumes of HGV traffic. Similarly other users will revert to car travel for the same reason;
- Developer contributions to make improvements to Hamble Lane will not make walking and cycling more attractive as majority of those travelling along Hamble Lane during peak period commute to/from work and cycling is not a viable alternative;
- Do not agree that the infrastructure for cyclists is adequate along Hamble Lane to Windhover roundabout;
- Development will result in Windhover roundabout over capacity during the morning peak resulting in unacceptable delays
- The walking, cycling, horse-riding survey provided does not reflect 'lived' experience. Large numbers of young people traveling along Hamble Lane from Netley and Bursledon to Hamble School in the morning and back in the evening. They will be in close proximity to the peak HGV movements.
- *Dirt and dust:* Concern for children walking to school during peak time will be affected by dust/dirt as max. number of HGVs using the site at this time;
- *Air pollution:*
  - Information provided in response to the Regulation 25 requests does not adequately address previous concerns regarding air pollution and dust created;
  - Concern about the long-term health effects of dust and other particulates and location immediately next door to the school and residential properties;
  - Concern about dust mitigation in form of water suppression and reliance on daily rainfall figures.
- *Ecology:*
  - Site considered to be of regional value for slow worms and common lizard; dormouse nests found last year;
  - Site considered to be of value for a number of bird species of conservation concern and identified as of value for overwintering birds;

- *Restoration:*
  - Should respect the habitat and territory of protected and vulnerable species, with retention of open acid grassland across the site, maintaining the scattered trees and scrubland which currently exist on the site, and that the entire site is protected following restoration for at least 30 years;
  - Current restoration does not adequately protect species as replacement habitats do not match those currently on site;
  - Concern about level of tree loss.

135. **Highway Authority:** Initially requested further information on a number of areas including clarification of speed data information; access visibility splays; provision of a Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) and vehicle tracking information.

Further information was provided in response to the Regulation 25 (part 1) requests and the Highway Authority responded as follows:

- The amendments proposed to the visibility splay to the south, crossing the site access are acceptable;
- The updated swept path analysis for the internal layout demonstrates that a 16.5m articulated vehicle can manoeuvre around the internal site layout;
- The Road Safety Audit has been undertaken and the matters highlighted can be addressed through the detailed design work, secured through a planning condition and a Section 278 Agreement;
- Updated Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data was provided and the Highway Authority is satisfied that the accident record has not identified any patterns that are likely to be exacerbated by this application;
- The proposed access has been designed to LTN1/20 Design Standards and provides a 3.0m wide shared footway/cycleway around the bell mouth of the proposed access and a refuge island inside the pedestrian guard railing;
- A Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) has been provided and reference made to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP);
- Updates to the TA in relation to Trip Generation includes visitors to site and this assumed that all staff/visitors will leave during the PM peak period as the development is planned to close at 17:00;
- The applicant has provided further information to evidence both the proposed HGV trip generation and the hourly profile of those trips to ensure that this reflects the operational requirements of the proposal;

- All HGV traffic arriving at the site will travel to and from the north of the site, arriving at and departing from the site via the M27 Junction 8. It has been assumed that all staff will also enter the site via the same route. A lorry routing agreement restricting HGVs to a right-turn out / left-turn in manoeuvre will be included within a s106 legal agreement.
- Previously, Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) surveys of the Hamble Lane corridor for 2016 and 2017 were supplied. Additional recent baseline survey data has been provided. The survey data shows that the AM and PM peak baseline traffic flows are mostly lower than the 2017 data presented in the previous Transport Assessment, and all are lower than the 2021 factored flows. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the traffic flow data used in the TA is robust.
- Traffic impact was initially assessed for the morning / evening peak hours for the future years of 2023, 2030 and 2034. This included forecasted traffic flows for the various developments (Land at Berry Farm, Satchell Lane, South of Mallards Road, North of Cranbury Gardens and Land south of Bursledon Road). It has been demonstrated that traffic growth is relatively stable (although high) and that planned development has now largely been completed and the resulting trips included in the updated traffic surveys.
- Recorded network peaks are now slightly different to the previously identified peaks (now 07:30 to 08:30 and 16:15 to 17:15). The HGV traffic associated with peak operations during Phase 2 has been added to the surveyed traffic on the local highway network.
- The TA Addendum outlines that the proposed development would have a maximum impact on two-way total traffic flows on the local highway network of 3% in the morning peak (on Hamble Lane in the vicinity of the site access) with 2% for the evening peak. The impact of HGVs on the morning and evening peak hours would have maximum impact on two-way HGV flows of 137% and 38% respectively. The HGVs in the morning peak will increase from 19 to 45 on Hamble Lane north of Hound Road;
- Junction assessments have been undertaken at site access/Hamble Lane, Hamble Lane/Satchell Lane, Hamble Lane/Hound Road Roundabout, Hamble Lane/Portsmouth Road, Hamble Lane/Lionheart Way, Tesco Roundabout, Windhover Roundabout and M27 Junction 8 Roundabout. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed site access junction would operate within capacity during the weekday morning peak hours. The analysis of the junctions further north demonstrates the impact of the proposed development traffic on the capacity operation of each junction. There are several junction which operate at or approaching theoretical capacity and above optimum

capacity which results in the delays recorded. The development traffic, particularly in the AM peak does worsen the position and therefore appropriate mitigation will be required to offset this impact;

- National Highways are aiming to deliver capacity enhancements to the M27 junction 8 / Windhover Roundabout to help alleviate congestion;
- The Highway Authority's position in relation to other planning applications (since 2019) has been steered by a presumption against new development trips being permitted on the peninsula without mitigation being in place to offset this impact
- The Highway Authority has been assessing alternative measures that would improve access on Hamble peninsula. A number of Active Travel and Sustainable Transport schemes are currently being developed that include greater provision for cyclists and pedestrians on Hamble Lane. It is considered that this would be an appropriate form of mitigation for this development, given the increase in HGV trips. To mitigate the impacts of the proposed development, a contribution towards transport measures for the Hamble Lane corridor should be secured via a s106 Legal Agreement.
- Requirement for a planning condition is secured to limit the number of HGVs accessing the site during local schools' start and finish times. This would offset the impact at these sensitive times of the day;
- A Lorry Routeing agreement (stipulating right turn out left turn in) should also be secured via a s106.

In response to Regulation 25 (part 2), the Highway Authority raised no objection and their recommendation remained unchanged from their previous response which is subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure a Highway Contribution of £500,000 to mitigate the development impact through the provision of a sustainable travel scheme on Hamble Lane and Lorry Routeing agreement (stipulating right turn out left turn in) as well as the imposition of planning relating to restrictions of HGV movements at peak hours, plans and particulars showing the detailed proposals for the site access works, restriction on the number of HGV movements, the implementation of the first 20m metres of the haul road, details of wheel-cleaning facilities and ensuring no debris passes onto the highway and the sheeting of vehicles.

136. **Landscape Planning and Heritage (Archaeology) (Hampshire County Council):** Has no objection. Requested that the applicant provide additional details with regard to the military structures at the site and to the site's Palaeolithic archaeological potential through planning conditions. It was noted at Regulation 25 (part 1) that the airfield is not considered to be of any

particular historic merit, however a written and photographic record of the surviving remains of the airfield can be secured by condition along with the longer-term management of the retained HQ.

137. **Landscape Planning and Heritage (Landscape) (Hampshire County Council):** Initially requested additional information on a number of areas. Commented at Regulation 25 (part 1) that revised restoration plans are generally an improvement on the earlier plan but there was a need to address issues such as the split in grassland areas, potential success of acid grassland with inert fill, additional details about how an acid based soil can be assured, clarification on the phasing plans in relation to the ponds. It was also requested that a landscape condition be imposed requiring exact planting details, with plant mixes and numbers for each area.

At Regulation 25 (part 2), it was concluded that the additional information supplied by the applicant to the landscape issues that were raised earlier was generally acceptable. The main remaining concern related to the management of the planting, fencing and details of fencing of scrub areas and their maintenance and the need to include Sweet Chestnut (*Castanea salva*) within the mix of trees if possible (this was not set out in earlier comments).

138. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** Initially requested additional information to demonstrate that the application site has a secure outfall to dispose surface water and to demonstrate that the quantum of development is achievable, whilst ensuring that flood risk will not be increased on or off site. It was noted that:

- The applicant is proposing to manage surface water through infiltration. However, there is no information which demonstrates that infiltration is feasible at the application site and an infiltration rate of 1.0 m/hr has been assumed for the calculations, which something that we would not support without site specific testing. Infiltration testing in accordance with the BRE365 (2016 publication) methodology at a depth and location commensurate with the proposed infiltration features was requested. The testing should be carried out within several trial pits at the proposed lagoons location and depth(s), and for each phase of the development;
- Discharging surface water runoff directly into the water table is not supported as the hydraulic capacity and structural integrity of the infiltration features will be compromised. Requested a groundwater assessment to demonstrate that there will be at least 1m unsaturated zone between the base of any infiltration feature, and the highest groundwater level recorded including seasonal variations. Additionally,

The EA must be consulted on surface water directly discharged into the water table at the planning application stage;

- Surface water runoff from the restored site will be managed through to two new pond features. Given the expected low permeability of the fill material, flow control devices will allow discharge from the ponds to linear infiltration trenches along the boundary of the site. Reference is made to evapotranspiration which is not appropriate to consider as a discharge option;
- The application site is within the extent of the Environment Agency (EA) Groundwater Vulnerability Zones. Therefore, and based on the implications with infiltrating surface water from the operational phases, the EA should be consulted regarding any potential contamination associated with infiltration at the planning application stage. This is to demonstrate that the application site has a secure outfall to dispose surface water and to demonstrate that the quantum 3 of development is achievable, whilst ensuring that flood risk will not be increased on or off site;
- The Flood Risk Assessment identifies current runoff to be directed to the borders of the site and reference is made to minor surface watercourses. Requested clarification on where these are in relation to the site as this can indicate that infiltration is not viable;
- The information submitted by the applicant on restoration indicates that surface water runoff from the restore site will be managed through to two new pond features within the site boundary. Additionally, and given the expected low permeability of the fill material, flow control devices will allow discharge from the ponds to linear infiltration trenches (around 2 m deep by 1 m wide, lined with a permeable membrane and filled with gravel) along the boundary of the site. Reference is made to evapotranspiration which we do not feel is appropriate to consider as a discharge option;
- Additionally, an infiltration basin will be positioned in the northwest of the site, outside of the fill area, to attenuate and discharge runoff from this part of the site to ground. Considering that the geology conditions will change with the infilling material, the applicant should undertake a detailed ground investigation / hydrogeology assessment report of the filling material. This should demonstrate that: The existing discharge rates and volumes leaving the site will not be increased as a result of the new ground conditions. The filling material will not change / block groundwater movement through the site, increasing groundwater flood risk into adjacent sites. In addition, given that the site will be progressively developed, the restoration plan needs to give more consideration as to how the partially restored site will function as it is

not clear how surface water will be managed when some storage features may not be in place. The current plans indicate potential for the catchment areas to be adjusted so further evidence is required to ensure no additional flows are directed to alternative locations.

In response to the information provided at Regulation 25 (part 1), the LLFA considered that sufficient detail had been provided but it did not consider that the application accords with best practice in relation to surface water drainage. The following was noted:

- *Insufficient information on infiltration rates* - As the exact specification of fill material is unknown it is recommended that parameters are set to give certainty on the likely range on infiltration rates. Providing parameters can be set to demonstrate the worst case infiltration rate, the exact infill specification could be conditioned;
- *Groundwater* - given the range of groundwater levels, drainage should be correctly located and zones in which basins/soakaways etc will be placed need to be confirmed together with maximum groundwater levels and maximum depth to ensure the 1m unsaturated zone can be provided, based on worst case expected infiltration rates. We would expect this to be provided at this stage to demonstrate that an appropriate drainage strategy is deliverable;
- *Fill material* - Concerns over the proposed infiltration into fill material. Consideration should be given to lining drainage features above fill material and including the attenuated volume into the discharge calculations;
- *Evapotranspiration* - Evapotranspiration has not been considered as a discharge option, rather it is stated that losses from the ponds and wetlands are likely to be greater through evapotranspiration than infiltration. Further explanation is required for the interaction and flow routes between ponds / wetlands and infiltration features before comments can be made with respect to this. Given the proximity of residential areas, pre, construction phase and post construction exceedance plans are required to demonstrate there will be no detriment to other areas;
- Given the proximity of residential areas, pre, construction phase and post construction exceedance plans are required to demonstrate there will be no detriment to other areas;
- It has been assumed that the general lack of groundwater within the superficial deposits means that obstruction of groundwater flows will not occur except for possibly in the areas of high groundwater. The LLFA had concerns that if groundwater flow paths are restricted it could trigger spring flows elsewhere. Recommended a technical note is provided as part of fill material specification to demonstrate that this has been considered and any risks managed appropriately;

- Clarity is required on the timeline for operations and restoration across all phases with details on how the drainage measures will be introduced to appropriately manage flood risk;
- The proposed post-restoration catchment areas will be redirected from the western catchment (pre-development) to the eastern catchment. It is suggested that Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) features will limit runoff to below greenfield runoff rates. Reference is made to the River Hamble and Southampton Water catchments however the concern is relating to potential increases in flood risk at a more local level. The LLFA do not consider the transfer of water to a different catchment appropriate particularly in this location where there are residential communities who could be affected.

In response to Regulation 25 (part 2), which noted that additional information has been provided to address, the LLFA acknowledged that additional information had been provided to address its previous comments. While some of the additional detail required can be addressed by condition (detailed drainage design and phasing), there remained one point which should be resolved at this stage in relation to the post-restoration levels which leaves a holding objection. It was noted that the proposals for the restored site are shown to have a different profile to the existing site, which means that adjacent ditch networks would receive disproportionate amounts of runoff from the restored site. This is not considered acceptable and the restored site should be profiled to mimic the existing site. The LLFA indicate that they require this information before they can make a decision on whether to recommend to the Local Planning Authority that planning permission is granted. The concern relating to post restoration ground profiles is significant given the impacts on the change in hydrology and therefore the assessment and conclusions within the Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulation Assessment. It may also affect other submitted proposals i.e. landscape strategy. As such, a holding objection remained in place. It was noted that the concern relating to post restoration ground profiles is significant given the impacts on the change in hydrology and therefore the assessment and conclusions within the Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulation Assessment. It was considered that it may also affect other submitted proposals i.e. landscape strategy. Recommended planning conditions were set out in the event that their concerns could be satisfied in relation to the requirements for a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site (pre commencement), detailed drainage for each phase of the development and restoration. It was also noted that the fill material will be of a different permeability to the extracted material. It was noted that the LLFA cannot comment further on this as this sits outside their remit / responsibility is in relation to surface water drainage.



139. **National Highways:** Raised no objection but did raise concerns about the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network in relation to the M27 and more specifically M27 Junction 8.

140. **Natural England:** Initially requested further information on a detailed Agricultural Land Classification and soil resource survey as well as for the landscape and restoration management period to be extended beyond 5 years to address the longer-term management and maintenance. It was also noted that soil management issues, hydrological impacts on the SSSI, noise management and updates to the Biodiversity Metric would need to be considered. Natural England also set out a requirement for an Environmental Management Plan.

In response to Regulation 25 (part 1), Natural England requested further information as they considered that the application could have potential significant effects on the provision of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land through a calculated Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade for the Site and subsequent assessment of impacts of the Development on BMV land.

Following the submission of Regulation 25 (part 2) information, Natural England responded that the application could have potential significant effects on the provision of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land in the Solent region. It therefore requested further information in order to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation by way of a calculated Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade for the Site and a subsequent assessment of the impacts of the development on BMV land. Additional comments were also provided on the Habitats Regulations Assessment, soils, landscaping, restoration and aftercare, the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy and SANG provision.

Following the receipt of Regulation 25 (part 2) information, Natural England responded as follows:

- An updated shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment has been produced and as previously advised, the HRA should consider impacts from the proposal in-combination with other plans/projects in the area, and with Local Plans.
- The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade for the site and subsequent assessment of the impacts of the development on BMV land shows that the proposed development would extend to approximately 60 ha at ALC grades considered BMV land. The Agricultural Viability Report concludes that an agricultural use of the land is unlikely to be viable, due to the length of time it has not been in production. It is for Hampshire County Council, as competent authority, to consider whether this is an effective use of BMV land.

The weighting attached to a particular consideration is a matter of judgement for the local authority as decision-maker.

The update to the landscape, restoration and outline five-year aftercare scheme is noted and Natural England re-iterate their previous advice that certain features such as wetland areas can take time to establish and may require ongoing management actions including vegetation clearing and desilting. Natural England recommended that the management period is extended to address the longer-term management and maintenance of this site.

A response from Natural England on the HRA record is still awaited.

141. **Network Rail:** Initially set out a holding objection due to further information being required in relation to impacts on localised de-watering, the impact of the lagoon and silt pond, and the impact of the inert fill on the railway line/cutting. Some planning conditions in relation to material storage, storm/surface water and effectiveness of drains/watercourse, unexpected ordnance, a trespass-proof fence adjacent to the existing railway boundary, and plant and equipment locations were proposed.

Following the submission of information under Regulation 25 (part 1), it was advised that the information did not evidence how the 10mm settlement figure has been derived nor how such lowering of the railway can be considered “low risk” and further information was requested. It was noted that Stantec acknowledge that there is likely to be an increase in ground water levels beneath the railway following restoration of the site with lower permeability materials. As the railway line sits within a cutting, this could result in additional water drainage requirements. It was also noted, that Stantec report refer to the possibility of creating ground water drains to transfer groundwater to the south, away from the railway line. This mitigation should be in place prior to development occurring.

Following the submission of Regulation 25 (part 2) information, Network Rail maintained their holding objection on grounds that they did not feel that all the concerns raised had been addressed. Further concerns were also raised in relation to the infiltration ponds in the north-eastern corner of the site and the lack of details of the dimensions or proximity to Network Rail’s boundary and the need for cross-sections of the boundary, level of the track and level of the proposed basins.

Following the amendments to the drainage design, Network Rail indicated that they are satisfied with the position and removed their objection to the scheme subject to conditions relating to groundwater monitoring and the construction

stage and the requirement for a plan to address excessive groundwater levels if recorded for over 3 months.

142. **Public Health (Hampshire County Council):** Has made the following comments:

- It is important to consider the location of this application and the populations and the impacts of increased air pollution. It is in close proximity to a primary school, outdoor leisure facilities and a health centre which may represent locations that are more likely to be frequented by residents who are more vulnerable to the ill-effects of air pollution, e.g. children, pregnant women, people with existing respiratory conditions, and older adults, all having been defined as more vulnerable to outdoor air pollution by Public Health England;
- Support increasing high-quality, accessible green space for the use of local residents following the site's restoration;
- *Noise:*
  - The noise assessment shows that during the period of bund creation, all the noise-sensitive properties would be well within the limit for temporary operations;
  - Changes to working patterns now mean that more people are at home during the day compared to pre-pandemic which means that the number of residents potentially exposed to increased noise and dust during the operational hours proposed is higher.
- Would like to see a commitment to travel planning, including means of encouraging and supporting staff of the proposed development to travel to work by sustainable modes;
- *Air quality:*
  - Increased vehicle movements associated with this proposal will result in increased vehicle emissions. The applicant should have regard to the opinion of the EHO in relation to air quality and vehicle emissions;
  - Whilst the proposed development is not expected to result in exceedances of air quality specified limits, it will be contributing to an increase in particulate matter. Recommends the applicant prevents and mitigates to the lowest practicable level the impact of process, by-product and vehicle emissions beyond achieving compliance with statutory thresholds where they apply;
- It is proposed to put in a permissive footpath at the start of the development. The notion of increasing accessibility for pedestrians is supported. Emphasises the importance of paths that are safe and maintained, are suitable for people using mobility aids or wheelchairs, and that benefit from natural surveillance to increase perceptions of safety and reduce risk of crime and antisocial behaviour.

**143. Public Rights of Way (Hampshire County Council Countryside):**

Initially objected to the scheme due to there being no benefits to public right of way. Comments questioned the alignment of the footpath on plans, the lack of guarantee of the permissive path, the desire to create a bridleway and links into the Hamble Rail Trail. This objection was maintained at Regulation 25 (part 1).

In response to Regulation 25 (part 2) and following comments submitted by the Local Highway Authority, no objection was raised subject to securing obligations via a s106 legal agreement and suggested planning conditions. This is predominantly based on the proposed diversion of Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 and the significant contribution of £500,000 to secure sustainable travel improvements in the area surrounding the site. It was recognised that, although this does not achieve an extended public right of way around the northern perimeter of the site, it does fund improvements to alternative routes for cyclists and pedestrians to improve links between the residential areas of Hamble, the railway station, and the Hamble School and Sports Complex. Therefore, the following was sought:

- a) Secure the contribution sought by the Highway Authority for sustainable travel improvements within the s106;
- b) Secure public access rights along the full lengths of the permissive paths proposed in the scheme within the s106 for 30 years. This would secure the maintenance of the permissive paths for this period;
- c) Secure the proposed permissive paths have a minimum surface width of 2 metres and are built to HCS Design Standards. Also recommended that the outer edge of the permissive path surfaces are offset from perimeter vegetation by a minimum of 1000mm to ensure they are not overgrown;
- d) Proposed that to address protection and enhancement of the PROW network, the scheme is improved by moving (diverting) Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 onto the line of the proposed permissive path along the east boundary of the site. This diverted Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 would be no longer, its end points not moving (with the exception of the opportunity to divert the north end where it meets Satchell Lane). This is based on the permissive paths being of a standard matching the design standards for an unbound surface of a width of 2 metres. It has been identified that the route walked on the ground differs from the definitive line (that is shown on this drawing). The Highways Authority is required to maintain the surface and public right of access along the definitive line of the route. The proposed permissive path crosses the existing definitive line twice. This does not result in high quality design and will require a highways agreement to carry out works to the surface of the PROW at these points to install the permissive path. It is just higher

quality design to have one path not two – removing duplication and giving the public an enhanced Footpath;

- e) To enable the public maintenance of Footpath 1, seek a commuted sum of £68,000.00, secured by either a Section 106 legal agreement or Section 278 highways agreement. Its trigger point shall be the issue by the Highways Authority of the certificate of maintenance for the footpath;
- f) The developer can carry out the works to the surface of Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 under a S278 highways agreement. The diversion can be made via an order under S257 of the TCPA 1990; and;
- g) The construction and operation of the development shall respect the continuous priority right for the public to use Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1.

144. **River Hamble Harbour Authority:** Made the following comments:

- Concerns about potential damage to vessels caused by fine particulates in prevailing westerly winds. Any litigation implications of directly attributable damage will merit consideration;
- Concerns over the potential for silt/sediment or contaminants from the site to enter the watercourse;
- Potential for the displacement of dog walking from the airfield to coastal paths, which may risk increasing disturbance to protected bird species; and
- Effective measures to mitigate such impacts should be secured and included in any management plans and/or conditions.

145. **Southampton Airport:** Has no objection from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective subject to a condition on the submission of a Bird Hazard Management Plan.

146. **Southern Water:** Initially provided comments and information in relation to Southern Water's assets. In response to Regulation 25 (part 2), Southern Water altered its response to fully supports the LLFA's recommendations and requests that the detailed surface water drainage scheme that is to be produced takes note of their previous surface water comments and that the design of drainage should ensure that no groundwater or land drainage is to enter public sewers. In addition, in the event that permission is granted, requested conditions relating to the protection of sewers, restriction on the location of soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses, or any other surface water retaining or conveying features, requirement for SUDs, construction details.

147. **UK Health Security Agency (Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards team):** Provided the following comments:

- Given the proximity of sensitive residential and educational receptors and the ability for PM10 to travel several hundred metres, concerns raised that this has the potential to result in an increase in the exposure of the local population;
- Whilst the currently predicted low levels of PM10 exposure appear to provide significant headroom before the 40µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual threshold is breached, UKHSA would not endorse an assessment approach that argued that an increase was not of relevance unless the 24 hour or annual thresholds for PM10 or PM2.5 were predicted to be exceeded;
- Suggests that any assessment of PM10 levels should consider worst case and mean hourly exposure patterns from the site over a 24 hour period, including an assessment of the impact of seasonal weather conditions on the release and transport of particulates. This additional analysis would allow the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed dust management measures will minimise the impact on local populations, particularly those with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular conditions;
- The local planning authority should consider if the particulate emissions from the site constitute a material consideration in determining this application. If so, the applicant could be asked to satisfy the local planning authority that the operation of the site will not result in a significant increase in PM10 levels above the existing background levels and provide modelled dust emissions assessing PM10 exposure patterns on local receptors, including an assessment of the annual average, 24 hour average, hourly averages and the impact of seasonal weather conditions on the release and transport of particulates; AND
- UKHSA is likely to be consulted on the associated environmental permit and will be able to assess the environmental assessment and dust management plans at that stage.

148. **Woodland Trust:** Objection on the following grounds:

- Opposed to the loss of T6 and T8 at the site access which could be considered veteran specimens based on their girth, and therefore their loss and deterioration is opposed; and
- It should be ensured that both trees are retained and suitably protected from the potential impacts of the proposal.

## Representations

149. Hampshire County Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) sets out the adopted consultation and publicity procedures associated with determining planning applications. When the planning application was initially submitted and subject to the first two rounds of public consultation, the

Hampshire Statement of Community Involvement (2017) was in place. In complying with the requirements of this SCI, Hampshire County Council:

- Published a notice of the application in the [Hampshire Independent](#);
- Placed notices of the application at the application site and local area at each stage of public consultation;
- Consulted all statutory and non-statutory consultees in accordance with [The Town and Country Planning \(Development Management Procedure\) \(England\) Order 2015](#); and
- Notified by letter all residential properties within 100 metres of the boundary of the site. This neighbourhood notification area was then significantly extended to account for the known interest in the site after the preparation of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

150. The extension of neighbourhood consultation area was at the case officers request, acknowledging the likely interest in the site following the preparation of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). It is acknowledged that even by extending the neighbourhood notification area, this would not capture all of those who previously responded during the plan preparation process. Such records of any previous representations made do not exist due to data protection requirements. It is also unlikely that a consultation area could be extended reasonably to include all who previously responded.

151. During the determination of the planning application, the previously adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2017) was replaced with the [Hampshire Statement of Community Involvement \(2023\)](#). This altered some of the procedures for press advertisements. At all stages of the planning process, community involvement and public consultation has been in accordance with the adopted SCI at the time each stage was taking place.

152. As already set out earlier in the [Environmental Impact Assessment](#) section of the report, further rounds of public consultation took place pursuant to Regulation 25 requests for further information.

153. As of 01/04/2024, a total of 5,744 representations have been received (from 4,630 representors). Many representors have submitted more than one response. The vast majority objected to the proposal, with only a small number of comments providing general comments or writing in support.

154. It is important to note that only representations received which relate specifically to the content of the submitted planning application are considered as part of the planning application determination process and published on the planning application webpages. Any requests made under Freedom of Information or as an Environmental Information Request are not published as

part of the application documents although relevant officers and teams will have provided the required responses to these requests.

155. Any responses which included offensive content (such as unacceptable language or threats to officers) have not been published on the planning application webpages.

156. The main areas of concern raised in the objections related to the following areas (have been grouped by subject areas but some matters may relate to more than one area):

157. *Climate change and net zero:*

- Proposal does not comply with current global and regional/local (including the Hampshire County Council Climate Change Strategy 2020-2025) requirements / strategies in terms of carbon emissions, pollution and promotion of green energy;
- Associated release of nitrogen, carbon dioxide, greenhouse gases and carbon from the soils other emissions;
- Should be avoiding carbon intensive activities e.g. creation and use of cement and concrete; and
- Concerns regarding the future use of the gravel (e.g. concrete-making, adding to the UK's carbon footprint).

158. *Principle of development:*

- The application is not consistent and in conflict with key policies in the development plan e.g. Policy DM23 of [EBLP \(2022\)](#);
- The application is in conflict paragraphs 91, 102 and 108(b), 210, 211 and section 9 of the NPPF;
- Proposal does not meet the provisions of the Environmental Act (2021);
- Contrary to the draft Quarries Bill;
- The location of the proposed development site is the only one of 19 sites listed under current Policy 20 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) which is located close to residential areas
- The use of Hamble Airfield for minerals extraction is in conflict with a Defra policy paper;
- Detrimental to a number of UN Development Goals, in particular numbers 3, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15;
- EIA produced is inadequate;
- The site was allocated in 2013 but much has changed since then e.g. other development, environmental issues and awareness;
- The site is not temporary given the number of years that it will operate and be restored;
- Where's the evidence this is an application worth considering?; and
- "You would not build a school next to a quarry, so why would you build a quarry next to a school?"



159. *Need:*

- Considering that the initial business case was made at least 20 years ago, does the business case and the requirement for the sand and gravel still stand?;
- The LAA shows that there has been a continual reduction in sales of land-won sand and gravel over the last decade;
- There is not a shortage of gravel. There are suppliers nearby, and other pits that are still viable;
- As the minimum 7-year supply can be demonstrated, the planning application should be refused; and
- Development is contrary to Strategic Policy S1 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#).

160. *Waste:*

- 'Landfilling' of waste;
- Material used to fill the land after extraction is likely to be either landfill waste, or imported to the site from a significant distance;
- Concerns that 'contaminated material' will be brought on to site;
- Concerns about the lack of definition of the inert material that will be used to fill the extraction void; source of the inert material needs to be defined; and
- No information provided on where backfilling materials will come from.

161. *Consideration of alternatives:*

- There are other sites and sources available which are in less built-up areas and have much better links to the national road network;
- The gravel is of the same quality which can be dredged from Southampton Water and the Solent;
- If granted permission access should be off Satchell Lane; and
- Alternatives should be sought, both in terms of materials (recycled materials) and locations.

162. *Ecology:*

- *Status and value of the site:*
  - Site is a great example of rewilding - the airfield has become a nature reserve and the wildlife there needs to be respected.
  - Loss of onsite habitats (including nesting grounds) flora / fauna, e.g. blackberry bushes, rare orchids, deer, foxes, bird of prey, great crested newts, endangered species, lizards, hedgehogs, bat sanctuary, Skylark, Linnets, Song Thrush, Dunnock, Common Whitethroat, Dartford Warbler (2017);
  - Site is a haven for wildlife with over 65 different species;
  - Micro ecosystems affected;
  - The application has underestimated the sites ecological importance;
  - Loss of habitats for species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981);
  - The site is an important wildlife corridor that is described as such by EBLP (2022).

- Impact on marine life;
- Damage to the site would mean that there would not be any wildlife left;
- The Hamble River is an important site ecologically;
- Micro ecosystems affected;
- The application has underestimated the ecological importance of the site;
- Legal obligations around Dormouse protection must be met.
- There are crested newts on the airfield;
- Skylarks will become an endangered species soon and the quarry will have a negative impact on their nesting grounds;
- The Hamble River is an important site ecologically and will be impacted;
- Impact on marine life from the proposal.
- **BNG:**
  - The 10% net increase will be at the cost of a 90% decrease for a decade;
  - The proposal fails to demonstrate the required biodiversity net gain;
- **Links to other strategies:**
  - Site is an ecological Network Opportunity Area and also a Priority Biodiversity Link within Eastleigh Borough Council's Biodiversity Action Plan (2012);
  - Contradicts the government's Biodiversity Action Plan;
- **Impacts and enhancement:**
  - Not confident about the proposals timeline and mitigation of loss of wildlife and habitat;
  - Huge environmental impact;
  - Where will onsite species live during operations, and how will they return?
  - Impact on lowland acid grassland;
  - Would affect the two Ramsar Sites on the River Hamble, SAC, SPA, Ramsar and SSSI and related habitats;
  - Do not feel that ecological impact on the area has been thoroughly assessed by applicant; and
  - Do not believe that animals, birds and their habitats can be protected and kept safe whilst the proposed works are carried out.
- **Quality of the ES:**
  - The ecology survey submitted was incomplete regarding over-wintering birds / nesting birds; and
  - Appendix 4.1 – Ecological Appraisal and Desk top study (November 2021) shows that area has an ecological value.
- **Other matters:**
  - The Environment Act 2021 should carry significant weight as a material consideration as to why this proposal should be refused;
  - The Council should enhance wildlife; and
  - Application provides no detail on how the development will achieve nitrate neutrality.

163. *Location in the countryside and settlement gap:*

- Rural area not suitable for heavy industry;
- The site will become a brown field site so will be open to further development e.g. housing;
- Former Hamble Airfield should be deemed unsuitable for extraction;
- The proposal and consequences do not seem to be thought through properly and smack of 'short termism';
- Site is being considered not because it is suitable, but because it is available for exploitation;
- Airfield provides a natural gap between other neighbouring parishes and villages of Hound and Netley;
- This area is allocated as “countryside” in the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) as well as within a strategic local gap between Netley and Hamble and Bursledon; and
- Other countries have legally banned quarries being sited this close to schools.

164. *Landscape:*

- Aesthetically unpleasant;
- Fundamental and irreversible damage to the landscape and character will be caused by the quarry;
- Airfield has reverted back to nature over decades;
- Ambience, peace and tranquillity will be lost;
- Hamble and its river are local beauty spots;
- To turn site into a manufactured 'green space' would be a tragedy; and
- Who will be responsible for the long-term maintenance of the area?

165. *Visual impact:*

- On neighbouring properties;
- Panoramic views would be spoiled / lost;
- Site is on a relatively elevated and exposed plateau;
- Hamble is unique peninsular;
- Bunds will block the light to homes and be an eyesore; and
- Proximity to village allotment.

166. *Arboriculture:*

- Impact of loss of trees on the site; and
- Request that a full survey of the trees on the site access is undertaken to ascertain if the classifications of the trees are correct.

167. *Soils:*

- Concerns that the soils on the airfield will change;
- Erosion to nearby properties and the river banks;
- What is the depth of extraction proposed and how will applicant mitigate/prevent or indemnify residents from slippage around the boundary of the site?;
- Application fails to address carbon release from soils; and
- Soil will become less fertile over the extraction period which will cause problems such as a lack of ability to maintain soil moisture, leading to other

problems such as reduced infiltration, increased surface runoff and increased susceptibility to soil erosion.

168. *Public rights of way and access:*

- The airfield has been an integral part of green space for the village for many years and is at the heart of the village, providing open space;
- The loss of open space, natural habitat, and public amenity;
- Proposal will result in less areas to walk dogs locally which will lead to a greater density of dog users in other areas creating more issues;
- The site should be left as it is to preserve nature and kept as green space;
- After Covid, the value of open space for leisure and recreation became more evident;
- Site is a critical part of wellbeing, live style and environment for the village;
- The proposed path and green made available to the public outside the designated site will be no compensation for the airfield;
- This land should remain as it is or turned into a country park / park;
- The pavement/cycle path along Hamble Lane will need to cross the planned entrance to the site - What steps will be taken to make this crossing point safe?;
- Degradation of the route, will impact hiker volumes;
- Site also forms part of the frequently used "strawberry route";
- Access to this area has never been restricted with footpaths all over it;
- There is an element of unnecessary duplication proposed for Footpath No 1 Hamble-le-Rice which should be avoided by the improvement of the corridor within which the existing path is located instead;
- In the Planning Statement there is an incorrect statement at paragraph 10.161. Footpath No 1 Hamble-le-Rice will need to be diverted to enable this gravel extraction to be undertaken. The alignment on the Definitive Map does not match the alignment that has existed on the ground for decades at the northern end;
- Walking routes already exist here therefore do not think a new footpath is going to benefit the local area;
- The "permissive path" around the site is welcome, but needs to be upgraded to a bridleway to allow cyclists to use it;
- Applicants are not the landowners; it will not be possible to dedicate paths as a right of way;
- The routes being sought are required as permanent features and provision and to ensure their preservation and maintenance they should be rights of way;
- The need to provide a footpath/cycleway/bridleway routes along Satchell Lane is identified in the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) - Policy S12;
- Loss of open space will adversely impact other areas such as the marshes and country parks;
- Loss of a valuable area of village to run, walk and use for 15 years which is a critical part of wellbeing, lifestyle and environment; and
- The site is the only safe route to the quay by foot from the walking trail at the top of Satchell Lane. It is also often a safe walking route from the school to parts of Hamble as Satchell Lane has no footpath.

169. *Design and sustainability:*

- *Bunds:*
  - Have any studies been carried out on the water runoff into Hamble Lane (which already suffers from flooding) and the railway line?
  - Bunds will affect light in people's houses / natural light;
  - Proposed bund will do little to mitigate noise, and nothing at all for the air pollution;
  - A bund in between the extraction area and residential properties may capture larger particles, but it is not clear how it will mitigate the more dangerous airborne transmission of finer material;
  - What is the proposed gap between the outer boundary of the site and the edge of the screening bund?
  - The bunding does not seem high enough;
  - Would like to see larger buffer zones around the site;
- No provision for parking and dropping off at Hamble train station;
- Current plan to return one small area to the community for recreation purposes after 14 years of disruption poses little in the way of compensation;
- Would like to see larger areas of green space;
- Proposed arrangement of using just wheel-wash could prove to be inadequate in preventing the build-up of sedimentation on the public highway and the air pollution issues this would cause and increase traffic;
- Processing plant is shown as being immediately adjacent to the Hamble School;
- Location of the site entrance/exit is also adjacent to a raised railway bridge. This is a major concern as it causes a blind crest;
- Don't require a boating lake;
- Gravel extraction will, at some points, be as close as 40m from residential houses; and
- The proposal states that they will create a pedestrian path (grass only) towards only the northern part of the airfield, which will help only Satchell Lane residents to walk to the Secondary School and railway;

170. *Cultural and archaeological heritage:*

- The flint stones have been there "forever" and would be sad to lose;
- Highly irresponsible to even consider extraction from the unique airfield site;
- Site is a very special place of historical interest and of great heritage value and deserves to be preserved;
- The airfield's role in protecting Britain during the Second World War needs to be protected so it is not irrevocably damaged;
- Impact on the historic village;
- No Intrusive Assessment has been undertaken on the site;
- Would affect Conservation Areas of Hamble and Old Bursledon.

171. *Amenity:*

- Early/late working hours (including working on Saturdays) will have a negative impact on the local community;
- The site is surrounded on all sides and is in the middle of a residential area;
- Applicant has not produced documentation in line with relevant regulations;
- The HMWP (2013) site allocation was determined prior to the all the additional housing granted along Hamble Lane, A3025, Grange Road and Bridge Road (A27);
- Site entrance is located between 2 schools;
- The site location fails the expectation of being beyond 100 metres of homes and schools;
- Inappropriate location: areas for extraction are set far too close to residents, the schools, nursery, Health Centre, sports complex, recreation ground, care home, and houses on Satchell Lane, The Close, and Hamble Lane;
- Concerns due to the proximity to residential properties;
- Airfield is in the heart of Hamble-le-Rice village; and
- To place industrial activity in the midst of housing is unacceptable;

172. *Air quality and dust:*

- The buffer zones are not large enough to mitigate the impact of dust and noise on the surrounding residential housing, schools and health centre that border the site on 3 sides; and
- No account has been taken of the unique meteorological conditions that exist on the Hamble Peninsula.
- *Impacts on air quality:*
  - Additional air-borne contamination;
  - Air pollution caused by on site machinery that runs on highly polluting high surplus red diesel;
  - The applicant has an objective of an annual mean PM2.5 of 25µg/m<sup>3</sup>, which is significantly higher than the WHO recommended limits;
  - Particles produced by HGVs will include NO<sub>x</sub>, as well as other chemical compounds as particulates, such as natural rubber, SBR (styrene butadiene rubber), and butadiene rubber, Zn, Fe, Ca, vulcanising agents, accelerators, retardants, pigments, fillers, reinforcing agents, softeners, antioxidants, anti-ozonates and desiccants; and
  - The applicant is unable to predict what effect the extraction will have on the local air quality.
- *Impact on AQMA:*
  - The northern end of Hamble Lane is already an AQMA because the level of nitrogen dioxide (mostly from vehicle exhaust's) regularly exceeds the target 'safe level';
  - The additional vehicles (HGVs + staff) will worsen the air quality;

- Records show levels exceeding World Health Organisation safe limits periodically;
- Pollution from emissions on Hamble Lane between the Portsmouth Road and Windhover roundabout;
- *Dust:*
  - Prevailing winds means residents expect to see most dust;
  - What steps are being taken to minimise dust pollution?
  - Residents / school children / marinas near to the site will be severely adversely affected by dust particles;
  - Dust pollution caused will make life intolerable;
  - A lot of dust and diesel fumes, further degrading quality of life;
  - Satchell Lane is both below and in the prevailing downwind direction of the site enabling fine airborne particles to travel further;
  - The levels of dust and airborne debris will be extensive;
  - Moving and digging minerals will create more dust;
  - Windows, doors and cars will need more regular cleaning;
  - Residents won't be able to have windows open;
  - Dust on boats will be abrasive;
  - Dust prevention measures not efficient enough / goes against all advice;
  - Silica dust is corrosive and by its very nature abrasive;
  - Wear and tear on vehicles from dust and debris on roads;
  - In the Dust Management Plan, the metrological data is based on the last 30 years' historical data to predict the percentage of wet days which does not take into account the climate crisis where year on year we experience more and more extreme conditions, especially high temperatures and longer dryer summers;
  - Residents will be severely adversely affected by air quality and diesel fumes throughout the extraction and restoration periods;
  - Extraction would restrict residents use of gardens especially during summer when the risk to air quality is at its greatest;
  - Proposed air quality buffer zone is inadequate where it is close to homes, gardens, schools, playing fields, community and sports centres;
  - Solar panels affected by dust from airfield;
  - Proximity to Hamble school and very obvious risk to children's health caused by breathing dust;
  - Already a peninsula which suffers from air pollution from Fawley and the cruise ship terminal in Southampton due to the prevailing wind direction; and
  - HGV movement every 3.5mins increasing pollution to pedestrians.

- *ES accuracy:*
  - Applicants methodology is flawed;
  - Lack of consideration in Environmental Statement Chapter 8 of phosphorus and phosphate levels; and
  - Dust Management Plan does not take into consideration the waterborne users of the River Hamble and potential damage to moored boats/yachts.
- *Other matters:*
  - Electric vehicles should used to meet CO2 targets and conform to national and international air pollution levels;
  - Believe the area is over the Defra air pollution limits;
  - Conditions should be placed on the operator for real-time air quality monitoring equipment adjacent to the local schools;
  - Applicant is quoting wind information from the airport which is not in proximity to the site;
  - Once site is stripped, it's left open and exposed for dust;
  - Site also sits approximately six miles from Southampton which is slated to be declared a ULEZ zone in the next two years;
  - Scientific reports admit that they have little or no data from sites in similarly sensitive locations / lack of consideration of comparable sites;
  - More studies need to be done taking into account the very strong winds the area is subject to and how this affects pollution levels for the local population; and
  - How will proposed mitigations be enforced? What are the consequences of failing to adhere to them?

173. *Emissions to land:*

- Concerns over contamination of the airfield / that contaminated waste will be uncovered.

174. *Noise/ Vibration:*

- Noise pollution would be horrendous as the airfield acts as a 'sub-woofer', a bowl, amplifying generated noise made upon it;
- What steps are being taken to minimise the potential noise pollution?
- Residents of Hamble Lane, Broadway and Satchell Lane could be severely affected by noise and vibration;
- Operations starting at 7am would mean that the additional noise would be a significant burden;
- Various studies have confirmed that excessive noises can create mental fatigue that impairs judgement and reduces morale. It also triggers physiological stress responses such as spikes in blood pressure and increases in blood rate;
- Has any analysis been made of the increased noise levels from the site for the residents directly adjacent to it and what are the limits of decibels you expect and at what times?



- Residents in both Hamble Lane and Satchell Lane already have daily noise from the site, starting at 7am;
- Noise impacts from beeps or lorries reversing, causing stress;
- Loss of enjoyment of gardens due to noise and reduced activity outside;
- Noise from heavy vehicles and processing machinery would ruin the tranquillity of surrounding areas;
- Residents near to the site will be severely adversely affected by noise throughout the extraction and restoration periods;
- Prevailing wind direction is West to South West which places all of Hamble and Warsash down wind of the noisiest form of aggregate removal;
- The continual noise of extracting and washing the mineral will have a detrimental impact on children's learning;
- Noise experienced would be well above the additional 10DB limit above background noise;
- Detrimental to the residents enjoying the peace and tranquillity of their gardens;
- More people working from home now so will be affected by the noise created;
- Not able to open windows due to the continuous noise;
- The Noise Assessment was undertaken four years ago. Material changes have taken place in the area since the survey was undertaken and therefore the survey is out of date;
- Negative effects on children's learning from noise resulting in poorer grades;
- Hamble Lane and its surrounding areas are already subject to various / unacceptable sources of noise pollution (e.g. Exxon refinery and Cooper Vision) and proposal will exacerbate this issue;
- Sleep disturbance;
- Noise pollution due to proposed 0700-1900 operating hours;
- Night-time and weekend noise;
- Risk and danger from tiredness of workers due to poor sleep; and
- Poor education at school from children having poor sleep quality.

175. *Health:*

- *General health related matters:*
  - Health and safety risks for the public, including school children;
  - Negative effect on the residents' physical and mental wellbeing;
  - Mental health issues from the poor sleep and stress of noise;
  - Impact on quality of life and how will this be compensated?
  - Residents near to the site will be severely adversely affected, impacting health, throughout the extraction and restoration periods; and
  - Many schoolchildren and adults walk through the disused airfield to get to school and other places. If this was lost they

would have to walk along Satchell Lane which is very dangerous.

- *Related to air quality and dust:*
  - Dust created would be hazardous to the public and to the village residents' health;
  - Concerned about the impact that the transmission of fine particles over many years will have on health;
  - Increased dust and air pollution will exacerbate issues for people living with respiratory illnesses and is likely to cause an increase in the amount of people being diagnosed with respiratory conditions;
  - Inhalation of silica dust can result in silicosis of the lungs, a chronic respiratory disease, as well as cancer, asthma and COPD. Silicosis takes 5-10 / 15-20 years to present;
  - Linked adverse impacts on those living, schooling, and working in Hamble (including health) by dust, noise and dirt emissions from the site;
  - Worried that facemasks will need to be used whilst at school to protect from the dust;
  - Eye problems due to dust;
  - Air pollution and the effect this will have on young developing lungs and respiratory systems or even losing their lives;
  - Impacts on residents respiratory systems;
  - Silicosis and particles PM2.5 and PM10;
  - Current plans do not prevent the production and widespread distribution of this Respirable Crystalline Silica dust; and
  - Increase in respiratory problems will worsen the burden on NHS and delays in getting medical attention will lead to later diagnosis and more severe disease in general.
  
- *Related to noise:*
  - Various studies have confirmed that excessive noises can create mental fatigue that impairs judgement and reduces morale. It also triggers physiologic stress responses such as spikes in blood pressure and increases in blood rate;
  - Inhalation of silica dust can result in silicosis of the lungs, a chronic respiratory disease, as well cancer, asthma and COPD. Silicosis takes 5-10 / 15-20 years to present; and
  - Fine silica dust can be blown for several kilometres;
  
- *Other matters:*
  - Insurance for future health claims?
  - Severe health risks: higher risk of cancer, respiratory illnesses, risk to eyes (compromising eye sight), lowered quality of life and increased danger;
  - Looking for compensation due to health issues;
  - Local GP surgery is already struggling to look after the local residents;
  - Ponds also create a drowning risk for children looking to cool off in warmer weather;

- Outdoor learning is a National Curriculum priority, the noise and dust created will impact this;
- Use of glyphosate;
- Huge impact on childhood development, if they cannot play and learn outside;
- Increased risk of dog faeces being left on fields if airfield removed, resulting in eColi;
- Missed GP appointments due to increased travel time;
- Applicant has no interest in the health of the local population;
- Anxiety and stress caused by noise and dust; and
- Eco-anxiety.

176. *Lighting:*

- Light pollution impacts with those closest being adversely affected by lighting throughout the extraction and restoration periods.

177. *Public safety:*

- The applicant has no experience of managing a quarry so close sensitive receptors so how do they know that's it's safe?
- How is a pond right next to the school fence safe?
- Impact on emergency services vehicles – delayed by increase in traffic;
- Concerned that youngsters may potentially be able to access site;
- The entrance would cut across the cycle way and be very dangerous;
- Risks of steep slippery banks into 20ft deep water in close proximity to a secondary school; and
- Impact of disturbing the WWII munitions dump.

178. *Impacts on strategic infrastructure:*

- Devastating effects upon the village's infrastructure;
- Impact on Esso pipeline;
- Impacts / damage / collapse of the railway bridge;
- The development and the associated traffic will cause infrastructure degradation issues.

179. *Cumulative impacts:*

- Schools like to keep the windows open (Covid measures) and this would impact the children with noise and dust;
- The planned extraction would create a negative cumulative impact of development generally in the Hamble and Bursledon area;
- Not a short term project – cumulative impacts;
- Cumulative impact of low level noise with noise from Fawley refinery and extension at Southampton Airport;
- Ground movement and structural damages to houses;
- Devaluing of houses;
- Noise and distraction from the quarry will disrupt teaching process and impact student performance (including at GCSE exams);

- Wider environmental issues with from the quarry;
- Houses along Satchell Lane have been underpinned to keep the foundations stable; and
- Risks of landslide.

180. *Impact on surface or groundwaters and flooding:*

- *Impact on hydrology:*
  - Effect on the water table;
  - Underwater springs and natural drainage would be destroyed;
  - Proposed site is identified by applicant as being one of seven surrounding surface water catchment areas;
  - Infiltration of glyphosate could result in the water table and proposed sub-catchment being contaminated;
  - Questioning the proposed de-watering;
  - Proposal does not appear to reference an in-depth hydrology analysis of the effect of the removal of 1.672 m tonnes of sand and gravel;
  - Lead Local Flood Authority indicate that the information provided is insufficient;
  - Concerned about the lack of surveys/planning presented by the applicant for the expected/management of water from the site;
  - There has been no full multi season review carried out and no proper survey of the hydrology impact of the removal of material from the site;
  - Two markings of 'Shallow valley wetland and pond for surface water drainage' on the plan are a cause for concern as Satchell Lane frequently runs with water draining off the airfield. This proposal could make it worse;
  - Insufficient information on the surface water drainage and disposal that will be required throughout the life of this proposed operation;
  - Will lead to contamination in the drinking water;
  - Insufficient evidence that this operation will not impact groundwater quality;
  - The site is relatively close to the shoreline;
  - Proposal would lead to contamination in the drinking water;
  - Hamble River is tidal with changes of some 4m twice daily;
  - There is a constant flow of groundwater and surface water from the airfield area across Satchell Lane to the River Hamble;
  - Decrease in adequate surface run off area; and
  - As soon as sea-level depth is reached during excavation, consequent gravel pits will likely flood, leaving a strip of land between the extraction site and Satchell Lane which must surely become saturated and 'fail', potentially catastrophically, for houses already in situ.

- *Flooding:*
  - Extraction of gravel which has provided natural drainage for Hamble and its surrounds for centuries, will leave some parts of lower Satchell Lane flooded;
  - Major water runoff from the airfield in all weathers, which causes flooding in Satchell Lane as far as the road drains in St Agatha's Road. This is treacherous both in wet and icy conditions. A quarry would further compound the problem;
  - What are the risks to pipelines and the properties along Satchell Lane should the proposed run-off catchment provision prove inadequate in the event of a flash flood?
  - Oakwood Way is already at risk of flooding and suffers from the impact of drainage across Satchell Lane;
  - Have any studies have been done to demonstrate the consequences of the proposed storage ponds breaking their banks and flooding the lane?
  - Concerned about water displacement and the effect it will have on the movement of the houses;
  - Historic run off/drainage ditches have been left to disrepair / have been built on;
  - How can it be certain that run off and contamination will not affect the levels of the Hamble River and it's potential to flood or impact the SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar?
  - Culverts installed to alleviate the run off from the airfield don't prevent water regularly running across the lane and underneath properties after heavy rainfall; and
  - Backfill materials likely to allow water to percolate through it differently (e.g. being denser which will cause surface water to exacerbate and result in flooding).
  
- *Pollution:*
  - Pollution of the River Hamble;
  - Open to subsidence claims in respect of the houses adjacent to the site and the need to underpin;
  - Underpinning of houses for those responsible, as they will have failed to take account of this danger;
  - Increase in ground water contamination and wider pollution;
  - Impact on 'the stream' not mentioned in documents;
  - Co2 and toxins that will be emitted by HGVs; and
  - Are regular pollution measurements taken along and around Hamble Lane area?

181. *Highways:*

- Increase in traffic pollution;
- Application fails to meet requirements of Policy 12 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#);
- *Concerns over current traffic issues:*
  - Traffic congestion is already an issue along B3397 which is not suitable to accommodate safely cyclists, pedestrians and

- heavy traffic. When it is not dangerous it sits at a standstill (both ways) during the rush hours – this road cannot take the level of additional traffic proposed – indeed it cannot take the current level of traffic;
- Hamble Lane only road in and out of Hamble and is the busiest B-road in the UK / Hampshire;
  - Pot holes from the tankers;
  - The County Council's Executive Member for Environment and Transport report (July 2019) recognises that Hamble Lane is already 'heavily congested with potential to improve the situation being limited by the geographical constraints' and this was before recent housing developments along Hamble Lane;
  - Already a very dangerous stretch of road;
  - Already been one fatal accident - accidents are at a high rate;
  - Satchel Lane is already notoriously unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists;
  - Dangerous tankers use road all day and most of the night going into the BP terminal; and
  - Hamble Lane has very heavy pedestrian footfall; particularly during school opening and closing hours.
- *Concerns over potential impacts of the proposal:*
    - Increased HGV movement will put children at risk;
    - Impacts of associated HGVs upon the already narrow and badly metalled and narrow Satchell Lane and Hamble Lane;
    - Danger to pedestrians and cyclists alike, along with the many children who use these two lanes daily on their way to and from the village's two schools;
    - Concerned that Satchell Lane could also become a rat run;
    - High risk of increased road traffic accidents;
    - Updates to the Highway Code and hierarchy of road users have implications for this proposal, with heavy vehicles having to pass a horse at least 2m away and a cycle 1.5m away;
    - Issues with drop off and pick up at school times;
    - Ingleside Road traffic will greatly increase;
    - Tankers creating potentially serious danger in the event of a collision on the narrow road;
    - Section of Hamble Lane is on a bus route with 4 bus stops, 2 of which would be within a couple of hundred yards of the proposed access road;
    - Hamble Lane has very heavy pedestrian footfall, particularly during school opening and closing hours; and
    - Wider impact on other roads and junctions, including Hound Road, Portsmouth Road and the Tesco superstore which are already heavily impacted at peak traffic flow times and in need of improvement,
  - *Adequacy of the supporting information:*
    - Data / Survey of pedestrian and cycle movements was undertaken in 2016 / 2017;

- None of the surveys would have captured data from the marina businesses and other holiday traffic during the sailing season;
- Application ignores the impact on surrounding roads, notably Satchell Lane;
- Sceptical about the Transport Assessment statistics;
- The traffic survey has failed to adequately show the increase in traffic;
- Applicants studies report that the volume of vehicles currently correlate with great levels of fear and intimidation based on average traffic of 1200 – 1800 vehicles per hour;
- Using a survey that is now nearly 6 years old is inappropriate;
- Incorrect assumptions have been made regarding peak hours;
- The applicant does not indicate how or whether they are signed up to reduce their emissions by 15% in line with the Government target;
- Incorrect speed restriction quoted for Hamble Lane (north of Hound Road) in Chapter 13 (Reg 25 – part 2);
- Highways Authority response dated 23rd March 2022 uses the Pre-application Design Review (PADR) as a basis for several points but report has surpassed its expiry date and should not be used for assessment purposes;
- Para 3.2.1 states the width of Hamble Lane as being 9.5m. What is not noted is that the vehicle carriageway is in fact just 5.77m wide at the narrowest point on top of the rail bridge;
- Note that the traffic impact study was conducted during the Covid pandemic “work from home” government mandate;
- Errors in transport assessments and data missing; and
- The Environmental Statement (ES) and Transport Assessment fail to refer to the abnormal loads.
- *Further impacts on the highway:*
  - Residents near to the site will be severely adversely affected in terms of local traffic safety, road cleanliness and repair, and diesel fumes throughout the extraction and restoration periods;
  - Impact of HGV traffic up and down Satchell Lane and Hamble Lane will create chaos;
  - Highway cleaning trucks will only make matters worse;
  - Concerns that the railway bridge may need replacing to deal with traffic movement due to damage;
  - Safety of cyclists and pedestrians - cyclists often use the road instead of the cycle path;
  - Proposal equates to one HGV every 6 minutes in years 1-2. In years 3-7 this will increase to one HGV every 3 mins 45s;
  - HGVs will struggle to leave the site during busy periods;
  - Additional 144 HGVs per day would be unacceptable;
  - The huge number of children walking along Hamble Lane at this time will be at increased risk of danger;
  - The amount of plant and equipment that will be brought in has not been assessed;

- The need for public transport to be addressed - it is not possible or sustainable to have a normal commute to Southampton or the Airport;
- The drains are already collapsing from the current traffic;
- Pavements on Hamble Lane are narrow and only on one side for the majority;
- Proposed access would be hazardous;
- Road safety would be compromised;
- What restrictions would there be on HGV movements?
- Prospect of delays to emergency services leading to delays in response time;
- The new junction along Hamble Lane will increase risk and increase the volume of traffic;
- Mud/ debris on the highway;
- The possibility of widening the junction turning right into Portsmouth Road by using the land on Manor Crescent thus allowing traffic to pass than waiting to turn right (avoiding traffic jams in the evenings);
- Possibility to re-open junction between Portsmouth Road - Hamble Lane, freeing up roundabout opposite Le Marechal Road;
- The railway bridge does not allow for cyclists to use the footpath meaning that they have to use the road;
- HGVs will be going up and down Hamble Lane every 4 minutes;
- What is being done to curb the speed of the traffic in Hamble?
- Fear and intimidation from HGV's;
- Lack of a crash barrier on the embankment to the north side of Hamble Lane rail bridge;
- Need for a relief road, to relieve the inevitable traffic chaos;
- Imperative that the works do not disrupt the constabulary's access to and from campus via Hamble Lane;
- The roads will be filthy from Cemex traffic and it will spread a good mile in all directions from the site entrance;
- Dangerous tankers all day and most of the night going into the BP terminal is unacceptable;
- Road damage and wear resulting in more frequent road repairs and more inconvenience;
- Assuming a truck capable of transporting 23 tons of material would weigh 10 tons unladen, this means an additional 1485 tons outbound and 450 tons inbound a day;
- In 2013, transport figures were 60 single journeys now they are 144 movements per day;
- Severe increase in heavy lorry traffic to the M27 junction 8;
- Carriageway damage; and
- Peak times (personal experience, covers any time from 07:00am to 09:30am, from 14:30-16:00 and 17:00- 18:30).
- *Other transportation options:*
  - Use of rail or barge should be considered / enforced;



- No information on applicant's plans to use electric/hybrid vehicles on our roads;
  - Use of railways is stated as an important part of Hampshire planning policy but has been ignored by the applicant;
  - Environmental Statement considers the main rail line but does not consider the branch line along the southwest boundary, where the old rails still exist;
  - Consideration should be given to extending the conveyor along the route of the branch rail line and to the BP jetty;
  - A feasibility study should be conducted to see if a combination of rail and waterborne solutions could be used to minimise the environmental impact as Cemex have an aggregates wharf at Southampton; and
  - Proposed cycling path is unsuitable because it will be used by children going to and from school.
- *Mitigation:*
    - County Council has promised improvements to the top of Hamble Lane / Windover roundabout but never delivered the improvements;
    - Would like to know what the proposals are to "contribute to as necessary to highway improvements";
    - There is no indication of what the £500k worth of mitigation would be, nor what it would be expected to achieve;
    - Applicant should contribute to maintaining the Lane and helping with traffic-flow systems throughout the years;
    - What will applicant contribute to the cost of the infrastructure needed to ensure that road users and pedestrians, especially school children, are safe e.g. traffic lights in/out of the site, traffic lights/pelican crossing at Satchel Lane Junction, traffic lights at the roundabouts, full safety rails around the pavements near the school, repairs to the roads caused by heavy lorries;
    - Interested to know what price the County Council will request from applicant for road repairs and will that money go direct to Eastleigh BC?
    - The Highway Authority should improve Hamble Lane; and
    - If traffic lights were established at the junction of Satchell Lane and Hamble Lane, road safety would be enhanced.
- *Other matters:*
    - The "Dani King cycle way" is inadequate and unsafe already;
    - Increased vehicles will further contribute to commuting issues;
    - The condition of the road surface along Hamble Lane is poor, this will be worsened by the additional HGV movements;
    - Cleaning activity to remove the inevitable dirt from the road will cause further delays to traffic;
    - The intention 'to fund local walking and cycling improvements', to mitigate the impact of the HGV traffic generated by the site

is not acceptable. It is not the lack of walking and cycling infrastructure, which is the reason for the traffic queues, it is the large number of lorries on the main road in and out of the village, and increased traffic on Satchell Lane will be a reason for people not to cycle;

- These companies should invest in rail partnerships to reduce traffic, not increase it;
- As a result of site traffic on Hamble Lane, there will be more traffic coming down Satchell Lane, putting cyclists and pedestrians at higher risk;
- Increase of traffic volume should not be considered as per vehicle as the increased traffic volume must consider the size of the vehicles. Large lorries take the space of 2 - 3 cars so the traffic volume will be far higher than based on single vehicles;
- Increase in idling traffic and cause increased vibrations that impact housing along the road;
- Possible entrance and exit is a huge risk to braking distances with restricted lighting;
- Site traffic causing damage to verges;
- Lack of cohesive transport strategy;
- Increase in potholes;
- The road is in a poor state already;
- CO<sub>2</sub> and toxins that will be emitted by HGVs;
- There is not an alternative route to the site if new restrictions are imposed;
- Hamble railway bridge is not structurally designed for hundreds of HGVs per week and may collapse / be damaged / is already in a bad condition;
- HGVs are wider than cars. Increase in HGVs will make it impossible for boats to be transported down the road to the port without disruption;
- Hours of operation will make traffic worse; and
- The HGVs will hold up the buses.

182. *Restoration and aftercare*

- The 5-year aftercare after the planting of 20,000 trees and shrubs to create a deciduous woodland is meaningless;
- Restoration to a nature reserve is laudable;
- Who will pay for the management of this site after the site has finished?
- Restoration plans appear to be trying to do the minimum at every stage, no guarantee works will be done;
- Entire site should be restored to a wildlife sanctuary;
- The proposed 'Community Access Meadow' is too far from the village;
- What guarantee is there that the restoration plans would be carried out and no further houses built?

- Cynical about the land being returned to a (better) natural habitat, as it is owned by Persimmon Homes. There is nothing to prevent the land being used for further development after restoration;
- Why would Persimmon let restoration happen without submitting planning applications on what would become a brown field site;
- Does not provide adequate amenity value for residents;
- The efficacy and timeline of restoring the land for grazing and recreation are unclear; and
- Proposed wildlife mitigation is entirely unsuitable and ill advised.

183. *Socio/economic impacts*

- Creation of seven permanent jobs for this project is minimal and in no way offsets the overall significant damage to the local community it would cause;
- Airfield is a vital part of the village environment, history and a recreation space;
- The gravel extraction from Hamble airfield is purely for profit, no care or consideration for people that live and work alongside the airfield;
- Lasting damage to the economy of the entire Hamble peninsula;
- Disruption to all businesses not only in Hamble village but all the other communities along the Hamble Lane corridor;
- Will reduce business activity when operational and will constrain growth and long-term investment in the area, with much greater long-term consequences for employment opportunities;
- Unwise to create a gold rush scenario;
- Concerned about the future sustainability of the village in terms of investment, employment and visitor numbers;
- Cause extreme damage to Hamble, shops restaurants and leisure facilities;
- Local residents lives a misery so the applicant can make lots of money;
- Impact on Tesco Superstore;
- Impact on the operations of the Hampshire Police HQ site;
- Will lead to further strain on existing resources, affecting the overall well-being of the community;
- Development within a village should be aligned to needs and wishes of the population;
- Will make Hamble a less desirable place to live, work and visit;
- Airfield is such an important massive community area;
- Loss of access to the farm shop on Hamble Lane;
- Won't be able to employ retail staff and businesses will have to relocate out of Hamble due to a lack of staff;
- Airfield is a community area;
- Loss of access to the farm shop on Hamble Lane;
- Impact on businesses that work on a shift system;
- Lack of a proper and detailed survey of the impact of proposal on local residents and businesses;

- Local industrial / retail businesses will struggle to recruit employees due to traffic congestion;
- Businesses will struggle to ship and receive goods;
- Harmful impacts on tourism and the Hamble maritime and aviation industry and history; and
- Development likely to cause negative social behaviour and annoyance.
- *Impact on the marine economy:*
  - The people/businesses that rely on the marina will suffer if the result is boat owners relocating the vessels;
  - Loss of staff / customers;
  - Mercury Yacht Harbour is less than 500 metres away from the proposed site and is in the exact same direction as the prevailing south westerly winds;
  - Vessels in marinas will be covered by aggressive dust, grit and potentially other corrosive contaminants that will damage gelcoat, teak decks, sails and canvas work;
  - The industrialisation of Hamble is likely to have a direct negative impact on the local leisure marine industry;
  - Hamble attempts to be a holiday destination with the sailing will be ruined;
  - Hamble is known internationally as a sailing hotspot with a rich and long heritage and reputation would be damaged beyond repair.
  - Hamble is one of the busiest leisure boating destinations on the south coast and a jewel of a village in Hampshire;
  - Businesses will close and relocate;
  - Proposal will result in people finding different venues to sail and get boats repaired;
  - Marine industries contribute £28.8m per annum to the local economy; and
  - Impact on yachting.
- *Impact tourism:*
  - Reduction in visitor numbers to the village;
  - Loss of tourism;
  - Mercury Holiday Park will be affected due to proximity to the site; and
  - Impact on attractiveness of Hamble Week.
- *Other matters:*
  - Local property houses will be affected;
  - Loss of major local amenity and wildlife space for runners, sports clubs and dog walkers;
  - The area is a social hub of the community meeting at various times of the day which is important for peoples mental health and wellbeing;

- Dog walkers will have to walk their dogs in alternative locations most likely going there by car;
- Increased insurance costs;
- Fuel, wear and tear costs associated with the increased traffic;
- Infringes human rights to enjoyment of home and possessions due to noise and disturbance;
- The development will make it undesirable for young families to live in the village;
- How can the secondary school children enjoy PE sessions and their much-needed outdoor break times; and
- If quarry is approved, County Council will fail in their duty of care to businesses in the area.

184. *Community engagement:*

- Lack of communication / engagement / willingness by applicant from the applicant;
- Merely tick box public consultation by applicant and very little consultation before the application was submitted / was too limited;
- No information was given in applicants Community Engagement Pamphlet regarding onsite working hours or detailed anticipation of offsite noise levels;
- Online consultation was too short / very sparse;
- The lack of detail from the applicant on the impact on communities suggests applicant knows they are bad;
- The consultation period should have been extended and the full plans and impacts made fully available;
- A lack of face-to-face engagement to allow residents and parish councils the opportunity to scrutinise their proposal;
- No direct communication from applicant to home owners proposal will affect;
- Lack of consultation of berth holders by the Planning Authorities or the Harbour Authority;
- Timing of Regulation 25 parts 1 / 2 consultations – over Christmas period;
- There has not been sufficient time for Hamble residents to prepare a response given the amount of new technical information (Reg 25 part 2);
- County Council has not helped local residents to understand complex issues arising from the development;
- Concerns about the fairness and transparency of the planning process;
- Technical language of documents - needs to be put into plain English, otherwise it is excluding a fair democratic process;
- It is impossible to identify where the new information submitted is as they are embodied in revised versions of previously submitted documents;

- Timings for the consultation for Regulation 25 (part 2) over Christmas with a deadline on 16th January were not appropriate; and
- Cemex did not comply to the Regulation 25 (part 2) deadline.

185. *Other issues:*

- *Reputation of the applicant:*
  - Applicant has poor reputation from development at other sites;
  - Applicant has no experience of managing such a quarry in the heart of a village, surrounded by schools, housing and healthcare; and
  - Applicant cannot be trusted to abide by regulations, rules and legislation in fact and in spirit.
- *Future use of the site:*
  - Surrounding area has undergone massive development of housing in recent years;
  - Housebuilders have initiated the extraction as a precursor to their ultimate aim to build on the land therefore any 're-wilding' by Cemex will be short lived and is an attempt to 'sugar-coat' these underlying intentions;
  - Future uncertainty regarding the land usage;
  - Area cannot sustain any further housing which the landowner will probably pursue; and
  - Increased housing developments and no traffic management.
- *Planning process:*
  - Website, language and processes are designed for those who work in the field of planning and disadvantage ordinary people;
  - Confusion about which Plan will provide the context for decision making;
  - Consultees haven't dealt with application properly; and
  - What Risk Assessments and Environmental Studies have taken place in response to this application?
- *Agriculture and livestock:*
  - Impact (e.g. dust) on livestock (including horses).
- *Impact on residential values:*
  - No compensation for any effects (lowering house prices, higher house insurance, health care etc) on the residents;
  - Effect on house prices and houses will be unsaleable; and
  - Devaluing of houses.
- The planning application specifically excludes residential gardens from the plans. This is outdated as gardens in plot sizes of up to 0.5 hectares are now considered and used as part of modern living space;
- *Timescales:*
  - No guarantee that even this long timescale estimate could not be further extended; and
  - Trying to portray the gravel extraction as a short term project of 7 - 13 years is misleading.
- There are not enough school places or doctors surgeries;

- Increase in Council Tax for the roads;
- Planning application is an example of corporate greed;
- Applicants list of benefits for the village is laughable;
- Overdevelopment is at the point of ruining what was a pleasant area with green land;
- Should work with the developers of this site to make it work for the residents; and
- Proposals are short-sighted and show a lack of understanding for the area.
- *Other planning appeals:*
  - Recent residential development proposal that was refused; application O/18/84191 was refused and dismissed at appeal with comments that Hamble Lane was already operating above capacity AM and PM;
  - Residential development on the old GE site was refused by the Planning Inspectorate on January 15, 2021; and
  - County Council objected (March 2021) to a smaller 61 home development on Satchell Lane 'due to the cumulative impact of traffic flows on Hamble Lane.
- The application is certainly abundant with 'greenwash'.

186. **Paul Holmes MP:** Has objected to the proposal in representations received dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2022, 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2022 and 17 July 2023. A summary of the objection areas are as follows:

- Great concerns that the application is not based on up-to-date traffic survey data and accident data. Traffic survey data is outside the scope of what would be considered acceptable by the County Council and this is recognised by the applicant who acknowledge the covid-19 pandemic as a reason for the age of the surveys. Personal Injury Data was also from 2016.
- Concerns about the proposed HGV impacts on morning and afternoon rush hour periods;
- Inaccuracies in the Transport Assessment:
  - i. It suggests the latest available accident record does not highlight any existing highway defects or safety issues that would be exacerbated by the proposed development;
  - ii. The proposal will lead to a huge increase in traffic and congestion along the route which will impact on residents, emergency services, commuters and visitors as well as leading to heavy wear on the existing infrastructure including a weak railway bridges;
  - iii. Vehicle movements cited do not include staff, visitors, contractors, management, etc adding further vehicular pressure;
  - iv. The report suggests that the current depressed traffic numbers along the route are a result of existing congestion deterring people making car trips during the peak periods. This does not justify increasing congestion further and additionally depressing local travel;

- v. Road traffic data takes into account development on land at Berry Farm, land North of Cranbury Gardens and the land South of Bursledon Road now completed. However, survey data acknowledge these developments have been completed but not whether these dwellings were occupied at the time of the survey thereby missing the additional increase in traffic stemming from the gradual increase in occupation rates. Consequently, no traffic associated with the previously identified committed developments has been added to the local highway network;
- Cemex's financial contributions towards improvements along the Hamble Lane corridor are not clear and specific commitments from Cemex regarding these improvements proportionate to the disruption have not been made;
  - Lack of consultation with community and stakeholders – lack of transparency or willingness to meet anyone or conduct any physical surveys. Severe long-term effects on local schools and residents through dust with no substantial consultation response to the health concerns outlined by the local community;
  - Location and unique nature of this settlement and roads means it is an unsuitable site and the application should be refused;
  - *Traffic and congestion* - The existing highway network is already under extreme pressure as a result of overdevelopment, particularly on Hamble Lane. Congestion is a major issue and the proposal would make the issue much worse. The impact of traffic and congestion is unacceptable. Huge expansion in traffic and congestion along the route which will impact on residents, emergency services, commuters and other visitors and on an already congested route. This will lead to rapid and heavy wear on the existing limited infrastructure including a weak railway bridge already showing signs of instability. Important planning precedents have already been taken where a housing development in the area has been refused partly on highways grounds which was subsequently endorsed by the Planning Inspectorate in dismissing the appeal for housing schemes on the basis of highway impacts;
  - *Proximity to local schools* - Proximity to local schools and the associated noise, air quality (including dust), health and highway impacts. Traffic accidents recorded involving school children. Granting permission for additional HGV movements will be very dangerous;
  - *Other environmental concerns* – noise, air quality (including dust), health and other environmental considerations associated with the construction and operation of the site on local residents. These will cause a significant adverse impact on residents as reflected in the assessment undertaken to support the application. This is inevitable as the site is in the middle of the village. The development of the site cannot be mitigated;
  - *Loss of green space and public amenity* – the site is a valued piece of land which is used by local residents for leisure and recreation purposes. The proposal does little to consider the impact on public amenity when the site is being worked;
  - *Site allocation in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan* - Notwithstanding the site allocation in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, the site is unsuitable for this type of development, and its allocation should not be used



as an excuse to allow this proposal. Hamble Airfield has always been an unsuitable site allocation and now that subsequent development has taken place on the peninsular, the suitability of the allocation has further reduced. The site should be deleted from the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan;

- *Highway Authority response* - Inadequate / woeful response from the Highway Authority and that the remedial amount proposed through the legal agreement will not be enough to make the necessary amendments to the highway;
- Level of local opposition to the planning application and the need to consider all issues raised.

187. A number of petitions were received from the Hamble Primary School which included letters of objection from parents and grandparents of pupils at the school. These included the following:

1. Petition 1 – 39 representations included;
2. Petition 2 – 59 representations included;
3. Petition 3 – 72 representations included;
4. Petition 5 – 82 representations included; and
5. Petition 4 – 8 representations included.

188. A number of representations have been received from school children during the application processing. Following advice in relation to data protection, these have not been published on our website but have been reviewed by officers.

189. The petitions focused on the following issues: concerns about noise, dust, air quality, traffic congestion, duration and flooding.

190. The Hamble Peninsular Residents Group (HPRG) submitted a number of different objections relating to the following areas (please note, the website published dates are shown below):

1. 18/01/2023 – Distance from the school and health implications;
2. 20/01/2023 – Lack of response from Network Rail, bridge stability and flooding;
3. 20/01/2023 – Bridge stability and flooding;
4. 27/01/2023 - Further comments regarding the Network Rail Bridge on Hamble Lane;
5. 30/01/2023 – Lack of response from the River Hamble Harbour Master;
6. 30/01/2023 – Location, traffic, flood risk, air quality, dust, health, impacts on children, ecological impact, noise, safety, community impact, displacement of recreation and economic impact;
7. 08/02/2023 – Consultation with the River Hamble Harbour Master and berth holders, concerns over environmental impact and dust;
8. 06/03/2023 – Concerns over highways information and wider highway concerns;

9. 14/03/2023 – Highways;
10. 12/04/2023 – NPPF consideration;
11. 12/04/2023 – Location, distance from schools, ecological impact, hydrology concerns, lack of consideration of impacts on residents, housing, the railing and nearby SSSI, inadequate site access, noise, dust;
12. 03/05/2023 – Proximity to sensitive receptors and associated health risks;
13. 05/05/2023 – Highways mitigation;
14. 05/05/2023 – Lack of community engagement, concerns about the Highway Authority response;
15. 09/05/2023 – Economic impact;
16. 09/05/2023 – Flaws in HRAs and consideration of habitats, off-site aquatic impacts, species disturbance, impact assessment methodology;
17. 18/05/2023 – Flooding and climate change;
18. 31/05/2023 - Many aspects of the planning application including amenity, highway, flooding and ecological impacts and mitigation;
19. 13/07/2023 – Buffer zones;
20. 13/07/2023 – Displacement of recreation, no alternative green space options, flaws in HRAs, BNG calculation not correct, inadequate mitigation measures;
21. 17/07/2023 – Highways and mitigation;
22. 01/08/2023 – Air quality;
23. 30/08/2023 - Number of officer visits to Hamble Lane;
24. 25/09/2023 – Update on Regulation 25 progress;
25. 29/09/2023 – Update on Regulation 25 progress;
26. 29/09/2023 – Update on Regulation 25 progress;
27. 16/10/2023 – Highways FOIs;
28. 19/10/2023 – Highways;
29. 20/10/2023 – Update on Regulation 25 progress;
30. 26/10/2023 - Public Health and Air Quality;
31. 31/10/2023 - Highway concerns;
32. 20/11/2023 – Highways design;
33. 22/11/2023 - Regulation 25 further information;;
34. 22/11/2023 – Regulation 25 further information;
35. 13/12/2023 – Highways;
36. 02/01//2024 – Air quality;
37. 17/01/2024 – Dust;
38. 24/01/2024 – Community engagement;
39. 25/01/2024– Noise;
40. 25/01/2024– Rights of Way;
41. 25/01/2024– Highways;
42. 25/01/2024 - Clarification documents;
43. 25/01/2024 - Health;
44. 08/02/2024 - Rights of Way;
45. 08/02/2024 – Air quality clarification document;
46. 19/02/2024 – Hydrology;
47. 19/02/2024 – Ecology;
48. 19/02/2024 – Habitats Regulations Assessment;

- 49. 20/02/2024 – Ecology;
- 50. 22/02/2024 – Economic impact;
- 51. 05/03/2024 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; and
- 52. 22/04/2024 – Need, climate change.

191. The HPRG object to the proposal and their reasons can be summarised as follows:

*Climate change:*

- Proposal is not in accordance with Policy 2: Climate change of the HMWP (2023).

*Need:*

- Hampshire has already fulfilled its requirements for sharp sand and gravel, up to 2036, satisfying national planning policy and requirements of the HMWP (2013);
- Existing supplies could easily be extended to at least 2044, based upon the Minerals and Waste Plan Update proposals without the need for the heavily constrained Hamble Airfield site being utilised;
- Extraction of excess, gravel and sand over the targeted supply limits fails to meet the requirements of both national and local climate change policy. It fails to recognise the changes in demand for land won aggregates as the UK moves towards Net Zero;
- Inaccuracies of the LAA; and
- The application itself has failed to adequately tackle the issue of climate change, the release of carbon from the land and trees, nor does it address the County Council's Climate Crisis policy and strategy. The proposed quarry at Hamble Airfield does not align with these policies.

*Ecological impact:*

- Shadow HRA is inaccurate on screening, BNG and recreational displacement matters;
- Habitat loss – inadequately addressed loss of scrub habitat and its effect on fauna. Opportunity for greater biodiversity net gain not explored;
- Off-site (aquatic) habitat damage;
- Disturbance of bats, birds and reptiles from lighting;
- Impact assessment methodology – method to determine the impact significance is not based on recognised good practice; inconsistent and unsafe for biodiversity;
- Proposal is not in accordance with Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species of the HMWP (2013) in relation to the shadow HRA and recreational displacement;
- Significant harm to the ecology of the site would be caused;
- Incomplete survey work;
- Inadequate mitigation measures;
- Potential impact on the SSSI site;

- Displacement of recreational activities – the land is no longer available to residents if permission granted;
- HRA assessment issues/concerns;
- BNG calculation – ‘over-inflated’ due to failure of accounting for displacement and additional impact on other designated sites; and
- Mitigation measures are inadequate.

*Restoration:*

- Proposal is not considered accordance with ‘Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments’ of the HMWP (2013) as significant harm cannot be avoided; and
- Restoration – much smaller pocket of land available for recreation; residents likely to use alternative sites putting pressure on SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites.

*Amenity and health:*

- Close proximity to sensitive receptors (residential houses, schools, playing fields etc);
- Unacceptably close to amenities and dwellings, historic village, schools, residential areas, etc;
- Lack of detailed awareness of the actual distance of the site from schools and residential areas;
- Very serious health concerns;
- Proposal is not in accordance with ‘Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity’ of the HMWP (2013) as it would cause an unacceptable impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters;
- Lack of consideration by the County Council in relation to the rationale for the inclusion of a 100-metre buffer zone around a quarry. Instead, the County Council appear to have nominally defined the 100-metre distance. This flies in the face of good policy making;
- Technical Guidance of the NPPF states that ‘In line with research carried out by Arup Environmental/Ove Arup and Partners and the University of Newcastle upon Tyne in 1995 and 1999 respectively, additional measures to control PM10 might be necessary if, within a site, the actual source of emission (e.g. the haul roads, crushers, stockpiles etc.) is within 1,000m of any residential property or other sensitive use. Operators should follow the assessment framework in figure 1.1 for considering the impacts of PM10 from a proposed site;
- Physical and mental health implications of the proposal;
- Proximity of Hamble Primary School, Hamble Sports Complex, Hamble Skate Park, Blackthorn Surgery and residential housing;
- Emission and dispersion of air pollution;
- Dust impact modelling robustness;
- Impact of dust on amenity and health;
- Health impacts (including mental health impacts) associated with air pollution, including silicosis;

- Lack of evidence that Cemex considered the negative impact on children`s health;
- Increased risk to children that cross Hamble Lane to go to school;
- Impact on children and their safety and on the operation of nearby schools;
- Impact on public safety - fear and intimidation;
- Impact on police and emergency services; and
- Fear from explosives and dangerous chemicals buried on site.

*Hydrology and flooding:*

- Concerns about recent flooding that caused fire;
- Water management plan robustness;
- Network Rail objected to the location of the lagoon relative to the railway;
- No consultation with the Environment Agency on current data;
- Lack of necessary drainage permissions from Southern Water;
- Key statutory report missing from the Flood Authority;
- Concerns about the long-term impacts of gravel extraction and replacement materials; and
- Concern about serious flooding and water run-off to properties as well as SSSI and conservation areas, polluting River Hamble and Southampton Water.

*Countryside, public access:*

- Impacts on public open space and access to opportunities for sport and physical activity; and
- Displacement of recreation.

*Design:*

- Proposal is not in accordance with Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the HMWP (2013);
- Site access – not adequate, tree loss;
- Concerns about dust suspension (especially in the dry summers) and associated health impacts;
- No suitable alternative natural greenspace options have been provided; and
- Concerns about how 100-metre buffer zone was set, and when and how it will be justified?

*Highways:*

- Highways design methodology;
- Data – incomplete, rosy, unrepresentative, inaccurate, generalised, inappropriate for the region;
- The lack of discussion with the community to identify specific highways mitigations that would be acceptable or required prior to the quarry work commencing;
- Risk hasn't been acknowledged;
- Road – already at full capacity;
- Too many errors, omissions, and misleading statements;

- The lack of confidence the local community now has in the highway authority to represent their views and needs, due to the lack of communication and collaboration;
- Inadequate (cycle) paths – cyclists have to cycle over the narrow bridge, slowing the traffic (safety concerns);
- 500K fund for cycling lane would not solve the problem; and
- Hamble Lane at full capacity; cannot cope with road congestion.

*Planning process:*

- Lack of evidence of issues that are raised by the group and other consultees being dealt with;
- Proposal is not considered in accordance with 'Policy 14: Community benefits' of the HMWP (2013) as the restoration and aftercare of minerals and waste sites should be appropriate to the environment, with local communities having a role in the preparation of restoration and aftercare schemes; and
- The failure to adequately communicate ideas or intentions with the local planning authority and all Parish Councils across the entire peninsula.

*Socio and economic impacts:*

- Negative economic impact of the proposal;
- Impact on local businesses and tourism;
- Instability of the railway bridge;
- Economic impact statement does not acknowledge the potential costs; and
- Expected fall in revenue for local businesses.

*Other issues:*

- Lack of community engagement;
- Lack of consultation with local berth holders;
- Harbour Master engagement;
- Impact on railway line and Southern Water facilities;
- Uncertainty of the dates for starting and completing work on the M27;
- Large number of housing developments have put strain on the local infrastructure and caused traffic jams;
- How many physical visits were undertaken of the Hamble Lane during the application?; and
- Lack of minutes, errors of judgement by senior officers and maladministration.

192. The applicant has prepared a number of responses to the concerns raised by consultees including:

- [Clarification Response to further Objections \(11 December 2023\);](#)
- [Clarification Response to RoW \(Reg 25 - 3 November 2023\);](#)
- [Clarification Response to EHO \(Reg 25 - 3 November 2023\);](#)
- [Clarification Response to Landscape \(Reg 25 - 3 November 2023\);](#)
- [Clarification Response to Natural England \(Reg 25 3 November 2023\);](#)

- [Clarification Response to the UKHSA \(and others\) on Air Quality \(19 April 2023\);](#)
- [Response to Arboriculture Comments \(14 March 2023\);](#)
- [Hydro Reg Response to NE, Ecology and LLFA \(Reg 25 28 November 2022\);](#)
- [Hydro Reg 25 Response to Network Rail and EA \(Reg 25 28 November 2022\);](#)
- [Trees CEMEX Response to Tree Officer \(Reg 25 28 November 2022\);](#)
- [CEMEX Response to Parish Council Concerns \(Reg 25 2 December 2022\);](#)
- [Cemex Clarification Response to further objections since the first Reg 25 submission \(11 December 2023\);](#)
- [Clarification Response to LLFA Comments from Applicant \(19 February 2024\);](#) and
- [Clarification response to Arboriculture comments from the applicant \(April 2024\).](#)

193. The above issues will be addressed within the '[Commentary](#)' section below, (except where identified as not being relevant to the decision).

### **Habitats Regulations Assessment [HRA]**

194. In accordance with the [Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017](#) (the Habitats Regulations), Hampshire County Council (as a 'competent authority') must undertake a formal assessment of whether a project which is the subject of an application for planning permission could affect the qualifying interest features of the following designated sites:

- Special Protection Areas [SPAs];
- Special Areas of Conservation [SACs]; and
- Ramsar sites.

195. The screening and appropriate assessment stages of the HRA process are collectively described as a 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' [HRA]. The HRA will need to be carried out unless the project is wholly connected with or necessary to the conservation management of such sites' qualifying features.

196. As already set out, the site location lies within 320 metres of three statutory designated sites within the national site network (NSN):

- Solent and Southampton Water (SSW) Special Protection Area (SPA), Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar;
- Solent Maritime (SM) Special Area of Conservation (SAC);
- The River Hamble, which lies approximately 410 metres to the east of the site, also forms part of the Solent; and

- Dorset Coast (DC) SPA, a maritime SPA designated to protect the foraging habitat of breeding terns.
197. The [Shadow HRA](#) was prepared by the applicant and was updated as part of the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage. Some representations received raised the HRA process as areas of concern. A summary of the issues raised is documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report. The HPRG in particular have argued that the shadow HRA prepared by the applicant fails to provide the quality of information required to satisfy the regulatory requirements of the HRA process.
198. Officers requested that the Environment Agency (EA) reconsider the submitted hydrological assessment and a follow up response was submitted by the EA (dated 17 April 2024). This concluded that overall the findings were fit for purpose and as the applicant plans to install attenuation ponds and infiltration swales and runoff will be directed to these. These should be developed in the appropriate places to mimic the current groundwater flow discharge to the springs. Surface runoff should be directed in the correct proportions to these attenuation ponds. If the attenuation ponds are located in the correct locations, the EA believe that the scale of impacts would be small and not sufficient to have any detrimental impacts on the designated sites although they defer to Natural England on this as the lead authority.
199. As competent authority, the County Council undertook its own independent screening and appropriate assessment (see [HRA Record Draft for Natural England Approval](#)). The HRA hereby carried out considers the proposed development to have no likely significant effect on the identified European designated sites. The development is neither connected to nor necessary to the management of any designated sites.
200. It is acknowledged that the proposed development includes environmental mitigation for the delivery of the proposed development regardless of any potential effects the development may have on impacts on designated sites. To address and mitigate impacts relevant to the HRA, the following is of relevance:
- Noise (Disturbance of wintering and breeding birds from quarrying activities):*
- bunds will be provided prior to the commencement of the development and the construction of these bunds will be managed via a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) required via planning condition in the event permission is granted. The bunds will ensure that the background noise levels of the operations will be below the level to trigger a response from coastal birds; and



- Conditions placing noise limits will be applied for the duration of the development in the event permission is granted.

*Long term management during the course of the development and post development (30 years) (Increase recreational impacts):*

- The management plan will ensure the proposed permissive footpath remains for the 30 years period and remains attractive to users. It will also control the long term management of the community meadow to ensure that this asset is as designed and maximises the potential for local users to benefit from the site;
- Planning conditions and a s106 could also secure the fencing that will be required to ensure the footpath and then the conservation grazing through the restoration of the site.

201. The HRA concludes that the application will have no significant adverse effects on the site's integrity, alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The Competent Authority therefore agrees with the conclusions of the shadow HRA. The [HRA record](#) was sent to Natural England. The consultation period has finished but a response is still awaited. This will be reported to committee post publication date.

202. The HPRG allege that the Council will be failing to follow the guidance issued to it on at least two separate occasions so far by Natural England. This is incorrect as it is only in this officer's report that the finalised HRA for the planning application has been provided. It is this report that represents the Council's compliance with its duty as competent authority.

## **Climate Change**

203. Hampshire County Council declared a [Climate Emergency](#) on 17 June 2019. Two targets have been set for the County Council, and these also apply to Hampshire as a whole. These are to be carbon neutral by 2050 and to prepare to be resilient to the impacts of temperature rise. A [Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan](#) has since been adopted by the Council. The [Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan](#) do not form part of the development plan, but many of the principles of the Strategy and Action Plan may be of relevance to the proposal due to the nature of the development. Where these principles are of relevance, they are addressed in the relevant parts of the '[Commentary](#)' section of this report below.

204. Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should minimise their impact on the causes of climate change, and where applicable reduce vulnerability and

provide resilience to impacts of climate change by being located and designed to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the more sustainable use of resources and avoiding areas of vulnerability to climate change and flood risk or otherwise incorporate adaptation measures.

205. Policy DM3 (Adaptation to climate change) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that all development should be designed to adapt to the predicted climate change impacts. It includes a number of criteria relating to surface water flooding, sustainable drainage systems, a cooling strategy and adapting to water stress (for example, drought resistant landscape design and planting (DM3.1(c)(iv))). Policy DM4 (Zero or low carbon energy) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) relates specifically to decisions made by the Borough Council about infrastructure so is not specifically relevant to minerals development.

206. Paragraph 152 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. Paragraph 154 states that new development should be planned for in ways to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change.

207. Each chapter of the Environmental Statement has discussed the ways in which the proposal has addressed climate change, where relevant. Specifically, [Chapter 17 of the ES](#) sets out more information about the proposal in relation to climate change and sustainability. It is considered that the proposal has the potential to be affected by, and to affect climate change, in the following ways:

- Flood risk;
- Vehicle emissions;
- Use of renewable energy;
- Site location relative to market; and
- Changes to habitat Flood Risk.

208. Many representations received raised climate change aspects as areas of concern. This includes detailed responses from HPRG. A summary of the issues raised is documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

209. From a climate change perspective, national planning policy for minerals is focused on the effective management of finite mineral resources. This recognises that the United Kingdom (UK) is transitioning to increasingly more sustainable and less exploitative approaches to development, but that it remains vitally important that supplies of primary minerals are still sufficient to meet the country's present needs. Nevertheless, key forward-thinking policies have been put in place to support the change that is needed to achieve the

long-term security of mineral resources for future generations. National policy is clear that the best use of minerals needs to be made; their supplies should be sourced indigenously wherever possible; and that secondary and recycled materials and mineral waste should be seen as a valid substitution for the extraction of primary minerals (where appropriate).

210. The applicant has a Carbon Emissions Reduction programme which considers its efforts on reducing emissions through the whole supply chain and in particular in priority areas. This includes their carbon labelling for cement products to the PAS 2050 carbon measurement standard. CEMEX has also achieved the Carbon Trust Standard certification for all of its British business units to demonstrate good management practices related to carbon, and a commitment to reduce carbon emissions over a two-year period across all business areas.

*Flood risk:*

211. Projections of future climate change in the UK suggest that short-duration, high-intensity rainfall and periods of long duration rainfall will become more frequent, which needs to be accounted for in calculating off-site flood risk from developments.
212. Climate change has been fully taken into account in [Chapter 8 of the ES](#) in respect of flooding. The impact of climate change on the flood risk from the proposed development to the surrounding area is considered in section 7 of the [Flood Risk Assessment](#) (FRA).
213. Future climate change has been accounted for in the application through the inclusion of run-off calculations with an increase of 10% applied to the rainfall for the anticipated duration of extraction, and a 40% increase to rainfall applied for the restoration phase in accordance with the [NPPF \(2023\)](#). The FRA concludes that the proposed development would result in reduced off-site run-off rates during the operational period given the large voids created within the quarry itself where the water would be directed to. Post-restoration, the surface water run-off will be mitigated by a Sustainable Drainage Strategy which includes pond features within the site and infiltration trenches on the boundary. It is therefore considered that climate change has been fully accounted for in the flood risk calculations. The commentary section on [Flooding](#) will also be of relevance here where the acceptability of the supporting information being examined.

*Vehicle emissions:*

214. Some representations received noted that electric vehicles should be a material consideration at the earliest opportunity to ensure that the County Council meets its own CO<sub>2</sub> targets and conforms to national and international air pollution levels. In terms of vehicle emissions, Cemex fleet drivers receive training under the Safe and Fuel-Efficient Driving (SAFED) scheme and are regularly assessed on their fuel usage and driving style in order to reduce the quantity of fuel used and, in turn, the carbon dioxide and other emissions generated.
215. The applicant also runs a dedicated programme called Be CareFUEL focussing on all aspects of fuel usage including a general awareness campaign, fuel-saving information in driver handbooks, and driver reporting, allowing for specific targeting of areas for improvement. The applicant has also indicated that they are trialling a 50% bio-diesel fuel blend. It is indicated that Cemex's own fleet of vehicles are on average under 5 years old and over 20% of the fleet meets Euro IV or higher standards, with the majority of the remaining fleet exceeding Euro III standards.
216. The proposed use of the site will result in additional vehicle movements to and from the site with associated emissions which can impact on climate change. However, these are being minimised as far as possible using the above measures to prevent impacts on climate change, and the impact of this on air quality has been assessed in [ES Chapter 8](#) to be negligible. The impacts of the proposal on air quality are discussed in more detail in the section of this report dealing with [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#).

*Use of renewable energy:*

217. The applicant has indicated that they use 100% renewable electricity at all UK sites, in partnership with energy group Engie. The energy that will supply the proposal will come from 100% renewable sources including wind and solar energy. It is indicated that the applicant is looking at a wide range of energy initiatives and ideas that can be rolled out across their sites. This could include solar panels, wind turbines, energy monitoring, car EV charging points, condition monitoring sensors, mobile plant telemetry sensors, energy saving opportunities, lower level external lighting towers and use of timers on equipment.

*Site location relative to market:*

218. The applicant notes that there are significant infrastructure projects planned in the local area and that it is imperative that the impacts on climate change are minimised by HGVs not having to travel significant distances to supply local projects. Major development areas include residential development in South Hampshire such as Wellborne and major highways schemes. It is clear the quarry could help to serve the South Hampshire market area. The sections of this report dealing with [Demonstration of need for mineral resource](#) and [Suitability of site location](#) are of relevance.

*Changes to habitat:*

219. The applicant has acknowledged that whilst habitats within the extraction area would be lost as a result of the working, this loss would be phased and the site progressively restored as it is worked. The habitats to be replaced on the site would be of greater biodiversity value than the site as it stands. As such the impact on habitats would be an improvement in biodiversity terms following the proposed development. Once the site has been restored, with increased biodiversity gain to the habitats, it is expected that the numbers of species on-site will increase as a result of the improved site habitat. The [Ecology](#) section covers such matters in more detail.

*Other matters:*

220. Some representations suggest that the proposal not in keeping with the declared climate emergency, and/or is in breach of the Hampshire County Council [Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan](#) and the need to avoid carbon intensive activities. These concerns are noted. There is still a need for minerals development to support the economy and the focus is on considering whether the development is acceptable.

221. The HPRG allege that the application provides no mitigation for carbon reduction in the proposals for example on soils. It is recognised that there is not a detailed carbon assessment in relation to soils. However, there is not a current policy requirement in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) to do so. This is not an area which can be considered to be a reason for rejection.

*Conclusions on climate change:*

222. *The application includes* a sufficient assessment of potential climate change impacts and associated mitigation and adaptation in accordance with Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adoption) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy DM3 (Adaptation to climate change) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). Key climate change impacts are also covered by the relevant sections of the commentary.

## Commentary

223. The commentary section discusses the key planning issues that are relevant to the proposal in more detail. These are as follows:

- [Development Plan and principle of the development;](#)
- [Demonstration of need for mineral resource;](#)
- [Need for waste management provision;](#)
- [Consideration of alternatives;](#)
- [Ecology;](#)
- [Location in the countryside and settlement gap;](#)
- [Landscape and visual impact;](#)
- [Arboriculture;](#)
- [Soil protection;](#)
- [Public Rights of Way and access;](#)
- [Design and sustainability;](#)
- [Cultural and archaeological heritage;](#)
- [Impact on public health, safety and amenity;](#)
- [Impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters and flooding;](#)
- [Links to environmental permitting;](#)
- [Highways impact;](#)
- [Restoration and aftercare;](#)
- [Socio-economic impacts;](#)
- [Community engagement and the planning process;](#)
- [Community benefits;](#)
- [Other matters raised;](#)
- [Non-material planning issues raised in representations;](#) and
- [Legal agreement.](#)

### Development Plan and principle of the development

224. This first section of the commentary summarises the main policy context for the proposal.

225. The main focus of the proposal is on the extraction of sharp sand and gravel. Hampshire's most widely worked local mineral is land-won sand and gravel. It is an important resource used for the building industry for construction materials such as concrete. The mineral resources located on site are safeguarded through Policy 15 (Safeguarding: mineral resources) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The application represents an opportunity to utilise these mineral resources. More information on the need for the proposal is set out in [Demonstration of need for mineral resource](#).

226. Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that an adequate and steady supply of aggregates until 2030 will be provided for Hampshire and surrounding areas from local and sand gravel sites '*at a rate of 1.56mtpa, of which 0.28mtpa will be soft sand*'. This is considered in more detail in the [Demonstration of need for mineral resource](#) part of this commentary.

227. The site is allocated in part 3 (iii) of Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) as a new sand and gravel extraction site, provided the proposals address the development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - Site allocations' of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The following development considerations are relevant to the proposal:

- Protection of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site and Solent Maritime SAC;
- The impact on all roosting and foraging areas used by qualifying bird species of the nearby SPA and Ramsar site;
- Protection of the Lee on Solent to Itchen Valley Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest;
- The impact on Badnam Copse and West Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation;
- Safeguarding of adjacent public rights of way (footpath no. 1);
- Maintain and manage existing informal recreational use of the site;
- Phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity of local residents;
- Protection of the water quality and recharge of the groundwater and surface water;
- Safe and satisfactory access to ensure provision is made for vulnerable highway users and the impact on peak flows is managed; and
- Traffic issues including consideration of school traffic and pedestrians, particularly at Hamble School and Hamble Primary, and management of traffic and congestion on Hamble Lane.

228. A conclusion on whether the proposal has had due regard to the above development considerations is included in the relevant sections of this commentary section.

229. Many representations indicated that the site was allocated in 2013 but much has changed locally since then, such as additional development in the locality and other environmental issues. These concerns are acknowledged. The site is allocated in the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#). Therefore, the focus for decision making needs to be on whether the proposal as submitted meets the requirements of the site allocation as well as the relevant policies of the Plan.

230. The [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that inert construction and demolition wastes can be directed to mineral workings (quarries) for agreed restoration schemes. The use of inert fill material to complete the approved restoration scheme designed to deliver a beneficial afteruse is supported by the [PPG \(Waste\)](#) as well as Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). This is considered in more detail in the [Need for waste management provision](#) part of this commentary.
231. A [Geological Report](#) was submitted as part of the application. This documented the findings of the drilling investigations undertaken in 1995 and 2017 which indicated an economically viable sand and gravel deposit (comprised of 52% gravel and 37% sand) at the site. An assessment of the available sand and gravel has determined a net saleable resource of 1.672 million tonnes (mt) at the site.
232. Many representations alleged that the EIA produced is inadequate. The acceptability of the information submitted in relation to particular issues will be considered in the appropriate sections of the commentary below.
233. Paragraph 6.2.50 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) identifies the future of Hamble Airfield as one of the pressing issues for the area. Policy HA3 (Hamble Airfield) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that *'if permission is granted for the extraction of sand and gravel at Hamble Airfield and the extraction takes place, the site shall be restored in accordance with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and it shall be retained as an area of accessible countryside and open space with grazing, public access and outdoor recreation facilities laid out to the satisfaction of the Borough Council'*. It is important to note that the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) does not include any commitment for the site to be retained in this manner so this aspect of Policy HA3 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) is contrary to the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
234. Whether the proposal is considered to be in accordance with paragraph 11 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#), Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Strategic Policy S1 (Delivering sustainable development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) will be considered in the remaining sections of this commentary.

#### Demonstration of need for mineral resource

235. As noted above, Hampshire's most widely worked local mineral is land-won sand and gravel. It is an important resource used by the building industry for construction materials such as concrete.



236. The proposal would contribute 1.7 (mt) of land-won sharp sand and gravel to the market if permission is granted. The rate of extraction would be approximately 250,000 tonnes per annum (tpa). As such, extraction is likely to last for 7 years with restoration taking place over a further 7 years (a total development period of 14 years).

237. When looking at the issue of need, it is important to consider aggregate supply and demand. The need for aggregate is considered in Section 10 of the [Planning Statement](#) as well as other sections of the ES. In addition, section 8 of the [Planning Statement](#) also sets out the benefits of the proposal and highlights the applicant's view that the aggregate extracted is required to facilitate many types of development needed in the Borough. In particular, the expansion of Southampton Airport, and the construction of approximately 120,000 new homes planned over 15 years are given as examples of developments that could use the aggregate extracted from the site. A number of bypass projects planned or under construction are also highlighted as projects in the area which require aggregates to be supplied.

238. Concerns were raised as part of the consultation process in relation to the business case and the overarching need for sand and gravel. These are acknowledged.

239. The [NPPF \(2023\)](#) recognises that *'since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation'*. Paragraph 215 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) also states that *"it is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs"*. Paragraph 219 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by, amongst other things, preparing an annual Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA), making provision in minerals plans and maintaining landbanks of at least seven years for sand and gravel, whilst ensuring that the capacity of operations to supply a wide range of materials is not compromised. The [NPPF \(2023\)](#) therefore supports mineral extraction and recognises the importance of ensuring a long-term supply through a landbank of at least 7 years. A landbank is the number of years of reserves remaining at an annual rate of aggregate supply. It is important to note that there is no theoretical maximum landbank that a minerals authority can achieve.

240. The focus of the need for a proposal in Hampshire is on the performance of Policy 17 (Aggregate – supply and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) through annual monitoring. Landbank requirements are translated into Policy 20 (Local

land won aggregates) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The County Council undertakes annual monitoring of the performance of Policy 17 (Aggregate – supply and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

241. The [LAA](#) shows that sales of land-won sand and gravel in Hampshire have shown a recent trend of steady decline. Paragraph 6.2 of the [LAA](#) reports that “sales of aggregates appear to follow the same overall trend, with all aggregates showing a decline in sales in 2022”. Furthermore, paragraph 6.3 goes on to say that “the ‘total aggregate sales’ line shows the steady decline of total aggregate sales since 2018, with a rapid decline over the last year”.

242. The [LAA](#) reports that the total permitted reserves for sand and gravel (sharp sand and gravel and soft sand) of 10.588 million tonnes (mt). The landbank in 2022 was 7.36 years based on the local requirement. The local requirement is the provision rate of 1.28mtpa for sharp sand and gravel set out in the adopted Plan. However, the landbank was 12.73 years based on the 2022 Annual Provision Rate (APR) rate and 10-year average sales as set out below. The APR is determined each year based on sales data and economic and construction forecasts.

243. The following extract from the LAA sets out Hampshire’s reserves and landbank.

**Table 3: Hampshire reserves and landbank**

|                                | Permitted Reserve (Mt) | Landbank based upon Local Requirement (Years)* | Landbank based upon 2022 APR Rate (years)** | Landbank based upon 10yr average sales between 2013-2022 (years) | Landbank based upon 3yr average sale between 2020-2022 (years) | Landbank based upon 2022 sales (years) |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Soft Sand</b>               | 1.167                  | 4.17   | 7.29  | 7.29   | 14.59  | 12.97                                  |
| <b>Sharp Sand &amp; Gravel</b> | 9.420                  | 7.36   | 12.73                                       | 12.73  | 13.65  | 17.13                                  |
| <b>Combined SS+SSG***</b>      | 10.588                 | 6.79   | 11.90                                       | 11.76  | 13.75  | 16.54                                  |

Source: Aggregate Monitoring Surveys, 2013-2022

Please note: the silica sand landbank is incorporated into the soft sand landbank as the resources can be classed as either soft sand or silica

\*Local Requirement for SS&G – 1.28, Soft Sand – 0.28, Total – 1.56 (mtpa)

\*\*APR Rate for SS&G – 0.74, Soft Sand – 0.16, Total – 0.9 (mtpa)

\*\*\*In some cases, operators were unable to quantify the individual sharp sand & gravel and soft sand reserves and only provide a total reserve. This has been assumed to be Sharp sand and gravel as the only three quarries which produce soft sand in Hampshire provided reserve figures

*Figure 1 - Hampshire’s Reserves and Landbank taken from the LAA (2023)*

244. When considering the [LAA](#) local and the APR requirements, it is acknowledged that the landbank is above the minimum 7 year requirement.

However, it is important to note that the majority of current sand and gravel reserves in Hampshire are contained in one site (Blashford Quarry (Plumley Wood)) which could have implications for the future supply if any issues with extraction were encountered.

245. The [LAA](#) also considers other relevant information relating to future need. To determine the 2022 APR, a range of relevant growth forecast factors were applied to the sales data. This was applied to gauge whether the 10-year average sales data was an appropriate provision rate, or whether there is likely to be an increase or decrease in this demand. It is accepted that 10-year sales data does encompass long-term trends but can be slow to adjust to rapid changes, particularly where a shift in trends is more recent. The approach whereby growth factors are applied to sales data returned that year has been used consistently for the past 5 years in the LAAs produced by Hampshire County Council and its partner plan-making authorities.
246. Section 7 of the [LAA](#) provides further information on areas which may impact the demand for aggregates including infrastructure projects. Paragraph 7.1 of the [LAA](#) notes that infrastructure projects are likely to place an additional demand of future aggregate in Hampshire in relation to housing, transport and other developments (including Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) and other redevelopment projects). Paragraph 7.20 of the [LAA](#) notes that the “*planned infrastructure in Hampshire suggests that there will be a continued demand for aggregate and a need to plan for that demand*”.
247. Minerals markets are not fixed to administrative boundaries. However, the demand is such in South Hampshire that it can be assumed that most of the mineral extracted here would be used locally. There is not a land-won site currently operating in this part of the South Hampshire market area. The [LAA](#) notes potential future need for aggregates, noting the expansion of Southampton Airport, the County Council’s Capital Programme projects (such as new schools), Development Consent Orders projects, and a number of housing and transport projects planned. It also notes the fact that to be able to meet this further anticipated demand, Hampshire will greatly need to increase its land-won aggregate landbank. Other future infrastructure projects are also likely to increase future demand for aggregates.
248. Since the adoption of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), sharp sand and gravel proposals at Roeshot, Forest Lodge Home Farm and extensions at Bleak Hill and Roke Manor have achieved planning permission. Roeshot has a permitted extraction rate of 3.0mt but is yet to commence operations. Bleak Hill is currently operational and is due to be completed by 2025. At the time of writing this report, Forest Lodge Home Farm is mothballed (in autumn 2023) and is due to

be completed by 2027 based on current permissions in place. The Roke Manor extension is due to commence extraction in 2024. These permissions all help to bolster the landbank. However, it is acknowledged that with the mothballing of operations and the fact that Roeshot has yet to commence, some caution is needed on what the actual reserves and rate of extraction currently are in Hampshire. The need for caution is set out in the [LAA](#).

249. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is also currently considering a proposal at Purple Haze for the extraction of soft sand and a smaller proportion of sharp sand and gravel (planning application [21/10459](#)). A planning application for a windfall (not allocated) sharp sand extraction site is also being considered at Ashley Manor Farm, near New Milton (planning application [22/10823](#)). Any potential reserves from these planning applications cannot be included in landbank projections until (and in the event that) planning permission is granted (following the completion of any associated legal agreements).

250. The HPRG submitted a representation relating to need and the findings of the [LAA](#). They note that ‘the figures in the [LAA](#) are known not to be accurate. They alleged that “*Hampshire County Council know this and yet no mention of this is made in the [LAA](#) 2022 itself, giving a false impression of supply levels*”. They go on to indicate that they have more accurate figures which shows the landbank supply of sand and gravel in Hampshire is 14 years, as of 2022 although no clear evidence of this is provided. It is important to note that the [LAA](#) is produced by the County Council and its partner authorities and based on the data available to the authorities at the time of preparation. The draft is then considered and ratified by the South East England Aggregate Working party before it is finalised to ensure its robustness.

251. The restoration of the site would involve inert material. This issue is covered in more detail in [Need for waste management provision](#).

252. It is recognised that alternative supplies of sand and gravel can be provided by recycled and marine won resources. This is considered in more detail in the section on the [consideration of alternatives](#).

*Conclusion on need:*

253. It is recognised that based on data from 2022, the minimum landbank requirement for Hampshire is being met by quarries with existing planning permissions for mineral extraction in Hampshire. However, for the reasons outlined in this section and in the [LAA](#), there are pressures on certainty and location of supply which also need to be considered. It is clear that the site

could feed the South Hampshire market where there is a known need for minerals. This site is not located in proximity to any other quarries. The majority of quarries in the southern part of Hampshire are clustered in the south-west of Hampshire and serve wider areas including markets in the urban areas around Poole and Bournemouth. The mothballing of existing sites and the lack of implementation (to date) of other sites with planning permission is also an important consideration. This proposal would be able to provide mineral to the geographical areas around the eastern side of Southampton, and the western side of Fareham and Portsmouth, by using its road connections to the M27. Therefore, having a site located in South Hampshire will shorten the journeys of HGVs which would otherwise travel to this area, making it a more sustainable way of supplying the South Hampshire areas. Whilst there is clearly not a specific need to ensure the landbank requirement is met, the factors identified in the LAA in relation to caution on existing supply means that this site will help to secure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates for South Hampshire whilst also contributing to the continued maintenance of the minimum landbank of at least seven years for sand and gravel. This meets the requirements of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#), as well as the requirements of Policy 17 (Aggregate – supply and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

#### Need for waste management provision

254. The submitted [Planning Statement](#) outlines that inert materials will be utilised in the restoration of the site. Essentially, following the extraction of sand and gravel, the site will have a void which will be progressively backfilled, with inert materials, to restore the site back to the approved topographic levels. The types of materials which will be required to meet the restoration requirements for the site will be inert waste such as builders' rubble and soils.
255. The inert restoration materials will be imported at a rate of 150,000tpa whilst extraction is ongoing, increasing to 250,000tpa once extraction has ceased. The applicant estimates that infilling would take a further 6 years approximately with a further year to finalise planting once importation has ceased (a total restoration period of 7 years).
256. Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) supports development which encourages sustainable waste management and reduces the amount of waste currently sent to landfill. The principles of the waste hierarchy are embodied in Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management). This development uses inert materials to restore a mineral working, which is considered to be a beneficial use, making it a recovery of waste rather than

disposal. This means it meets the national and local requirements of driving waste to be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy. It will also reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill.

257. Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) identifies arisings of 2.49mtpa of inert waste by 2030. The [AMR \(2021\)](#) shows that the amount of inert waste put to beneficial use has increased by 22.5% from 1.18mt in 2020 to 1.45mt in 2021. This proposal will utilise inert waste to restore the site, providing additional recovery capacity, achieving objectives set out in Policy 27 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
258. Everyone involved in waste management is expected to use all reasonable methods to apply the waste hierarchy, except where, for specific waste streams, departing from the hierarchy is clearly justified. This requirement to apply the waste hierarchy comes from [The Waste \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2011](#). This legal obligation on waste producers and transferors seek to ensures that waste that should be recycled is not sent to a recovery facility or landfill for treatment or final disposal. It also seeks to ensure that planning decisions are made in the context of the waste hierarchy.
259. A summary of the issues raised in relation to waste management are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.
260. Landfill in Hampshire is considered to be 'disposal' except if the waste is inert and has a significant beneficial use. Inert wastes which are used to restore mineral workings, in civil engineering developments or for other beneficial uses are not considered disposal (landfill), but recovery. This is because the land is restored to the desired levels. It can also provide other environmental and amenity benefits. Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that where there is a beneficial outcome from the use of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste in developments, such as the restoration of mineral workings, the use will be supported provided that as far as reasonably practicable all materials capable of producing high quality recycled aggregates have been removed for recycling. In this regard, Policy 30 is linked to Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregate) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). It is considered that this requirement to remove materials for high-quality recycling could be secured by the inclusion of a planning condition in the event that permission is granted.
261. Concerns have been raised about whether there would be sufficient inert material available to achieve the restoration phasing in accordance with the Working and Restoration Schemes. These concerns are acknowledged. It will

be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure there is enough fill material to meet the restoration requirements. There is no evidence presented to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority which suggests that this will be an issue. Indeed, recent experience with other quarries elsewhere in Hampshire has not shown this to be a significant issue. However, it is recognised that any shortfall in achieving the required annual level of inert fill could result in the need to extend the duration of operations beyond the current envisaged time period. However, there is no evidence before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this time to suggest that the proposal is not compliant with policy in this respect. In the event that permission is granted and that there are shortages of supply, this would need to be addressed by the applicant at a later stage if this led to any changes required to the phasing and timing of development, for example.

262. It is important to note that the management of waste is not fixed to administrative boundaries, with waste arisings in one authority's area frequently being managed in another. Contracts for inert material to restore the site would be established following any permission being granted and would be based on the demands of the site at any given time. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority would expect that the type of inert material to be used at the site would include inert waste which cannot be used for any other beneficial outcome to ensure compliance with Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management), 27 (Capacity for waste management development) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development). This could be secured by a planning condition. Furthermore, in the event that permission is granted, a condition could also be applied requesting details of fill material before each phase commences. This addresses some wider concerns raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) earlier in the planning process.

*Conclusion on need for waste management:*

263. Taking all matters into consideration, with the potential to apply planning conditions on the fill material, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management), 27 (Capacity for waste management development) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) if conditions are applied on fill material in the event that permission is granted.

Consideration of alternatives

264. Paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 of [The Town and Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#) requires that an Environmental Statement should include: "*A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed*

*project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects.”*

265. [Chapter 6 of the ES](#) sets out the applicant’s assessment of potential alternatives. This considered alternative ways of meeting the demand, the site selection process, scheduling and ‘do nothing’ scenarios and are summarised below.

*Alternatives to meet demand:*

266. It is acknowledged by the applicant that there are almost no reasonable alternatives to sand and gravel for construction materials. Recycled and secondary aggregates can make a contribution for certain applications of aggregate, and the [LAA](#) shows that there are 26 active sites for recycled and secondary aggregates in Hampshire. The [LAA](#) also highlighted that sales of recycled and secondary aggregate have been falling year on year in Hampshire and for a number of years. The capacity for recycled and secondary aggregates is estimated in Hampshire’s [LAA](#) to be around 2.8mt per annum (based on 2022 sales return data). However, average sales in the last three years have been 0.72mt (0.83mt over the last ten years).

267. Recycled aggregate tends to account for around 25-30% of the supply of aggregate only, as it is limited by the supply of construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste, constraints in site locations given the processes required to produce recycled aggregate which can be detrimental to amenity, availability of appropriate sites and the amount of investment needed to convert CDE waste into a high-quality aggregate. Recent figures from the Minerals Products Association had recycled aggregates accounting for 29% of the aggregate supply. Recycled aggregates tend to have a lower relative density than primary aggregates and absorb more water. Concrete from recycled aggregate often has higher drying shrinkage and creep as well as being less durable. As such primary aggregates are more consistent in performance and strength and tend to be used for concrete production over recycled aggregates that tend to be used more for fill and capping. Recycled aggregates also tend to be available in smaller quantities as they rely on waste being produced from the construction industry, so it can be less useful for larger construction projects where consistency of composition, strength and quantity is key. Therefore, materials of different physical properties and qualities are often needed to meet different end uses, and the scope to substitute one aggregate material for another can be limited.

268. As already set out, Policy 17 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out that an adequate and steady supply of aggregates until 2030 will be provided from



local sand and gravel sites, at a rate of 1.56mtpa. The supply will be augmented by safeguarding infrastructure capacity so that around 1mtpa of recycled and secondary aggregates, 2mtpa of marine aggregate and 1mtpa of limestone delivered by rail can also be supplied. This is considered to reflect the market and environmental conditions in Hampshire, without prejudicing the supply of aggregates to the wider region. It is clear that all of these sources of aggregate supply are required to provide a sufficient long-term supply in Hampshire.

269. Alternative options to dredge sand and gravel from the sea bed were raised in some representations. Marine aggregates are acknowledged as another source of supply in Hampshire, and account for the majority of the supply, with Policy 17 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) identifying a supply of approximately 2mtpa of marine-won aggregate. However, the latest [LAA \(2022\)](#) shows that actual supply was lower at just over 1.2mtpa in 2022. There are five aggregate wharves in Hampshire, with two in Southampton, one at Marchwood and the remaining two close to Portsmouth and Havant. However, supply from wharves is limited by a lack of capacity, and some wharves have closed in the last few years. Marine aggregates also have a finite supply, and there can be pressure on wharves for redevelopment given their locations, with some constrained by incompatible surrounding land uses.

270. Officers agree that assessment of alternatives of supply.

*Location alternatives:*

271. As an allocated site in [HMWP \(2013\)](#), the applicant has indicated that the site has been considered to be a suitable and sustainable site which warranted allocation. The site was considered to be an acceptable site allocation, by the Planning Inspectorate, at the time of the examination of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The allocation process considered a wide range of issues including likely effects on the landscape, ecology, residential amenity, archaeology and heritage as well as the site's location in terms of access to major roads. The site is also allocated specifically as a site to meet the South Hampshire market area.

272. It is acknowledged that Hampshire is constrained by large parts of the county being within National Parks and National Landscapes (formerly referred to as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) designations. It is also acknowledged that potential mineral sites are also often constrained by access, ecological designations, and a wide range of other factors.

273. Due to the site allocation, the applicant has not assessed any other site alternatives. Officers agree that the site allocation means that alternative site locations need not be considered at this stage.

*Process / design alternatives:*

274. The applicant has indicated that the proposal has been through design alterations and the development proposed is considered to result in the least impact on the environment and amenity. The location of the access (now revised) has been determined following detailed discussions with the County Highway Authority and the provision of a supporting document including a Road Safety Audit. Furthermore, it is indicated that the stand-offs from the boundary and height of the bunds have been determined in consultation with a noise consultant, as has the location of the proposed plant site, to ensure no significant impacts on surrounding noise sensitive receptors. As such, the proposal has been shaped by the various assessments carried out as part of the EIA process.

275. Conveyors will be used to transport the material from the excavation areas to the processing area which will have less environmental impacts than movements of HGVs between these two areas.

276. In terms of access to the site, there is no suitable alternative to road access. The site is adjacent to the railway line at the north of the site. However, there are a large number of factors restricting the use of the railway to transport mineral from the site, including the lack of a rail siding and access to the rail network. In order to transport mineral by rail, there also has to be suitable facilities at the receiving point and the applicant is not aware of any suitable locations for it to be unloaded at nearby stations. The mineral is also required in this part of South Hampshire and as such it would not be sent further afield. The costs are also considered to be prohibitive. More information on this matter is set out in the [Highways impact](#) section of the report.

277. Using barges to transport the mineral would also not be possible given that the site is not adjacent to any river, and as such the same number of HGVs would have to leave the site to transport the mineral to the nearest barge facilities, which could involve using Satchell Lane and other small roads to reach the water. As such it would not result in any benefits in terms of reduced congestion to local roads and would result in less suitable roads having to be used.

278. Officers agree that the applicants assessment of process / design alternatives.

*Scheduling alternatives:*

279. When the site was allocated in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), it was anticipated that the site would come forward any time from 2016. As already set out in the [Demonstration of need for mineral resource](#) section, whilst the landbank has increased since this application has been submitted, the [LAA](#) still states that to meet future demand for aggregate, Hampshire will need to increase its land-won aggregate bank of reserves.

280. The applicant has indicated it is likely to take over a year before the site is up and running in the event that planning permission is granted. By which time, the impact of mothballed sites and a depletion of mineral reserves will impact supply. The applicant argues that the site is required to meet need requirements.

*Do nothing scenario:*

281. The applicant also explored a “do nothing” scenario, which means considering the impact if this proposal were not to go ahead. If this site were not worked for mineral extraction, it would result in aggregate coming to the South Hampshire area from further afield, which the applicant argues is less sustainable in terms of vehicle movements than providing a local supply. It is acknowledged that if Hampshire does not supply sufficient land-won sand and gravel for its own needs, it may result in sand and gravel being imported from other counties. The applicant also argues that a reduction in supply is also likely to result in construction projects, including house building and extensions, taking longer to complete, with the associated adverse impacts on surrounding neighbours for a longer period, and prices significantly increasing with the short supply.

282. An option not explored by the applicant was not to progress with the current planning application and instead wait for any wider development at the site. The site is owned by Persimmon Homes. From the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority perspective, this proposal can only be considered on its merits. However, the fact the site is owned by a housing developer who has in the past actively sought to get the site allocated in the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) cannot be ignored. An option to delay any mineral extraction until such a time (if this is the case) that the site obtains permission for other uses was not explored. However, it is recognised that this is not an option suitable for the applicant.

*Conclusion on consideration of alternatives:*

283. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has reviewed the applicant’s assessment of alternatives and is sufficiently satisfied with its conclusions. The key focus for the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in the context of the

site allocation is whether the planning impacts of the particular proposal are acceptable. This will be considered throughout this commentary section.

## Ecology

284. Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out a requirement that minerals and waste development should not have a significant adverse effect on, and where possible, should enhance, restore or create designated or important habitats and species. The policy sets out a list of sites, habitats and species which will be protected in accordance with the level of their relative importance. The policy states that development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon the identified sites, habitats and species will only be permitted where it is judged that the merits of the development outweigh any likely environmental damage. The policy also sets out a requirement for appropriate mitigation and compensation measures where development would cause harm to biodiversity interests.

285. By reference to the site allocation in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), the following development considerations are relevant to the proposal in relation to ecology:

- Protection of the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site and Solent Maritime SAC;
- The impact on all roosting and foraging areas used by qualifying bird species of the nearby SPA and Ramsar site;
- Protection of the Lee on Solent to Itchen Valley Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest; and
- The impact on Badnam Copse and West Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

286. Policy DM11 (Nature conservation) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) is the Borough Council's planning policy on nature conservation. The provisions of the policy are specific to the Borough Council determining planning applications but many of the principles of Policy 3 are reflected. Specifically, part 1 (c) of states that "*The Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers, and will determine planning applications, to: [...] c. seek a net gain of biodiversity on all development sites (including sites for redevelopment) through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing and provision of new habitats and features of nature conservation interest compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough, having regard to local geodiversity and soils*".

287. Strategic Policy S9 (Green infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that the Borough Council will seek to achieve the provision, retention and/or

enhancement of through various factors including connected habitats (linking the network of designated sites and existing priority habitats).

288. Paragraph 180 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that planning decisions “*should contribute to and enhance the natural environment*”. In addition, paragraph 186 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:*
- a) *if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;*
  - b) *development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;*
  - c) *development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and*
  - d) *development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity”.*
289. [ES Chapter 10 Ecology](#) was prepared as part of the application. This was also supported by an [Ecological Appraisal & Desk Study](#) (Appendix 4.1), [Habitats Regulations Assessment](#) (Appendix 4.2), [Bat Surveys](#) (Appendix 4.3), [Breeding & Wintering Bird Surveys](#) (Appendix 4.4), [Hazel Dormouse Surveys](#) (Appendix 4.5), [Invertebrate Survey](#) (Appendix 4.6) and [Reptile Surveys and Mitigation Strategy](#) (Appendix 4.7).
290. Additional and updated information was submitted under Regulation 25 (part ). This included amendments to [ES Chapter 10 Ecology](#), [Shadow Habitat Regs Assessment](#) (Appendix 4.2), [Breeding & Wintering Bird Surveys](#) (Appendix 4.4), [Reptile Surveys and Mitigation Strategy](#) (Appendix 4.7), [BNG Calculations](#) (Appendix 4.8) alongside a [Restoration Plan](#).

291. A variety of different concerns in relation to the impact on nature conservation were raised. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.
292. Concerns were raised about the scheme following the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage, in particular by the County Ecologist (as documented in the [representations](#) section of this report). Following the outcomes of the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage, the applicant requested informal discussions with the County Ecologist about outstanding concerns. Following these discussions, it was clear that the potential further changes to the scheme proposed by the applicant went to the heart of the ES and therefore required public consultation. This led to [additional requests](#) being made by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in relation to ecology (and other associated issues such as arboriculture, landscaping and restoration) at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage to ensure due process was followed.
293. The applicant submitted [Ecology Vol 2 BNG Calculations](#) (Appendix 4.8), and [Condition assessments](#) (Appendix 4.9) and [ES Chapter 10 Ecology, Shadow Habitat Regs Assessment](#) (Appendix 4.2), under Regulation 25 (part 2).

*Ecological value of the site and protected species:*

294. Many different concerns were raised in relation to ecology. This included concerns about impacts on nearby designations, wildlife and species as well as on lowland and acid grasslands. Concerns were also raised in many representations that the applicant has underestimated the ecological importance of the site and that the site has rewilded.
295. No designated land of International or National importance for nature conservation is located within or directly adjacent to the site. The closest designations are set out below. Despite comments received to the contrary, the airfield does not have any formal designation as a nature reserve.
296. The site is highlighted as an ecological 'Network Opportunity' area within the HBIC desk study information (see [appendix 4.1 of ES Chapter 12](#)). The site is part of a wider area identified as the Solent Coast, Hamble Estuary and Ford Lake Priority Biodiversity Area in [Eastleigh Borough Council's Biodiversity Action Plan \(2012-2022\)](#). Paragraph 5.74 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) identifies Hamble Airfield as a 'Priority biodiversity link'.
297. A number of priority habitats are identified within two kilometres of the application site. The site and adjacent land is designated as a non-statutory

site for use by waders and brent geese, although it is confirmed as being a site with only negative records i.e. with no record of brent geese present.

298. Baseline habitat [condition assessments](#) were undertaken for grassland, native hedgerows, woodland and scattered rural trees. Such assessments have been provided by the applicant despite assertions that they had not been by the HPRG. Assessment work has shown that onsite habitats include semi-improved grassland. Scrub, native hedgerows, broadleaved woodland and scattered trees all of which are considered to be of 'local value' with the exception of hedgerows which is considered to be of 'regional value'. Nearby offsite habitats were also assessed.

299. Post intervention habitat [condition assessments](#) have also been undertaken for existing and retained acid grassland, restored acid grassland, scattered scrub habitats, native hedgerows, woodland, scattered rural planning, wetland habitat creation and ponds. The HPRG also alleged that the botanical report submitted is incomplete and insufficient. It is important to note that there are no guidelines in relation to the minimum number of quadrats needed for condition assessments and this is a matter of judgment for the ecologists. It is the responsibility of the County Council's Ecology team to scrutinise the data provided in support of the planning application. It is clear that the team queried if the entire grassland was of the same condition as part of the Regulation 25 process and this was addressed. There is no evidence to suggest that the information provided in relation to condition assessments is inaccurate and therefore this matter was deemed to be resolved by the County Ecologist.

300. The trees and vegetation around the outskirts of the site will largely be retained, other those identified for removal to create the access and within the extraction area. The applicant is proposing that over 18,000 trees and shrubs are proposed to be planted, as set out on the [Concept Restoration Plan](#).

*Survey work:*

301. Survey work undertaken highlights the following:

- **Badgers:** The site holds potential to support badgers although no firm evidence of badger activity was identified during surveys. Despite this, badgers have previously been recorded in the locality and there is potential that badgers could occasionally use the site at night-time for foraging purposes, and/or the large stands of dense scrub may conceal old, disused, or partially-used setts.
- **Bats** (see [appendix 4.3 of ES Chapter 12](#)):
  - Roosting - The updated ground-level tree roost assessment identified four of the mature off-site trees along the east side of

- Hamble Lane as holding potential to support roosting bats. No trees within the site were identified to hold any potential to support roosting bats. The potential bat roosting features identified on the adjacent off-site trees are considered to be of Local value; and
- Foraging and commuting - Phase 2 bat activity surveys identified that the site supports a bat population of Regional value with low numbers of five species, and three genera of bat recorded during the activity surveys/
  - *Phase 2 breeding bird surveys* undertaken identified that the site supports a breeding bird assemblage of local value (see [appendix 4.4 of ES Chapter 12](#)).
    - A total of seventeen species were confirmed as breeding on site during the update survey in 2020, which included the bird species of national conservation concern such as skylark, linnet, song thrush, dunnock and common whitethroat;
    - The site was also identified to be of ornithological interest and value in terms of the overall assemblages of bird species recorded (all species recorded during the breeding season surveys, including all breeding, possible breeding and non-breeding records);
    - One individual of the protected species Dartford warbler was recorded on site on one occasion surveys (2017) with no records since then;
    - No wading birds or waterfowl were recorded on site during the breeding bird surveys.
  - *Phase 2 wintering bird surveys* undertaken identified that the site supports a wintering bird assemblage of local value (see [appendix 4.4 of ES Chapter 12](#)). The site was identified to be of value for overwintering flocks of the farmland bird species skylark, linnet and meadow pipit as well as for its overall assemblages of birds recorded during the winter surveys. Low numbers of the Dartford Warbler were recorded on site during the winter surveys prior to 2018 with no records since that date.
  - *Great Crested Newt (GCN)*: The site provides suitable terrestrial habitat for great crested newt and the desk study returned 38 individual records of the species from a location over 1km to the north-east of the site. However, it is considered highly unlikely that GCN's are utilising the site or any immediately adjacent land due to the considerable intervening distances between the site and any suitable waterbodies (well above the typical 500 metres dispersal distance of this species), as well as the presence of a number of significant barriers to GCN movements within the intervening landscape (as set out in [appendix 4.1 of ES Chapter 12](#)).
  - *Hazel dormouse*: The site provides suitable habitat for hazel dormouse and the species is known to be present in the wider surrounding area, although



no dormouse records within 2km of the site were returned in the desk study. Standard presence / absence surveys for hazel dormouse were undertaken and the species was not recorded (or any evidence to indicate its presence) (as set out in [appendix 4.5 of ES Chapter 12](#)). It is therefore concluded that hazel dormouse is currently likely absent from the site and immediate surrounding land.

- *Hedgehog*: The site provides a substantial amount of suitable habitat for the European Hedgehog and the desk study returned 19 records of hedgehog within 2km of the site. It is considered that hedgehog could potentially be utilising the site and the site would therefore be of Local value to this species.
- *Invertebrates*: Surveys recorded a total of 472 invertebrate taxa, of which, 22 have a conservation designation. This includes three Section 41 Priority Species / UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species, one Nationally Rare species, nine Nationally Scarce, or provisionally Nationally Scarce species, one 'Vulnerable' species (likely to be reassigned Nationally Scarce in an upcoming review), one 'Rare' species (likely to be reassigned Nationally Scarce in an upcoming review), and seven Nationally Scarce - Notable species. No protected species or species of significant conservation importance were recorded. The survey work also identified the site to support three specific invertebrate assemblage types that were in favourable condition, namely, F001 Scrub edge, F003 Scrub-heath and moorland and F112 Open short sward (as set out in [appendix 4.6 of ES Chapter 12](#)). The survey findings indicate that the site is of local value for terrestrial invertebrates.
- *Reptiles*: The site provides a substantial amount of suitable habitat for common UK reptile species. A targeted Phase 2 reptile survey recorded an exceptional population of slow-worm and a good population of common lizard. An update reptile survey recorded a good population of slow-worm and a low population of common lizard (as set out in [appendix 4.7 of ES Chapter 12](#)). Although the survey results appear to have shown a decline in the populations of both slow-worm and common lizard, the site does still provide a very substantial area of grassland and scrub mosaic that is highly suitable for these species. It is therefore assumed that the populations of both slow-worm and common lizard on site could potentially be exceptional. On this basis the site is considered to be of regional value for slow-worm and common lizard.
- *Water vole and otter*: The desk study returned three records of European water vole and one record of European otter within two kms of the site (dated between 1992 and 2009). However, a review of online mapping did not identify any watercourses in close proximity to the site that could

potentially support either of these species (as set out in [appendix 4.1 of ES Chapter 12](#)).

302. Representations received, including from the HPRG, question the quality of ecological surveys undertaken to support the application. The HPRG continue to argue that the ecological assessments undertaken *'are fundamentally flawed. They fail to meet basic standards required to have any level of credibility. As a result, the ecological impacts that may result from the proposed quarry on the neighbouring SSSIs/SPAs/Ramsar/SAC/SINC sites cannot be shown in full'*.
303. The HPRG argue that the application was not supported by specific nesting bird surveys and small mammal surveys. It was also suggested that not all bird species on the airfield were identified in the surveys, an example being the Dartford Warbler. The HPRG stated they have evidence of it being on site but did not provide the specific and detailed evidence. It is important to note that breeding and wintering bird surveys have been carried out as noted above (see [appendix 4.4 of ES Chapter 12](#)). The impacts on the Dartford Warbler have been considered as part of the planning process due to the previous presence of Dartford Warbler on site. The County Ecologist considers that the proposed restoration plan is suitable for this species and will provide high quality habitat in the form of scattered scrub within areas of acid grassland post restoration. Furthermore, the impact on nesting birds will be addressed through timing of the works, provision of compensatory habitat and supervision should clearance be required during the nesting season. The concerns raised by the HPRG in relation to nesting birds are therefore unfounded.
304. In addition, the HPRG also questioned the lack of a Phase 2 survey for the site. Again, as set out above, detailed Phase 2 surveys have all been prepared to the satisfaction of the County Ecologist and no other issues have been raised by other consultees.
305. Andrews Wildlife Consultants have indicated that the method used by the *'applicant's ecology assessment to determine an impact's significance is not based on recognised good practice (i.e. CIEEM 2019) and also appears to be inherently inconsistent with its own stated method'*. Following the assessment undertaken by the County Ecologist, it is concluded that any deviation in assessment methodology does not give rise to any significant concerns in relation to the assessment of impacts and the provision of proportionate avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures. It also should be noted that 'guidelines' can be adopted and deviated from based on the professional judgement and experience of the consulting ecologist. The assessment by the applicant is considered to be acceptable by consultees.

306. The HPRG have indicated that there has been a failure to assess the prevalence of species such as field vole, field mouse, weasel, and yellow necked mouse and that there is no population data for such species. However, there is no requirement to undertake surveys of these species in support of a planning application.
307. The HPRG have also suggested that the assessments undertaken have not identified the Grasshopper Warbler as being present on the airfield and that the group have evidence of this bird nesting on the airfield within the last year. However, variations in survey results are acceptable, provided that the works are carried out in line with best practice guidelines. The County Ecologist is satisfied that this is the case here. The proposed restoration plan has ensured suitable habitat in the form of scrub and wet areas available on site for this species.
308. The use of desktop surveys was also questioned by the HPRG, in particular with regards to GCN. They state that *'the majority of the surveys provided by Cemex are desk top studies, which means they are not specific to the location of the airfield at actual time of this planning application'*. However, this is the nature of desktop studies. Desktop studies are considered to be an acceptable exercise in combination with site surveys. In relation to GCN, the desktop survey was combined with a review of any waterbodies present on site and within a 500 metre radius of the site, which is considered to be acceptable by the County Ecologist.
309. In response to Regulation 25 (part 2), Eastleigh Borough Council raised concerns about the amount of scrub cover that would be lost as part of the development. It notes that *"in the context of the site and the species that use it, this loss is considered significant"*. This matter has been assessed through the submission documents and through the proposed changes to the restoration of the site to provide more high quality scrub post development.
310. Following the submission of additional ecological information under Regulation 25 (parts 1 and 2), the County Ecologist was satisfied that the survey work undertaken across the application was acceptable. No concerns have been raised by Natural England about the survey quality or coverage following these. The survey work is therefore considered to be acceptable.

*Impact on designated sites:*

311. As previously noted, there are no ecological designations located on the site. The [Ecological Appraisal & Desk Study](#) prepared as part of the application

identified that the following designated sites could potentially be impacted by the proposed project:

- Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site;
- Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC);
- Solent and Dorset Coast SPA;
- Lee-On-The Solent to Itchen Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI;
- Mercury Marshes Local Nature Reserve (LNR);
- Badnam Copse Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC);
- West Wood (Royal Victoria Country Park) SINC;
- Mallards Moor SINC; and the
- Mercury Marsh South SINC and Mercury Marina Saltmarsh SINC.

312. The HPRG have indicated that several breeding birds are species identified as being the qualifying features for the SPA and this should have been reflected in assessment work and the shadow HRA. For clarity, no qualifying species of the SPA were found using the site in survey work undertaken. On the basis of the comments received, the applicant responded that survey work undertaken had shown that the findings of the wintering bird surveys to date are in line with the current [Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy](#) which does not identify the site as being used by citation SPA/Ramsar species. The site is not currently considered as functionally linked to the SPA.

313. The accuracy of the information provided is to the satisfaction of the County Ecologist in relation to the impact on designated sites. The Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy 2020 does not identify the site as being used by citation SPA/Ramsar species.

314. No concerns have been raised by Natural England in relation to connectivity between the site and the nearby designations. Natural England did note in their initial response date that *'while we tentatively agree with the Environmental Statement's conclusion in that changes in hydrology are unlikely to impact nearby designated sites, we would advise further consideration of the Lincegrove and Hackett's marshes SSSI in particular informs your decision making'*.

315. Officers requested additional clarification from the Environment Agency (EA) on their position in relation to hydro-connectivity with the designated sites (March 2024). Following review, the EA commented the following: *"We have reviewed the hydrological assessment and whilst the document could have gone into more details about some aspects, overall our conclusions were that the findings were fit for purpose and as the applicant plans to install*

*attenuation ponds and infiltration swales, runoff will be directed to these. These should be developed in the appropriate places to mimic the current groundwater flow discharge to the springs. Surface runoff should be directed in the correct proportions to these attenuation ponds. If the attenuation ponds are located in the correct locations, we believe that the scale of impacts would be small and not sufficient to have any detrimental impacts on the designated site although we would defer to Natural England on this as the lead authority”.*

316. The imposition of a planning condition in relation to ensuring best practice working methods and mitigation during the development phase of the development that pollution from machinery, equipment or materials may enter into the water can be covered by an appropriate planning condition or obligation for an Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in the event that permission is granted. This could cover a list of defined potential impacts on the nearby designated sites, details of methods for pollution control, details on the storage and disposal of waste, details on how sediment/concrete/other debris will be managed and details of biosecurity. Conditions could also be applied in relation to the attenuation ponds and infiltration swales and runoff.

317. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) provides more information on noise limits and mitigation as part of the proposal. Natural England indicated in their initial response that *“wherever possible, percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax – measured at the sensitive receptors) should be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March inclusive)”*. The disturbance of wintering and breeding birds from quarrying was raised as an area of concern by the HPRG. They claim that noise impacts are inadequately defined in the assessment work and that it makes no reference to the topography of the site or consider meteorological conditions. It is clear from the proposal that any works producing noise levels over 69 dB LAF Max along the boundary of the SPA between October and March will be avoided. The proposal is unlikely to have adverse impact in terms of noise on the recognised ecological receptors. The assessment work submitted by the applicant demonstrates calculated site noise levels at receptors on Satchell’s Lane during works would be between 45 and 47 dB Leq. These levels would be achieved with the perimeter bunding in place and are below the 50dB low response threshold identified for estuarine species. Eastleigh Borough Council’s ecologist confirms that these receptors are also significantly closer to the site than the SPA/Ramsar sites and therefore the impact will be even less at these sites which builds in some degree of precaution. The HRA states that *“predicted changes in noise levels at the SPA/Ramsar sites will be below the threshold for disturbance to occur to estuarine bird species. The perimeter bunding is necessary to ensure that the site can be worked whilst keeping noise levels within the limits based on*

*current government guidance. With this mitigation in place it is concluded that there is no likelihood of an adverse effect on the interest features of SSW SPA/Ramsar and SDC SPA, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects.” As set out in [Noise](#) section of the report, conditions could be applied in relation to noise issues to ensure that there is no impacts noise on the designated sites.*

318. The [Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy](#) identifies a network of non-designated terrestrial wader and brent goose sites that support the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, Portsmouth Harbour SPA, and Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA and aims to protect it from land take and recreational pressure associated with new development. These sites can be referred to as 'SPA functionally linked land' or 'SPA supporting habitat'. The site is not part of the mapped network of SWBGS sites across the Solent.

*Biodiversity net gain (BNG):*

319. BNG is an approach to development, and/or land management, that aims to leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand. It delivers measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development, and this can be achieved both on-site and off-site.

320. Relevant national planning policy within the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) sets out that planning should provide BNG where possible and the [Environment Act \(2021\)](#) includes mandatory BNG in England to ensure that developments authorised under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value with habitats secured for at least 30 years via obligations/ conservation covenants.

321. The mandatory requirement for BNG has recently come into force (12 February 2024). It is important to note that the specific requirement to apply a 10% BNG applies only to planning applications submitted after this date. This planning application was submitted at the end of December 2021 so a 10% BNG requirement does not apply.

322. Whilst the achievement of BNG is not mandatory for this particular development, maximising the net gain from all developments is encouraged by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. The proposed development presents an opportunity to enhance the biodiversity value of the site.

323. The County Ecologist raised concerns during the planning process about the accuracy of the BNG work undertaken and this has been addressed through Regulation 25 (part 2) submissions. [Appendix 4.8 - Biodiversity Metric](#)

highlights that the proposed scheme will result in a 9.89% increase in habitats units on the site and a 109.17% increase in hedgerow units. The County Ecologist noted that the submitted habitat condition assessment sheets, alongside the BNG Metric calculations, now take into account the delays in habitat creation and demonstrate a 9.89% net gain in habitat units and a very large gain in hedgerow units which is considered to be satisfactory.

324. For clarity, following comments made by the HPRG, the applicant has a duty to prepare the BNG assessment work, not the planning authority. This is then checked by relevant consultees to ensure accuracy.
325. Criticism from the HPRG that the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority had accepted the applicants BNG assessment work without full and detailed calculations being provided is unfounded. Further information relating to the BNG Assessment was requested under Regulation 25 (part 1) with follow-up information requested under Regulation 25 (part 2) after informal discussions about the clarifications needed to meet the requirements of consultees.
326. The HPRG also allege that the assessment of BNG is over-inflated due to the failure to deal with the recreational displacement issues and the impact on the SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. This is incorrect as BNG does not relate to any matters relating to potential displacement. BNG also does not specifically relate to the HRA process so any requests to undertake further HRA work on this basis is based on a misunderstanding of the process. The HPRG also allege that there has been an under-reporting of current species on the airfield meaning that the BNG calculations are incorrect. The HPRG also allege that the BNG supplied is seriously overestimating the potential gain due to incorrect baseline information. These allegations are not substantiated. The County Ecologist's concerns have been addressed and the additional survey work undertaken, the proposed mitigation, along with the revised BNG results, are considered to be acceptable.
327. In relation to a number of comments received from the HPRG, it is important to note that BNG is purely habitat based and protected species surveys are not relevant to BNG.
328. Some comments received related to the BNG requirement and the assumption that the value of the site would be reduced by 90% for the duration of the development. This is not correct. BNG relates to enhancement above a baseline.
329. Whilst at least 10% BNG requirement would be preferred, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority acknowledges that biodiversity enhancement has

been planned for. Given the timing of the planning application and the enhancement provided, alongside the proposal for a 30-year management agreement (via a s106 agreement if permission is granted), the provision for BNG is considered to be acceptable. Conditions would need to be applied relating to the submission of the BNG Plan, in the event permission is granted alongside an obligation for long term management of the site which would relate to the delivery of BNG.

*Links to aquatic habitats:*

330. Paragraphs 10.6.15-10.6.17 of the [updated ES](#) lists what it believes are the off-site habitats including semi-improved grassland, scrub, native hedgerows, broadleaved woodland, plantation woodland, coastal habitats, and urban, residential, and developed land. Water Environment Ltd, on behalf of the HPRG, raised concerns that the ES does not mention any aquatic or wetland habitats, despite the presence of springs and small streams adjacent to the site that rely on and are directly fed by the groundwater within the site.

331. Water Environment Ltd have argued that the hydrology of the nearby off-site streams will be impacted by the proposed works in both the operation and post-restoration phases. In addition, they argue that the effects of this on the internationally-designated sites these streams flow into, the streams themselves represent potentially important off-site ecological receptors. They allege that the diversion of groundwater away from the eastern spring-fed streams during operation could significantly impact the aquatic ecology of the streams (e.g. through lower baseflows, drought and reduced dilution of pollutants). The HPRG have argued that there will be potential harmful effects on the ecology of the area – including the SAC, SPA, Ramsar and SSSIs that lie close to the airfield and that benefit from water flows from the airfield. Hydrological connectivity issues are covered in [Impact on surface or groundwaters and flooding](#).

*Recreational displacement:*

332. The issue of recreational displacement from the informal use of the site and impacts on the designation is an area which has been in community representations. Hamble Parish Council have argued that if the Airfield is *“lost to recreational use then there may well be a tangible impact on the SPAs which has an adverse effect on their condition”*.

333. The HPRG also raised concerns that the greatest likelihood is that the majority of the current airfield users will make use of other areas, most particularly including the SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar site and may impact wider areas such as the New Forest National Park. The HPRG argue that the *“proposed path and open space available to the public would be woefully*



*inadequate to compensate the community for the loss of access to the airfield*". The HPRG have also raised this issue specifically in relation to potential impact on designated sites and the inadequacy of the shadow HRA as a result. They allege that the displacement of activities from the airfield will be permanent. They raised specific and serious concerns about the "*detrimental impact that the displacement of the current airfield users will have on areas surrounding the airfield*" and that these effects have been extremely downplayed. In addition, a report was prepared by Andrews Wildlife Consultants, on behalf of Hamble Marine Businesses, provided further assessment on the impact of recreational displacement.

334. The HPRG alleged that the additional evidence collected calls into question the validity of the HRA and the BNG calculations supplied by the applicant. It is important to note that recreational displacement is not of relevance to BNG.

335. Genesis Planning on behalf of Ancasta Marine, Hamble Yacht Services, plus other marine businesses on the Hamble peninsula conclude in their assessment that "*the proposed mitigation for recreational damage and disturbance to the internationally designated sites is potentially inadequate and has not been sufficiently evidenced and assessed by recreation experts to allow a confident conclusion of no adverse effect*". They argue that '*too much uncertainty over the recreational effects currently exists to satisfy the precautionary requirements of the HRA*". Similar concerns were also raised by AWC on behalf of the Ancasta Marine, Hamble Yacht Services, plus other Marine Businesses.

336. It is clear that the informal use of the site would cease in its current form upon the commencement of any mineral workings. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority acknowledges that the site airfield is in proximity to SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar designations. However, it is also recognised that proposed development is a temporary development on land and as set out in the section on [Public Rights of Way and access](#), is taking place on land which is in private ownership. The applicant has proposed permissive access on the site. This provides opportunities to provide designated permissive access on a site where there is currently no official public access.

337. In addition, justification has been provided in the [Shadow HRA](#) that there are other green spaces available in the area for the public to use, in addition to the route offered through the application and the restoration of the site. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is also aware of other recreational areas nearby which could be used such as the Royal Victoria Country Park and Weston Shore.

338. Whilst the concerns of the local community are noted on this matter, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would be likely to have a significant impact on the designated sites. The [Shadow HRA](#) concludes that there will be no significant changes in patterns of recreational activity within the SPA/Ramsar and the SAC predicted as a result of the implementation of the proposal and its associated mitigation. No impacts on birds and/or habitat within the sites is predicted. The conclusion of the Shadow HRA is that the proposals will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites identified above, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Natural England have not raised any specific concerns in relation to recreational displacement and the impact on the designations. The section on [Habitats Regulation Assessment \[HRA\]](#) covers this issue in more detail and the competent authority has concluded that the application will have no significant adverse effects on the site integrity, alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

*SANG provision:*

339. In response to the further information provided by the applicant at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage, Natural England recognised the potential strategic value of the site and therefore recommended that Hampshire County Council should explore ways to maximise this site's potential to form a 'Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace' ('SANG'). In light of comments made by Natural England, Hamble Parish Council also highlighted that they would welcome the formal designation of the site as a SANG to reduce pressures on other more sensitive locations especially Hamble Common.

340. As set out in the [Public Rights of Way and access](#) section, there will be a permissive path running from the southeast to north-west corners from early on in the development, and along the western side also upon restoration. The applicant is not the landowner. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has been advised that it is not the landowner's wish to designate the site as SANG. The site is currently private. The proposed permissive path as well as the area of community open space in the north-east corner of the site, will be a benefit in terms of providing an accessible and suitable walking route, with links between the residential areas to the south and east of the site, to the north-western side of the Hamble School site, and the west (once restored).

*Landscaping and restoration and ecological management:*

341. Ecological issues also arise in relation to landscaping and restoration. The acceptability of the proposal in these regards are covered in the [Visual impact and landscape](#), [Restoration and aftercare](#) and [Legal agreement](#) sections of this commentary.

342. In initial responses to the planning application, the County Ecologist raised concerns about the duration of the long-term management and monitoring. In response, the applicant changed the period of long-term monitoring and management to 30 years. The management of the site will be set out in an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) which can be secured via a s106 [Legal agreement](#) in the event that permission is granted. This deals with the concerns raised by the County Ecologist about the duration of management and monitoring. The County Ecologist has indicated that the s106 will need to be clear that the 30-year period will be triggered by the completion of the aftercare period and the EMMP associated with it. An EMMP would ensure that the mitigation and monitoring are all considered together and to enable it to be updated and monitored throughout the lifetime of the development. The restored/created acid grassland on site is proposed to achieve a 'moderate' condition through long-term management and monitoring. This is considered to be reasonable by the County Ecologist. The County Ecologist also noted that the revised restoration plan means that post-development, a mosaic of better quality habitats will be created and retained on site.

343. In the event that planning permission is granted, a planning condition could be applied requiring the applicant to implement the measures detailed within the approved [Chapter 10 of the ES](#) and [BNG Metric](#) and the principles set out in the landscaping, restoration and outline 5-year aftercare scheme.

344. As already identified, the site will be worked in a phased manner. The HPRG raised concerns, in particular in their ecological response dated 19 February 2024, that the phasing does not consider the nesting birds which will be on the ground that is to be cleared. This is not correct. The phasing of the development does consider the impact on species and indeed this has been a matter of consideration for the County Ecologist when coming to a view on the acceptability of the proposal.

345. The HPRG allege that the proposed wildlife mitigation is "*entirely unsuitable and ill advised*". They state that "*the proposed plans for the restoration of the site once quarrying activities are concluded are insufficient to meet the needs of existing endangered species to be found on the airfield today. In the cases of, for example, the Skylark, Dartford Warbler and Grasshopper Warbler, the failure to provide adequate grassland, gorse, heather and other appropriate conditions, will mean these birds will be unlikely to return to the airfield. In addition:*

- *the proposal for the land to be managed by grazing shows a total lack of understanding and planning. Cattle will destroy young scrub and other plants before they can become established.*

- *The provision of bird boxes is not suitable for these endangered species - ground nesting birds will not suddenly seek to nest in boxes. The continued failure to provide adequate scrub and ground cover will mean these birds will no longer find a suitable home on the airfield. This approach is indicative of the contempt Cemex has of its responsibilities to the nature it will destroy”.*

346. Whilst the comments are acknowledged, they are not considered to be accurate. The restoration proposals have been carefully assessed by the County Council’s qualified and experienced ecologists. The County Ecology team have significant experience in the restoration of minerals sites. The restoration has, following some changes as part of the Regulation 25 process, been deemed to be acceptable. No concerns have been raised by Natural England on this aspect.

347. In the long-term, post restoration, it is considered that the site will be of substantially greater value to wintering birds. This is based on the provision of a greater extent of broadleaved woodland cover and native hedgerows as well as better quality grassland habitat and some wetland habitat. These habitats will provide a greater supply and variety of winter foraging opportunities, as well as substantially improved habitat connectivity within the local landscape. The planted and retained scrub, hedgerows and woodland will also provide good resources as well as overnight roosting opportunities. The grassland habitat on site, with both rough and open sward types, will also provide a good foraging resource to birds seeking invertebrates and seeds from grassland plants. There is also potential that the wetland habitats created on site, including ponds with surrounding damp fen vegetation, could attract waders and waterfowl from the surrounding coastal areas and National Site Network sites (SAC and SPA). The positive effects on wintering birds are expected to become more pronounced in the long term as the habitats on site become more established and the tree and shrub planting matures. This could potentially result in small local increases in wintering bird numbers and/or draw in a greater diversity of bird species to the site each winter period. There will therefore be long-term positive effects in terms of the effect upon wintering birds from the proposals. Specific management in relation to the grassland being created to ensure it is suitable for wintering birds can also be considered in the detail of the EMMP

348. Specific measures regarding wintering birds can be considered in the detail of the EMMP. On this basis, it is concluded that the proposal will result in long-term positive effects on wintering birds in terms of the habitats being provided, over and above the habitats currently present on site, and being fenced and managed without public access will also enhance the value of the site for the birds.

*Impacts of conservation grazing:*

349. Conservation grazing is proposed as part of the restoration of the site. The HPRG argue that the grazing proposals will be a deterrent to the use of the site by ground nesting species such as such the Dartford Warbler and Grasshopper Warbler species. No such concerns have been raised by the County Ecologist or Natural England. The proposed permissive access would be around the edge of the site and the public access area in the north-east of the site, so disturbance to birds would be prevented. The remainder of the site is likely to be fenced and will have a number of small freshwater pools, which would also ensure the site is suitable for the wintering birds. Long term management measures are also proposed through planning conditions and the s106 agreement in the event that permission were to be granted.

*Links to hydrological impacts:*

350. The HPRG commissioned reports Water Environment Limited (Hydrology) and Andrews Wildlife Consultants to consider the impact on ecology and hydrology. The group alleged that the effect of hydrology changes is seriously under-estimated and that there would be impacts on nearby designations that lie close to the airfield and that benefit from water flows from the airfield.

351. Water Environment Limited's report concludes that the impacts of the proposed quarrying on both the local groundwater flow regime and the local stormwater runoff regime will result in a profound and irreversible change in the hydrology and hydrogeology of the site itself and the surrounding area. They allege that this, in turn, will likely result in significant changes in stormwater runoff, and in spring flow, and a reduction in drought resilience for the baseflow of the surrounding streams which discharge into designated ecological sites in Southampton Water and the River Hamble. Following the initial responses received by the EA, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority sought additional guidance from the EA on this matter. A follow up response was submitted (dated 17 April 2024). This concluded that assessment work was fit for purpose and with drainage features located appropriately, the EA believe that the scale of impacts would be small and not sufficient to have any detrimental impacts on the designated sites. This is set out in [Impact on surface or groundwaters and flooding](#).

352. Andrews Wildlife Consultants have also questioned the lack of consideration of likely hydrological and water quality effects on internationally designated sites, particularly within the shadow HRA. Furthermore, they also indicate that the post-restoration effects should also not have been screened out because the HRA's conclusion still relies on mitigation (attenuation ponds and infiltration trenches). It is also important to note that Natural England, the

County Ecologist or the EA or have not raised any concerns. This issues has been addressed by the Competent Authority's assessment of the HRA.

353. Eastleigh Borough Council raised concerns that the potential hydrological impacts of the proposals on the Mallards Moor SINCS had not been addressed. No concerns have been raised by the County Ecologist, Natural England or the EA on this matter.

354. Whether the application is acceptable in terms of its wider hydrological impacts is considered in the section on [Impact on surface or groundwaters and flooding](#).

*Shadow HRA:*

355. In relation to the HRA process, it is for the County Council as competent authority to conclude on the HRA and seek the views of Natural England on the conclusions. The HRA work is summarised in [Habitats Regulation Assessment \[HRA\]](#) section above.

*Nutrient neutrality:*

356. Some representations also raised the issue of nutrient neutrality and the lack of consideration in relation to ecology. In freshwater habitats and estuaries, increased levels of nutrients (especially nitrogen and phosphorus) can speed up the growth of certain plants, impacting wildlife. This is called 'eutrophication'. There is no evidence presented that any part of the development will cause an increase in nutrient levels. The term 'nutrient neutrality' is only of relevance to housing or waste water treatment developments so is not of relevance to this proposal.

*Legal agreement:*

357. In the event that permission were to be granted, a legal agreement should include BNG delivery and long-term habitat management through an EMMP. The EMMP is required to ensure that the mitigation and monitoring are all considered together and to enable it to be updated and monitored throughout the lifetime of the development.

*Conclusion on ecology:*

358. Taking all ecological work undertaken and associated matters into account, with the application of planning conditions and the proposed legal agreement, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as the provisions of Policy DM11 (Nature conservation) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). On this basis, it is considered that the proposal will not materially impact the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site, the Solent Maritime SAC, the Lee on Solent to Itchen

Valley Estuary SSSI and the Badnam Copse and West Wood SINC, thereby meeting the development considerations identified in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

359. As previously noted the [HRA record](#) was sent to Natural England and a response has not been received within the consultation period. This will be reported to committee post publication date. If any issues are raised, this section of the report will be amended as required.

#### Location in the countryside and settlement gap

360. Unlike many other types of development, minerals can only be worked where they are found. As already identified the site is an allocation for minerals development in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

361. Concerns were raised in relation to the impact on the countryside or settlement gaps. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

362. Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development in the open countryside, outside the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now re-branded National Landscapes), will not be permitted unless certain criteria are met. The policy also includes an expectation that the highest standards of design, operation and restoration will be met. As already noted, there will be a requirement that the site is restored in the event it is no longer required for minerals and waste use. These aspects are considered in more detail in the sections on [Design and sustainability](#) and [Restoration and aftercare](#).

363. The whole of the site is considered to be in a countryside location in the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). Although the site has a former use as an airfield, such uses ceased in the 1980's. The proposal is a time-limited mineral development thereby meeting part (a) of Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

364. The [EBLP \(2022\)](#) highlights the future of the Hamble Airfield as one of the most pressing issues in Hamble-le-Rice. Strategic Policy S5 (New development in the countryside) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) sets out a number of criteria as to where planning permission will be granted for new development in the countryside. It is clear that the proposal does not meet any of the criteria identified in part 1 of the policy which includes certain uses such as agricultural employment, residential extensions and conversions, community facilities, tourist and visitor uses, outdoor recreation and space, allotments and

cemeteries. It could be argued that through the restoration of the site, open access will be delivered. Part 2 of the policy relates to how the Borough Council will determine development in the countryside and includes a reference to avoiding the sterilisation of mineral resources, in accordance with the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) (part c).

365. Paragraph 4.33 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) highlights that the *“Borough’s countryside performs an important role in separating and providing a setting for the Borough’s settlements. Maintaining the individual identities of the Borough’s communities is an important priority for the Borough Council. The most obvious way of achieving this is keeping them physically separate from each other and from Southampton”*. It goes on to say that *“the Council considers that designating areas between settlements as settlement gaps to be kept free of urbanising development is the best way of preventing further loss of local identity”*.
366. Paragraph 135 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) requires that planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Furthermore, paragraph 180 states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (amongst other considerations) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services.
367. Many representations received commented that the site is part of a strategic local gap between Netley and Hamble-le-Rice and Bursledon. The northern part of the site is located in the Hamble-le-Rice, Netley and Bursledon Settlement Gap. Strategic Policy S6 (Protection of settlement gaps) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that development within a *“Settlement Gap as set out in the Policies Map will be permitted provided that: a. it would not undermine the physical extent and/or visual separation of settlements; and b. it would not have an urbanising effect detrimental to: i. The character of the countryside; or ii. The separate identity of the adjoining settlements”*.
368. In their initial response to the planning application, the Borough Council’s Landscape Officer noted that the proposal was *“not intrinsically in conflict with the countryside and gap policies”* (in the [EBLP \(2022\)](#)) because the site is acknowledged as being allocated for mineral extraction. They went on to say that *“although the proposals would have a medium term impact on the designations, in the long term the land would retain its function as open and*



*free from development. Subject to appropriate design and mitigation of impacts during the operational phase, the temporary proposals could, in principle, be accommodated in accordance with the countryside policies".* This position is acknowledged and also reflects the temporary nature of the proposal.

369. Many responses received also indicate that the proposal will result in the loss of Green Belt land. It is important to note that the site is not located in an area allocated as Green Belt. The only Green Belt in Hampshire is located in the south-west of the New Forest.

370. Concerns were also raised about the site's location in relation to the proximity of residential areas and other sensitive receptors and uses. Concerns raised also highlighted the site as a rural area and the need to consider alternatives. These matters are considered in more detail in [Impact on public health, safety and amenity](#) section of this report alongside other relevant policies which will guide the assessment as to whether this is a suitable location for minerals development.

*Conclusions on location in the countryside:*

371. The site is located in an area of countryside and within a settlement gap. As a time-limited mineral extraction proposal, the site meets the policy requirements of Policy 5 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Strategic Policy S5 (New development in the countryside) and Strategic Policy S6 (Protection of settlement gaps) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#).

Landscape and visual impact

372. Part (d) of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals development should not have an unacceptable visual impact. Furthermore, Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape and townscape. It also states that the design of appropriate built facilities for minerals and waste development should be of a high-quality and contribute to achieving sustainable development.

373. In relation to landscape and visual impact matters, Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states all new development should (only relevant areas included):

- c) *take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views. Where adjoining development is poor in urban design terms, new development should contribute to improving the character of the area;*
- d) *not involve the loss of or damage to trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ponds, priority habitats or other landscape features of value to the character of the area, for appearance or biodiversity unless they can be replaced with features of equivalent or enhanced value (recognising that some species and habitats may be irreplaceable);*
- e) *include a landscape scheme covering the design and layout of external space;*
- f) *protect and enhance public rights of way and National Trails and provide fully connected green infrastructure that interlaces the development and connects into the wider network;*
- g) *provide satisfactory management arrangements for all landscape, green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement;*
- h) *incorporate design measures to inhibit criminal and anti-social behaviour;*
- i) *incorporate provision for on-site waste management; and*
- j) *include provision for public art associated with new large scale development in accordance with the Council's adopted Public Art Strategy.*

374. Strategic Policy S9 (Green infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that the Borough Council will seek to achieve the provision, retention and/or enhancement of through various factors including landscape scale strategic links, interlinked publicly accessible open spaces, incorporation of green infrastructure, interconnected urban green infrastructure (including green, cycle ways, paths and linkages between community facilities and open spaces to link community facilities), connected habitats (linking the network of designated sites and existing priority habitats) and the incorporation of historic buildings and landscapes.

375. Paragraph 135 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) requires that planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Furthermore, paragraph 180 states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (amongst other considerations) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services.

376. The proposed site is not identified as being a 'valued landscape' for the purposes of paragraph 180(a) of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) and the surrounding local landscape does not have a statutory landscape designation.
377. The site is included in the [Hamble Valley](#) assessment within the Hampshire Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (HLICA).
378. **Appendix F – Landscaping Plan** provides an overview of the landscaping proposed.
379. [ES Chapter 9](#) sets out the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, (LVIA) of the proposal. Additional assessment is also set out in [Landscape Detail Sections \(Operational Phase\)](#) and appendices relating to [Visual Elements](#) (Appendix 3.1) and [Landscaping Restoration and outline Five year Aftercare Scheme](#) (Appendix 3.2). Additional documentation was also submitted under Regulation 25 (part 1) including [Landscape & Visual Reg 25 Addendum](#), [Appendix 2 Restoration Plan](#), [Appendix 2 Aftercare & Management Areas](#), [Appendix 2 Landscape Layout Operational Phase](#), [Appendix 2 Phased Restoration Plan Part 1](#), [Appendix 2 Phased Restoration Plan Part 2](#), [Appendix 3.2 Outline Landscape Restoration & Aftercare Scheme](#) and [Appendix 3.3 Estimate for Planting & Restoration Costs](#).
380. A variety of different concerns in relation to the potential landscape impacts of the proposal have been raised. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.
381. Whilst the proposed development is not located within a protected landscape, it is acknowledged that it is a well-used area of land for informal recreation. In the initial round of public consultation, the County Landscape Architect commented that the [LVIA](#) did not fully address the effects on the perception of the site. Whilst it is accepted that this is private land, unauthorised access has taken place over many years. Therefore there is a perception of community use of the site, as an area of open space adjacent to, or near to their homes and that this will be lost through the development.
382. Following the outcomes of the Regulation 25 (part 1) consultation, the applicant requested informal discussions with the County Ecologist and Arboriculturist on outstanding concerns. It was clear following these discussions that the potential further changes to the scheme proposed by the applicant went to the heart of the ES and therefore required public consultation. This led to additional requests being made by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in relation to ecology and other associated issues

such as arboriculture, landscaping and restoration under a Regulation 25 (part 2) request to ensure due process was followed.

383. Additional information submitted under Regulation 25 (part 2) included [Landscape Detail Sections \(Operational Phase\)](#), [Landscape Layout Plan Operational Phase, Landscaping Restoration and outline Five year Aftercare Scheme](#) (Appendix 3.2) and [estimated planting costs](#) (Appendix 3.3) as well as a [concept restoration plan](#).
384. The [LVIA](#) summarises the existing condition of the site as follows:
- The proposed extraction area is generally devoid of mature tree and woody shrub vegetation or landscape features;
  - Most of the application area is under rank coarse grassland and encroaching bramble scrub;
  - Vegetation within the application area is therefore principally limited to the site boundaries, where generally there is mature vegetation forming part of the longer established landscape framework:
    - The northern and western boundaries of the site (along the railway line to the north and Hamble Lane to the west) are characterised by Oak, Birch, Sycamore and Goat Willow trees up to 9m high with an understorey of Field Maple, Hazel, Hawthorn and Blackthorn;
    - The eastern boundary (along Satchell Lane) is characterised by roadside hawthorn hedgerows;
    - The south-east boundary (along the existing footpath) is characterised by existing scattered mature oak trees, bramble scrub;
    - The southern boundary is characterised by maturing broadleaved; tree plantations (including Oak, Ash, and Alder 8m high) established for screening the site from the housing development in the mid-1990s); and the
    - Core of the site is characterised by scattered blocks of bramble and hawthorn scrub.
  - The main vegetation features of the immediate vicinity are largely comprised of mature parkland groves and specimens around Royal Victoria Country Park to the west, regenerating woodlands to the east and north-east, and the estuarine valley side woodlands and reedbeds along the River Hamble.
385. The landscape of the former airfield landholding is poorly managed, being largely un-grazed (except for some informal grazing) but with some mature remnant boundary hedgerows and linear woodland features. The County Landscape Architect notes that due to lack of positive management over the years the site has become invaded by scrub and rough grasses.

386. The airfield's chain-link fences are also in a poor state of repair. The landscape it is not designated at a national or local level. In addition, it is acknowledged that there are some significant detracting features within the surrounding area such as the proximity to the rail corridor, and the visual impact of the nearby oil refineries at Hamble-le-Rice and Fawley.
387. The applicant acknowledges that in the short term, the development will temporarily alter the surrounding landscape character if permission were to be granted.
388. The [LVIA](#) notes that for the parts of the site which will be operational for the entire duration of the development (such as site access, haul route, plant site and lagoons) the magnitude of landscape impact is considered to be High. For the wider extraction and restoration parts of the application area, this will be seen within a very local context and the Magnitude of Impact is considered to be Medium to Low.
389. Approximately 18,000 trees and shrubs will be planted, creating enhanced nature conservation corridors as part of the site restoration proposals. Landscaping details have been provided to support the application as set out above. In response to Regulation 25 (part 1), the County Landscape Architect stated that a revised detailed planting plan would be required showing greater diversity in the proposed native planting lists, with slightly different mixes used in different parts of the site. In response, the applicant indicated (see [Clarification response to Landscape](#)) that it would be happy to discuss a variation of the planting mixes to future-proof the restoration planting. Any further detail on planting species could be secured via a scheme to be submitted to discharge a planning condition in the event permission is granted.
390. In responding to Regulation 25 (part 2), the County Landscape Architect noted that the landscape issues previously identified had been addressed and are considered to be generally acceptable. A concern remained related to the management of the planting. The County Landscape Architect notes that "*the restoration proposals state that the large open field will be maintained by grazing and whilst there is no objection raised to the grazing, fencing would be required*". This aspect can be covered by the imposition of planning conditions in the event permission is granted alongside the requirement for details of fencing.
391. It was also noted that if cattle are grazing the land post restoration, the fences will need to be maintained for at least 20 years. Details of stock proof fencing will therefore be required and again this could be covered by a planning condition and indeed the section 106 for the long term management

of the fencing if required. This issue could also be covered by the EMMP of the site which would be secured through a legal agreement in the event that permission is granted. More information on this aspect is set out in the section on [Arboriculture](#).

392. The restoration will provide additional peripheral woodland and hedgerow planting both as advanced planting and at final restoration. This would form a medium to large scale field pattern, together with small ponds and wetter areas, and areas of new acid grassland. In the longer term, the applicant has indicated that the proposed restoration will *“assimilate into the pastoral landscape to contribute to its habitat and visual diversity, and recreational and amenity potential”*.

393. The applicant has indicated that the Working and Restoration Schemes have been designed to retain and protect the greater proportion of mature trees and existing hedgerows. They argue that the woodland, grassland, wetland, and hedgerow creation will also help to integrate the restored landform into the surrounding landscape. The application site and its surroundings will therefore benefit from an increase in native tree and shrub cover, and supplementary and replacement hedgerow planting that will reinforce existing boundaries and provide enhanced linkages across the restored landform. The magnitude of landscape impact for the application area post restoration is considered to be Low – Negligible, with the greater part of the application area being restored to original ground levels and under a similar management regime. The overall landscape impact significance of the site restoration in the longer term is therefore Minor-Neutral Beneficial. The County Landscape Architect agrees with this conclusion *“as the proposal does not impact permanently affect the landscape elements on the site”*.

394. The County Landscape Architect commented that the [LVIA](#) described the site well and in general appears to be a fair assessment of the potential effects of this development. It was noted that the proposed working of the site has taken account of most of the landscape concerns. In responding to the planning application, the County Landscape Architect noted that the proposal appears to have taken care to minimise the effects on the landscape elements to restore the land to similar ground levels as currently existing, therefore replicating the existing topographical features. It was noted that the proposed mitigation should integrate the landscape features into the surrounding landscape as required by the [EBLP \(2022\)](#).

395. Concerns were raised in representations, including from the HPRG that the landscape assessment was not accurate. This included concerns that the landscape and visual impact had failed to adequately recognise local heritage.

The impact on heritage assets is covered by the section on [Cultural and Archaeological Heritage](#). There is no evidence presented to suggest that the landscape impact assessment by the applicant is not accurate and indeed no issues about accuracy have been raised by consultees.

*Visual impacts:*

396. The proximity of residential properties and other receptors to the site boundary means that the visual impact of the proposal is an important consideration.
397. As noted, a variety of different concerns in relation to the potential visual impacts of the proposal have been raised. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report. Many comments received noted that the site is on a relatively elevated and exposed plateau. This includes comments from the HPRG who state that *'the site's elevated position above the surrounding area will mean an adverse visual and noise impact not only locally but across the Lower Hamble Valley, which the County Council has documented as a 'valued landscape'*.
398. The [LVIA](#) notes that there are properties or publicly accessible viewpoints at the site boundaries from which views of the proposed site can be obtained. However, direct, open, proximate, extensive, or prolonged views of the application area from properties and public rights of way are mainly limited to the proposed soil storage mounds at the operational periphery. It is considered that once mitigation is implemented, impacts will be reduced. The various mitigation measures proposed include:
- Revisions to the site access;
  - further boundary advanced hedgerow and tree planting;
  - the retention, management, and supplementation of boundary vegetation;
  - the design of the processing plant;
  - careful location of key aspects of the proposal (plant site, silt lagoons, haul road, conveyor);
  - the provision of grassed soil screen mounds for acoustic and visual screening;
  - a phased scheme of working and restoration;
  - the reinstatement of pastoral agriculture and the creation of new areas of woodland, landscape, and conservation;
  - improvements to the condition of the existing Public Rights of Way Network; and a
  - new additional length of permissive footpath.

399. The bunding proposed has been raised as an area of concern by Hamble Parish Council and in other representations received. The location of the bunds is shown on the [Method of Working Phasing Overview](#). Bunds will be required to mitigate visual impacts but also for dust and noise mitigation. The County Landscape Architect notes that the “*screen mound along the eastern footpath will be quite enclosing and domineering. The path is long and straight and the high mound will be on one side and garden fences on the other side. The proposal provides a 3m wide path, which is a reasonable width and will help to lessen the impact, but if in areas it could widen out further it would be preferable, but this has not been proposed*”. The County Landscape Architect also notes that this is an area that would benefit from sequential restoration occurring after each phase is completed, removing the mound and opening up views across the open landscape again. This aspect could be covered by a planning condition, if required and acceptable, in the event that permission were to be granted. The location of the bunds, whilst close to some properties in some locations, is considered to be acceptable due to the associated mitigation. More consideration of the issues of buffer zone is included in the [Human health](#) section of the report. The height of the bunds and stockpiles could be controlled by planning condition in the event that permission is granted.

400. The [LVIA](#) considered the visual impact of the proposal from a number of viewpoints (the assessment of the visual effects of the proposal, with the proposed mitigation, are noted alongside the viewpoint locations):

- Properties along Hamble Lane (south of the railway): Minor adverse;
- Properties along Satchell Lane (Wessex House, Manor and Bungalow): Negligible;
- Properties along Satchell Lane (Sample viewpoint no 81): Moderate - Minor Adverse;
- Properties on the Close Satchell Lane (Sample viewpoint no 3): Moderate - Major Adverse;
- Properties on Tutor Close and Astral Close (Sample viewpoint no 63): Minor Adverse;
- Properties along Hamble Lane (north of the railway) (Sample viewpoint no 63): Minor Adverse;
- The Hamble School (north of the railway): Minor Adverse;
- Old Bursledon Conservation Area: Neutral Adverse;
- Royal Victoria Country Park and Registered Park and Garden: Neutral Adverse;
- Hamble public footpath no 1: Minor Adverse;
- Public footpath former railway corridor at the northern edge of Astral Way, Spitfire Way and Tutor Close: Neutral Adverse;



- Public footpath eastern shoreline of Hamble estuary: Neutral Adverse;
- Spitfire Way playground, Hamble: Minor Adverse;
- Hamble Lane: Minor - Neutral Adverse; and
- Satchell Lane: Minor – Neutral adverse.

401. The visual impact of any changes to the tree line outside of the site access has been assessed.

402. Whilst the concerns of residents about visual impacts are acknowledged, no significant visual impact concerns have been raised by consultees. No significant impacts on the wider Lower Hamble Valley are identified either. With mitigation, the [LVIA](#) concludes that the residual visual effects of the development will be of minor significance. The County Landscape Architect notes that the [LVIA](#) description of the visual effects is considered to be accurate and is agreed. The visual envelope for this scheme is limited to the immediate setting and surrounds but it is acknowledged that this includes a significant number of private houses. However, the proposals do not fully maximise the full extraction area and the proposed screen mounds are not located immediately adjacent to garden fences of nearby properties but a reasonable distance away. It is acknowledged that screen mounds can be very oppressive and enclosing if they are located too close to residential areas or public rights of way.

403. The mitigation measures, the extensive restoration and planting proposals, will ensure that the development can take place without permanent detriment to the visual appearance and quality of the surrounding landscape, and will positively enhance the habitat and landscape value of the site in the longer term. The measures proposed are considered to be acceptable.

404. It is also important to note that the visual impact of the proposal will be impacted by the level that the operatives are working at. During phased extraction, the ground levels will reduce as the mineral is extracted.

405. Many comments received also related to the fact that neighbouring properties currently look out on open space and have panoramic views and that this view will be lost. This is acknowledged. The loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration. However, the overarching visual impact of the development is a material consideration as discussed in this section.

*Tranquillity:*

406. With regard to tranquillity, paragraph of 191 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states “*planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is*

*appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:...b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason”.*

407. Many representations received raised concerns that the peace, ambience and tranquillity of the site and wider area will be lost. Comments were also made that the airfield is at the heart of the village. Concerns raised about the proximity to village allotments are also noted. The HLICA notes that “*The valley offers different experiences along its length in term of tranquillity. South of the M27 the waterside scene is bustling, colourful and can sometimes feel crowded*”.

408. The site is not identified as an area of tranquillity in the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). The impact on amenity is covered in [Impact on public health, safety and amenity](#) and [Cumulative impacts](#).

#### *Conclusion on visual and landscape impacts:*

409. It is clear that in the short term, the development will temporarily alter the surrounding landscape character and have a visual impact. However, with the application of the proposed mitigation measures, the Magnitude of Landscape Impact during operations is considered to be Medium to Low and Low – Negligible through the restoration of the site. The overall landscape impact of the site in the longer term is considered to be Minor-Neutral Beneficial. With mitigation, the residual visual effects of the development will be of minor significance. Therefore, on the basis of the proposed mitigation and planning conditions, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) (part d) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). The proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to landscape and visual impacts.

#### Arboriculture

410. Part d of Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states all new development should not involve the loss of or damage to trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ponds, priority habitats or other landscape features of value to the character of the area, for appearance or biodiversity

unless they can be replaced with features of equivalent or enhanced value (recognising that some species and habitats may be irreplaceable).

411. In relation to veteran trees it is noted that paragraph 186 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:...c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons [for example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat] and a suitable compensation strategy exists*”.
412. It is noted that Eastleigh Borough Council covered the site with a Tree Preservation Order after the planning application was made.
413. Concerns were initially raised in many representations about the loss of trees both within and on the boundary of the site both by County Arboriculture, Eastleigh Borough Council, the Woodland Trust and local residents. These are acknowledged. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Consultations](#) and [Representations](#) section of the report.
414. The proposed extraction area currently comprises rough grassland and scrub, with a mosaic of field boundary trees, ranging in age from young through to mature trees. No over mature or veteran trees are apparent within the application boundary. Mature trees are most prominent on the northern, eastern, and part of the western boundaries and largely comprise English oak, common ash, common alder, silver birch sycamore and willow, with an under story of holly, goat willow, field maple and hawthorn. These trees would be retained and protected, except for those trees identified around the proposed access point for removal.
415. An [Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement](#) was submitted as part of the planning application alongside a [Tree Survey Constraints & Protection Plan](#). Additional information was submitted under Regulation 25 (part 1) included [Trees CEMEX Response to Tree Officer](#), [Trees Vol 1 Appendix 3 CAVAT Valuation](#) and [Trees Vol 1 Appendix Areas of Trees Marked as Group](#).
416. Initially it was proposed that 21 individual trees and 9 groups of trees identified, 4 trees (T5, T6 and T7, T8) on the site access and one small group of internal trees would be removed from the site as part of the proposal. These would be removed to enable the construction of the access road and are

categorised as C1 (T5, T6, T8) and B1 (T7). Category B trees are considered to be of moderate quality and category C trees are considered to be of low quality.

417. In response to the submissions made under Regulation 25 (part 1), the County Arboriculturist commented on the revised plans and raised concerns about the impact on two trees, T8 and T6, and there was a need to make revisions to the already submitted [Arboricultural Method Statement](#) (AMS). This was considered to be a main point of concern, *“that two ancient trees would be lost with no provision made for mitigation or replacement, such that the proposed access point should not be approved”*.
418. Following Regulation 25 (part 1), the applicant requested informal discussions with the County Arboriculturist. The focus was on the issues raised by County Arboriculture at Regulation 25 (part 1). It was clear following these discussions that the potential further changes to the scheme proposed by the applicant went to the heart of the ES and therefore required public consultation. This led to additional requests being made by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in relation to arboriculture (and other associated issues such as ecology, landscaping and restoration) under Regulation 25 to ensure due process was followed.
419. The applicant has asserted that impact on trees has been taken into account in designing the scheme, including the revised location of the proposed access in response to Regulation 25 (part 2) (see [Vol 2 Appendix 7.2](#)) to reduce the impact on T8. The changes to the location of the site access moved it slightly further south, so that it is located further outside the root protection area of T8, a retained oak tree immediately north of the access. On the basis of this change, it is now proposed that of the 21 individual trees and 9 groups of trees identified, 3 trees (T5, T6 and T7) on the site access and one small group of internal trees would be removed from the site as part of the proposal. Trees T5, T6 and T7 would be removed to enable the construction of the access road outside of the site and are categorised as C1 (T5, T6) and B1 (T7).
420. Eastleigh Borough Council maintained an objection at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage due to the impact of the access works on protected trees, noting that at least 3 trees would need removing. It is noted that a further tree, T8, is indicated for retention with measures suggested for its protection. However, it is the Borough Council’s view that *“this tree will also be adversely impacted by the works and is unlikely to be successfully retained, therefore potentially resulting in further tree loss. The resulting loss of trees to facilitate the access would impact on amenity by altering the visual nature of Hamble Lane”*.

421. The County Arboricultural Officer has indicated that the change of the location of the access *“is better, but this still requires the loss of three highway trees, one of which (T6) is of substantial age and size”*. The applicant has indicated that the revised access is the best position in terms of highway safety and to minimise the loss of trees, as demonstrated in [Vol 2 Appendix 7.2](#). The relocation of the access slightly further south, as shown by the latest plans, reduces the incursion into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of retained T8, which the County Arboricultural Officer had previously expressed concern about.

422. The County Arboricultural Officer also indicated that the *“removal of the footway on the northern side is supported, as long as there is some load-bearing provision to stop soil compaction through pedestrian movements on unprotected RPA”*. This could be covered the requirement for a scheme via a planning condition in the event permission were to be granted.

423. The County Arboricultural Officer is clear that concerns still remain. These relate to the following areas:

- Concerns over the plotting of the RPAs;
- Need for the AMS to be amended in relation *“roots of over 25mm diameter and the need for more information on utilities over root protection areas and what alternative solutions have been sought”*. The location of a street lighting column must also be relocated;
- Use of sand base – this needs to be clean sharp sand, not builders’ sand as this has a high lime content and is toxic to tree roots.

424. The applicant acknowledged in response that the proposed location of the access would still result in a small impact on T8 and they have done as much as they can to minimise this impact.

425. In relation to utilities, the applicant does not propose to locate any utilities with any of the RPAs of the trees which are identified to be retained in the survey. Where utilities have been proposed they have been routed to avoid any conflict with the RPAs of trees (see [Tree Survey Constraints & Protection Plan](#)). The applicant has indicated that *“If for any reason it becomes unavoidable, and utilities must be sited within RPAs, it will be necessary to consider the effects that the installation may have on their health. Utilities will only be installed where approved mitigation is be adopted by further consultation and approval with the project Arboriculturist and the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.”*

426. The applicant has already indicated that the lighting column will be relocated as part of the delivery of the access. The relocation could

necessitate the location / design of columns over a greater length being reviewed. If planning permission were to be granted, the applicant could consider this in more detail at where this could be moved to and submit the information via the discharge of a planning condition attached on this matter.

427. Many of the other concerns identified by County Arboriculture can be addressed via planning conditions in the event that permission were to be granted. This could include the requirement for a revised AMS prior to the commencement of any works, reporting requirements and conditions relating to local authority trees. The correction of CAVAT calculations can take place if a S278 is lodged if permission is granted.
428. In addition, the [Landscaping, Restoration and Outline Aftercare Scheme](#) outlines that tree and shrub species had been carefully selected; restoration planting will comprise native deciduous types found locally within this lowland coastal plain area. All transplant tree and shrub planting will be carried out by notch planting using bare root or cell grown stock. All tree and hedgerow planting will be protected from rodent damage by 1.2m "Tubex" shelters, and where required, post and wire fencing or timber post and rail fencing will be erected around new planting to protect it from field operations and potential grazing damage. This could be addressed by a planning condition and as part of the long-term ecological management of the site (via a legal agreement) in the event that permission is granted.
429. As part of discussions prior to the submission of Regulation 25 (part 2), the County Ecologist advised that the proposed 'medium' sized trees should be changed to 'small' as the biggest trees available in nurseries are extra heavy standard trees which do not meet the criteria for medium sized trees (30-90cm diameter). All proposed trees were therefore changed to 'small' trees. This was amended under Regulation 25 (part 2) submissions.
430. Some representations requested that the Council undertake a full survey of the trees on the site access that need to be removed to ascertain if the classification of the trees is correct. The assessment work undertaken by the applicant has been assessed to be accurate by the County Arboriculturist. The work is considered to be acceptable, so no further work is required. The submission of inspection reports by an arboricultural supervisor can be covered by a planning condition in the event that permission is granted.
431. Arboriculture matters interrelate with other aspects covered elsewhere in this commentary including [Ecology](#) and [Visual impact and landscape](#).

*Legal agreement:*

432. As set out above, the long-term management of fencing could be covered by a legal agreement in the event that permission is granted as part of the long-term management of the site.

*Conclusion on arboriculture:*

433. It is acknowledged that there will be some loss of trees. There will be some offset of this impact through the proposed planting of trees and shrubs during restoration, and over 1km of new hedgerow. The retained boundary trees will be protected by a fence on the outside of the bunds during the operational period. Improvements to the scheme have been made during the planning process which has reduced the impacts on T8. Part c of Paragraph 186 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) is clear that any development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat and a suitable compensation strategy exists. The proposed changes to the access help to reduce arboricultural impacts although T5, T6 and T7 are still impacted. T5 and T6 are considered to be low quality but T7 is considered to be of moderate quality. Whilst it is recognised the loss of the identified trees is not ideal, a balance needs to be made here about the provision of the safest access into the site. The Highway Authority have accepted the changes to the access in this regard. It is considered that in the event that permission were to be granted for development here, the provision of safe access on to the highway network would make this an exceptional reason. Proposed mitigation measures and the application of planning conditions will also help to mitigate any impacts.

Soil Protection

434. Soil issues are particularly relevant for minerals developments as extraction usually involves disturbance to land and soils over large areas.

435. Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste developments to protect and, wherever possible, enhance soils. It also states that development should not result in the net loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. It also contains provisions for the protection of soils during construction.

436. Part g (iii) of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) also relate to contaminants.

437. Paragraph 180 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that planning decisions “*should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)*”. Footnote 62 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality*”. It also states that “*The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development*”. The [NPPF \(2023\)](#) defines best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as Grades 1, 2 and 3a of the agricultural land classification.

438. Paragraph 040 (Reference ID: 27-040-20140306) of the [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) states that “*where working is proposed on the best and most versatile agricultural land, the outline strategy should show, where practicable, how the methods used in the restoration and aftercare enable the land to retain its longer term capability, though the proposed after-use need not always be for agriculture*”.

439. The site is situated on a shallow terrace sand and gravel deposit. The mineral is on average approximately 3.0m deep, overlain by a reasonable thickness of overburden clay and topsoils. The [Geological Report](#) for the site identifies topsoils to an average depth of 0.4m and overburden to depths of between 1.18m to 2.01m (average depth 1.54m). These soils together with imported inert restoration materials will form the final restoration cover for the site. To access the mineral resources, the applicant has indicated that 662,000m<sup>3</sup> of overburden, comprising soils, subsoils and clays, will need to be stripped, stored and used in restoration.

440. With regard to the soil resource and BMV agricultural land, it is noted that letters of representation object to the proposal on the grounds of permanent loss of agricultural land. This included concerns raised by Hamble Prish Council. These concerns are acknowledged.

*Impact on best and most versatile agricultural land:*

441. The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) involves the classification of agricultural land into five categories according to versatility and suitability for growing crops. The top three grades (Grade 1, 2 and 3a) are referred to as ‘Best and Most Versatile’ land. An ALC survey of the site identifies it as comprising of the following:



- Grade 1 (Land with no or very minor limitations to agricultural use) in broadly the western part of the site; and broadly in the eastern part of the site a mixture of
  - Grade 2 (Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting); and
  - subgrade 3a (Land with moderate limitations which affect the choice of crops, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or the level of yield. Land capable of consistently producing moderate to high yields of a narrow range of arable crops, especially cereals, or moderate yields of a wide range of crops including cereals, grass, oilseeds and roots).
442. Evidence shows that the site has not been in full agricultural production for approximately 100 years although there is some evidence of small-scale market gardening on parts of the grade 1 land.
443. A [Soil Resource Assessment](#) and associated appendices were submitted as part of the Regulation 25 (part 1) response. The updated [Soil Resource Assessment](#) concluded that the site consisted of unmanaged scrub/amenity grassland used for recreation, informal public open space and conservation habitat. The following characteristics were noted:
- No evidence of recent agricultural activities such as cultivations, cutting, grazing, fencing, vegetation management or general maintenance normally associated with either grassland or arable use;
  - An absence of internal field boundaries;
  - No formal agricultural field system or enclosures;
  - No management of external field boundaries or vegetation;
  - A remnant MOD fence in poor repair to all sides with significant public access being obtained from the urban fringe;
  - No evidence of water supplies;
  - No watercourses or evidence of modern drainage systems;
  - Localised grazing by transient and tethered horses/ponies;
  - Informal footpaths used recreationally for walking and dog exercise;
  - Approximately 40ha to the west of the site was occupied by bramble, gorse, scrub and broadleaved weeds with dense, inaccessible thickets up to 3m in height. The remaining land is extensive grass with extremely limited agricultural potential; and
  - pH and nutrient levels that do not reflect agricultural inputs of lime, fertiliser or manure for many years.
444. The applicant also reported that the current owner has not been in receipt of formal basic farm payments, conservation or agri-environment grants since the land was purchased in the 1990s. Eastleigh Borough Council also concluded that this area of land was non-agricultural in their [Strategic Land Availability Assessment \(2016\)](#) (SLAA-8-2-C).

445. The applicant concluded that the site has been undergoing reversion from the previous airfield/grassland uses to extensive scrub and amenity grassland over a period of at least 25-30 years. The applicant further concluded that bringing the land into agricultural use will require significant interventions in terms of vegetation clearance and management, weed control, land drainage, agricultural inputs of fertiliser/manure, fencing, access and water supply that are economically and logistically impractical. It concluded that the land is severely constrained in its agricultural potential and that the land should be designated as non-agricultural. Despite the above conclusion, the soils within the site have an intrinsic value and quality which supported Natural England's recommendation that soil resources should be fully considered within the ES.
446. An additional [ALC grades assessment](#) (Appendix 9.13) was undertaken at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage. A survey was submitted which indicated that the site comprised 35.50ha of ALC Grade 1, 18.94ha of ALC grade 2 and 5.60ha of ALC subgrade 3a, An [Agricultural Viability Report](#) (Appendix 9.14) was also prepared. This concluded that the land *"is not and has not been for nearly 100 years in agricultural production. In its current state and condition, it would be impossible to farm the land or grow a commercially viable crop in its current condition"*. It concludes that the applicant does not believe that an agricultural use of the land is viable or practical and does not believe the land should be classified as BMV agricultural land.
447. In response to Regulation 25 (part 2), Natural England noted that based on the information provided, the proposed development would extend to approximately 60ha at ALC grades considered to be BMV land. It was noted that it *"is for the planning authority to consider whether the current use of the site is an effective use of BMV land and to assess the weight to be given to considerations relevant to the use of BMV land"*. There is no evidence before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to suggest that the site has been in active agricultural use since the airfield was decommissioned. Indeed, as already set out, there is evidence to suggest that the site has not been used for agriculture for over a century. Therefore, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority concludes that proposed use of the land as BMV land as a weighty consideration against the proposal. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority also consider the applicant's consideration of the soils on the site and the impact of the proposal on those soils to be acceptable.

*Impact and management of soils:*

448. Natural England's initial consultation response recommended that the Site required an Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Resource Assessment so the potential impact on soils could be explored more fully.

449. The soils on site are defined as the following (see [Appendix 9.2 – Soil type distribution](#)):

- Soil type 1 – Medium heavy loam (39.84 ha of the site); and
- Soil type 2 – Stoney medium loam (20.20 ha of the site).

450. The applicant has indicated that soils will be handled in accordance with the [Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils' prepared by The Institute Of Quarrying](#) (2021). Soils will only be handled when in a dry and friable condition. The criteria for determining dry and friable shall be based on a field assessment of the soils' wetness in relation to its Lower Plastic Limit. Topsoils will be stored in mounds not exceeding 3.0m in height and subsoils and subsoil substitutes will be stored in mounds not exceeding 5.0m in height. The general locations of all soil storage screen mounds are shown on the submitted [Method of Working](#) Plans. Topsoil and subsoils will be stored separately. Materials shall be stored like upon like i.e. topsoil shall be stripped from beneath subsoil and overburden bunds prior to installation. Where continuous bunds are used, dissimilar soils will be separated by a third material such as geotextile layer or straw. All soil bunds are to be placed in accordance with the [Tree Protection Plans](#) to protect rootzones and to allow for maintenance access.

451. The proposed restoration design provides for the re-instatement of the site requiring suitable soil profiles for re-instatement, representing approximately 97% of the site. The remaining 1.87ha of impacted land will be restored to lakes, wetlands and riparian margins.

452. The installation of a post-working drainage system, the rapid establishment of a vegetative cover in the restored areas and an aftercare management plan will help to ensure effective soil management, establishment and provide suitable soil profiles and healthy plant growth in the longer term.

453. Concerns were raised about changes to the airfield's soils as a result of the extraction, the potential soil erosion and fears of slippage around the boundary of the site. These concerns are acknowledged.

454. The applicant has indicated that any areas of failed sward on the soil storage areas will be cultivated and reseeded with the appropriate mix in the next seeding season. Soils will be placed to achieve, as near as possible, the levels shown on the [Restoration Plan](#). Objects greater than 100mm in any direction brought to the surface by this cultivation will be removed from the soiled area. For grassland areas, subsoils or imported subsoil forming materials will be spread to a maximum settled depth of 900mm. Topsoil will be

spread to a minimum even settled depth of 300mm and disc harrowed upon replacement. Any movements across the soil will be kept to a minimum. The design proposes to mitigate likely significant effects by repurposing topsoil and subsoil from the wetland areas into restored land within the site. Conditions can be applied to ensure soil stripping, storage and re-instatement is undertaken during drier periods of the year (usually between April and October) and to require the submission of a Soil Management Plan and further mitigation relating to soil handling and re-instatement. All such conditions could be applied in the event that permission is granted.

455. The restoration of the site will involve a combination of grazing alongside nature conservation, open space, public access and woodland, in accordance with Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The applicant has indicated that the site will be returned to a productive use as land with agricultural potential, conservation and wetland use within a five-year aftercare period post extraction and this will require the creation of soil profiles to sustain the land use types proposed.

456. There are concerns about the lack of definition of the inert material that will be used to fill the These are acknowledged. The availability of inert fill is covered in [Need for waste management provision](#).

*Conclusion on soils:*

457. Whilst it is recognised that the proposal will technically result in the loss of BMV agricultural land during its operational phase, it is clear that the site has not been in active agricultural use for a significant period of time. Restoration will include grazing, and soil management mitigation measures can be effectively controlled by planning condition in the event permission is granted. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard. The site, although defined as BMV, has no long-term or established agricultural use and indeed the [Soil Resource Assessment](#) produced suggests that it would not be viable to return the site to agricultural uses. The applicant has indicated that the site will be returned to a productive use as land with agricultural potential. Soil management proposed as part of the application is also considered to be acceptable. On this basis, with the application of planning conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

458. The potential to manage any contamination discovered during the movement of soils meets part 'g iii' of Policy 10 (Protection of public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

## Public Rights of Way and access

459. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that “*where minerals or landfill sites are located close to or affect a public right of way footpath network, measures should be put in place to protect or divert (for a temporary or permanent period, as appropriate) the route*”. This is also considered under Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
460. Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) includes development considerations in relation to the site allocation such as the safeguarding of the adjacent public rights of way (Footpath no 1 and the path to the south-west) and maintaining and managing existing informal recreational use of the site.
461. Strategic Policy S9 (Green infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that the Borough Council will seek to achieve the provision, retention and/or enhancement of green infrastructure through various factors including landscape scale strategic links, interlinked publicly accessible open spaces, incorporation of green infrastructure, interconnected urban green infrastructure (including green, cycle ways, paths and linkages between community facilities and open spaces to link community facilities), connected habitats (linking the network of designated sites and existing priority habitats) and the incorporation of historic buildings and landscapes.
462. Strategic Policy S12 (Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that “*new development should integrate with existing routes and public rights of way, and wherever possible maintain, protect and enhance their function*”. Development that would sever, obstruct or otherwise have a detrimental impact on the existing or proposed network of green routes as shown on the policies map will not be permitted. Part 3 of the Strategic Policy S12 also states that “*new development should integrate with existing routes and public rights of way and wherever possible maintain, protect and enhance their function*”. Part n of Policy S12 identifies the provision of new and strategic footpath/cycleway/bridleway routes between Botley and Hamble via Manor Farm Country Park. This proposed route would be on the upper eastern boundary of the site to connect Hamble le-rice Footpath no 1 to Bridleway no 9, and along the northern half of the western boundary to connect to public footpath no 16.
463. As already set out, Policy HA3 (Hamble Airfield) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that “*if permission is granted for the extraction of sand and gravel at Hamble Airfield and the extraction takes place, the site shall be restored in accordance*

*with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and it shall be retained as an area of accessible countryside and open space with grazing, public access and outdoor recreation facilities laid out to the satisfaction of the Borough Council”.*

464. Paragraph 96 (c) of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that planning decisions should “*enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling*”. Paragraph 104 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users. Furthermore, paragraph 108(c) states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals, so that “*c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued*”.

465. The impacts on public rights of way (PROW) are considered in a number of chapters of the ES including sections on [landscape and visual impacts](#) and [restoration](#).

*Current access:*

466. Most representations received referenced the potential loss of the airfield as a site with public access. This included comments from Paul Holmes MP, Hamble Parish Council and the HPRAs. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

467. It is important to note from the outset that there is currently no formalised public access (PROW or permissive) across the entire site. However, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is aware that the site is accessed informally. The site is in private ownership but has been and is used for informal recreation through openings in the existing fence line. Many representations noted that access into the site has never been restricted. It is understood that the site owner (Persimmon Homes) has attempted many times to secure the site, and as such existing access is considered to be unauthorised by the landowner. However, all restrictions have been removed / damaged by other parties meaning unauthorised access has continued for an extended period. As a result, there is a perception of access held by the local community. It is acknowledged that the site has been and is used for informal recreation through openings in the existing fence line. Hamble Parish Council have indicated that the site has been used “*extensively for casual recreational activity, particularly for dog walking, and this use has continued since at least*

1986". Hamble Parish Council undertook a survey in April 2022 which confirmed that at least 300 people use the site for dog walking on a regular basis.

468. The existing site has limited connections to the PROW network due to its history as an airfield, and links to the south and north are restricted by the railway and existing residential development. The Hamble-le-Rice 1 public footpath runs north to south along the site's eastern boundary for approximately 700m. It is noted that the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) shows a strategic footpath (Policy S12) along the upper eastern boundary of the site to connect Hamble-le-Rice 1 public footpath to Bridleway no 9, and along the northern half of the western boundary to connect to Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 16.

469. The [Hampshire Countryside Access Plan 2015–2025](#) describes how rights of way and access to the countryside will be managed over the coming years. The plan should be read in conjunction with the [Countryside Access Plan for the Solent 2008-2013](#). The [Countryside Access Plan for the Solent 2008-2013](#) is one of seven area plans which, together with an eighth 'County Overview' CAP, form the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) for Hampshire. The plan identifies the following issues for the whole of the Solent area (not specific to Hamble-le-Rice):

- The rights of way network is particularly fragmented in this part of Hampshire;
- There is an undersupply of access resource for horse riding and carriage driving;
- Countryside users can be forced to use or cross busy roads to link up off-road access;
- Many Solent area residents travel some distance to find accessible countryside; there is a high reliance on cars and the availability of car parking to access the countryside both within and beyond the Solent area;
- The Solent area offers good potential for cycling, but improvements are needed to both the network and the associated infrastructure;
- There is a strong demand for access to the coastal areas and river estuaries in this area, both by land and by water;
- Lack of local 'greenspace' and rights of way puts pressure on existing publicly accessible sites, which may also be of high conservation value; and
- A coordinated approach to providing information is needed to facilitate and promote enjoyment of the countryside for all and to encourage responsible use.

470. Some responses received raised that the [Hampshire Countryside Access Plan 2015–2025](#) and [Countryside Access Plan for the Solent 2008-2013](#) should be considered as part of the determination of the planning application. The area CAPs explores in greater detail the specific issues affecting enjoyment of the countryside and propose actions to address them. CROW are clear that these actions are intentionally broadly-defined and aspirational. Whilst recognising the aspirations of the plans, the plans are not supplementary planning documents.

471. Concerns were raised about potential impacts on Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 during the operation of the quarry. It is acknowledged that the northern length of Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 is within the application site, although this appears to be largely abandoned as there is no access from the northern end of the footpath out onto Satchell Lane. Instead, it is understood that pedestrians use the adjacent footpath 1 to the east which leads out onto Satchell Lane. The proposal will not affect the definitive line of Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 within the site, as it lies outside the bunds and proposed fence line, so will be available throughout the development and upon restoration for access. The proposed bunding and fencing is considered to be acceptable, to protect the rights of way during the operation of the site if permission is granted. Planning conditions could also be applied to ensure this protection.

472. The existing [Hamble Rail Trail](#) which runs to the south of the application site will not be impacted by the proposal. The Hamble Rail Trail is a 4.5 mile (7.2km) long circular footpath running alongside a disused railway track built during the First World War to transport oil to and from the BP oil terminal in Hamble. The rail line has not been used since 1986 when BP installed its pipeline.

*Access proposed:*

473. It is acknowledged that it may be inappropriate to allow public access across parts of the site where there is potentially high-risk plant, machinery or other infrastructure associated within minerals and waste development. This is covered by the phasing of the development as proposed.

*Permissive path:*

474. The proposal includes a new permissive footpath linking the south-east and the north-west of the site with multiple exit/entry points, as a permissive path for the community to use during operations and following restoration. It is noted that some sections of the footpath would be provided at the start of the development once bund and tree screening has been implemented. Certain sections would only be provided upon restoration for health and safety reasons



as these cross the site access point so cannot be delivered until it is safe to do so.

475. Paragraph 4.41 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) acknowledges that “*permissive footpaths do not carry the same weight as adopted public rights of way*”. Local representations including those made by the HPRG argue that the proposed permissive path is unacceptable both in practical and policy terms. Concerns were also raised that the permissive provision being proposed will not compensate for this loss. These concerns are acknowledged.

476. Some other representations welcomed the proposed "permissive path" around the site but requested that it needed to be upgraded to a bridleway to allow cyclists to use it. This included a request for the designation of a bridleway by Hamble Parish Council.

477. The restoration of the site will formalise public access to the site by the creation of a new permissive footpath linking the south-east and north-west of the site, to allow access from residential areas in Satchell Lane to the station, Hamble School and the sports complex. It is envisaged that this will also enable easy access to existing paths on the opposite side of Hamble Lane. The footpath will have several entrance/exit points to allow permeability around the proposed mineral workings.

478. The applicant has indicated that the proposed new permissive path will provide a safe, off-road route to link the Hamble School and the station with the houses at the south and east of the site, (and west once restored) and will encourage walking where previously people may have driven to the school. The applicant has indicated that there is currently no clear or easily accessible way out at the north-west corner of the site and as such the new path will be of clear benefit in this regard and will encourage those who may have not used the site previously due to the lack of accessibility in this corner, or its private status, to make use of the site for walking. On this basis, the applicant concludes that the proposal will result in improved public access and encouragement to use sustainable transport measures via the creation of the permissive footpath and public open space on the site. This will make the site more accessible to pedestrians via a clear and accessible walking route, linking houses at the south and east of the site to the school and station in the north-west, and upon restoration will have additional links along the western side. It is clear that the proposal will provide permissive access to the site when currently there is not authorised access. This is a benefit of the scheme.

479. The Countryside Rights of Way (CROW) team initially raised objection to the proposal on the basis that it did not offer benefits to the Public Rights of

Way network contrary to the relevant policies of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and the Hamble Airfield site allocation. In essence, the concerns related to the provision of a 'permissive' rather than dedicated public right of way because the permissive status does not secure any public right of access and is granted at the behest of the landowner. The CROW team proposed that a public right of way be built to County Council bridleway specifications, operating as a permissive path for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders during the final restoration phase of the site at which point the path should be dedicated as a new bridleway. A financial contribution towards the maintenance and management of the dedicated path was also requested, to be secured by way of a legal agreement/planning obligation. In addition, it was recommended that the existing public right of way (Footpath 1) to the east of the site be merged with the proposed permissive path into one new public bridleway thereby enhancing the experience of the users by moving into the green area rather than running hard against the fence line of the neighbouring properties.

480. The applicant responded to the CROW team in January 2023 at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage (see [Cemex clarification response to Countryside Rights of Way](#)). The applicant stated that the applicant is not the landowner and therefore it will not be possible to formally dedicate the path nor provide a bridleway. Hamble Parish Council have argued that the fact that the applicant is not the owner of the land makes no difference as to whether this can or should be a requirement of any planning consent'.

481. It is considered that the proposed footpaths within the site would help to fulfil the ambitions of Policy S12 (Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) to have connecting footpaths in the immediate vicinity.

482. Whilst the response from the CROW team states that the permissive status of the proposed footpath provides no guarantee about permanent provision, the path is to be made available to the public and is clearly shown on the [Restoration Plan](#). The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority therefore agrees with the assertion made by the applicant that any revision to this plan would need to be secured through a subsequent planning application. This provides some certainty that it will be available for public use.

483. Some representations also raised concerns that the proposal will create a pedestrian path towards only the northern part of the airfield, which will help only Satchell Lane residents to walk to the Hamble School and the railway and not provide wider linkages and benefits. The HPRG disagree that the proposed new path will in any way compensate for the loss of the airfield It

was noted that, although welcomed, “*it will merely link the Roy Underwood public park (a much smaller parcel of land also used for football, cricket and other activities) and Hamble Lane and it would not create easy access to Royal Victoria Country Park*”. They conclude that whilst some may use the new route, it is ‘*absolutely beyond credulity that this will in any way be adequate compensation for the extensive area of open land*’. Whilst these comments are acknowledged, as previously set out, the site does not currently have authorised access across it. Whilst the value of this use is acknowledged, it is unauthorised so cannot be given the weight that it could if there was open access across the site.

*Community access area:*

484. Public access is proposed for an area in the north-eastern corner, which will be restored to a parkland area with a number of trees and paths, and a hedgerow dividing this area from the private grazing areas beyond. The public access area will be accessible from the permissive paths around the edges of the site and will, in the applicants view, result in an area of high-quality public access where currently there is no public right of access.

*Impacts of pavements on Hamble Lane:*

485. Concerns were also raised about the safety of the pavement/cycle path along Hamble Lane which will need to cross the planned entrance to the site. These are acknowledged. This aspect is also considered in more detail in the [Highways impact](#) section of this report.

*Wider access:*

486. Hamble Parish Council strongly supports the creation of new and permanent active travel routes.

487. It is acknowledged that a “safe alternative to Satchell Lane for cyclists” was requested by some representations received. It is important to note that Satchell Lane will not be impacted by the proposals as routing of HGVs will be secured via s106 to ensure that HGVs only use Hamble Lane in the event that permission is granted. It is therefore considered that providing an alternative to Satchell Lane for cyclists is unnecessary as this is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

488. Provision for vulnerable highway users and peak flows has been considered. The applicant has agreed to a planning condition which limits the entry and exit of vehicles exiting during peak times when the schools opens and closes each day. This could be considered by way of a planning condition in the event that permission is granted. This is covered in more detail in [Highways impact](#) section of the report.

489. Many representations called for a dedicated cycle route as part of the proposal. Wider active travel aspects will be covered by the proposed highway contribution as set out in the [Highways impact](#) section.

490. Following the receipt of the Highway Authority response to the further information submitted by the applicant at the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage, and the submission of the Regulation 25 (part 2) documentation, the CROW officer submitted a revised response indicating that they had no objection to the proposal subject to the following provisions:

- 1) Secure the contribution towards sustainable travel improvements required by the Highway Authority within the s106;
- 2) Secure public access rights along the full length of the permissive paths proposed in the scheme within the s106 for 30 years;
- 3) Ensure that the proposed permissive paths have a minimum surface width of 2 metres and are built to HCS Design Standards;
- 4) Propose the scheme is improved by moving (diverting) Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 onto the line of the proposed permissive path along the east boundary of the site. This diverted Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 would be no longer, its end points not moving. This is based on the permissive paths being of a standard matching the County Council design standards for an unbound surface of a width of 2 metres;
- 5) A commuted sum to be paid by the developer of £68,000.00 to enable the public maintenance of Footpath 1. This would be secured by either s106 legal agreement or by s278 highways agreement;
- 6) The developer can carry out the works to the surface of FP1 under the permission of a s278 highways agreement. The diversion can be made via an order under section 257 (Town and County Planning Act (1990)) by the Planning Authority; and the
- 7) Construction and operation of the development shall respect the continuous priority right for the public to use Footpath 1. Any proposed temporary closure or diversion will be for a reasonable period of time and will require, in advance, an application separate to this one to gain permission from the Highways Authority and to allow the required public notification.

491. In relation to points 1 and 2, as noted in the Highway Authority response, an agreement has been reached for a contribution of £500,000 for a scheme to improve active travel measures in the vicinity of the site, most notably by improving walking and cycle access to Hamble Station (see [Highways impact](#) section of the report). It is acknowledged that the CROW team requested a financial contribution to support upgrading part of the existing Hamble Rail Trail for cycle access. The applicant has argued that they have agreed to

provide a significant sum for use for sustainable transport measures, i.e. walking and cycling. The agreed sum for the legal agreement relates specifically to the areas within the jurisdiction of the Highway Authority. Whilst the concerns of the CROW team are acknowledged, there will be no significant impact on the Hamble Rail Trail.

492. The HPRG submitted a detailed response to the Regulation 25 (part 2) response from the CROW team. They continued to argue that the proposed permissive path is unacceptable both in practical and policy terms but did not provide any real justification for this position. They commented that the proposal fails to meet Countryside standards. They also argue that the currently proposed path will seriously disadvantage many residents in Hamble. It is acknowledged that the proposed path may not be specifically suitable for cyclists. However the wider package of messages proposed for active travel addresses this aspect.
493. To ensure certainty over access, it would be necessary for the permissive path to be secured for 30 years. Following further discussions, the applicant indicated that they could remove the area showing the permissive footpath to the east of the definitive line and use the definitive line to link up the permissive paths. This approach would be supported by the CROW team and could be secured by a revised scheme via a planning condition or through the legal agreement negotiations. This will secure the path legally and address concerns raised about its ongoing use.
494. In relation to point 3, the applicant has indicated that they will not be surfacing the footpath. The path will be maintained with grass cut to a width of 3m – so in excess of the 2m asked for. However, due to potential impacts on the RPAs of retained trees around the boundaries, and the ecological and net gain impacts of putting down a hard surface, they are not proposing to hard surface any of the footpath. Not surfacing the PROW is considered to be unacceptable by the CROW team. They argue that relevant planning policies all require protection and enhancement of PROW as part of development. The enclosure of the PROW with bunds and loss of the landscape character it sits within is typically against Hampshire Countryside Service positions. Resurfacing (by this the CROW mean's to an unbound surface, such as hoggin, to Hampshire Countryside Service design standards) is suitable and necessary mitigation, as well as address accessibility needs for a PROW. Whilst CROW's position is acknowledged, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers this position to be acceptable due to the need to protect the RPAs and to ensure wider ecological benefits.

495. In relation to point 4 to divert Hamble-le-Rice footpath 1, the applicant has confirmed that they will not divert the path due to wider implications on the proposed scheme. The HPRG also argued that this change in route would impact nearby residents. The current path backs onto homes on Satchell Lane and it has been indicated that at least 15 properties have gateways from their back gardens onto the existing public right of way and most have had back gates and access for much longer than 20 years, although the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has not seen evidence to support this timescale. The HPRG allege that changing the positioning of the public right of way will have a materially negative impact on these households and their access. These concerns are acknowledged. The applicant has also noted that the public footpath to the east of the site is a well-used and well defined partly gravel path and that they do not consider it would be a benefit to remove this path. Whilst the proposal by the CROW team to divert the path is recognised, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority does not consider this to be an appropriate proposition at this stage in the planning process. In any case, a diversion has not been proposed by the applicant and indeed the diverted path route has not been suitably assessed for its wider implications. It is therefore not considered to be required to make the development acceptable.

496. In relation to points 4-7, the applicant has questioned the accuracy of the definitive line. The [Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981](#) (as amended) places a requirement on the County Council to maintaining an up to date definitive map. What is clear is that the Footpath is on the definitive map as it currently stands regardless of its use. It is acknowledged that the permissive path route proposed crosses the unused definitive line, but the applicant indicates that this will not be impacted as no surfacing is proposed. It is confirmed that neither footpath line will be visible on the ground within the site, and both will be accessible.

497. As set out under point 5 above, CROW requested a commuted sum of £68,000 secured by either by a s106 legal agreement or Section 278 (s278) highways agreement to enable the public maintenance of Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1. No specific details have been provided by CROW about the intention of this contribution and how it is different to the contribution agreed for wider active travel contributions under highways. The applicant has argued in response that as the proposal will not be affecting the line of Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1 nor the unused section of the definitive line, that such a request is not compliant with the planning obligation tests set out in paragraph 57 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#). This states that "*Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:*

- a) *necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- b) *directly related to the development; and*

c) *fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development*".

498. Section 122 of the [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#) also translates these tests.

499. Taking the request into account, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers it to be unreasonable to apply a requirement for additional financial contributions due to the lack of significant impacts on Hamble-le-Rice Footpath 1. The applicant would also provide a significant contribution to wider active travel measures as well as a permissive path secured for a 30 year period in the event that permission is granted. There has also been no clear justification from the CROW team about the requirements for this contribution, meaning the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority cannot be satisfied it meets the relevant planning obligation. A financial contribution on this matter is not considered to be required to make the development acceptable in this regard.

500. The HPRG submitted a detailed response to the Regulation 25 (part 2) response from the CROW team. They continued to argue that the proposed permissive path is unacceptable both in practical and policy terms but did not provide any real justification for this position. They commented that the proposal fails to meet countryside standards. They also argue that the currently proposed path will seriously disadvantage many residents in Hamble. It is acknowledged that the proposed path may not be specifically suitable for cyclists. However the wider package of measures proposed for active travel would make provision for cyclists.

*Additional mitigation measures:*

501. It is noted that Hamble Parish Council provided some recommendations for areas to be considered and improvements to public access including increased buffer zones to increase the amount of public space maintained. These are acknowledged and have been considered by officers alongside the information submitted by the applicant and the response from CROW.

*Recreational displacement:*

502. The issue of recreational displacement from the informal use of the site is an area which has been raised in community representations. This is covered in more detail in the [Ecology](#) section in relation to the potential impact on nearby designations.

503. Paragraph 5.46 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that "*where minerals and waste development results in recreational displacement or similar environmental effects are considered to be an issue, minimising the area being*

*worked will be a key consideration of the principles of design. Areas of alternative green space may be required*". Significant concerns have been raised in relation to the loss of the recreational space of the airfield. The HPRG raised specific and serious concerns about the "*detrimental impact that the displacement of the current airfield users will have on areas surrounding the airfield*" and argued that these effects have been extremely downplayed. They suggest that the site has become the place people use to walk, cycle and ride horses with friends and family. A survey undertaken by Hamble Parish Council in April 2022 confirmed that at least 300 people use the site for dog walking on a regular basis, most of whom will do so several times each week and this was provided as evidence. In addition, a report was prepared by Richard Andrews report (Andrews Wildlife Consultants) on behalf of Hamble marine businesses which provided further assessment on the impact of displacement.

504. It is clear that the site is used by the local community and this is not disputed. It is also clear that the potential development of the airfield would result in the perception of a loss of recreational space for the local community. Whilst the local concerns are acknowledged, the unauthorised use of the airfield for recreation has to be recognised and considered by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. Furthermore, no concerns have been raised by Natural England in relation to recreational displacement from the site or indeed any significant impacts on designated sites.

505. The HPRG also request that the site should be designated as a village green under the [Commons Act 2006 s15\(8\)](#). This is not a matter which cannot be considered as part of the determination of this planning application.

*Local Nature Recovery Strategy:*

506. Hampshire's [Local Nature Recovery Strategy](#) (LRNS) is emerging. Introduced by the [Environment Act 2021](#), LNRS are a new system of plans for nature recovery covering the whole of England. They are a key mechanism for planning and delivering the National Nature Recovery Network and will consist of a map of the most valuable areas for wildlife, opportunities to improve nature in the future and local priorities. A first draft of the LNRS will not be produced until after this report is considered by the Regulatory Committee which means its provisions cannot be considered part of the determination process.

*Links to restoration:*

507. Calls have been made by the HPRG for the whole site to be set aside for public access. The restoration specific for the site includes public access alongside a combination of grazing, nature conservation, open space and woodland. The acceptability of the proposal in accordance with this



specification is the focus of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. More information is set out in the section on [Restoration and aftercare](#).

*Legal agreement:*

508. As noted above, a legal agreement could be used to secure the use of the permissive path for a 30 year period. This will help to secure the path legally and addresses concerns raised about its ongoing use.

509. As noted above, the request by CROW officers for additional financial contribution is not taken forward. There is no clear justification from the CROW officers about the requirements for this contribution, meaning the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority cannot be satisfied it meets the relevant planning obligation. A financial contribution on this matter is not considered to be required to make the development acceptable in this regard.

510. Some comments received from parties including the HPRG indicate that the applicant have no rights over a Section 106 agreement as they are not the landowner so cannot secure the permissive path. It is important to note that whilst the landowner will be a signatory, all other interested parties including the applicant (as well as highways, countryside service etc) will also need to be a signatory. The concerns raised by the HPRG about the severe risk that that the landlord could withdraw permission at any point are not substantiated due to the legal agreement that could be put in place to secure the use of the path.

*Conclusion on public access and rights of way:*

511. The concerns raised in many representations about the loss of public access to the site are acknowledged. The perception of the loss of public access is clear. The site, despite being in private ownership with no authorised public right of access, has been used as open space by the local community for an extended period. Permissive access is offered as part of the proposal and can be secured via a legal agreement for 30 years. This coupled with a financial contribution to fund improvements active travel measures provides a clear public benefit which, on balance, overcomes concerns initially raised by CROW. Whilst it is recognised this is not as wide an offering that Hamble Parish Council and the local community would like to see, there is an improvement none the less. On the basis of securing the permissive path and wider appropriate contributions towards active travel improvements, the CROW team confirm that their initial objection to the scheme has been resolved. The request by CROW officers for a commuted sum to be paid by the developer of £68,000.00 has not been taken forward as there is no clear justification for it and it is not considered to be required to make the development acceptable in this regard.

512. Taking all matters into consideration, on balance, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in relation to public access. In terms of the relevant policies of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and [EBLP \(2022\)](#) which seek to protect and enhance public rights of way, it is considered that the provision of a permissive path around the site, in addition to the existing dedicated public rights of way, goes some way to address the policy requirements. Hamble le-Rice footpath 1 is protected as part of the development and the addition of formalised permissive access helps to maintain and manage existing informal recreational use of the site. Taking all matters into account, including the proposed mitigation, the potential to apply planning conditions, and a legal agreement to secure the permissive path, on balance, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 5 (Protection of the countryside), 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Strategic Policy S12 (Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) in relation to public access. This means that the site allocation development considerations in relation to ‘*safeguarding of adjacent public rights of way (footpath no. 1) and maintaining and managing existing informal recreational use of the site*’ have been met.

#### Design and sustainability

513. Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires that minerals and waste development “*should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape. The design of appropriate built facilities for minerals and waste development should be of a high-quality and contribute to achieving sustainable development*”. Part d of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) also protects residents from significant adverse visual impact and is relevant to design.

514. Paragraph 5.45 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that in order to demonstrate that the key design and operation principles are met, all minerals and waste development should consider a number of factors including (only relevant factors included):

- “*be appropriate in scale and character in relation to its location and the surrounding area*”;
- “*encourage the use of high-quality building materials made from recycled and secondary sources, where appropriate*”;
- “*minimise the use of primary aggregates*”;

- *“seek to ensure a good standard of amenity and proposals should consider potential impacts on the local community”;*
- *“avoid and minimise the risk of flooding as far as possible if the development is located in areas of flood risk, through an appropriate location, layout and design”.*

515. Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states *“all new development should* (only those criteria relevant to the development are presented here):

- c) take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views;*
- h) incorporate design measures to inhibit criminal and anti-social behaviour; and*
- i) incorporate provision for on-site waste management”.*

516. Paragraph 131 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and helps create better places in which to live and work and to make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 135 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) requires that planning decisions ensure that developments *‘will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting’*. Paragraph 139 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) also advises that permission should be refused for development that is not well designed.

517. The acceptability of the proposal in relation to its scale and character has already been considered in [Location in the countryside and settlement gap](#) and [Landscape and visual impact](#). The applicant has indicated that they have carefully considered the design and location of the processing plant (minimising its height), the phasing of the development, the siting of key features to mitigate any potential impacts on amenity and visual impact (see [Visual impact and landscape](#)), the proposed landscaping and planting, ecological (see [Ecology](#)) schemes.

518. The high quality design of restoration and aftercare schemes is also an important part of sustainable design. Further assessment of the acceptability of the proposed restoration and aftercare is set out in the section on [Restoration and aftercare](#).

519. The proposal is for a mineral extraction site. The need for the proposal has already been considered in the sections on [Demonstration of need for mineral resource](#), [Need for waste management provision](#) and the [Consideration of alternatives](#).
520. As already set out, **Appendix C – Layout Plan** and **Appendix D – Phasing Plan** provide more information on the layout and phasing of the development.
521. As set out in [Consideration of alternatives](#), the applicant went through various stages of design alterations when coming up with the final scheme. This included revisions to the access, the extent of stand-offs from the boundary and varying the height of the bunds. The proposal before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has therefore been shaped by the various assessments carried out as part of the EIA process.
522. Many representations received were related to design aspects. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report. Concerns included the design of the bunds and impacts on flooding / drainage and local health and amenity, pollution and the level of buffer zone applied. Many representations questioned the location of key aspects of the development including the wheel wash, the processing plant (proximity to the school) and site access. These are acknowledged. Paragraph 5.50 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is clear that it expects that minerals operators “*will undertake good site management by adhering to high standards of operation which minimise any amenity impacts at all times*”. These aspects are considered in more detail in the sections on [Impact on public health, safety and amenity](#), [Highways impact](#) and [Impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters and flooding](#).
523. Some representations also noted concerns about how the proposal could comply with current global and regional requirements in terms of carbon emissions and the promotion of green energy. Aspects in relation to climate change have already been covered in this report (see [Climate Change](#)). As previously noted, the energy that will supply the site will come from 100% renewable sources including wind and solar energy. It is indicated that the applicant is also looking at a wide range of energy initiatives and ideas that can be rolled out across its sites which could be implemented in the future.
524. Fencing is included in the design to safely secure the site, meeting part h of Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). This meets the requirements of [Regulation 16 of the Quarries Regulations 1999](#) (relating to perimeter security around a quarry) which builds upon duties imposed by section 3 of the [Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974](#). [Section](#)

[151\(2\) of the Mines and Quarries Act 1954](#) also relates to quarry boundary security. This fencing would need to remain in place during the operation of the quarry and its associated restoration. This addresses the concern raised by the HPRG about securing the site. As set out in sections on [Visual impact and landscape](#) and [Arboriculture](#), the long-term management of fencing associated with the restoration of the site could be covered by a legal agreement in the event that permission is granted.

525. Some representations also raised the issue of nutrient neutrality and the lack of consideration in relation to design. As previously noted, there is no evidence presented that any part of the development will cause an increase in nutrient levels. The term 'nutrient neutrality' is only of relevance to housing or waste water treatment developments so is not of relevance to this proposal.

526. In terms of access to the site, there is no suitable alternative to road access. The site is adjacent to the railway line at the north of the site. However, there are a large number of factors restricting the use of the railway to transport mineral from the site including the lack of a rail siding and access to the rail network. Using barges to transport the mineral would also not be possible, given that the site is not adjacent to any river, and as such the same number of HGVs would have to leave the site to transport the mineral to the nearest barge facilities. More information on these matters are set out in the [Highways impact](#) section of the report.

*Conclusion on design:*

527. The design of the proposal, with mitigation (with the exception of the drainage design (see [Impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters and flooding](#))), is considered to be generally acceptable. The site's design and layout have taken into account the findings of a number of assessments prepared to support the ES including the [LVIA](#) and noise assessment work. In general, the development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). How the proposal meets the requirements to protect public health safety and amenity are covered in [Impact on public health, safety and amenity](#) and [Highways impact](#) sections of this commentary.

Cultural and archaeological heritage

528. Section 66 of the [Planning \(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#) imposes a general duty with respect to listed buildings in the exercise of

planning functions. Subsection (1) provides that *“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”*. Section 72(1) of the Act imposes a general duty in regard to conservation areas in the exercise of planning functions stating, *“with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area... special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”*.

529. Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste developments to protect and, wherever possible, enhance Hampshire’s historic environment and heritage assets (designated and non-designated), including their settings unless it is demonstrated that the need for and benefits of the development decisively outweigh these interests.

530. Strategic Policy S8 (Historic Environment) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) sets out the Borough Council’s position on conserving and/or enhancing heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance: *“This includes all heritage assets including listed buildings and structures, Conservation Areas as designated on the policies map, landscapes and archaeology”*. Furthermore, Policy DM12 (Heritage Assets) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that *“development of a heritage asset or within its setting will be permitted provided it does not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset, and sustains and enhances its special character and qualities. The more important the asset, the greater the weight that should be accorded to this criterion”*. This includes the requirements for assessment of assets through the application process.

531. Paragraph 203 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *“in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”*. Paragraph 205 goes on to say that *“when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”*.

532. Concerns have been raised, in particular by the HPRG, that the proposal will have a major adverse impact on important heritage assets. The Group argue that *“there will be a major detrimental impact on the social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment entails”*. These concerns are acknowledged.

533. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

*Archaeology:*

534. [ES Chapter 11 Archaeology & Culture Heritage](#) was prepared as part of the application and is supported by an [Archaeological Desk Based Assessment](#) (Appendix 5.1).

535. Concerns were also raised in representations about the impact on Hamble’s unique airfield site and the heritage value of this site.

536. As noted previously, a record of an Alert Green and a WWII pillbox are in proximity to the site. In addition, the site was previously a military airfield and is associated with past military built structures including Battle HQ. The Battle HQ was recorded as still being in existence in 2014 and located in a location marginal to the proposed extraction area. Therefore, initially the County Archaeologist raised some concerns about the lack of explicit discussion of the previous military structures as well the palaeolithic potential of the site.

537. Additional information was submitted at the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage (see [Archaeology Vol 2 Chapter 11 Updated Archaeology and Heritage](#)). It was confirmed that the Battle HQ asset would be maintained as part of the development. Following the submission of further information on this aspect and the palaeolithic potential, the County Archaeologist raised no concerns. No change was reported to this position following Regulation 25 (part 2).

538. The application documentation notes that *“the degraded remains of the former airfield will largely be lost to the development”* although the Battle HQ will be retained. The County Archaeologist notes that *“the Airfield is not considered to be of any particular historic merit; however a written and photographic record of the surviving remains of the airfield that are to be lost can be made prior to and during development”*. No further concerns about the loss of the airfield were received from consultees and it is clear that the lack of management of the site in a historical context since the airfield ceased use has meant that the value of the site is not as strong as locals present.

539. Concerns were raised during the consultation about the loss of flint stones. With regard to the palaeolithic potential of the site the revised [Archaeological assessment work](#) acknowledges that not a lot is currently understood of the potential and that this matter will be subject to review and mitigation prior to extraction. The County Archaeologist recommended that as the potential at the site appears to be for 'derived' artefacts (i.e. not likely that an in situ site will be found), it would be appropriate to secure such provision via an archaeological planning condition. This could be included in the event that permission is granted.

*Impact on nearby Conservation Areas:*

540. The Old Bursledon Conservation Area and Hamble Conservation Area are located 100-120m to the north-east of the site and 200m to the south of the site respectively.

541. Concerns were raised about the impact of the proposal on the historic village of Hamble and on these Conservation Areas. There is no evidence to suggest that the Conservation Areas would be unduly impacted by the proposal and no concerns have been raised by consultees.

*Impact on the registered park and garden:*

542. The Grade II listed Royal Victoria Country Park Registered Park and Garden containing the Grade II Victoria House at Victoria Hospital is located 250m to the west of the site. There is no evidence to suggest that these assets would be impacted by the proposal. Indeed, the distance is such that there could not be any impact on the setting of these assets.

*Impact on listed buildings:*

543. There are a number of listed buildings to the west, south-west and south-east, all of which are located over 500m from the site boundary. The distance from the site is such that the impact on these buildings is not significant and could not be significant given the visual mitigation that is proposed.

*Conclusion on Cultural and Archaeological Heritage:*

544. No evidence has been presented to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to indicate that there will be a significant impact on the historic environment, as suggested in some representations received. The impact on the historic environment from the proposal is considered to be low. The distance between the proposal and heritage assets, the mitigation proposed and the potential for planning conditions to be applied in the event permission is granted means that the proposal is in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as



Strategic Policy S8 (Historic Environment) and Policy DM12 (Heritage Assets) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#).

Impact on public health, safety and amenity

545. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires that any development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. It sets out a number of criteria. Also, any proposal should not cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between minerals and waste developments and other forms of development.
546. Development considerations are also included in Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) for the site allocation, relating to the safeguarding of adjacent public rights of way and maintenance and management of existing informal recreational use of the site (as previously covered in the [Public Access](#) section) as well as a phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity of local residents.
547. Policy DM1 (General criteria for new development) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance, residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast and sets out a number of criteria relating to site density, mass and design which relate to aspects of protecting health, safety and amenity.
548. Policy DM8 (Pollution) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that development will not be permitted if it is likely to cause loss of amenity or impact on public health or other unacceptable environmental impacts through a) air pollution including odours or particulate emissions. The supporting text to this policy states that where development is likely to generate pollution, adequate site reports and assessments carried out by a competent person must be supplied with the planning application to allow the potential or actual impacts to be assessed. Details of mitigation should be provided prior to commencement of the development. Post development, further assessments and reports may be required to show that the polluting effects have been controlled to the agreed standard, and that the mitigation/remediation measures remain effective for the lifetime of the pollution risk identified.
549. Paragraph 180 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that planning decisions should *“contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible,*

*help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate”.*

550. Government policy concerning pollution control and associated health issues is most clearly set out within the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) and the [NPPW \(2014\)](#) including its supporting planning practice guidance. Paragraph 191 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *“planning decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life; b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”.*

551. Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 27-013-20140306) of the [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) covers environmental issues associated with mineral sites including dust, noise associated with the operation, air quality and lighting.

552. With specific regard to minerals, paragraph 217 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *“when determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy. In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should:*

*b) ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality;*

*c) ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions and any blasting vibrations are controlled, mitigated or removed at source, and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties...”*

553. Matters related to visual impact have already been covered in [Visual impact and landscape](#). Emissions to water are covered in [Impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters and flooding](#).

554. Planning and permitting decisions are separate but closely linked. Planning permission determines if a development is an acceptable use of the land.

Permitting determines if an operation can be managed on an ongoing basis to prevent or minimise pollution. More information on this aspect is set out in [Links to Environmental Permitting](#).

555. The Environment Agency was consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposal on the basis of air quality or noise. It is not appropriate for the planning process to condition operational issues which come under the jurisdiction of the environmental permit. Paragraph 050 of the [PPG \(Waste\)](#) states that Planning Authorities should assume that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively rather than seek to control any processes, health and safety issues or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under other regimes.

*a) Emissions to the atmosphere (air quality) and dust:*

556. It is recognised that mineral development can give rise to dust and air quality impacts arising from dust-generating activities on site (e.g. sand and gravel extraction, stockpiling of sand and gravel, creation of bunds with soil) and from additional HGV and other vehicle movements. Without appropriate mitigation, this could lead to wider impacts on health and habitats.

557. Part ‘a’ of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not release emissions to the atmosphere, land or water above appropriate standards. Furthermore, part ‘c’ of the policy states that development should not cause unacceptable dust impacts.

558. Paragraph 192 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement*”.

559. Paragraph 005 (Reference ID: 32-005-20191101) of the [PPG \(Air Quality\)](#) states: “*Where air quality is a relevant consideration the local planning authority may need to establish:*

- *the ‘baseline’ local air quality, including what would happen to air quality in the absence of the development;*
- *whether the proposed development could significantly change air quality during the construction and operational phases (and the consequences of this for public health and biodiversity); and*

- *whether occupiers or users of the development could experience poor living conditions or health due to poor air quality.*

560. Paragraph 006 (Reference ID: 32-006-20191101) of the [PPG](#) (Air Quality) states: *“Considerations that may be relevant to determining a planning application include whether the development would:*

- 1) *Lead to changes (including any potential reductions) in vehicle-related emissions in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development or further afield. This could be through the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure; altering the level of traffic congestion; significantly changing traffic volumes, vehicle speeds or both; or significantly altering the traffic composition on local roads. Other matters to consider include whether the proposal ... involves construction sites that would generate large Heavy Goods Vehicle flows over a period of a year or more;*
- 2) *Introduce new point sources of air pollution;*
- 3) *Expose people to harmful concentrations of air pollutants, including dust... through development in places with poor air quality;*
- 4) *Give rise to potentially unacceptable impacts (such as dust) during construction for nearby sensitive locations; and*
- 5) *Have a potential adverse effect on biodiversity, especially where it would affect sites designated for their biodiversity value.”*

561. Paragraph 007 (Reference ID: 32-007-20191101) of the [NPPG](#) (Air Quality) states, amongst other matters: *“It is not necessary for air quality assessments that support planning applications to duplicate aspects of air quality assessments that will be done as part of non-planning control regimes, such as under Environmental Permitting Regulations. Air quality is a consideration in Environmental Impact Assessment, if one is required, and also in a Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment.”*

562. As detailed in the [representations](#) section of this report, there have been a number of concerns raised over the impact of the proposal on local air quality. This includes the potential impact of the development on the amenity of sensitive receptors surrounding the site including residential properties, adjacent schools and nearby designated sites of ecological value. Concerns about the proximity to the local schools were also raised by Hamble Parish Council, Paul Holmes MP and the HPRG amongst other parties. These concerns are acknowledged.

563. There are a number of houses located around the periphery of the site at Hamble Lane, the residential estates at Tutor Close and Astral Gardens to the south of the site and Satchell Lane to the east. The Hamble Sports Complex and the Hamble School lies approximately 45m to the north of the site beyond the West Coastway railway line. Hamble Primary School lies approximately

120m to the west of the site beyond Hamble Lane. Potential amenity impacts on these sensitive receptors need to be considered, as do the impacts of the development on the AQMA (which covers the area from Windhover Roundabout south on Hamble Lane to the junction with Portsmouth Road (A3025) and east along Providence Hill (A27)) to the north of the site.

564. The application is supported by [ES Chapter 12 \(Air Quality\)](#) and accompanying [Technical Appendices](#).
565. Paragraph 007 (Reference ID: 32-007-20191101) of the [PPG](#) states, amongst other matters: *"It is not necessary for air quality assessments that support planning applications to duplicate aspects of air quality assessments that will be done as part of non-planning control regimes, such as under Environmental Permitting Regulations"*.
566. The Institute for Air Quality Management (IAQM) is the professional body for air quality professionals providing the authoritative voice for air quality by maintaining, enhancing and promoting the highest standards of working practice in the field. It has published a series of guidance notes of relevance to the assessment of air quality for planning purposes.
567. The IAQM and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) have together published the [Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality 2017](#) guidance to help ensure that air quality is properly accounted for in the development management process. It clarifies when an air quality assessment should be undertaken, what it should contain and how the impacts should be described and assessed. It also sets out a recommended approach to assess the significance of impacts and effects. The guidance states that best-practice design and operational measures should be recommended and applied to all developments that require an Air Quality Assessment to reduce emissions and human exposure to poor air quality.
568. The IAQM has also published '[Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning](#)' (2016). This document is designed specifically for the planning process based on the judgement of the IAQM Minerals Working Group. The IAQM guidance provides an effective methodology in the absence of any other guidance for the assessment of dust from mineral sites. This guidance states that *"emissions of dust to air from minerals sites can occur during the preparation of the land, extraction, processing, handling, and transportation of extracted minerals. Emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific operations being undertaken, and the weather conditions. The scale of these impacts depends on the dust suppression and other mitigation measures applied"*.

569. The European Union’s Directive on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe (European Parliament, Council of the European Union, 2008) set legally binding limit values for NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. These EU limit values were transposed into UK legislation within the [Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010](#), which still apply after the UK’s departure from the European Union . Achieving the limit values is a national rather than local obligation.

570. The air quality objectives for England are prescribed in the [Air Quality \(England\) Regulations 2000 and the Air Quality \(England\) \(Amendment\) Regulations 2002](#). The objectives are set out in the [Air Quality Assessment work](#) (AQA) that supports the application and are set out in the following table.

| Pollutant       | Concentration measured as | Objective  |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|
| NO <sub>2</sub> | 1 hour mean               | 200µg /m <sup>3</sup> not to be exceeded more than 18 times per year |
|                 | Annual mean               | 40µg /m <sup>3</sup>   |
| PM10            | 24 hour mean              | 50µg /m <sup>3</sup> not to be exceeded more than 35 times a year    |
|                 | Annual mean               | 40µg /m <sup>3</sup>   |
| PM2.5           | Annual mean               | 20µg /m <sup>3</sup>   |

*Table 1 - Air Quality Objectives*

571. The objectives apply at locations where members of the public are likely to be regularly present and are likely to be exposed for a period of time appropriate to the averaging period of the objective.

*Methodology:*

572. The methodology section of [ES Chapter 12](#) provides an overview of the air quality objectives applicable to the proposed development and the assessment of the potential air quality impacts of the proposal. The section also refers to the applicable policy documents ranging from the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) to relevant local policy. The [Environmental Targets \(Fine Particulate Matter\) \(England\) Regulations 2023](#) have been included and assessed within the applicant’s Regulation 25 (part 1) submission which references the new PM2.5 target of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup>. An [independent review of the Air Quality Chapter](#) by RSK Environment Ltd has confirmed that the guidance presented remains relevant.

573. The [ES Chapter 12](#) Methodology Section (Section 12.2) sets out the assessment methodology to establish existing conditions and to assess road traffic impacts and operational dust impacts with reference to [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#). Detailed modelling assessments to predict the impacts of operational traffic has been carried out with reference to EP-UK [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#)

due to the proximity of the Hamble Lane AQMA and a summary of the model input data is provided in [Appendix 6.1 of the ES](#).

574. ADMS Roads (dispersion modelling software) has been used to predict concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> to provide a baseline and for 2023 both with and without the proposed development. The assessment was undertaken in accordance with the methodology set out in Defra Air Quality Technical Guidance (TG16). TG16 has been superseded by [TG22](#) which includes the updated PM<sub>2.5</sub> target of 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> bringing it in line with the legislation cited above. The applicant's air quality assessor confirms that annual mean PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations have been predicted at roadside receptors in 2023 at 9.3 to 11.2µg/m<sup>3</sup>, well below the PM<sub>2.5</sub> 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> limit value (Air Quality Assessment Ltd, J0801/2/F1 dated 10.11.23).
575. The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), Eastleigh Borough Council and others who made comments questioned the validity of the model/data used in the AQA, particularly the use of qualitative data to predict baseline and predicted levels of PMs/dust. In response, the applicant's air quality specialist has addressed this in the Regulation 25 (part 2) submission. Defra background concentration maps have been used to model the data. These maps are widely used by local authorities carrying out Local Air Quality management assessments and reviews as well as other air quality professionals. These maps are validated against national monitoring undertaken in 2018 and provide a robust estimate of background concentrations. The use of the Defra maps is encouraged by the [IAQM guidance: 'Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality'](#). It is therefore considered that the data provided in modelling air quality as part of the AQA has been carried out in line with the current guidance.
576. The HPRG suggest that the modelled data fails to take account of the impact of idling HGVs and acceleration patterns. In response to this, the applicant's Air Quality Specialist confirms that "*the ADMS Roads dispersion model is widely used in the UK to predict the impact on air quality due to road traffic for planning applications. Congestion at junctions has been considered by assuming a vehicle speed of 20 km/h within 25m of a junction stop line, as recommended in Defra Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance.*"
577. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority employed RSK Environment Ltd as an independent assessor on air quality to confirm that the completion of the qualitative assessment has followed the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) for dust and minerals assessment, and that the assessment provided in [ES Chapter 12](#) has been carried out in accordance with the current legislation and guidance

(see [RSK report - Former Hamble Airfield Air Quality Assessment Review Final](#)). Specifically, the assessment follows the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) which states that a qualitative assessment is adequate and that quantitative modelling has not been extensively researched due in part to the lack of UK-derived emission factors for mineral sites that could be used for modelling. It is noted that *“The collective view of the IAQM Working Group is that it is currently inappropriate to use a quantitative modelling approach to predict the impact in most cases and a qualitative risk-based approach using the S-P-R concept should usually suffice”*.

578. RSK Environment Ltd has also [reviewed](#) the air quality model files including traffic numbers; model scenarios and the modelled years; meteorological data for modelling; receptor locations; model input files; and verification of the model, and has confirmed its validity. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers the methodology used in the air quality assessment is valid and is consistent with current legislation and guidance.

*Baseline Environment:*

579. [ES Chapter 12](#) and accompanying [Technical Appendices](#) (6.1 and 6.2) describes the existing air quality conditions surrounding the site, both with and without the proposed development, assesses the likely impacts of dust and vehicle emissions from proposed operations on local air quality and the amenity of local receptors in the context of the current legislative framework and guidance. It also sets out the proposed onsite embedded mitigation measures which will be used on site.

580. As set out above, [Technical Appendices](#) (6.1 and 6.2) set out the modelling methodology used to assess the impact of the development on air quality. Clarification and additional information including a Dust Management Plan and Health Impact Assessment have been provided through the Regulation 25 (parts 1 and 2) stage and are discussed in more detail below.

581. Section 12.3 of [ES Chapter 12](#) details the baseline environment including reference to nearby AQMAs including the Hamble Lane Area AQMA which lies north of the site (see Figure 2). It confirms that existing air quality data has been collated from a number of sources which includes: the results of monitoring and the Air Quality Annual Status Reports undertaken by Eastleigh Borough Council (Eastleigh Borough Council 2020) as well as background pollutant concentration maps published by Defra (Defra, 2021).

582. Eastleigh Borough Council carried out NO<sub>2</sub> diffusion tube monitoring at a number of sites in the Borough in 2019 including three locations on Hamble Lane. The data shows measured annual mean concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> along



Hamble Lane ranged from 21.7 to 42.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> between 2015 and 2019. Whilst annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations exceeded the NO<sub>2</sub> objective in 2016 and 2017 at one site along Hamble Lane within the AQMA, no exceedances have been measured at any of the locations in 2018 or 2019.

583. The [ES Chapter 12](#) provides 'estimated annual mean background concentrations' of NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> in 2019 and 2023 against the objectives set out in the [Air Quality \(England\) Regulations 2002](#). The range of data is shown in Table 2.

| Annual Mean (µg /m <sup>3</sup> ) |      |                                 |      |                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|-------------------|------|
| NO <sub>2</sub> (objective 40)    |      | PM <sub>10</sub> (objective 40) |      | PM <sub>2.5</sub> |      |
| 2019                              | 2023 | 2019                            | 2023 | 2019              | 2023 |
| 15.6                              | 13.8 | 15.0                            | 14.3 | 10.2              | 9.6  |
| 16.8                              | 15.5 | 13.6                            | 12.9 | 9.5               | 8.9  |
| 15.5                              | 14.1 | 13.9                            | 13.2 | 9.4               | 8.9  |

*Table 2 - Estimated annual mean background concentrations*

584. Predicted baseline concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> have been modelled at the 10 receptor locations (see Figure 2 below) for 2019 and 2023.



Figure 2 – Location of receptors

585. [ES Chapter 12](#) confirms that predicted baseline NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations are below the respective objectives set out in [Air Quality \(England\) Regulations 2000](#) (as amended) (see Table 3).

| Recept<br>or | Annual Mean (µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) |      |                  |      |                   |      |
|--------------|----------------------------------|------|------------------|------|-------------------|------|
|              | NO <sub>2</sub>                  |      | PM <sub>10</sub> |      | PM <sub>2.5</sub> |      |
|              | 2019                             | 2023 | 2019             | 2023 | 2019              | 2023 |
| R1           | 21.8                             | 18.8 | 14.6             | 13.9 | 10.1              | 9.5  |
| R2           | 22.7                             | 18.9 | 15.4             | 14.6 | 10.3              | 9.7  |
| R3           | 19.6                             | 16.8 | 14.7             | 13.9 | 9.9               | 9.3  |
| R4           | 19.8                             | 17.0 | 14.7             | 13.9 | 9.9               | 9.3  |
| R5           | 19.9                             | 17.0 | 14.7             | 14.0 | 9.9               | 9.3  |
| R6           | 28.2                             | 22.5 | 17.6             | 16.8 | 11.7              | 11.0 |
| R7           | 29.3                             | 23.3 | 17.8             | 17.0 | 11.8              | 11.1 |
| R8           | 29.7                             | 23.5 | 17.4             | 16.6 | 11.6              | 10.9 |
| R9           | 22.4                             | 18.4 | 16.3             | 15.6 | 11.0              | 10.3 |
| R10          | 22.0                             | 18.1 | 16.2             | 15.4 | 10.9              | 10.2 |
| AQAL         | 40                               |      | 32               |      | 25                |      |

Table 3- Predicted Baseline Concentrations for 2019 and 2023

586. RSK Environment Ltd have [reviewed](#) this section of the ES and note that:

*“Modelled receptors used within the assessment are located nearby modelled roads, therefore the receptors would be more representative of roadside conditions. Monitored roadside data (sourced from the Annual Status Report) are considered to be more representative and more conservative compared to the Defra background 1x1 km<sup>2</sup> gridded concentrations. The monitored NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations referenced from the Annual Status Report (diffusion tube ref: HL, HL2, and HL3, as presented in Table 12.4 of Chapter 12: Air Quality) would be the recommended background reference concentrations. However, based on the model results and the IAQM guidance, the results would still present a <1% change in concentrations from the proposed development and therefore would remain as a ‘negligible’ impact (Table 12.7 – 12.9 of Chapter 12: Air Quality)”.*

587. In response to comments from the Borough Council’s Environmental Health Officer (EHO) and the UKHSA regarding monitoring for PM<sub>10</sub> on site, RSK Environment Ltd also agrees with the applicant’s use of annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations as background concentrations from the automatic monitoring site sourced from Eastleigh’s Annual Status report. They conclude that this data would be conservative for the assessment as it is located within the AQMA.

588. The HPRG (see Appendix III) provided its own plotted estimate background PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations for 2023 comparing data from other quarries nationally. In this, The HPRG suggests that Hamble “*exceeds the UK averages for all pollutants according to the estimated concentrations*”. However, the applicant’s air quality specialist states this comparison of the background concentrations in the Hamble area with the national average background concentration is not comparing like with like, nor is it relevant to the assessment of impacts from road traffic due to the proposal (Response to Representations J0801/2/F1, Air Quality Assessments Ltd).

589. On the basis of the information provided in [ES Chapter 12](#) (and appendices), the supplementary information and clarification received as part of the Regulation 25, and the advice of the Authority’s independent assessor ([RSK Environmental Ltd](#)) the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that the data used is considered to be relevant to assess baseline conditions of the site.

*Embedded Mitigation:*

590. The proposal includes embedded mitigation which includes:

- Screening bunds constructed along the site boundary between the onsite operations and nearby sensitive receptors. The bunds will be seeded immediately on completion;
- Existing vegetation will largely be retained, where practicable;
- Won minerals will be transported to the processing area using a field conveyor;
- The processing area and stockpiles will be located more than 100m from any dust-sensitive receptors;
- The screening and washing of minerals is a wet process which would minimise dust emissions;
- Drop heights will be minimised;
- Water suppression will be used as necessary;
- Duration and timing of dust-generating activities will be restricted when undertaken within 100m of dust-sensitive receptors during dry/windy conditions, when operationally possible;
- On-site vehicle speeds will be kept below 10mph; and
- All HGV/HDVs would be covered prior to leaving the site and would use a wheel wash and travel over more than 50m of clean, hard surface before joining the public highway.

591. A [Dust Management Plan](#) (DMP) has also been provided by the applicant as part of its Regulation 25 (part 2) submissions. This document sets out a series of dust monitoring and control measures, which are in addition to the embedded mitigation cited above. The DMP recommends:

- Restrictions on soil movement during dry periods;
- Exposed soils will be grass seeded as soon as practicable;
- The processing area and stockpiles be located more than 100m from any dust-sensitive receptors. Stockpiles to be sprayed with water to maintain moisture if required;
- Water suppression will be used as necessary within 100m of receptors, including the use of mobile water bowsers;
- Hard-surfaced areas will be regularly cleaned and the roads dampened as necessary during dry weather;
- Road sweeping and cleaning plant will be used at the site and on the public highway, as necessary;
- Inert material will be subject to visual inspection on arrival. Material not conforming to acceptance procedures will be rejected. Where the site cannot accept a specific material, the load will be redirected to a facility capable of compliantly accepting it (Restoration phase); and the
- Site manager to have responsibility for ensuring effective dust control by monitoring weather conditions during dust-sensitive periods, undertaking

regular visual dust monitoring and identifying and monitoring the intensity of potential dust-generating activities.

592. The [DMP](#) sets out the roles, responsibilities and training provided to ensure the site is operated in accordance with the measures outlined above. It confirms that daily visual inspections will be carried out by appointed staff and records of those inspections recorded in a logbook which will be maintained. In the event that significant dust is identified beyond the site boundary a 'Dust Event Form' will need to be completed and immediate investigation/remedial action taken. These forms will be reviewed regularly to ensure appropriate action is taken and to identify problem areas which may require additional mitigation. During adverse meteorological conditions when it is dry and/or windy, additional inspections will be carried out downwind of any dust-generating activities. Compliance with the DMP can be secured by planning condition. As discussed above in section [Ecology](#), a planning condition could require the submission of an EMMP which could cover, amongst other considerations, the prevention of sediment run-off from the site.
593. An automatic particulate monitor will be installed at suitable locations on sites. The appropriate locations for these can be agreed with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority via an appropriate planning condition in the event that permission is granted. The [DMP](#) stipulates that monitoring will start prior to any dust-generating activities in order to establish baseline conditions. Thereafter, the automatic monitor will remain on site and will not be removed without the prior agreement of relevant stakeholders, including the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.
594. The monitoring of dust emissions during the operational phase will be required due to the proximity of sensitive receptors. Whilst monitoring has been proposed within the [DMP](#), only one monitoring location has been proposed. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority would seek additional monitoring locations prior to and during operations to cover Hamble Primary School to the west and The Hamble School to the north. This could be covered by a planning condition in the event that permission is granted.
595. Similarly, meteorological stations will also be installed to record real-time windspeed and direction. This data would be monitored throughout the day to identify potential adverse conditions that may trigger a requirement for additional mitigation measures.
596. Section 6 of the [DMP](#) (Trigger Levels, Risk Factors and Corrective Action) details actions necessary in the event that visible dust is observed beyond the site boundary or dust complaints are received. The [DMP](#) states that if

unacceptable dust emissions continue, despite additional mitigation measures, consideration should be given to modifying site operations and temporarily suspending site operations until the issue can be resolved.

597. The [DMP](#) also identifies risk factors which may require contingency action to prevent dust emissions. A 'Site Action Level' for PM10 concentrations will be set at 190µg/m<sup>3</sup> measured as a 1-hour mean. This is taken from the [IAQM Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites](#) (2018). Although reference is made to construction sites, it is recognised to protect the health of receptors close to dust emitting activities and is considered appropriate for use at quarries. The applicant has indicated that an alert system will automatically contact the Quarry Manager if the Site Action Level is exceeded.
598. If the quarry were to be a source of dust, a review of site operations would be required to ensure that best practice mitigation is being applied. A continued significant breach of the Site Action Level occur would result in work being stopped as soon as is practicable, and the dust-emission source identified and remedied prior to the recommencement of work.
599. Other risk factors identified in the [DMP](#) include equipment failure, abnormal waste and adverse weather. The [DMP](#) includes details of corrective action to be carried out in the event of these scenarios.
600. The assessment also concludes that the embedded mitigation and the [DMP](#) follow the guidance referenced in [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#).
601. However, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority notes that the [DMP](#) does not include an assessment of Hamble Primary School to the west of the site. The primary school is within 250m of the site and is therefore considered a sensitive receptor by the Authority. However, it is acknowledged that Receptor D7 of in the [DMP](#) (see figure 2) is closer to the site compared to the school and that a negligible impact has been identified for Receptor D7.
602. [RSK Environmental Ltd](#) have confirmed that although the [DMP](#) shows that the predominant wind direction blows towards the north-east, meteorological conditions can be variable and short-term exposures are relevant to all boundaries. It is therefore advised that an additional nephelometer be placed on the western boundary, close by to receptor D7, where this would be representative of nearby residents and the Hamble Primary School. Should all other matters be acceptable, this could be secured by planning condition in the event that permission is granted.

603. The Borough Council's EHO queries the data capture/meteorological data used in the Air Quality assessment to inform the [DMP](#), definitions of conditions of dust disamenity, unacceptable levels for dust deposition, wind direction measures and "long periods of dry weather". As set out above, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that the data used in the Air Quality Assessment is relevant and has been independently validated as set out above. Similarly, the [DMP](#) has been independently reviewed and found sound. The [DMP](#) is a working document and will be reviewed periodically and in consultation with stakeholders via a planning condition should permission be granted. The EHO has acknowledged a willingness to be party to these discussions.

604. Within [ES Chapter 12](#) (Likely Significant environment Effects), air quality impacts are separated into 'road traffic impacts' and 'operational dust impacts'.

605. The Highways Authority have confirmed that a number of Active Travel and Sustainable Transport schemes are currently being developed for the area, providing greater provision for cyclists and pedestrians on Hamble Lane. On this basis, an appropriate contribution towards improved walking and cycling for local trips could be secured by s106 to help to mitigate impacts.

*Road Traffic impacts:*

606. Parts of Hamble Lane fall into a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), designated for exceedances of the annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 40µg /m<sup>3</sup>. The submitted Air Quality Assessment (AQA) suggests that there are no local AQMAs designated for PM<sub>10</sub> and as such it is unlikely there are any exceedances of PM<sub>10</sub> in Eastleigh Borough.

607. The Hamble Lane Area AQMA is to the north of the site covering the area from Windhover Roundabout south on Hamble Lane to the junction with Portsmouth Road (A3025) and east along Providence Hill (A27) (See Figure 3).




Figure 3: Air Quality Management Area along Hamble Lane

608. The AQA considers the effect on air quality from PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the expected additional vehicle movements including fleet composition data associated with the development. It is considered unlikely that contributions from the proposed development would exceed the PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration for the following reason cited in the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) document:

*“Regarding the smaller particles (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), the 2012 Bradley decision states: “As for smaller particles, the PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the modelling shows there would be only a marginal increase in concentrations over the baseline level, such that the cumulative concentration would fall well below the thresholds given in Air Quality Objectives.”*

609. Additional qualification of the impacts of the development on air quality from road traffic have been provided following the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage (see [response on air quality \(Air Quality Assessment Ltd dated 10.11.23\)](#)). This confirms that the maximum increases in pollutant concentrations due to road traffic generated by the proposed development are as follows:



- NO<sub>2</sub> – 0.13µg/m<sup>3</sup>, the increase is 0% of the AQAL;
- PM<sub>10</sub> – 0.04µg/m<sup>3</sup>, the increase is 0% of the AQAL; and
- PM<sub>2.5</sub> – 0.02µg/m<sup>3</sup>, the increase is 0% of the AQAL.

610. With regards to the impact of road traffic on air quality, the Borough Council maintains that the [Transport Assessment](#) predictions regarding vehicle movements are a vital input to air pollution modelling and that an agreed traffic assessment is used for the purposes of air pollution modelling.

611. The HPRG raises concerns about the accuracy of the information provided in the [Transport Assessment](#) insofar as it is used in the air quality dispersion model and dates of the baseline traffic data. In response to this, the Highway Authority has confirmed that it agreed the baseline traffic flows provided in the assessment. In addition, the applicant's air quality specialist has clarified how the baseline traffic flow data has been (see [response on air quality \(Air Quality Assessment Ltd dated 10.11.23\)](#), paragraph 3.6.2)).

612. The HPRG (Appendix III) refers to additional HGV contributions to PMs, NO<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> along Hamble Lane as a result of this development. The applicant's air quality specialist confirms that road traffic emissions have been assessed in accordance with the approach set out in [IAQM Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality \(2017\)](#). The proposed development does increase concentrations, but by such a small amount that the percentage change relative to the AQAL is zero.

613. The Highway Authority also adds that the financial contribution sought in mitigation would support active travel modes and seek to reduce some vehicular trips on the network by facilitating greater take up of walking and cycling. Similarly, RSK's [assessment](#) of the application confirms that there is a 0.1% increase in modelled concentrations from traffic associated with the proposal [72 HGVs and 122 LDV] through Hamble Lane AQMA which under the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) is a 'negligible' change in air quality as a result of the increase in traffic.

*Operational dust impacts:*

614. The [ES Chapter 12](#) recognises that the residential properties, schools, commercial operations and ecologically sensitive areas which lie close to the application site will be most sensitive to operational dust. [ES Chapter 12](#) sets out a qualitative source-pathway-receptor (S-P-R) assessment method to determine the risk of dust effects as described in the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#), and the dust impact assessment method set out in [ES Appendix 6.2](#) is based on the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#). It describes a number of steps to determine the site characteristics and baseline conditions, with an estimate of the dust impact risk and likely magnitude of effects.

615. The AQA follows the guidance in the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) which divides activities on minerals sites into seven groups:

- Site preparation and restoration;
- Mineral extraction;
- Material handling;
- Mineral processing;
- Stockpiling and exposed surfaces; and
- On-site and offsite transportation.

616. A series of steps then consider the potential impact due to:

- the risk of health effects from an increase in exposure to PM10;
- annoyance due to the deposition of dust; and
- harm to the natural environment.

617. Potential dust sources and activities have been identified and the risk of impacts at sensitive receptors determined based on the prevailing meteorological conditions and topography, the likely magnitude of emissions (with mitigation in place) are discussed below, and the distances over which effects may occur are set out (see Table 3).

618. The AQA has screened the proposal and has identified that there are sensitive human receptors and an area of ancient woodland at Mallards Moor within 250m of the boundary of the site.

619. Indeed, there are receptors between 60-200m from the site boundary. This includes residential properties and commercial units along Hamble Lane which share a boundary with the site on the southwest. In addition, there are dwellings to the north and northeast, dwellings to the site's southern boundary south of the Hamble Rail Trail, and to the south-east boundary along Satchell Lane.

| Receptor | Overall Residual Source Emissions | Pathway Effectiveness | Dust Impact Risk | Receptor Sensitivity | Magnitude of Dust Effect |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| D1       | Small                             | Ineffective           | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D2       | Small                             | Moderately Effective  | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D3       | Small                             | Moderately Effective  | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D4       | Small                             | Moderately Effective  | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D5       | Small                             | Ineffective           | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D6       | Small                             | Ineffective           | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D7       | Small                             | Ineffective           | Negligible       | Medium               | Negligible               |
| D8       | Small                             | Ineffective           | Negligible       | High                 | Negligible               |
| D9       | Small                             | Moderately Effective  | Negligible       | Medium               | Negligible               |

Table 3 - Summary of Dust Deposition Effects

620. Dust receptors at 100m and 200m distances from the working area are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Dust receptor and 100m and 200m distances from working area (Figure 12.4 Chapter 12 of ES)

621. The AQA includes dust sensitive receptors within 100m of quarrying activities (dust receptors D1, D2, D3, D4, D5 and D7 as set out in Table 3 and Figure 4) and receptors between 100m and 200m from dust generating activities (dust receptors D6, D8 and D9). The AQA confirms that 100m is the threshold between receptors described as close or intermediate when defining the receptor distance category, as described in the Dust Risk Assessment Methodology as set out in [ES Appendix 6.2](#).
622. The Hamble School and Sports Complex (with the sports complex approximately 45m from the site boundary) are located immediately north of the site separated by the Hamble railway line. Hamble Primary School is located approximately 120m to the west of the site beyond Hamble Lane. In addition to residential dwellings and commercial properties there are a number of ecologically sensitive sites in close proximity to the site including Badnam Copse/Mallards Moor Ancient Woodland (SINC) located approximately 65m to the north-east of the site boundary, Mercury Marina Saltmarsh North and South SINC located 225m to the east, West Wood (Royal Victoria Country Park) SINC located 190m to the west of the site boundary.
623. The AQA states that residual source emissions (the emissions with designed-in mitigation in place) have been estimated for each of the main operational activities including site preparation, mineral extraction and on-site transport, and processing and stockpiles and exposed surfaces. The AQA notes that there is a risk of medium residual source emission during the site preparation phase while the screening bunds are being constructed which could result in slight adverse dust effects at The Hamble School and Wessex Manor, to the north and northeast of the application site respectively, and dwellings off Satchell Lane to the east. However, it considers this to be of short-term duration until the screening bund has been constructed, after which time the dust deposition effects would be negligible.
624. In response to this, the applicant's air quality specialist states that the seasonal plots show some small variation in wind direction, but that the predominant wind direction in each seasonal plot is from the southwest. The response suggests that undertaking detailed analysis of the meteorological data to consider seasonality would not change the conclusions of the assessment: *“Operations at the site will take place across the whole year and will not be limited to particular seasons; therefore, it would make no sense to consider seasonality in the assessment. The average weather conditions*

*across the whole year will determine what the risk of an impact is at a particular receptor.”*

625. There is a risk that dust will be entrained from the ground even when no dust generating activities are taking place. Wind speeds greater than 5 m/s are considered strong enough to initiate the suspension of dust from the ground, and the risk is increased on dry days, i.e., when less than 0.2 mm of rainfall are recorded over a 24-hour period. The prevailing wind data show that, for approximately 59% of the time, wind speeds are likely to be below 5 m/s, when dust is unlikely to become suspended in the air.
626. As already noted, the proposal includes screening bunds. Along the site's north and east boundary the bund would be 4m high, 5m high along the south boundary and the majority of the west bound and 3m high on the west boundary immediately north of the site entrance (as shown on [Method of Working Phasing Overview](#)) The bund is set back from the site boundary between 20m to 103m as shown on the [Landscape Layout Plan](#). This drawing illustrates the bund set back from the nearest properties. The bunds would be constructed using soils and overburden removed from the Phase 1 areas and seeded immediately upon completion.
627. [ES Chapter 12](#) acknowledges that there is a risk of 'medium' residual source emission from topsoil and overburden removal during site preparation when the screening bunds are being constructed. This could result in a dust impact risk, and a slight adverse magnitude of dust effects at receptors D2, D3 and D4 (see figure 4). However, it is stated that the risk of slight adverse dust effects would be of short duration and, once the screening bund construction is complete, the dust deposition effects would be negligible.
628. [ES Chapter 12](#) states that it is unlikely that there will be more than five heavy plant in operation during the site preparation works. Sand and gravel would be extracted using a 360° excavator and moved by a wheeled loading shovel onto a field conveyor, which will move the aggregates to the plant area for processing, minimising any dust emissions from on-site transportation. Each working area would be relatively small with just one extractor in use at any one time to win the minerals.
629. The minerals would retain a high level of moisture, reducing the likelihood of dust emissions as the minerals are worked. Most of the extraction works would take place more than 100m from dust-sensitive receptors and would be screened from the surrounding area by bunds.

630. The [ES Chapter 12](#) suggests the dust residual source emission magnitude during mineral extraction, handling and on-site transportation is 'small'. It confirms that as the site is being progressively worked, the exposed surface of the void would never be more than 10ha and the sand and gravel would have a low dust potential due to inherent moisture in the minerals. The working areas are shielded from local receptors by the screening bunds.
631. Processed mineral will be moved to stockpiles in the centre of the plant area by loading shovel. The stockpiles would be located more than 100m from any dust sensitive receptors, and water suppression would be used if visible dust emissions were observed from the stockpiles. The [ES Chapter 12](#) concludes that the residual source emission magnitude from exposed surfaces and stockpiles is small.
632. In terms of mineral processing, the processing plant would be located at the north of the site, more than 100m from dust sensitive receptors. The extracted minerals will be screened and washed and sorted into sizes (10mm, 20mm and sand fractions). The screening and washing process is wet, which would control any dust emissions, and the AQA states that the mineral processing residual source emission magnitude would be small.
633. In terms of off-site transportation, anticipated vehicle movements in and out of the site are anticipated as set out in the section on [Highways impact](#). The AQA states that all HGVs would be covered prior to leaving the site and a wheel-wash would be employed for more than 50m of clean, hard surface before joining the public highway. The dust control measures would ensure a minimal track-out from the site. Therefore, the AQA states that the residual source emission magnitude for off-site transportation is considered to be small. This could be controlled via a planning condition.
634. A summary of the residual source emissions is shown in Table 4.
635. The AQA concludes that the magnitude of dust effects on the identified receptors will be 'negligible'.
636. The applicant's air quality specialist states that the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) takes the approach that there is little risk that a process contribution from a dust source would lead to an exceedance of the objectives where background ambient PM10 concentrations are below 17ug.m3. Because the annual mean PM10 concentration at the receptor nearest the site entrance (R1) is 14.6ug/m3, the proposed development would have an insignificant effect on health due to fugitive emissions of PM10.

| Activity  | Residual Source Emissions |
|---|---------------------------|
| Site Preparation  | Medium                    |
| Mineral Extraction, Materials Handling and On-site Transportation | Small                     |
| Stockpiles and Exposed Surfaces                                   | Small                     |
| Mineral Processing  | Small                     |
| Off-site Transportation   | Small                     |

Table 4 - Summary of the residual source emissions (source: ES Chapter 12 Air Quality Table 12.10)

637. This stance has recently been upheld by a Planning Inspector ([Appeal Ref: APP/E1855/W/22/3310099](#)) appeal decision dated May 2023 where the Inspector confirmed that:

*“The IAQM Guidance on mineral dust advises that where the long-term background PM10 concentration is less than 17 µg/m3 there is little risk that additional contributions from a mineral site would lead to an exceedance of the annual mean air quality objective. The guidance advises that if this is the case then no further consideration is typically required..... On this basis, I accept that no further consideration of potential PM10 impacts from the proposed development would be required.”*

638. In its response to concerns raised by the UKHSA and the Eastleigh Borough Council EHO as well as Parish and third party comments, the applicant’s air quality consultant (see ‘Technical Note’ J0655/2/F1 18.4.23 & ‘Second Regulation 25 Response’ J0801/1/F1, 16.10.23, Air Quality Assessments Ltd) confirms that monitoring data for similar sand and gravel quarries is not available but that data is available in the IAQM Guidance which illustrates a falling-off of PM10 concentrations with distance from the source at mineral sites, and that “sand and gravel quarries are likely to increase PM10 concentrations by less than 1µg/m3 (almost zero) at distances of around 50m, 150m and 400m from quarry operations”. It goes on to suggest that annual mean PM10 process contributions from the proposed development estimated using these sources would be in a range from 2-5µg/m3. Furthermore, it states that using conservative figures for annual mean background PM10 concentrations and process contributions, would result in total annual mean

PM210 concentrations (27.5ug/m<sup>3</sup>) well below the annual mean PM10 objective of 40 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, “and the air quality assessment level of 32ug/m<sup>3</sup> to ensure compliance with the 24-hour mean PM10 objective” (see para 5.1.11 Technical note 18.04.2023). In addition, it is contended by the applicant that bunds are effective mitigation for dust emissions – used at most mineral sites – and dust emissions will also be controlled at source using water suppression as set out in the [DMP](#).

639. The UKHSA notes the [Planning Statement](#) makes reference to dust from restoration material (the importation of 150,000 tonnes per annum increasing to 250,000 tonnes after year seven) and plant at the northern end of the site (aggregate processing plant, conveyor, weighbridge, wheel wash etc). The applicant reaffirms that given the designed-in mitigation measures set out above the magnitude of dust effects from these sources would be negligible. The mitigation and an appropriate Dust Management Plan should be secured by a planning condition in the event permission is granted. A requirement for a wheel-wash system could also be secured by way of condition in the event that permission is granted.
640. In its conclusion, the UKHSA does acknowledge that the applicant has followed the approach recommended by [NPPG/ NPPF \(2023\)](#) and [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) in assessing the site and potential impacts and that qualitative assessments, using a source/pathway/receptor methodology, are standard where measured data is not available. They also recognise that permit related matters are not usually considered as part of the planning process. However, they consider the number of sensitive receptors located between 60 and 200m from the site boundary makes this site somewhat atypical.
641. Therefore, the UKHSA recommends planning conditions be imposed if permission is granted which require the submission of additional monitoring data to validate the submitted qualitative assessment and the provision of a dust management plan. In response to this, the applicant’s air quality consultant suggests that the information provided is based on the industry standard and in line with the [PPG](#) and [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#). Similarly, much of what is being requested by the UKHSA is not available, including monitoring data from other comparable sites, due to there not being a requirement to carry out this work at sand and gravel sites.
642. In terms of pathway effectiveness, the AQA notes that the transport of fugitive dust in the air is dependent on the prevailing meteorological conditions, and that receptors downwind of the dust emissions source are more likely to be exposed to dust more frequently than those located upwind.



The AQA relies on data from Southampton Airport meteorological station, which, it states, shows the prevailing wind direction is from the southwest. Southampton Airport meteorological station is 9km to the north-west of the site which the AQA suggests means the wind conditions are likely to be similar to the application site.

643. The AQA does acknowledge that there is a risk that dust will be entrained from the ground even when no dust generation activities are taking place. It also suggests that wind speeds greater than 5 m/s are considered strong enough to initiate the suspension of dust from the ground and that the risk is increased on dry days, when less than 0.2 mm of rainfall are recorded over a 24 hour period. However, the prevailing wind data shows that, for approximately 59% of the time, wind speeds are likely to be below 5 m/s, when dust is unlikely to become suspended in the air. The AQA states that analysis of average rainfall data for the area shows that, over the 30 year period from 1981 to 2010, an average of 150-160 days will be wet days (i.e. rainfall will be greater than 0.2 mm (Met Office, 2021)). Therefore, for approximately 42% of the time, daily rainfall will be greater than 0.2 mm, when there will be natural dust suppression.
644. The UKHSA response (dated 22.03.23) notes that meteorological data from Southampton Airport has informed the assessment and agrees with the wind rose that shows the wind direction is predominantly from the south west. However, it states that the data does not consider seasonal variations in wind patterns. The UKHSA provides a wind rose that demonstrates there are some seasonal variations in wind patterns which it states result in potential pathways for wind-blown dust exposure at sensitive receptor sites surrounding the site, therefore it advocates for further consideration be given to the effects of varying wind direction and speed, relative humidity and rainfall including the likelihood of extended dry period.
645. Similarly, the HPRG (response dated 9 July 2023 and Appendix III) suggests that the Air Quality Assessment failed to adequately identify or to understand the prevailing weather in Hamble and the implications this has for dispersion of PM10 and PM2.5. It states that the Southampton Airport wind rose is not representative of conditions on site and that Hamble's weather can be influenced by Solent Sea breezes with residents experiencing localised meteorological conditions compared with inland. In particular, it is argued that it does not take account of the interaction between wind, temperature, rainfall and humidity, which it states is essential to understanding the impact on sand particles and particularly PM10 and PM2.5 held within the sand and aggregates.

646. With reference to wind speed, the HPRG suggest that wind speeds much lower than the 5 m/s cited in the AQA can lift PM10 and PM2.5 particles and deposit them within the wide area surrounding the quarry. The AQA states that *“the prevailing wind data show that, for approximately 59% of the time, wind speeds are likely to be below 5 m/s, when dust is unlikely to become suspended in the air”*.
647. The applicant’s air quality specialist response (see Response to Representations J0801/2/F1) states that winds at Southampton Airport are likely to be influenced by the topography of the River Itchen and winds at Hamble are likely to be influenced that of the River Hamble. Overall wind conditions in the area are also likely to be influenced by the north-northeast to south-southwest topographic features due to many other tributaries running into The Solent in the area between Southampton Airport and Hamble. On this basis, it is suggested that the wind conditions at Southampton Airport and Hamble are likely to be similar, given the similar topography at, and between, the two sites.
648. [RSK Environmental Ltd](#) (the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority’s Independent Air Quality Assessors) confirm that the supporting meteorological data within the assessment was chosen with sufficient data capture and is representative of the site.
649. Following the construction of the screening bunds, the applicant’s air quality specialist states that most dust-sensitive receptors would be more than 100m from dust-generating activities on site. This does not include part of The Hamble School, Wessex Manor and Mallards Moor (ancient woodland) to the north and northeast of the application site respectively, and some dwellings off Satchell Lane to the east, which will be within 100m of dust-generating activities and would be categorised as ‘close’. However, notwithstanding this, and recognising that particles responsible for the most dust annoyance will usually deposit within 100m of the source, the AQA concludes that the potential for dust deposition effects at all receptor sites is ‘negligible’.
650. This assessment of a ‘small’ residual source emissions magnitude has been questioned by the HPRG (see Appendix III Air Quality) suggesting that the IAQM guidance is open to *“differences in interpretation depending on the desired outcome”*. In response to this, the applicant’s air quality specialist has confirmed that notwithstanding the extraction rate is 250,000 tonnes/year, which may indicate a ‘medium residual source emission’, most of the extraction activities will take place more than 100m from any dust sensitive receptors, the working phase areas will be less than 20 hectares, there will be a low number of plant in operation, sand/gravel with retained moisture have a

low dust emission potential and screening bunds will be placed around the site. Therefore, their overall judgement is that during mineral extraction, handling and on-site transportation the magnitude of residual source emissions will be small.

651. In their response (J/0801/2/F1 dated 10.11.2023) the applicant's air quality specialist further clarifies that "*even if the overall residual source emission magnitude was judged to be medium, this would result in no more than a slight adverse risk of dust effects at dust sensitive receptors*" which will be controlled by the mitigation measures set out in the DMP.

652. In responding to observations, Table 8 of the [ES Air Quality Appendices 6.1 & 6.2](#) provides: 'examples of residual source emissions magnitude' omits 'minerals extraction', the applicant's air quality specialist confirms that the omission was an error although the IAQM guidance was referred to in the assessment ([ES Chapter 12](#), paragraph 12.2.38) and that the appropriate assessment carried out as follows:

*For mineral extraction, a large source emission magnitude might be a large working area (>100ha), high energy extraction methods (drilling and blasting), material of high dust potential (small particle size and/or low moisture content) or a potential high extraction rate (1,000,000 tpa).*

*For mineral extraction, a small source emission magnitude might be a small working area (<20ha), low energy extraction methods (hydraulic excavator), material of low dust potential (coarse material and/or high moisture content) or a low extraction rate (<200,000 tpa).*

653. Concerns have been raised in third party representations on behalf of Hamble marine businesses about the impact of dust on local manufacturing and other commercial activities in the area. However, impacts on the most sensitive receptors closest to the site have been assessed and found to be negligible. Businesses are less sensitive to air quality and dust and as such impacts would be even smaller than those on the residential receptors.

654. The Mineral and Waste Local Authority's independent assessor confirms their agreement in respect of the assessment and findings of the 'Residual Source Emissions' as presented in the [ES Chapter 12](#) and associated appendices.

655. The [ES Chapter 12](#) states that all HGVs would be covered prior to leaving the site and would use a wheel wash and travel over more than 50m of clean, hard surface before joining the public highway. The dust controls would ensure that there is minimal trackout from the site. This could also be controlled via a

planning condition. On this basis, it is concluded that the residual source emission magnitude for off-site transportation is small.

656. UKHSA state that they do not endorse the approach to risk assessments relating to PM10 set out in the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#), i.e., that there is little risk that a process contribution from a dust source would lead to an exceedance of the objectives where background ambient PM10 concentrations are below 17µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The applicant's air quality consultant states that the IAQM approach to screening PM10 is intended to prevent the "need for unnecessarily detailed consideration of PM10 emissions where there will not be an adverse effect." The response goes on to state that the screening criterion is conservative, using screening impacts from all minerals sites, which includes those with higher dust emission potential (i.e. clay quarries and hard rock quarries using blasting) and assumes that there could be a process contribution of up to 15µg/m<sup>3</sup>.
657. [ES Chapter 12](#) provides predicted baseline concentrations for NO<sub>2</sub>, PM10 and PM2.5 for 2019 and 2023. In its section on 'dust deposition health effects' it states that the annual mean PM10 concentration at Receptor 1, a residential property closest to the site's entrance, is predicted to be 14.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in 2019. It is suggested that given the proximity of this receptor to the road, this is likely to be the maximum annual mean PM10 concentration within the area that may be affected by PM10 emissions from the proposed development.
658. Following the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#), the report suggests that there is little risk that a process contribution from a dust source would lead to an exceedance of the objectives where background ambient PM10 concentrations are below 17µg/m<sup>3</sup>. On this basis the report concludes that the proposed development will have an insignificant effect on health due to fugitive emissions of PM10.
659. The response from UKHSA (dated 27.1.23) has identified predicted levels (using data from Defra air quality background mapping data for local authorities) of annual PM10 in the locality of 12.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to 13.21 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and that it is unlikely that the Air Quality Objectives (AQO's) would be breached from the operation of the quarry. This is significantly lower than the current UK threshold of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. However, the UKHSA states "*we do not accept the premise that simply not exceeding current UK thresholds demonstrates that there is no risk to health.*" This statement is in response to the World Health Organisation (WHO) reducing recommended exposure levels. However, the UKHSA also notes that the levels referred to in the WHO guidance have not been adopted in UK legislation and therefore have no force in law. However, it considers that reducing public exposure to below air quality standards has

potential public health benefits and supports approaches to minimise or mitigate public exposure to air pollutants and their consideration during development design, environmental and health impact assessments and development consent.

660. Notwithstanding this, the use of the AQOs as a threshold for the assessment of health impacts is established in the paragraph 030 Reference ID: 27-030-20140306 of the [PPG](#) (Air quality):

*“Operators should follow the assessment framework for considering the impacts of PM10 from a proposed site.”*

661. The applicant’s air quality consultant states that the [PPG](#) assessment framework (Site Assessment Flow Chart) makes clear that where PM10 concentrations are not likely to exceed the AQOs, good practice measures should be sufficient, without the need for monitoring and specific controls on PM10 emissions.

662. Attention is drawn by the applicant’s advisor to the examples of appeal decisions (provided in Appendix 1 of the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#)) where dust from minerals sites was a consideration. Regarding PM10, the appeal decisions indicate that the site assessment flowchart in the paragraph 005 (Reference ID: 32-005-20191101) the [PPG](#) (Air Quality) should form the basis of an assessment, and decisions about acceptability are based on whether the predicted concentrations are likely to fall below the relevant Air Quality Objective.

663. In summarising the evidence provided as part of the ES Air Quality Assessment, the applicant’s air quality consultant states the evidence (derived from the Defra’s background maps, atmospheric dispersion modelling (ADMS) and the data from the ES1 automatic monitoring site) indicates that baseline PM10 concentrations within the study area would be well below the annual and 24-hour mean objectives. Given that the contribution to PM10 concentrations due to the onsite operations at the quarry would likely be significantly less than 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> it is considered that the AQOs would be achieved by a wide margin and that good practice measures, as set out in the [DMP](#) for the scheme, are sufficient to protect the health of local receptors.

664. The UKHSA suggest that whilst these background levels are encouraging, quarry developments (extraction, processing and vehicle movements) are likely to produce elevated levels of PM10. They remain concerned that the proposal has the potential to result in increased exposure given the proximity of sensitive residential and educational receptors within 100 – 200m of the site

and the ability for PM10 to travel several hundred metres. However, it does recognise that the predicted low levels of PM10 exposure appear to provide significant headroom before the 40µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual threshold is breached.

665. Consequently, UKHSA suggests assessment of PM10 levels should consider worst case and mean hourly exposure patterns from the site over a 24 hour period, including an assessment of the impact of seasonal weather conditions on the release and transport of particulates, on the basis that this additional analysis would allow the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed dust management measures will minimise the impact on local populations, particularly those with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular conditions.

666. In relation to dust impacts, the [ES Chapter 12](#) concludes that the operational phase dust risk assessment has determined that, with the designed-in mitigation measures, the magnitude of the dust effect from the extraction of the minerals is negligible.

667. Hamble Parish Council raised concerns about the lack of information on the profile of vehicles as part of the application. Paragraph 100/191 of the [Planning Statement](#) confirms that the applicant's vehicles are continually replaced and, are on average under 5 years old, to ensure they operate a modern, clean and fuel efficient fleet. Over 20% of the fleet exceeds Euro IV or higher standards. The applicant confirms that they use a number of measures to reduce emissions which includes fleet drivers being trained in safe and fuel-efficient driving, in order to reduce the quantity of fuel used and emissions accordingly. Details of the fleet profile can form part of the Site Environmental Management Plan (see section Public safety and safety safeguarding zones below) which could be required via a planning condition.

668. The Environment Agency was consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposal on the basis of air quality.

669. The Borough Council have requested that the applicant uses EURO V and above HGVs to ensure that development related traffic will have the smallest possible impact. More information on this aspect is considered in the section on [Climate Change](#).

*Legal agreement:*

670. Eastleigh Borough Council request that if the application is approved, a financial contribution towards air quality measures identified in the Eastleigh Borough Council Air Quality Action Plan (to be agreed in negotiation with EBC)

should be sought towards a permanent monitoring station to be installed on Hamble Lane, allowing both NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> to be monitored.

671. It is clear that the Air Quality Assessment illustrates that the proposal will have a negligible impact on air quality and that the applicant's assessment of air quality has been found to be adequate. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has sought KC advice on this appropriateness of seeking a contribution as requested by Eastleigh Borough Council towards air quality measures. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers that such a contribution does not meet the legal test in regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulations 2010 of being "*necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms*".

*Conclusions on air quality:*

672. The conclusions of the **Air Quality Assessment**, undertaken using the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) are that:

- the effect on amenity at sensitive receptors is considered to be 'not significant';
- the effect on PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations at sensitive receptors is considered to be 'not significant';
- the effect from dust on ecological receptors is considered to be 'not significant'; and
- the effect from traffic emissions on human and ecological receptors is considered to be 'not significant'.

673. The overall conclusion of the assessment is that effects on air quality are 'not significant'. The [DMP](#) has determined that with good practice dust controls there is a negligible risk of dust soiling and PM<sub>10</sub> health effects due to operations at the site. The assessment concludes that subject to appropriate planning conditions to include securing mitigation set out in the [DMP](#), the proposal will not cause adverse public health and safety impacts nor unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. The assessment therefore concludes that the proposal complies with parts 'a' and 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to emissions to air and dust.

674. Notwithstanding this, a number of concerns have been raised regarding the [ES Chapter 12](#) including the use of qualitative data and modelling over quantitative data. The applicant's air quality specialist has confirmed that the methodology and approach to assessing air quality follows the [IAQM Guidance \(2016\)](#) and this has been confirmed by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority independent assessors along with validating the findings.

675. The air quality report concludes that there is a negligible change in air quality as a result of increased traffic from the proposal and the results are well within the Air Quality Assessment Levels (AQAL). Similarly, it has been demonstrated that the increase in traffic in the Hamble Lane AQMA will result in a negligible change in air quality. The report also confirms that dust deposition effects would be negligible with the bund in place. Mitigation has been further articulated in the submitted [DMP](#).

676. Based on the information provided as part of the planning application and the subsequent Regulation 25 submissions, as well as the advice provided by the Independent Air Quality Assessor, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with parts 'a' and 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and complies with the [PPG](#) and the relevant guidance provided by the IAQM. It is considered that the air quality impacts associated with the proposal can be adequately and appropriately mitigated through planning conditions and there is no justification for refusing the application on air quality grounds.

*b) Emissions to land:*

677. Part 'a' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not release emissions to the land above appropriate standards.

678. Soil issues have already been covered in [Soil Protection](#). The previous use of the site as an airfield could mean that the site has some contamination. Paragraph 14.3.12 of [Chapter 14 of the ES - Soil Resource Assessment](#) states that soil samples were analysed at a suitably accredited laboratory (NRM Ltd).

679. The potential for site contamination is an important matter which requires consideration. Paragraph 001 (Reference ID: 33-001-20190722) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) states that "*failing to deal adequately with contamination can cause harm to human health, property and the wider environment*".

680. The HPRG highlighted a *fear of dangerous chemicals buried in soil from the historical airfield site*. These concerns are acknowledged.

681. Eastleigh Borough Council requested a planning condition relating to a contaminated land site assessment and agreement of any necessary mitigation measures. This could be included in the event that permission is granted but it is also considered that a condition could require the submission of a Remediation Strategy if any areas of contamination are discovered. This is a standard condition applied for sites where there is a potential for contamination due to previous uses. A condition could also be applied for a



Site Environmental Management Plan. This could cover, amongst other considerations, details on the management of any contaminated material found on site.

682. Site contamination issues and any potential emissions to land would also be considered the [Environmental Permitting Regulations](#), under which an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency is normally required to cover the treatment and/or redeposit of contaminated soils if the soils are 'waste'.

*Conclusions on emissions to land:*

683. On the basis of the potential planning conditions which could be applied if permission is granted, the proposal is in accordance with part 'a' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to emissions to land.

*c) Noise and vibration:*

684. Part 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not: cause unacceptable noise impacts.

685. Potential noise impacts associated with the proposal have been subject to the focus of consultation responses from Hamble Parish Council, Paul Holmes MP and Eastleigh Borough Council as well many representations received (as summarised in the [Representations](#) section of this report.

686. [Chapter 7 of the ES \(Noise\)](#) considers the impact of noise from the proposal on the nearest noise-sensitive receptors. It includes baseline noise survey and assessment locations, survey results, calculated noise levels from site operations and suggested noise limits, along with associated data including vehicle movements, which are included within the supporting appendices, and a discussion of temporary and routine operations.

687. Paragraph 020 (Reference ID 27-020-20140306) of the [PPG \(Noise\)](#) states that mineral planning authorities should take account of the prevailing acoustic environment and in doing so consider whether or not noise from the proposed operations would:

- give rise to a significant adverse effect;
- give rise to an adverse effect; and
- enable a good standard of amenity to be achieved.

688. This would include identifying whether the overall effect of the noise exposure would be above or below the significant observed adverse effect level and the lowest observed adverse effect level for the given situation.
689. There are known noise generating uses close to the site. Eastleigh Borough Council concluded that the railway line immediately to the north of the site was a 'Significant Noise Generating Use' in their [Strategic Land Availability Assessment \(2016\)](#) (SLAA-8-2-C).
690. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) confirms that background noise levels were measured in 2018 and that it considers these to be representative of normal background noise levels in the vicinity of the site (falling outside the period of restrictions due to the Covid 19 pandemic). The assessment identifies the nearest noise-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the site as residential properties around the western, southern and eastern boundaries and the Hamble School directly to the north of the site. The initial noise monitoring took place at 6 locations over 3 dates in February, April and May 2018 (see Figure 5). Sample measurements of 15-minute duration were taken at each location during different time periods (from midday to 3.30pm) totalling 1 hour's monitoring at each site. The applicant's noise consultant confirms that the chosen timeframe corresponds with the established view that in the UK the 'rush hour' period between 07:00 to 09:00 hours and the corresponding afternoon period when schools and the work day finishes, are generally noisier in terms of background noise levels. Background noise levels during the period 10:00 to 14:00 hours represent the quietest part of the day and therefore represent a worst-case scenario.
691. In response to the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage, an [updated background noise monitoring exercise](#) was carried out to better reflect current noise levels. An additional day's surveying was undertaken in July 2022, duration between 30 minutes and 1-hour at the original 6 sites was carried out with the intention of looking at the period between 07:00 and 08:00 hours as requested by Eastleigh Borough Council's EHO. The six assessment locations are shown in Figure 5 below and the baseline noise survey data for both 2018 and 2022 in Table 5.



Figure 5: Baseline Survey and Assessment Locations

| Location                     | Average LAeq (dB) |      | Average LA90 (dB) |      | Range LA90 (dB) |          |
|------------------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
|                              | 2018              | 2022 | 2018              | 2022 | 2018            | 2022     |
| 1 Astral Gardens/Tutor Close | 46                | 49   | 40                | 43   | 38 to 43        | 39 to 46 |
| 2 The Close, Satchell Lane   | 44                | 45   | 39                | 42   | 37 to 42        | 41 to 43 |
| 3 Satchell Lane              | 45                | 46   | 40                | 42   | 39 to 41        | 39 to 45 |
| 4 Wessex Manor               | 53                | 55   | 45                | 47   | 41 to 48        | 43 to 50 |
| 5 Hamble School              | 52                | 49   | 45                | 43   | 43 to 46        | 41 to 45 |
| 6 Hamble Lane (rear)         | 49                | 47   | 44                | 43   | 43 to 45        | 42 to 45 |

Table 5 - Baseline Noise Survey Data for 2018 and 2022 (based on information provided in Updated Baseline Noise Survey Following Regulation 25 Letter, WBM Acoustic Consultants, ref: 5173, 28 July 2022).

692. The [Planning Statement](#) recognises that the proposal has the potential to generate noise from routine operations including HGV traffic to and from the site, as well as noise generated by 'temporary operations'. In this instance for

the purposes of the noise assessment, temporary operations would consist of soils and overburden stripping and the construction of the bund, which the report suggests will take two to three weeks to complete. Routine activities include:

- the phased extraction of the mineral;
- transporting the extracted mineral to the processing plant site via a conveyor (with the exception of Phase 1 when a dump truck will be used);
- stockpiling and processing the extracted mineral via the processing plant (using loading shovel and radial conveyors); and
- transporting the processed mineral off site and bringing inert material in by HGVs to infill the void.

693. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) states that calculations and the assessment of noise levels have been based on all these components of the mineral extraction, infilling and processing operations taking place simultaneously and for 100% of each hour during the expected working day to represent a realistic worst-case scenario. However, in reality, the report suggests this situation is unlikely to occur and therefore the predicted noise levels would be lower than presented in the assessment.

694. The calculated site noise levels at the nearest dwellings and the suggested site noise limits are shown in the Table 6 below. The calculated site noise levels are at ground floor level (1.5 metres above local ground height) for sand and gravel extraction, infilling with inert material and mineral processing operations. The calculated site noise levels are based on all routine operations taking place simultaneously and assume that all plant for extraction and infilling is operating simultaneously in the closest practical area of the site to each receiver location. Set back distances from the proposed bunding have been explored and the highest calculated site noise levels presented. [NB calculated site noise levels have been updated to reflect additional surveying carried out in 2022 and are shown in table 6 below]:

| Location          | Receptor Sensitivity | Calculated Site Noise Level<br>dB L <sub>eq, 1hour free</sub><br>field | Suggested Site Noise Limit (Routine Operations)<br>dB L <sub>eq, 1hour free</sub><br>field | Complies with Noise Limit (Y/N) | Magnitude of Impact | Significance of Impact   |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Astral Gardens | High                 | 49   | 50   | Y                               | Moderate/Minor      | Good standard of amenity |
| 2. The Close      | High                 | 46   | 49   | Y                               | Moderate/Minor      | Good standard of amenity |
| 3. Satchell Lane  | High                 | 47   | 50   | Y                               | Moderate/Minor      | Good standard of amenity |
| 4. Wessex Manor   | High                 | 49   | 55   | Y                               | Moderate/Minor      | Good standard of amenity |
| 5. Hamble School  | High                 | 48   | 55   | Y                               | Moderate/Minor      | Good standard of amenity |
| 6. Hamble Lane    | High                 | 50   | 54   | Y                               | Moderate/Minor      | Good standard of amenity |

*Table 6 - Calculated Site Noise Levels (Routine Operations) Source: Table 7.8 ES Chapter 7 Noise, Cemex*

695. The supporting information confirms that the noise assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in the paragraph 021 (Reference ID: 27-021-20140306) of [PPG](#) (Minerals). This advises that *“Mineral Planning Authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background noise level (LA90,1h) by more than 10dB(A) during normal working hours (0700-1900). Where it will be difficult not to exceed the background level by more than 10dB(A) without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator, the limit set should be as near that level as practicable. In any event, the total noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field).”*

696. Comments from the Borough Council’s EHO and third party representations question whether the appropriate British Standard has been used to quantify noise impacts. In response to this, the applicant’s noise consultant states that BS4142 is a standard which details the method for assessing the impact of sound from industrial processes, therefore BS4142 is not intended to apply to the assessment of sound from mineral sites and the relevant guidance and advice regarding assessments is set out in the [PPG](#) (Minerals).

697. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) confirms that as the [PPG](#) (Minerals) does not contain details of noise prediction methods, the calculations in the ES are based on the methods contained in [BS5228-1: 2009 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites'](#) which provides a calculation method for the propagation of external noise and is the British Standard relating to noise calculations on construction and open sites. In addition, **the Regulation 25 (part 2) clarification document** (WBM 2173 dated 22.11.23) confirms that: *"BS5228-1:2009 was used for the calculation of noise from the site only, not for the assessment. The only criterion for the assessment of the significance of noise effects detailed in BS5228-1:2009 are those provided in Annex E for construction noise and advise noise limits generally in excess of those suggested in Planning Practice (Minerals)."*
698. In addition, whilst BS5228-1:2009 provides example sound power levels for plant, the applicant's noise consultant suggests that this data should be used with caution as it is relatively old. In the assessment provided as part of this application, the applicant's noise consultant confirms that data measured by them (WBM Acoustic Consultants) on similar sites was used to inform the sound power levels for the plant.
699. Specifically addressing comments (HPRG Appendix VI dated 30.01.23) regarding the processing plant and noise levels associated with types of plant on site, the applicant's noise specialist (**Response to HPRG Comments, Ref: 5173 dated 22.11.23**) has confirmed that as is normal procedure, the sound power levels/calculations and source heights included in the ES calculations are based on sound power levels measurements from similar plant items on other sites to establish a sound power level for the processing plant as a whole. In addition, the main noise sources for the processing plant have been prepared at height (4m above ground level) to be representative of the highest point of the main noise generating plant. Noise limits for both temporary and operational activities on site could be controlled through a planning condition.
700. The [Planning Statement](#) confirms that this site would be in operation between 0700-1700 hours Monday to Friday and 0700-1200 hours on Saturdays. A planning condition could be applied to secure appropriate working hours which would exclude Sundays and Bank Holidays if permission is granted.
701. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) concludes that the calculated site noise levels for routine and temporary operations at the proposed quarry comply with the [PPG](#) (Minerals) noise limits at the six assessment locations with the embedded mitigation of a 3-5m high bund around the site boundary (see [Method of Working Phasing Overview](#)). The report confirms that the noise experienced

at the nearest noise sensitive receptors, with the bund in place, will be well within the required noise limit of no more than 10dB(A) above background noise (see Table 7). Whilst this represents a slight moderate/minor impact, the report states that the occupiers of those properties will continue to experience a good standard of amenity whilst the site is in operation.

| Location                                  | 2022 Average L <sub>A90</sub> (dB) | PPGM 2022 Suggested Site Noise Limit (dB L <sub>Aeq</sub> , 1 hour free field) | ES Noise Chapter Suggested Site Noise Limit (dB L <sub>Aeq</sub> , 1 hour free field) |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Routine Operations (07:00 – 17:00)</b> |                                    |  |   |
| 1. Astral Gardens                         | 43                                 | 53   | 50  |
| 2. The Close                              | 42                                 | 52   | 49  |
| 3. Satchell Lane                          | 42                                 | 52   | 50  |
| 4. Wessex Manor                           | 47                                 | 55   | 55  |
| 5. Hamble School                          | 43                                 | 53   | 55  |
| 6. Hamble Lane                            | 43                                 | 53   | 54  |
| <b>Temporary Operations</b>               |                                    |  |   |
| All Locations                             | N/A                                | 70   | 70  |

Table 7: Based on updated baseline noise survey data, site noise limits based on [NPPG](#) (Minerals). Source Regulation 25 (April 2022) Updated Baseline Noise Survey July 2022 (Source: Regulation 25 April, Technical Note, WBM Acoustic Consultants, 28<sup>th</sup> July 2022).

702. Hamble Primary School is approximately 120m further south-west of the nearest assessment location - position 6 Hamble Lane - and on the opposite side of Hamble Lane. The noise impacts from routine operations experienced at location 6 is calculated to be 50 dBLAeq, 1hr (free field). Being further removed from the site and on the opposite side of Hamble Lane, the primary school will therefore experience lower noise levels from the proposed operation than the nearest assessment location. As the calculated site noise levels indicate that a good standard of amenity will continue to be experienced at the assessment locations, so too will the primary school.

703. Third party representations set out concerns about the impact of noise generated by activities on site and associated vehicle movements, and the detrimental impact this would have on the pupils' ability to concentrate and learn. Representations have been received from both local schools and Hamble Village Pre-school which operates from the Memorial Hall approximately 400m south of the site boundary.

704. Correspondents include parents, pupils, school councils and governing bodies. This includes a petition (see [Representations](#)) submitted from Hamble Primary School citing concerns that the noise arising from the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the children's mental health, their ability to

concentrate in lessons and learn effectively. The Hamble School is particularly concerned about the impact noise will have on pupils during exam times and those children with Special Education Needs who, it states, will find the constant noise particularly distracting. In addition, both schools state they have outdoor areas for learning and exercise, and that windows are kept open to provide well-ventilated rooms. Concerns have been raised due to the 'constant' nature of the additional noise associated with the machinery, processing and movement of the mineral on site, and the particular noise associated with vehicle reversing alarms.

705. Location 5 (Hamble School) (shown on Figure 5) is the closest assessment position to the secondary school. Between the school and the site is the Hamble Sports Complex a sports venue open to the public. The background noise at this assessment location is stated as 43 dB average LA90 (2022 figure).

706. The highest calculated site noise levels at The Hamble School for routine operations when the mineral extraction/infilling operations are at the closest point to the school are predicted to be 48 dB (Leq, 1hour free field). This is “7 dB(A) below the suggested site noise limit of 55 dB (Leq, 1hour free field) and 4 dB(A) below the existing representative ambient noise level in that area” (**Cemex Clarification Response (WBM Acoustic Consultants ref: 5173 dated 22.11.2023)**). The applicant's noise consultant further notes that this calculated site noise level would only be the case when working in that area at the top of the mineral and will reduce in subsequent phases when operations move further away from the school. [NB: the applicant's noise specialist has confirmed that reference in WBM report 5173 22.11.2023 which states that “*site noise levels increasing with distance as the operations move further away*” is an error and should read ‘decreases’]. The applicant suggests that if operations in the area closest to the school are carried out during the summer holidays, this could reduce the impact further. This is something the applicant has indicated that they are willing to discuss. This approach could also be used for the construction of the bund.

707. The applicant's air quality specialist refutes the suggestion by the HPRG that they have ‘downplayed’ an opportunity to reduce the noise limit at The Hamble School because it is not a residential site. The table above illustrates the updated 2022 measured noise level alongside the 2018 and 2022 ‘suggested site noise limits’. The applicant confirms that the lower suggested site noise limit (53 dB LAeq, 1hr free field) can easily be complied with without the necessity for additional mitigation measures. By way of explanation, he goes on to state that: “...in a free field setting a difference of 3dB(A) is just noticeable and a difference of 1 dB(A) is unlikely to be perceptible” (WBM, Response to Hamble Peninsular Residents Group (HPRG) comments, ref 5173, dated 22.11.2023).



708. The guidance on appropriate noise standards for mineral operators for normal operations is set out in paragraph 021 (Reference ID: 27-021-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) relates primarily to residential dwellings and the applicant's noise consultant states there is no specific guidance for the impact of minerals operations on schools in the [PPG](#) (Minerals). However, the supporting Noise Assessment has included the school as a sensitive receptor and suggested site noise limits based on [PPG](#) (Minerals) guidance of 55 dB LAeq, 1 hour are appropriate.
709. In response to concerns about the impact of noise experienced in the schools outdoor areas, the **Cemex Clarification Response (WBM Acoustic Consultants ref: 5173 dated 22.11.2023)** states that for the majority of the life of the quarry, the Hamble School will be subject to levels of no more than 48 dB LAeq, (1 hour free field) due to routine site operations, at least 7dB(A) below the upper limit of 55LAeq, 30mins" set out in Building Bulletin 93 (BB93 Department for Education 'Acoustic design of schools: performance standards, February 2015') and would not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 1 hour free field. Whilst BB93 does not constitute a statutory planning document against which the proposal can be judged, reference to this document is included in this report as it has been referenced by third parties and therefore referred to in the applicant's submitted clarification documents.
710. In response to concerns raised about the level and nature of noise generated from vehicle and plant alarms, **Cemex Clarification Response (WBM Acoustic Consultants ref: 5173 dated 22.11.2023)** contends that the majority of noise characteristics can be addressed with good site management detailed through a Noise Management Plan which would be secured by a planning condition. This would include details of noise silencers/insulation on plant and vehicles, the use of broadband (white sound) reversing alarms, etc and a procedure for dealing with any noise complaints. Additional planning conditions could require that vehicles and machinery are maintained in accordance with manufacturers specifications.
711. The HPRG refer to a World Health Organisation (WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region 2018') statement regarding noise as a "*harmful environmental stressor in Europe*" and a lack of regard to WHO guidelines in the supporting noise assessment. The applicant has clarified in **WBM Response to Hamble Peninsular Group (HPRG) Comments (dated 22 November 2023)** that the noise assessment is in line with the WHO 2018 objective in that it follows the latest Government guidance in relation to noise from minerals sites, as set out in [PPG](#) (Minerals). It is this guidance that has been used in assessing noise for the purpose of this development and the

Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is duty bound to determine planning applications in light of the evidence provided and in accordance with the development plan and Government policy as set out in the relevant planning practice guidance.

712. In response to concerns about the health effects of chronic noise on the body's stress response system, this is dealt with in more detail in [Chapter 16 of the ES](#) and in the [Human health](#) section below. However, in summary, the applicant's noise consultant confirms that the calculated site noise levels at all receptors for routine site operations will not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 1 hour free field (see Table 6 above). The calculated noise levels are based on the typical worst-case scenario and noise levels will reduce once works move away from the closest phase of the development to the school and as works move further below the existing ground level.
713. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) considers other noise-sensitive receptors surrounding the site, in particular the public footpath which runs along the site's southern boundary and the SPA/SAC and Ramsar sites. In this regard, the proposal is unlikely to have adverse impact in terms of noise on the public rights of way or recognised ecological receptors. The [draft shadow HRA](#) submitted by the applicant demonstrates calculated site noise levels at receptors on Satchell's Lane during works would be between 45 and 47 dB Leq. These levels would be achieved with the perimeter bunding in place and are below the 50dB low response threshold identified for estuarine species. Eastleigh Borough Council's ecologist confirms that these receptors are also significantly closer to the site than the SPA/Ramsar sites and therefore the impact will be even less at these sites which builds in some degree of precaution. The HRA states that *"predicted changes in noise levels at the SPA/Ramsar sites will be below the threshold for disturbance to occur to estuarine bird species. The perimeter bunding is necessary to ensure that the site can be worked whilst keeping noise levels within the limits based on current government guidance. With this mitigation in place it is concluded that there is no likelihood of an adverse effect on the interest features of SSW SPA/Ramsar and SDC SPA, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects."*
714. In terms of temporary operations, [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) confirms that the proposal complies with the temporary (up to 8 weeks in a year) daytime noise limits levels (70 dB LAeq, 1 hour (free field)) as set out in paragraph 022, (Reference ID: 27-022-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals).
715. [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) confirms that it will take two or three weeks to complete the construction of the bund and that the highest noise levels at those 6 receptor locations – including those closest to the bund - will be

reached only on a few days. Table 7.9 in [Chapter 7 of the ES](#), paragraph 7.7.12 shows site noise levels of 60-66 dBLeq 1hour free field resulting in a 'major/moderate magnitude with the significance of impact being 'adverse effect'. Notwithstanding this, the noise levels for this temporary period are within the 70 dBLeq, 1 hour (free field) normal maximum as set out in [PPG \(Minerals\)](#). It states within clarification document **Cemex Clarification Response (WBM Acoustic Consultants ref: 5173 dated 22.11.2023)** that works to construct the bund and soil stripping where this occurs at the closest point to the school could be undertaken during school holidays or when the school is not occupied. This could be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) via condition in the event that permission is granted.

716. As required by Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), section 7.9 of [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) considers the cumulative impacts with other operations/developments in the locality. These include the closest minerals extraction operation at least 4km from the site and Ashley Crescent recycled aggregates site over 1.5km from the site. The report concludes that the distances involved will render these operations inaudible.

717. The report concludes that the calculated site noise levels for routine and temporary operations comply with the current guidelines on noise set out in [PPG \(Minerals\)](#). The data from the 2022 survey indicates that the background noise levels in 2018 and 2022 are overall relatively similar. The previously suggested limits in the ES chapter are lower than the updated 2022 survey suggests at three locations (Astral Gardens, The Close and Satchell Lane), the same at one location (Wessex Manor) and higher at the remaining two locations (Hamble School and Hamble Lane). Notwithstanding this, the applicant's noise consultant confirms that the noise limits set out in the [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) are appropriate for all the working hours of the site.

718. In response to this updated information, Eastleigh Borough Council's EHO still has concerns regarding the duration of monitoring stating that for a development of this nature they would expect noise surveys of a longer duration to ensure the data is representative of meteorological and other conditions which might be encountered. In response, the applicant's noise consultant confirms that data was collected on three separate days over a 4-month period in 2018, supplemented by an additional day's surveying in July 2022. In his response, he states there are "*ever-present reasonably constant noise sources*" such as road and rail traffic, commercial activity etc, and consistent noise levels over the course of winter to spring. In addition, the applicant's noise consultant suggests that measurements to establish background noise levels vary very little between measurements of 15 minutes

duration and those of an hour. Long-term measurements were not undertaken due to lack of safe, secure locations to install the necessary sound equipment on publicly accessible land.

719. Paragraph 021 (Reference ID: 27-021-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) states that Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background noise level (LA90,1h) by more than 10dB(A) during normal working hours (0700-1900) and in any event, the total noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1 hour (free field)
720. The EHO highlights that the nearest dwelling on Hamble Lane to the site entrance/compound has not been surveyed (**31.01.2024 consultation response**). The boundary of that property is approximately 66m south of the proposed site access with the closest survey monitoring station at Point 6 Hamble Lane (rear) which is approximately 195m south of the proposed site entrance. The applicant's noise consultant states that initial monitoring was carried out at the front of the properties along Hamble Lane, however, sound levels in that location were dominated by road and rail traffic noise resulting in considerably higher background noise levels (which would suggest a site noise limit of 55dB LAeq, 1hour free field for this location higher than 54dB LAeq, 1hour free field suggest noise limit). An alternative location facing the site (i.e. from the backs of the properties along Hamble Lane) was selected for the second survey day as it was considered to demonstrate lower background noise levels more representative of the rear of the properties facing the site. Noise arising from HGV movements (including transporting the processed mineral off site and importing inert materials on site by HGV) have been included as part of the combined site operations assumptions. However, the applicant has not clarified whether the property at the site's entrance is likely to be differently affected by increased noise levels given its location close to the site entrance and the concentration of vehicle movements, although it will be subject to the same suggested noise limit of 53 dB (LAeq, 1 hour free field) as suggested at Point 6 Hamble Lane.
721. Information submitted at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage confirms that the worst-case noise levels from the quarry would be below the upper noise limit and below the background sound levels +10 dB as illustrated in Table 7.8 (see pages 7-21 of [Chapter 7 of the ES](#)). Furthermore, as works move away from the dwellings and as extraction moves further below the existing ground level, noise levels will reduce. However, Eastleigh Borough Council's EHO suggests that 10dB has been added to the measured L90 to derive the relevant 'noise limit' and that 'true' noise impacts – and therefore noise limits - would be lower than the predictions suggest. The applicants noise consultant states that the

data from the additional survey in 2022 indicates noise limits would be higher at three of the five residential assessment locations than suggested in 2018, and that at one residential location noise level data indicated that the site noise limit could be reduced by 1 dB(A). However, they consider that the calculated site noise levels presented in the [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) still safely comply with a reduced site noise limit.

722. In response to concerns raised by Hamble Parish Council, Eastleigh Borough Council and third parties, planning conditions could be applied to secure noise limits and require the submission of a noise management plan to cover other issues such as reverse alarms and additional noise monitoring station to provide the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, District Local Planning Authority and the community additional comfort regarding noise emissions from the site and their management.

*Conclusions on noise:*

723. It is recognised that noise concerns are significant for local residents. Background noise levels have been provided along with calculated site noise levels and suggested site noise limits based on the advice in [PPG](#) (Minerals) on 'appropriate noise standards' for minerals sites, as set out [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) and subsequent Regulation 25 stage documents. The noise assessment states that a good standard of amenity will be maintained for the occupants of the surrounding dwellings, schools and commercial properties during routine operations at the site. Calculated site noise levels for temporary operations are also predicted to be within the increased temporary daytime noise limits at specified noise-sensitive properties.

724. The calculated site noise levels in [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) are presented as 'worst case scenarios' with all plant operating at full capacity over the course of an hour which is unlikely to occur in practice. Site noise levels have been based on the site operating at the closest point to each receptor. As the site is being worked in phases, the noise levels will decrease with distance as the operations move further away from the receptor.

725. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated, through [Chapter 7 of the ES](#) and documents provided as part of the Regulation 25 submissions, compliance with the requirements of paragraph 019 (Reference ID: 27-019-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) for the control or mitigation of noise emissions in that:

- Identified the main noise sources including plant items and sound power levels; identified the nearest noise sensitive receptors;
- Provided average background noise levels at noise-sensitive locations;

- Estimated likely future noise from the development and its impact on the neighbourhood of the proposed operations;
- Identify proposals to minimise, mitigate or remove noise emissions at source.

726. Notwithstanding the comments from third parties and the Borough Council's EHO regarding the validity of the assessment work undertaken, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that an appropriate noise assessment has been carried out in accordance with the relevant advice as set out in the [PPG](#) (Minerals). It is considered that appropriate mitigation has been proposed in the form of a bunds surrounding the site to mitigate impacts. Additional mitigation could also be secured by further planning conditions relating to noise limits if permission is granted. Subject to the proposed mitigation and planning conditions, it is considered that the proposal complies with the [PPG](#) (Minerals) as well as part 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to noise and therefore there is no justification for refusing the application on noise grounds.

*d) Human health:*

727. The potential impact on human health has been raised as a significant area of concern in representations, in particular with regards to the potential for silicosis and the effects of noise exposure on mental health. Concerns were also raised by many residents in relation to the potential impact on human health and the proximity of the workings to sensitive receptors such as Hamble Primary School, Hamble Sports Complex, Hamble Skate Park, Blackthorn Surgery and residential housing. These included comments received from Hamble Parish Council, Paul Holmes MP and the HPRG. These concerns are acknowledged.

728. Part 'b' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in that it will not have an unacceptable impact on human health.

729. [Chapter 16 of the ES](#) sets out an assessment of the impact of the proposal on human health. There are also a number of cross-cutting themes in other parts of the ES including [Noise \(Chapter 7\)](#), [Hydrology and Flood Risk \(Chapter 8\)](#), [Landscape and Visual Impacts \(Chapter 9\)](#), [Dust & Air Quality \(Chapter 12\)](#) and [Transport \(Chapter 13\)](#).

730. The ES is supplemented by a [Health Impact Assessment](#) ('HIA') (appendix 10.1) provided as part of the Regulation 25 (part 2) submissions.

731. The potential pathways to impacts on human health have been considered, drawing on the conclusions of the relevant chapters of the ES, and the [HIA](#) concludes that the proposal would have no significant adverse effects on human health. Mitigation measures are proposed to mitigate any impact on human health including:

- Bunds (for noise, visual and air quality mitigation);
- Good site management practices including no fuelling at the excavation face and keeping fuels in bunded tanks with spill kits on site;
- Infilling with imported restoration materials to be carried out under strict controls with regards to types of materials and may require a clay geological barrier. Infilling to be undertaken in line with an environmental permit granted for the site;
- A [DMP](#) has been submitted as part of Regulation 25 (part 2);
- Won minerals will be transported to the processing area using a field conveyor;
- The processing area and stockpiles will be located more than 100m from any dust-sensitive receptors;
- The screening and washing of minerals being a wet process will minimise dust emissions;
- Drop heights will be minimised;
- Water suppression will be used as necessary for dust suppression;
- Management of the duration and timing of dust-generating activities;
- On-site vehicle speeds will be kept below 10mph;
- All HGVs would be covered prior to leaving the site and would use a wheel wash and travel over more than 50m of clean, hard surface before joining the public highway;
- Further boundary hedgerow and tree planting;
- Retention, management and supplementation of boundary vegetation.
- The design of the processing plant, minimising its height;
- A phased scheme of working and restoration;
- The design of the final restoration scheme;
- Financial contribution towards Active Travel solutions; and
- Improvements to the condition of the existing Public Rights of Way Network and provision of an additional length of permissive footpath.

732. Particulate Matter (PM) is a generic term used to describe a complex mixture of solid and liquid particles of varying size, shape, and composition. Some particles are emitted directly from sources such as cars and other vehicles and operations that involve burning fuels such as wood or coal (primary PM); others are formed in the atmosphere through complex chemical reactions (secondary PM). The composition of PM varies greatly and depends on many factors, such as geographical location, emission sources and

weather. PM is often classified according to aerodynamic size and referred to as:

- coarse particles (PM<sub>10</sub>; particles that are less than 10 microns (µm) in diameter);
  - fine particles (PM<sub>2.5</sub>; particles that are less than 2.5 µm in diameter; and
  - ultrafine particles (PM<sub>0.1</sub>; particles that are less than 0.1 µm in diameter).
- The size of particles and the duration of exposure are key determinants of potential adverse health effects.

733. Particles larger than 10µm are mainly deposited in the nose or throat, whereas particles smaller than 10 µm pose the greatest risk because they can be drawn deeper into the lung. The strongest evidence for effects on health is associated with fine particles (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). There is an extensive body of evidence that long-term exposure to PM increases mortality and morbidity from cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. Outdoor air pollution, particularly PM, has also been classified by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) as carcinogenic to humans (a Group 1 carcinogen) and causing lung cancer. There is some experimental evidence that ultrafine particles may also pass through the lungs into the bloodstream. There is a developing evidence base for a link between exposure to particulate matter and poorer early childhood development as well as the development of central nervous system conditions such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. Currently, there is no clear evidence of a safe level of exposure to PM below which there is no risk of adverse health effects.

734. With regard to health impacts, the [PPG](#) (Healthy and Safe Communities) states that *"it is helpful if the Director of Public Health is consulted on any planning applications (including at the pre-application stage) that are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population or particular groups within it. This would allow them to work together on any necessary mitigation measures. A health impact assessment is a useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts"*.

735. The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) notes that minerals abstraction can result in impacts that may have a negative impact on public health in terms of air quality. This has been addressed in full in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section of this report.

736. In their initial response, the UKHSA recommended that the applicant provide modelled dust emission for PM<sub>10</sub> exposure patterns on local receptors over time (annual and 24 hour average) and additional information on the impact of seasonal weather conditions on the release and transport of



particulates. Indeed, the [IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning](#) confirms that detailed dispersion modelling of dust impacts from minerals sites is extremely rare and not recommended given the lack of accurate emissions data for this sector, adding that the [Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance](#) (Defra 2022) also states that emission sources “*are not well quantified and it is therefore difficult to predict PM10 concentrations with any accuracy. For these reasons, a qualitative assessment focussed on mitigation measures is justified rather than a dispersion modelling approach*”.

737. In a subsequent response, the UKHSA states that it is “*not suggesting that there is demonstrable evidence that the operation of this quarry would pose a significant risk to public health*” but restates that given the proximity of the boundary of this site to sensitive receptors, additional care needs to be taken in assessing the potential impacts. It accepts the methodology used for the road traffic assessment but continues to raise concerns about the qualitative nature of the assessment and models used to predict potential dust emissions from the site. The applicant’s air quality specialist confirmed that the IAQM guidance had been followed in determining baseline and background concentrations using both local and national monitoring data (also used in the assessment for road traffic). This approach has been verified and validated by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority’s [independent Air Quality Assessor](#) including the meteorological data. In its assessment of the proposal, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority relies on the advice of its independent air quality consultants, who confirm that PM10 contributions from the site were estimated appropriately in the AQA, following the IAQA methodology.

738. As requested by the UKHSA, a [DMP](#) has been submitted. This includes a number of dust receptors which the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority’s [independent Air Quality Assessor](#) have confirmed are appropriately located, including two receptors close to the schools. Dust controls are appropriately listed. This matter is detailed in full in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section of this report, including a dust monitoring programme for the site.

739. The UKHSA conclude by suggesting planning conditions to cover dust management plan and additional air quality onsite monitoring. The former has been subsequently provided, a planning condition to cover the latter could be imposed in the event that planning permission is granted.

740. As previously set out in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section of this report, the applicant has submitted an air quality assessment which states that the proposal will result in a negligible (0.01%) change in air quality for NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> as result of increase traffic; the residual source emissions during the various extraction operations is considered to be 'small' and 'medium' only for a temporary period during site preparations (particularly during the construction of the bund). With the appropriate mitigation in place, the proposal will have negligible dust effects on the identified receptors. The baseline PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations are below 17 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in which case the IAQM states there is little risk that additional contributions from a mineral site would lead to an exceedance of the annual mean air quality objective and that no further consideration is typically required. This is the stance taken by a Planning Inspector in Worcestershire in March 2023 in the [Lea Castle Planning Appeal](#). In this case, the appeal site was located in close proximity (between 60 – 170m) of sensitive receptors including dwellings, schools and commercial business).
741. Similar concerns regarding air quality were raised by the HPRG, the local medical centre and third party objectors, in particular, about the lack of perceived awareness of the distance that the schools and residential areas are from the location of the quarry.
742. The site has a number of residential properties, commercial businesses and schools around its perimeter. The Hamble School (secondary) and Hamble Sports Complex lie approximately 45m north of the site boundary, approximately 75m from the Phase 1 of the proposed mineral extraction and 53m from the bund across the railway line which divides the two sites. No. 108 Hamble Lane lies on the B3397 and is the closest residential property to the site entrance. Its rear garden boundary is approximately 60m west of the mineral extraction associated with Phase 2. The rear elevation of this property is approximately 76m from the proposed bund with landscaping between. Hamble Primary School is approximately 190m to the west of working Phase 3 across Hamble Lane. The residential estates of Tutor Close and Astral Gardens lie to the south of the site with the closest properties being approximately 100m from the working Phase 4 and 80m from the bund. The site boundary borders properties along Satchell Lane to the east with a minimum distance of 100m from the working area of Phase 4 and 70m between the bund and their rear elevations. **The properties at The Close are approximately 100m from the working phase. The properties closest to the northeast corner of the site** (Wessex Manor, Wessex Bungalow and Wessex House) across Satchell Lane, are approximately 120m from Phase 1 working area and 100m from the bund.

743. Concerns have been raised by the Parish Councils, Blackthorn Health Centre and in a number of representations in relation to the impact of the development on local residents' health from airborne dust containing crystalline silica and the association with silicosis. Concern has also been raised about the health and safety risks for people and school children, including concerns about the impact of the transmission of fine particles on health, impacts on residents' physical and mental wellbeing and quality of life, the potential for severe health risks (cancer, respiratory illnesses, eyes), concerns that youngsters may potentially be able to access site if approved, concerns over wastes and the potential use of glyphosphate. Whilst these concerns are acknowledged, the [IAQM Guidance on mineral dust](#) advises that where the long-term background PM10 concentration is less than 17 µg/m<sup>3</sup> there is little risk that additional contributions from a mineral site would lead to an exceedance of the annual mean air quality objective. The guidance advises that if this is the case, as it is with this proposal, then no further consideration is typically required.

*Silicosis:*

744. Many minerals contain silica - a naturally occurring substance found in varying amounts in most rocks, sand and clay - and produce silica dust known as respirable crystalline silica (RCS). The proposed quarry will be extracting sand and gravel for which the crystalline silica concentrations are around 70% for these minerals according to the Health & Safety Executive ([HSE](#)). All RCS are hazardous by inhalation as the 'respirable' dust, which is very fine and invisible under normal lighting, can get deep into the lungs. Long-term inhalation of RCS may give rise to silicosis. It is known that a proportion of PM10 emitted from minerals developments could comprise respirable crystalline silica (RCS).

745. In relation to objections from local residents regarding silicosis, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority notes that the [HSE guidance](#) states that *"one of the health risks from working in the quarry industry is that of exposure to fine dust containing crystalline silica (otherwise known as quartz). Quartz is found in almost all kinds of rock, sands, clays, shale and gravel. Workers exposed to fine dust containing quartz are at risk of developing a chronic and possibly severely disabling lung disease known as "silicosis". It usually takes a number of years of regular daily exposure before there is a risk of developing silicosis. Silicosis is a disease that has only been seen in workers from industries where there is a significant exposure to silica dust, such as in quarries, foundries, the potteries etc. No cases of silicosis have been documented among members of the general public in Great Britain,*

*indicating that environmental exposures to silica dust are not sufficiently high to cause this occupational disease.”*

746. In '[Cemex Clarification Response](#)' to objections received since [Regulation 25 \(part 1\) response](#), the applicant confirms that the Workplace Exposure Limit (WEL) for respirable silica dust is 0.1mg/m<sup>3</sup> (100µg/m<sup>3</sup>). This is significantly higher than the annual mean and 24-hour mean air quality objective concentrations for PM10 that protect public health; therefore, PM10 concentrations below the air quality objective concentrations would not pose a risk with regards to silicosis. The applicant further confirms that there have been no known cases of silicosis in Cemex UK employees in at least the last 30 years.

747. The HPRG (Appendix III) suggest that whilst Cemex UK employees are required to wear PPE under other health and safety legislation, the protection this affords does not extend to school children and Hamble residents in close proximity to the operations. In making its assessment of this proposal, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has regard to the current advice from the HSE which is set out above insofar as...*”no cases of silicosis have been documented among members of the general public in Great Britain, indicating that environmental exposures to silica dust are not sufficiently high to cause this occupational disease”*.

748. Nevertheless, the potential health impacts due to the respirable dust (PM10 fraction of dust emissions) have been considered in the Dust Deposition Health Effects section of the [Air Quality ES Chapter](#). This sets out [the IAQM minerals guidance](#) approach that there is little risk that a process contribution from a dust source would lead to an exceedance of the objectives. Should the background PM10 concentration at receptors within 250m of dust-generating activities be less than 17µg/m<sup>3</sup>, the impact of the proposed development on health is deemed to be not significant. In this case, the background annual mean PM10 concentrations across the study area range from 13.6-15.0µg/m<sup>3</sup>, therefore significantly lower than the objective. Based on the evidence submitted in the Air Quality Assessment and supplemented by the Regulation 25 (parts 1 and 2) stage on air quality, the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant effect on health due to fugitive emissions of PM10.

749. Furthermore, it is considered that the implementation of mitigation including the dust suppression measures in accordance with the submitted [DMP](#) would minimise the risk of RCS emissions from the site. There is no compelling evidence that clearly demonstrates that the proposed development would pose a potential significant risk to the local population due to RCS.

750. Again with reference to the appeal [decision](#) for Lea Castle in Worcestershire, there is no UK established or recommended ambient air quality standard for RCS and no recommended methodology for the assessment of potential RCS emissions to ambient air or potential off-site impacts. In that decision, the Inspector referred to the Health and Safety Executive advice that *'No cases of silicosis have been documented among members of the general public in Great Britain, indicating that environmental exposures to silica dust are not sufficiently high to cause this occupational disease'* (Appendix KEH10 PoE Katrina Hawkins).

751. As noted above, the [HIA](#) was submitted in response to the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage. The [HIA](#) has been undertaken with reference to the Public Health England guidance '[Health Impact Assessment in spatial planning: A guide for local authority public health and planning teams](#)', published October 2020, which outlines best practice for the preparation of an HIA. This is supplemented by the applicant's and consultant's experience of other similar sites and developments.

752. The [HIA](#) identifies a number of health determinants relating to:

- Lifestyle;
- Social and community influences on health;
- Living/environmental conditions affecting health;
- Economic conditions affecting health;
- Access and quality of services; and
- Macro-economic, environmental and sustainability factors.

753. No significant adverse effect on health was recorded for living/environmental conditions including air quality, noise, light, access to green space and due to air quality. This is concluded on the basis of the findings of the technical assessments provided for both air quality and noise.

*Buffer zones / stand-off:*

754. Paragraph 5.15 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that *'the screening of sites and other mitigation measures are often required to ensure an acceptable degree of potential impact of minerals and waste developments on the habitats, landscape, townscape and local communities. It is standard practice in Hampshire for operational mineral extraction and inert waste recycling sites to have a minimum buffer zone of 100 metres, where appropriate, from the nearest sensitive human receptors, such as homes and schools, though this distance will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis'*.

755. Paragraph 018 (ref ID: 27-018-20140306)) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) specifies the criteria to be applied as: *“Any proposed separation distance should be established on a site-specific basis and should be effective, properly justified, and reasonable. It should take into account:*

- *the nature of the mineral extraction activity;*
- *the need to avoid undue sterilising of mineral resources, location and topography;*
- *the characteristics of the various environmental effects likely to arise; and*
- *the various mitigation measures that can be applied”.*

756. Figure 4 in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section of this report illustrates 100m and 200m distances from the working area of the site, taken from the [DMP](#). The buffers include existing tree and scrub belts which will be further reinforced with planting at the start of the operational phase. The buffer also includes a 3-5m high bund which will be grass seeded. The buffer (landscape and bund) at its narrowest on the northwest corner is approximately 30m deep up to approximately 100m deep towards the south of the site (see [Landscape Layout Plan](#)).

757. In their comments (HPRG Appendix III Air Quality, the HPRG state that the dust impact assessment “... *ignores sensitive receptors within 100m and uses the invisible 100 metre boundary as grounds for dismissing any impact of dust beyond it.*” However, dust receptors within 100m of quarrying activities area have been included in the assessment (see Figure 4 in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section). [ES Chapter 12](#) does recognise that there is a risk of medium residual source emission during the site preparations phase when the bunds are being constructed. This could lead to a dust impact risk and slight adverse magnitude of dust effects at receptors D2, D3 and D4 (within 100m). However, the report suggests that the risk of slight adverse dust effects would be of short duration and once the bunds were construction the dust deposition effects would be negligible (paragraph 12.5.27 [ES Chapter 12](#)). Impacts at receptors more than 100m from dust generating activities have also been considered. They will be smaller as is indicated at dust receptors D6, D8 and D9, where the impacts are described as negligible (see Table 3 in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section).

758. The submitted [DMP](#) sets out dust control and mitigation measures including the use of water suppression; when operationally possible restricting movement of soil and dust generating activities during dry/windy conditions; seeding exposed soils and screening bunds; using a field conveyor to transport won minerals; and locating the processing area and stockpiles more

than 100m from any dust sensitive receptors. In addition to this, good practice dust mitigation measures will be put into place by the applicant with accountability to the Quarry Manager.

759. In response to comments that the consequence of dust at 250-500m boundary has not been addressed, the applicant's air quality consultant refers to the IAQM advice on screening out the need for detailed assessment of visible dust impacts is in the [IAQM guidance](#). Where there are no special circumstances, such as high local PM10 concentrations, impacts from sand and gravel quarries can be screened out of requiring detailed assessment at distances of more than 250m from dust-generating activity. Local PM10 concentrations are low; therefore, impacts at receptors more than 250m from the proposed development have been screened from the assessment (IAQM Screening Flow Chart ([IAQM Minerals Guidance 2016](#)))

760. In response to the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage request for further information, specifically in response to comments from the HPRG in relation to stand-off/buffer zone distances, the applicant has confirmed that acceptable distances will vary at each sand and gravel site depending on what is proposed and a range of existing background data (including that of noise and air quality). In this case, the stand-offs have been designed to ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts in terms of amenity upon the nearest residents and occupiers in terms of noise, air quality, visual impacts and other issues, and ensure a significant buffer around the edge of the site to allow for pedestrian use and as retained habitat for fauna during the operation of the site.

761. In its response to the information provided at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage, Eastleigh Borough Council's EHO (November 2023) recommends that the buffer is expanded to 250m or 400m to "*align with the 2016 IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning (May 2016) to acknowledge the potential impact of particulates especially those with a diameter of 2.5µg.m<sup>3</sup> and less which can travel beyond 250m and 400m*". [ES Chapter 12](#) follows the [IAQM Minerals Guidance 2016](#) and the buffers shown in Figure 4 (in the [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section) relate to the categories of receptor distance for the estimation of pathway effectiveness as recommended in the [IAQM Minerals Guidance 2016](#) (Table A3-3) reproduced below:

| Category     | Criteria   |
|--------------|--|
| Distant      | Receptor is between 200 m and 400 m from the dust source |
| Intermediate | Receptor is between 100 m and 200 m from the dust source |
| Close        | Receptor is less than 100 m from the dust source         |

Figure 6 - Categorisation of Receptor Distance from Source (source: IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning, May 2016)

762. With regards to the Eastleigh Borough Council's EHO comments about smaller PMs ( $\leq$ PM2.5), mineral activities can contribute to PM2.5 concentrations, Section 1.2 (Potential Impacts and Effects) of the [IAQM Minerals Guidance 2016](#) states that "for quarries most of this suspended dust will be in the coarse sub-fraction (PM2.5-10), rather than in the fine (PM2.5) fraction".

763. Furthermore, in direct response to this question from the Borough Council's EHO, [RSK Environmental Ltd](#) points to section 4 (Potential Impacts), paragraph 4.2.2 (suspended particles) of the [IAQM Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction](#) (August 2023 v2.1) which states that:

*"As reported in the European Environment Agency EMEP Guidance (2.A.5.b Construction and demolition), research indicates that dust suspended by construction activities has a relatively low content of PM2.5 in PM10. According to MRI (2006), the overall PM2.5 fraction in PM10 of construction emissions varies between 5 and 15%, while Muleski et al. (2005) measured 1 – 10% (average 3%) for several specific sources. For construction as a whole, it is recommended that the average PM2.5 content of PM10 should be assumed to be 10%"* (Section 4 Potential Impacts, para 4.2.2 suspended particles).

764. On the basis of the evidence provided in [ES Chapter 12](#) and the Air Quality and independent assessment of that document carried out [RSK Environmental Ltd](#), the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that the buffer/stand-offs have been designed to ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts in terms of amenity upon the nearest residents and occupiers in terms of air quality/dust.

765. The [IAQM Minerals Guidance 2016](#) states that "If there are relevant human and/or ecological receptors within 250 m or 400 m (depending on the rock type) then a disamenity dust impact assessment will almost always be required." An



assessment of dust and a [DMP](#) has been carried out which demonstrates that with the designed-in mitigation measures, the magnitude of the dust effect from the extraction of the minerals is negligible.

766. Eastleigh Borough Council, EHO sought confirmation that the EU Guidance in the form of European Environment Agency/Compilation of Air emissions Factors/US EPA had been considered to supplement the information in the assessment. Paragraph 027 (Reference ID: 27-027-20140306) of [PPG](#) (Minerals) states that *“Computer modelling techniques can be used to understand how dust could disperse from a site. Alternatively, a more qualitative approach, relying on professional judgement, could be used”*. Similarly, the HPGR (Appendix III) question the use of qualitative modelling over a quantitative approach.

767. In response to these points, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority’s independent air quality assessor (out [RSK Environmental Ltd](#)) has confirmed that:

*“It is widely recognised that dispersion modelling of fugitive dust has a high uncertainty because of the number of variables including variation in site activities, the operational profiles and other associated influences cannot be simulated realistically in a dispersion model. The IAQM Guidance states that “detailed dispersion modelling of dust impacts from minerals sites in the UK is extremely rare and is not generally recommended by the IAQM given the lack of accurate UK emissions data for this sector” (Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning May 2016, Section 2.3 Planning Guidance on Minerals Dust Assessments).*

*In the UK, the approach generally adopted and recommended by the professional body (the IAQM) is qualitative assessment, based on the source-pathway-receptor model, taking into account the empirical evidence/experience of the authors and the assessor, and with a focus on good practice mitigation measures to minimise impacts. The evidence before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is that the methodology used is reasonable and consistent with widely accepted and best practice guidance within UK”.*

768. It is the opinion of [RSK Environmental Ltd](#) that screening of 250m was appropriately undertaken. A 100m and 200m receptor distance has been referenced within the [Air Quality ES Chapter](#) (see Figure 12.4 for human receptors and ancient woodland). As stated within the [IAQM Dust and Minerals Guidance](#) *“it is commonly accepted that the greatest impacts will be within 100m of a source and this can include both large (> 30 µm) and small dust particles”*.

769. Hamble Parish Council and the HPRG raised concerns about the foundations and rationale behind the 100m buffer zone. It is important to note that the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) has been publicly examined. The Planning Inspector was satisfied with the consideration of the buffer zones when he found the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sound and suitable for adoption. The supporting text provides guidance on how this should be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority would also rely on the comments of consultees in relation to any distances proposed to assess whether the buffers zones are acceptable. There are examples elsewhere in Hampshire where the proposed buffer zones are less than 100m and this has been found to be acceptable based on the submissions and proposed mitigation.
770. Additionally, the Source-Pathway-Receptor assessment would typically categorise receptors situated closer to the source as subject to a higher magnitude of dust effect. Receptors that are located further from the site boundary would therefore have a smaller impact magnitude, but the assessment would consider the worst-case scenario. On this basis, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied with the approach taken in the [DMP](#) and that appropriate buffers zones have been used alongside wider mitigation measures.
771. The HPRG also suggested that additional measures to control PM10 might be necessary if, within a site, the actual source of emission (e.g. the haul roads, crushers, stockpiles etc.) is within 1km of any residential property or other sensitive use. Paragraph 030 of the [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) indicates that ‘*good practice measures*’ are sufficient where PM10 is unlikely to exceed the Air Quality Objective. The submitted [DMP](#) states that given the baseline PM10 concentration of 14.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> within 250m of dust-generating activities is significantly lower than the IAQM screening criterion of 17µg/m<sup>3</sup>, there is no risk of exceedances of the PM10 air quality objectives due to operations at the site and good practice measures to control dust should be sufficient to control PM10 emissions, without the need for PM10 monitoring and specific PM10 controls.
772. The HPRG recommended that a buffer zone of at least 250m should be applied on the basis of the “*available evidence that a greater distance is still required due to the distance PM10 and PM2.5 particles can travel*”. The [IAQM Minerals Guidance 2016](#) states that “*from the experience of the Working Group, adverse dust impacts from sand and gravel sites are uncommon beyond 250m*”. In this case, [ES Chapter 12](#) states that IAQM guidance has been followed and that where there are no special circumstances, such as high local PM10 concentrations, impacts from sand and gravel quarries can

been screened out of the assessment at distances of more than 250m from dust-generating activity. The applicant states that imposing a 250m buffer would result in only a very small area of the site being workable and would render the development unviable.

773. In ‘Response to Representations’ (Air Quality Assessment Ltd J0801/2/F1, dated 10.11.2023), the applicant’s air quality consultant confirms that the worst case impacts will be at receptors within 100m of dust generating activities. Impacts at receptors further from the dust emissions sources will be smaller. Within 100m, receptors are defined as close, which when combined with a moderate frequency of potentially dusty wind gives a moderately effective pathway effectiveness. This document goes on to state the proposed mitigation, including the construction of screening bunds and the [DMP](#), between the quarry face and receptors, the residual source emissions would be considered to be small. A small residual source emission combined with a moderately effective pathway results in a negligible dust impact risk at highly dust sensitive receptors (see figure 7 below).

|                       |                              | Residual Source Emissions |                 |             |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
|                       |                              | Small                     | Medium          | Large       |
| Pathway Effectiveness | Highly effective pathway     | Low Risk                  | Medium Risk     | High Risk   |
|                       | Moderately effective pathway | Negligible Risk           | Low Risk        | Medium Risk |
|                       | Ineffective pathway          | Negligible Risk           | Negligible Risk | Low Risk    |

Figure 7: Estimation of Dust Impact Risk (source: Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning May 2016 (v1.1))

774. The applicant’s air quality consultant confirms (Air Quality Assessment Ltd J0801/2/F1, dated 10.11.2023) that when determining the residual source emission magnitudes, the designed-in mitigation measures are taken into account. It also confirmed that most of the extraction activities will take place more than 100m from any dust-sensitive receptors and the working phase areas will be less than 20ha at any given time. There will be a low number of plant in operation, and sand/gravel with retained moisture, will have a low dust emission potential. With screening bunds around the site, the judgment overall is a small residual source emission magnitude for mineral extraction.

775. Concerns raised about the buffer zone to the Hamble School are acknowledged. The closest dust receptor to the Hamble School is D2. The Air Quality Assessment submitted at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage acknowledges that the Hamble School is within 100m of quarrying activities

(as are receptors D1, D3, D4, D5 and D7 (see Figure 4 above)). The report acknowledges that the worst case impacts will be at receptors within 100m of dust generating activities, defined as 'close' which "*when combined with a moderate frequency of potentially dusty wind gives a moderately effective pathway effectiveness.*" The report goes on to confirm that based on the mitigation proposed (i.e. bunding and [DMP](#)) the residual source emissions are considered to be 'small'.

Heck link

776. A small residual source emission combined with a moderately effective pathway results in a negligible dust impact risk at highly dust-sensitive receptors. The Council's independent assessor ([RSK Environmental Ltd](#)) on air quality review of the evidence provided in [ES Chapter 12](#) (and associated appendices) and the [DMP](#) raised no concerns regarding the evidence presented. However, it notes that Hamble Primary School has not been included as a sensitive receptor although receptors D7 and D8 are closer to the site than the primary school. If Hamble Primary School were to be included as its own receptor, it is expected that results would be negligible with mitigation measures implemented, as per IAQM [guidance](#).

777. Had all other matters been acceptable, details of all monitoring locations could be required by way of a planning condition with the addition of monitoring to the north and west to capture both schools.

778. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers that no additional separation distances / buffer zones are required over and above those already proposed, given that the ES and associated assessments do not identify unacceptable impacts to residential amenity or adjacent designated sites for nature conservation from operational dust. It is considered that any additional separation distances / buffer zones would not be properly justified or reasonable in this instance.

779. Furthermore, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority notes that the [PPG](#) (Minerals) specifically deals with the matter of 'separation distances / buffer zones' in relation to mineral extraction. Paragraph 018 (Reference ID: 27-018-20140306) of [PPG](#) (Minerals) states that "*separation distances / buffer zones may be appropriate in specific circumstances where it is clear that, based on site specific assessments and other forms of mitigation measures (such as working scheme design and landscaping) a certain distance is required between the boundary of the minerals extraction area and occupied residential property. Any proposed separation distance should be established on a site- specific basis and should be effective, properly justified, and reasonable. It should take into account:*

- *the nature of the mineral extraction activity;*
- *the need to avoid undue sterilisation of mineral resources;*
- *location and topography;*
- *the characteristics of the various environmental effects likely to arise; and*
- *the various mitigation measures that can be applied”.*

780. A number of third parties mention impacts on private property and boats from dust arising from the operation. The Marina is more than 400m from the site and therefore the proposal is unlikely to result in adverse impacts from dust. No evidence has been submitted during the process of this planning application to demonstrate this would be an issue.

*Air quality and health:*

781. Blackthorn Health Centre’s submissions to the original application and the Regulation 25 consultations (parts 1 and 2) raise concerns about the long and short-term implications for patients’ health of the proposed quarry particularly in response to air quality, noise and loss of greenspace. It makes reference to approximately 10,700 patients on the Eastleigh Southern Parishes Primary Care Network register with pre-disposed or pre-existing health conditions (including respiratory/lung disease, cardiovascular, eyes and mental health). These concerns are acknowledged and are dealt with in more detail in the following sections.

782. In response to impacts on health from the proposed development, the [ES Chapter on Air Quality](#) includes an assessment of health impacts due to road traffic emissions and visible dust deposition. Information submitted under Regulation 25 (part 2) (see Response to Representations, Ref: J0801/2/F1 dated 10.11.23) Air Quality Assessments Ltd) confirms that road traffic impacts have been assessed using an atmospheric dispersion model, which has been verified against local monitoring data. The road traffic emissions impacts have been assessed using the approach outlined by Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and the [IAQM in guidance on Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality](#) (EPUK and IAQM, 2017). The air quality impacts have been described at each receptor by determining the percentage change in concentrations relative to an air quality assessment level (AQAL) based on the air quality objectives/limit values, compared with the total long-term average concentration. Blackthorn Health Centre refer to the existing air quality in the postcode area using an online site, which is not a supported Government or local authority website. The data sources are not divulged so its findings cannot be uncorroborated.

783. Based on the model results and the [IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning](#) guidance, road traffic impacts from the proposal would present a <1% change in concentrations and therefore would remain as a 'negligible' impact (see Table 12.7 – 12.9 of [Chapter 12: Air Quality](#)).
784. The impacts due to visible dust deposition have been assessed using the qualitative source-pathway-receptor risk assessment approach set out in the [IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning](#). The risk assessment has determined that there would be a negligible risk due to visible dust emissions, with a slight risk at some receptors during the construction of screening bunds. This risk will be of short duration, and once the bunds are complete, the Air Quality Assessment states that they will be effective at screening local receptors from dust emissions.
785. The [DMP](#) will ensure that dust assessment forms part of daily inspections, and that dust is primarily controlled by good operational practices, with appropriate measures undertaken to prevent visible dust beyond the site boundary.
786. The HPRG, Hamble Parish Council, Blackthorn Health Centre (also submitted as an open letter 23 January 2023, HPRG Appendix IV Health Issues) and other third party representations refer to various studies linking air quality and dust emissions to adverse health effects (e.g. WHO reports, Chief Medical Officer's report on Air Pollution). It is established in the [NPPG](#) (Minerals) that operators should follow the assessment framework for considering the impacts of PM10 from a proposed development, and that the air quality objective for PM10 (annual mean 40 µg.m3) is the appropriate metric for determining whether minerals operation will have an effect on health due to dust emissions. The assessment framework states that where PM10 concentrations are not likely to exceed the air quality objective, good practice measures should be sufficient, without the need for monitoring and specific controls on PM10 emissions.
787. Public Health (Hampshire County Council) notes that increased vehicle movements will increase vehicle emissions. This matter has been dealt with in other sections of this report and the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied, based on the evidence provided, that the proposal will result in a negligible change in air quality as a result of the increase in traffic.

788. The Mineral and Waste Planning Authority notes the comments made by Public Health (Hampshire County Council) in relation to “*no safe acceptable level of air pollution*”. These comments have also been received by a number of third parties. As noted in the section on [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#), in response, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has assessed the application based on the evidence provided. The applicant has submitted an Air Quality Assessment which complies with the [NPPG](#) (Minerals) and [IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning](#) relevant to the assessment of planning applications, and that assessment has been independently verified by [RSK Environmental Ltd](#) on behalf of the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority. The impact on air quality from the proposal is ‘negligible’ as a result of an increase in traffic. Emissions from operations at the proposed development fall below 17µg/m<sup>3</sup> and will have an insignificant effect on health due to emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> from the quarrying operations.

789. The evidence provided in [Chapter 12: Air Quality](#), supplemented with the additional information provided in the Regulation 25 (part 1 and 2) stage, establishes that baseline PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations at the application site, and at local receptors that may be affected by PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from the proposed development, are well below the air quality objectives. The maximum annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from operations at the proposed development is predicted to be 14.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The [IAQM Guidance on mineral dust](#) advises that:

*“where the long-term background PM<sub>10</sub> concentration is less than 17µg/m<sup>3</sup> there is little risk that additional contributions from a mineral site would lead to an exceedance of the annual mean air quality objective.”*

790. On this basis, the applicant’s air quality specialist has concluded that the proposed development will have an insignificant effect on health due to emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> from the quarrying operations.

791. As previously set out, the current Air Quality Objectives are in accordance with the [Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010](#) (as amended). These are legally binding limit values for concentrations of major air pollutants in outdoor air that impact public health, including nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The [Environmental Targets \(Fine Particulate Matter\) \(England\) Regulations 2023](#) set out two new legally binding targets for PM<sub>2.5</sub> of 10µg/m<sup>3</sup> annual mean concentration PM<sub>2.5</sub> nationwide by 2040, with an interim target of 12µg/m<sup>3</sup> by January 2028. Reference to a target of 10µg/m<sup>3</sup> in the Blackthorn Health Centre comments is premature.

Predicted annual mean PM2.5 concentrations are provided in the Air Quality Assessment as ranging from 9.3µg/m<sup>3</sup> to 11.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> at roadside receptors as a result of the proposal, below that of the 20µg/m<sup>3</sup> limit value.

*Noise and health:*

792. The [HIA](#) details the effects of exposure to noise on health which includes annoyance and sleep deprivation; increased level of stress hormones leading to the possibility of long-term effects on blood pressure and cardiovascular disease; effect on mental health and impairment of cognitive performance in children. The impact of chronic noise on health is also acknowledge in supporting information from the applicant's noise consultant (WBM, Response to HPRG Comments, 22.11.2023 clarification document).

793. Noise has been fully assessed in [ES Chapter 7](#) which demonstrates that the proposed development complies with the advice set out in [PPG \(Minerals\)](#). With mitigation, calculated site noise levels for routine operations do not exceed 50 dB (LAeq,1 hour free field), based on worst-case scenarios, and suggested site noise limits range from 52 – 55 dB (LAeq,1 hour free field), which complies with current Government guidance ([PPG \(Minerals\)](#)). For temporary operations, which include 2-3 weeks to construct the bund, calculated site noise level could reach 66 dB (LAeq,1 hour free field), within the 70dB(A) LAeq 1h (free field) limit in [PPG \(Minerals\)](#).

794. On this basis, [ES Chapter 16](#) and the [HIA](#) concludes that the proposal is not expected to have an adverse impact on health as a result of noise issues from the operation, or construction which remain within the guidance set out in [PPG \(Minerals\)](#).

795. Public Health (Hampshire County Council) note that changes to home working patterns since the Covid 19 pandemic mean that more people are at home during the day and will potentially be exposed to increase during the operational hours proposed. They acknowledge the submitted noise assessment which demonstrates that the noise experienced at the nearest noise sensitive receptors, with the bunds in place, will be within the required noise limits of no more than 10dB(A) above background noise.

796. Public Health (Hampshire County Council) refer to 'sustainable modes of transport' relating to the development. The majority of the vehicular movement associated with this proposal will necessarily be the larger HGV and Light Duty Vehicles (LDVs). However, a financial contribution to support active travel modes and to reduce some vehicular trips on the network by facilitating greater take up of walking and cycling has been suggested which could be secured through a s106 agreement to be agreed with the applicant and the



Highway Authority. More information on this aspect is set out in the [Highways impact](#) section of this commentary.

797. The [Noise](#) section of this report deals with the health concerns raised by local residents regarding the impact on noise associated with the proposal, the WHO findings with regards to noise (Environmental Stressor in Europe) and the concerns raised by the senior leadership, governing body, parents and children attending the local schools. The submitted noise assessment does identify that for a short period of time (suggested to be only a few days) during construction of the bund and soil stripping, the noise levels at the chosen receptors will result in a 'major/moderate' magnitude result having an 'adverse effect'. However, notwithstanding this, the noise levels within the temporary period would not exceed the 70dBLAeq, 1 hour (free field) normal maximum set out in the [PPG](#) (Minerals). The applicant has confirmed that where this work occurs close to The Hamble School, it could be carried out during school holidays or when the school was not occupied. This could be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan via a condition in the event that planning permission is granted.

798. The noise arising from the operation of the site is assessed as below the suggested site noise limits and the evidence provided suggests that a good standard of amenity for the occupants of the dwellings during operations at the site will be maintained. Furthermore, the calculated noise levels are presented as a worst case scenario and are unlikely to occur in practice. The predicted noise levels are all within the guidelines set out in the [PPG](#) (Minerals) and will not exceed background noise levels by more than 10dB(A) during the site's working hours. Furthermore, the site is being worked in phases and noise will drop away with distance.

*Conclusions on the impact on human health:*

799. Overall, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied, subject to appropriate mitigation and planning conditions, that the proposed development would not, by reason of noise, dust or poor air quality, have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of the area or the living conditions and health of those living nearby or using recreational features. The supporting [HIA](#) confirms that the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact on health or quality of. The proposed operations comply with the advice set out in the [PPG](#) (Minerals with regard to both routine and temporary operations, and it is considered that the site can be worked while keeping noise emissions to within environmentally acceptable limits.

800. In view of the above matters, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers that, subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions including those relating to operating hours, restricting permitted development rights, limiting the duration of the development, extent of mineral extraction, phasing scheme, construction of soil screening bund, limiting height of stockpiles, all vehicles and plant being maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' specification, upward facing exhausts on plant and machinery, 'broadband' (white sound) reversing alarms on mobile plant and machinery, use of water bowser and spraying, maximum on site speed limit, internal roads to be maintained, and Community Liaison Group, that there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts human health. Planning conditions, alongside the proposed mitigation, will ensure that the proposal is in accordance with part 'b' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Policies DM1 (General criteria for new development) and DM8 (Pollution) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022).

*Convention Rights of a Child:*

801. Some interested parties suggested that the proposed development would breach [Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights](#) (ECHR) and also Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child which provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions by public authorities concerning children. However, no clear and coherent evidence was presented to suggest how the Convention on the Rights of a Child may be breached. However, it has been assumed from the representations that the concerns relate to the impact of the proposed development on human health as a consequence of the effect on air quality and dust emissions with particular regard to children attending nearby schools.

802. The judgment of the High Court in *Stevens v Secretary of State for CLG* [2013] EWHC 792 (Admin) (paragraphs 56- 69) is of relevance here. As noted previously, the proposed development is not considered to result in unacceptable levels of dust and the maximum average predicted PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations in which the proposed site is located are predicted to be substantially below the relevant AQOs. Furthermore, there is no compelling evidence that the proposed development would pose a potential significant risk to the local population due to RCS.

803. Whilst the best interests of children are a primary consideration in the decision to be made on this application, the evidence indicates that the proposed development would not have an adverse material impact on children. It is difficult to see, therefore, how the claim that the proposal

breaches the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child can be made out. Nor is there any clear basis for alleging that the private and/or family life of any children are breached contrary to Article 8 of the ECHR.

e) *Lighting:*

804. Part 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not cause unacceptable lighting impacts.

805. In terms of impacts from lighting, the site is only likely to require lighting during the evenings in winter, until 5pm. Lighting is proposed on the access road to the plant site and within the plant site itself, both of which are away from sensitive receptors. No flood lighting would be used, and all lighting would be angled downwards with low lux levels and be sensitive to ecological corridors. In the extraction areas, the only lighting would be that of vehicles.

806. Concerns were raised in relation to light pollution during winter evenings and nights and that residents near to the site will be severely and adversely affected by lighting throughout the extraction and restoration periods.

807. No lighting concerns were raised by the Borough Council's ecologist or EHO. The County Ecologist initially asked for more information following the initial review of the lighting layout plans and lighting proposed. More information was submitted at the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage. Initially, the County Ecologist indicated that the issue had not been resolved. However, it is clear that paragraph 10.5.15 of the [Ecology chapter](#) states that "the operational quarry working hours will be no later than 17:00 and there will be no night-time working or use of flood lights involved, therefore no significant mitigation measures to limit lighting disturbance impacts on foraging and commuting bats are required". Furthermore, paragraph 10.6.49 states that "*there will also be no lighting included on site as part of the restoration strategy, so therefore no lighting disturbance should restrict the use of the site by foraging and commuting bats*". The submitted lighting plans show the lighting is within the plant site only and is not located close to areas of vegetation and would only be used in winter after 4pm. Otherwise, it would only be headlights on the excavation vehicle that could potentially be used after 4pm whilst returning to the plant site. Additional lighting layout plans were also submitted under Regulation 25 (part 2) (see [Lighting Layout - Haul Road Car Park & Weighbridge](#) and [Lighting Layout - Aggregate Processing Plant](#)). The County Ecologist has concluded that previous concerns in relation to lighting have now been addressed.

808. In the event that planning permission is granted, further details on lighting could be requested via a planning condition as well as hours of working to ensure that lighting associated with the minerals working and restoration is acceptable. As already noted, the proposed bunds and tree screening, and the separation distances between properties will also have the effect of preventing any significant visual impacts on surrounding neighbours.

809. On the basis of the proposed mitigation and the potential to apply planning conditions to mitigate the effects of the development in relation to lighting, the proposal is in accordance with part 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

*f) Odour:*

810. The extraction of minerals will not result in any odour impacts, Likewise, inert materials will not cause an odour. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with part 'c' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in that the proposal does not have any potential to endanger aircraft from bird strike and structures.

*g) Bird strike:*

811. Southampton Airport Safeguarding have raised no objection to the proposal (including the restoration of the site) as the proposal does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. In the event that permission is granted, a condition could be applied requiring a Bird Hazard Management Plan should this be considered to be required. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with part 'e' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in that the proposal does not have any potential to endanger aircraft from bird strike and structures.

*h) Subsidence:*

812. Part g (iii) of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that Minerals and waste development should no cause an unacceptable impact on subsidence.

813. The risks of landslide from the proposed development were raised in some representations. These concerns are acknowledged.

814. Paragraph 033 (Reference ID: 27-033-20140306) of the [NPPG](#) (Minerals) is clear. "*The consideration of slope stability that is needed at the time of an application will vary between mineral workings depending on a number of factors, e.g. depth of working; the nature of materials excavated; the life of the working the length of time interim slopes are expected to be in place; and the nature of the restoration proposals*".

815. Initially, significant concerns were raised by Network Rail on the impact on the railway cutting and the potential to cause subsidence. Following the submission of revised drainage plans and subsequent discussions between the applicant and Network Rail, Network Rail withdrew their objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions relating to groundwater level monitoring at the construction phase and the requirement for information on what would happen if excessive groundwater levels were continually recorded for a period of more than 3 months. Such planning conditions could be applied in the event that planning permission is granted. The withdrawal of the Network Rail objection took place after discussions occurred directly between the applicant and Network Rail which the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority was not party too. The applicant provided the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority with a copy of the associated documentation associated with these discussions (see [Copy of additional Information Provided by Applicant to Network Rail \(20 February 2024\)](#)).

816. No other evidence has been presented to indicate that there is any risk of landside associated with the working area. The depth of working is such that it is not considered to be an issue of concern.

817. On that basis of the proposed mitigation and the potential to impose planning conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to part g (iii) of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

*i) Public safety and safety safeguarding zones:*

818. Part 'f' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not cause an unacceptable impact on public safety safeguarding zones.

819. [Chapter 17 of the ES](#) covers vulnerability to accidents and disasters. The proposal is not considered to be highly vulnerable to accidents or disasters as a result of the nature of operations proposed within the Application Site.

820. The HPRG highlight a fear of explosives buried in soil from the historical airfield site. These concerns are acknowledged. The ES includes information in relation to a [Detailed Unexploded Ordnance Risk Assessment](#). The ES identifies that there is a medium risk of unexploded ordnance/bombs due to the site history. However, robust mitigation is proposed to deal with the risk, and this could be conditioned in the event that permission is granted. Therefore, no likely significant effects on the environment have been identified as result of potential accident and disasters affecting the proposal.

821. Many representations including responses from Paul Homes MP and the HPRG raised concerns about the stability of the Hamble Lane railway bridge in terms of proximity to the working and existing damage and the condition of the bridge. The HPRG raised their concerns with Network Rail directly. They indicated that they believed that HGVs crossing this bridge regularly poses a significant risk of damage wear and tear. No concerns have been raised on this matter by Network Rail or the Highway Authority. The bridge is already used by HGVs and tankers regularly. The bridge would continue to be maintained in accordance with standards.

822. [Chapter 17 of the ES](#) also covers other matters such as fire, flood, severe weather conditions including rainfall, high winds, heavy snow and freezing temperatures and Industrial accidents.

823. A planning condition could be applied for a Site Environmental Management Plan in the event that permission were to be granted. This could cover, amongst other considerations a number of safety related matters such as the:

- provision for emergency vehicles;
- details of the area(s) subject to construction activity to include provision for all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles loading and unloading plant and materials;
- Fleet profile for HGV vehicles;
- of plant and other associated materials used in constructing the extension area; e) storage of liquids, oils, fuels or chemicals used in constructing and operating the development;
- health and safety/site management;
- how any waste generated on site will be managed; h) measures emergency procedures for pollution events;
- details of biosecurity procedures; and
- Details on the management of any contaminated material found on site.

824. On this basis of the proposed mitigation and the potential to apply planning conditions, the proposal is acceptable with regards to part 'f' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).  
accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to public safety and safety safeguarding zones.

j) *Public strategic infrastructure:*

825. Part 'i' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not: cause an unacceptable impact on public strategic infrastructure.

826. [Chapter 17 of the ES](#) assesses the proposals vulnerability to accidents and disasters. There are two underground fuel pipelines and a gas main pipeline within or close to the site boundary. These are shown on [Proposed Site Plan](#), and separately in the approximate locations as set out [Appendix 8.1 Esso Pipeline](#), [Appendix 8.2 Exolum Pipeline](#) and [Appendix 8.3 Gas Pipeline Plan](#).
827. The applicant has indicated that the scheme has been designed with a significant stand-off between the extraction and these pipelines to prevent any issues with pipeline stability or safety. The minimum stand-off from the extraction area and the pipeline along the eastern boundary where both pipelines are is 41m, with a 20m stand-off to the outer bund. Along the southern boundary, the extraction area would be at least 44m from the pipeline, with a 20m stand-off to the outer bund. The gas pipeline also runs along the northern boundary, and again there is a 20m stand-off to the bund and 40m to the extraction area. As such the extraction area will be kept at a distance from the pipeline, with no soil bunds placed on top of the pipeline. The applicant has indicated that they would work with the pipeline owners prior to commencing any extraction on site to ensure the safety and stability of the existing pipelines during the proposal. Pipeline Protection Zones are located in stand-off areas to properties on Satchell Lane, which are also due to be used for bunding and habitat enhancement. This level of mitigation is considered to be acceptable.
828. Concerns have been raised in representation in relation to the potential affects upon the villages' infrastructure and the impact on ESSO pipeline. No evidence has been presented to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority on what impact this would be. Indeed, quarries can work without incident from infrastructure and pipelines with the appropriate mitigation. There is no evidence before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to suggest that this would be an issue.
829. The Regulation 25 (part 2) submission (amended the location of the onsite utilities and now shows them coming along the access road and within the RPAs of proposed felled trees T5, T6 and T7.
830. The ES concludes that the proposal is not considered to be highly vulnerable to accidents or disasters as a result of the nature of operations proposed. With the proposed mitigation, the proposal acceptable with regards to part 'I' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to public strategic infrastructure.

k) *Cumulative impacts:*

831. Regulation 4 (2) of the [Town and Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#) states that the Environmental Impact Assessment must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development on a number of factors this includes the interaction between the factors of population and human health, biodiversity, land, soil, water, air and climate, material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape.

832. Schedule 4, Part 5 states in relation to information for inclusion within Environment Statements (ESs), this includes “*the cumulation of effects with other existing and / or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the use of natural resources*”. This is reiterated in the [NPPG](#) (Environmental Impact Assessment) (paragraph Reference ID: 4-024-20170728), which states that “*each application (or request for a screening opinion) should be considered on its own merits. There are occasions, however, when other existing or approved development may be relevant in determining whether significant effects are likely as a consequence of a proposed development. The local planning authorities should always have regard to the possible cumulative effects arising from any existing or approved development*”.

833. Cumulative effects result from combined impacts of multiple developments that individually may be insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a significant cumulative impact; as well as the inter-relationships between impacts – combined effects of different types of impacts, for example noise, air quality and visual impacts on a particular receptor. With regards to inter-relationships between impacts, it is considered that based upon the studies and content of the individual chapters within the submitted ES, the underlying conclusion is that there is no single topic or combination of issues which should objectively prevent the development from proceeding.

834. Concerns were raised about the development creating a negative cumulative impact generally in the Hamble and Bursledon area and these are acknowledged.

835. All ES chapters have addressed potential cumulative impacts arising from the proposal in combination with other nearby developments. In looking for other potential sites that may result in cumulative impacts, a search of other mineral sites within close proximity has also been carried out, as well as a search of major planning applications and development projects which could



potentially be undergoing construction within close proximity to the site whilst the site is operational.

836. The cumulative impact of housing developments either under construction or with extant permissions have been taken into account in [ES Chapter 13 Transport](#) (including Appendix 7.1 Transport Assessment Parts 1-2), and the cumulative impacts on the transport network have been assessed as negligible.
837. Consideration of the cumulative impact of the proposed movements with other HGV movements has also been assessed as part of the Road Safety Audit. As set out in the [Highways impact](#) of this report, there is no evidence to suggest that the cumulative impacts on the road network from this development would be sufficiently severe.
838. Similarly, and as set out in the section on [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#) section of this report, the proposal would result in a negligible (0.1%) change in air quality in the Hamble Lane AQMA from additional traffic. In this regard, the proposal accords with paragraph 192 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) which states that “*sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas...*”
839. The [Impact on public health, safety and amenity](#) of this report considers cumulative impacts of air quality/dust and noise on health, living conditions and the natural environment. It concludes that the nearest quarry is approximately 4km away on the other side of Southampton Water and Ashley Crescent recycled aggregates site over 1.5km from the site. Given the distances involved, they are unlikely to result in any significant adverse cumulative impacts on air quality or audible noise.
840. The impacts of approved residential schemes in the area alongside in-combination effects of the proposal are considered unlikely to contribute significant cumulative effects on identified important ecological features (identified in [Chapter 10 Ecology](#) (Table 10.4 Assessment of the Magnitude of Effects)). Similarly, no cumulative impacts have been identified in respect of the impact on archaeology or cultural heritage.
841. Notwithstanding that concerns were raised about the development creating a negative cumulative impact specifically and generally in the Hamble and Bursledon area, topic areas within the ES have considered the cumulative impact of consented residential schemes, the nearest quarry and minerals processing sites and traffic impacts and demonstrate that the proposal will not

result in any significant adverse cumulative impacts that would be harmful to the environment or amenity. In addition, no objections on cumulative impacts grounds have been raised by statutory consultees. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in line with the above policies, and National Planning Practice Guidance in this regard.

842. Development considerations were included in Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) relating to the safeguarding of adjacent public rights of way (footpath no. 1) and maintenance and management existing informal recreational use of the site (as previously covered in the [Public Access](#) section of this report) as well as a phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity of local residents.

843. As already noted in wider sections of the commentary, mitigation measures are proposed to address potential impacts, including cumulative impacts.

*Conclusion on cumulative impacts:*

844. The proposal is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) (j) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in that it has been demonstrated that the proposal will not cause unacceptable cumulative impacts in combination with other consented developments, and other operational waste and minerals developments in the area.

Impact on surface or groundwaters and flooding

845. Mineral deposits have to be worked where they are found, and these are often located in flood risk areas. Mineral extraction and processing can take place in flood risk areas, provided any potential impact on the site and surrounding area is adequately managed so that the risk of flooding does not increase including during the restoration phases. Applications for minerals and waste proposals within Source Protection Zones or areas at risk of groundwater flooding should be accompanied by a Hydrological and Hydrogeological Risk Assessment. Mineral extraction may provide opportunities for flood water to be alleviated, by providing water storage when the area is restored.

846. Part 'a' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not release emissions to water (above appropriate standards).

847. Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) relates to minerals and waste development in flood risk areas and sets criteria which

developments should be consistent with relating to flood risk offsite, flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures, design of drainage, net surface water run-off and Sustainable Drainage Systems.

848. A development consideration is included for the site allocation (Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#)) in relation to the protection of the water quality and recharge of the groundwater and surface water.

849. Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that development will only be permitted within the areas at risk of flooding, now and in the future, as identified on the Environment Agency's most recent flood maps and the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provided that it meets five set out criteria. It also indicates that development should not increase flooding elsewhere.

850. Policy DM6 (Sustainable surface water management and watercourse management) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) sets out the requirements to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in new developments. It sets out a number of criteria to guide this development. In addition, Policy DM8 (Pollution) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) also relates to ensuring development is not permitted if it is likely to cause loss of amenity or impact on public health or other unacceptable environmental impacts through pollution of surface, underground, coastal waters or other watercourses (part b).

851. Paragraph 165 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *"inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere"*. Paragraph 173 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *"when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:*

*a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*

*b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;*

*c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;*

*d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan”.*

852. Paragraph 167 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) seeks to ensure that residual flood risks are properly managed. Furthermore, paragraph 168 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *“the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding”*. Paragraph 175 goes on to say that *“major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should: a) take account of advice from the lead local flood authority; b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and d) where possible, provide multifunctional benefits”*.

853. Paragraph 023 (Reference ID: 7-023-20220825) of the [PPG](#) (Flood risk and coastal change) makes it clear that the sequential approach *“is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk. This means avoiding, so far as possible, development in current and future medium and high flood risk areas considering all sources of flooding including areas at risk of surface water flooding”*. It also recognises that *“mineral deposits have to be worked where there is no scope for relocation (and sand and gravel extraction is defined as water-compatible development in the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) (Annex 3), acknowledging that these deposits are often in flood risk areas). However, mineral workings should not increase flood risk elsewhere and sites need to be designed, worked and restored accordingly”*. The [PPG](#) (Flood risk and coastal change) goes on to provide more information on how it can be demonstrated that development will reduce flood risk overall.

854. Furthermore, paragraph 041 (Reference ID: 7-041-20220825) of the [PPG](#) (Flood risk and coastal change) states that residual risk comes in two main forms:

- Residual risk from flood risk management infrastructure; and
- Residual risk to a development once any site-specific flood mitigation measures are taken into account.

855. Examples of residual flood risk from flood risk management infrastructure include “a flood event that exceeds a flood management design standard, such as a flood that overtops a raised flood defence, or an intense rainfall event which the drainage system cannot accommodate”.
856. [ES Chapter 8 Water Environment & Flood Risk](#) was prepared as part of the submission. This was also supported by [Borehole Logs](#) (Appendix 2.1), [Flood Risk Assessment](#) (Appendix 2.2), [Hydraulic Conductivity](#) (Appendix 2.3) [Saturated Thickness Chart](#) (Appendix 2.4) and Ground Condition Assessments [Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#) (Appendix 2.5).
857. Additional information was requested at the Regulation 25 (parts 1 and 2) stages and provided in the form of the [Hydro Reg Response to NE, Ecology and LLFA](#), [Hydro Reg 25 Response to Network Rail and EA](#), [Appendix 2.7 Infiltration Testing Report](#) (Exc Appendix B), Hydro Vol 2 Appendix 2.7 Infiltration Testing Report Appendix B [Part 1](#), [Part 2](#), [Part 3](#), [Part 4](#), [Part 5](#), [Part 6](#), [Part 7 Appendix 2.6 Borehole Logs Hydro Reg 25 Response - Drainage and Infiltration Testing](#) and [Updated Drainage Design](#) was also provided. There was an error with the published updated drainage design which meant an additional consultation was required on this document (see [Updated Drainage Design](#)).
858. **Appendix G – Drainage Design** provides an overview of the drainage design proposed which has been subject to changes through the planning process.
859. [Chapter 17 of the ES](#) also covers matters such as the risk of flood and severe weather conditions including rainfall.
860. There is significant local concern about the impact of the proposal on flooding and ground and surface waters. A large number of representations raised concerns about ground and surface water. These included concerns regarding the existing ground and surface water issues, the effect on the water table and natural drainage systems, impacts of dewatering, the quality of the assessment work, the potential for pollution and contamination as well as associated concerns relating to subsidence and impacts on the River Hamble. Many representations received also raised concerns about the potential for flooding. Existing conditions on Satchell Lane and Oakwood Way most notably, were raised as areas of concern, as well as perceived exacerbation of the current situation and wider climate change impacts. Concerns over historic run off/drainage ditches having been left to disrepair or that have been built on, and about over development were also raised. A summary of the issues raised

in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

861. The proximity of the site to the shoreline of the River Hamble has been raised in some representations in terms of potential impacts. The River Hamble is approximately 410 metres to the east of the site. There is no evidence presented which indicates that the proposal will have a significant impact on the river due to the distance from the proposed site. All concerns raised are acknowledged. Concerns were also raised about the restoration of the site and its associated flood impacts.
862. The site is wholly within Flood Zone 1 and as such complies with the policies which seek to direct development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding. Many representations received highlight locally known flooding issues. Hamble Parish Council in one of their earlier representations on the planning application noted that the supporting information did not *“provide sufficient reassurance that the gravel extraction process and restoration proposals will not increase the risk of flooding to roads and property in the vicinity of the site”*.
863. Southern Water have confirmed that the site is located 13km from their nearest groundwater abstraction catchment and will not impact any Southern Water groundwater abstractions.
864. The additional information provided at the Regulation 25 (parts 1 and 2) stages was sufficient to demonstrate a viable surface water drainage scheme was achievable within the site layout in accordance with current guidance with further details suitable to be submitted via conditions. This has been confirmed by the LLFA. However, it did not address the concerns raised by the LLFA regarding final site levels and the effective change to overland flow catchment areas.
865. The applicant has asserted that during the course of the extraction and restoration periods, off-site flood risk would be reduced, given that the large voids within the quarry would retain any excess surface water, rather than it drain off the site. Once the site is restored, drainage features including shallow ponds and ditches would ensure that the off-site flood risk would not increase from pre-development levels.
866. Water Environment Ltd, on behalf of the HPRG state that *“after site restoration, the baseflow in all such streams surrounding the site could be lower due to reduced aquifer storage”*.

867. The introduction of inert fill material was an area of concern and one which was shared by the LLFA earlier in the planning process due to a lack of certainty. Hamble Parish Council also noted that *“the introduction of large volumes of compact and impermeable material as in-fill, replacing free draining sand and gravel, must lead to a profound change in the way in which the site responds to surface water. The applicant has provided no material evidence in support of the assumptions made in its flood risk assessment regarding infiltration rates and invites the local planning authority to simply accept that the measures proposed will provide sufficient assurance of no damaging impacts”*. This concern has been addressed through subsequent discussions, information submitted at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage and the potential to apply a planning condition relating to fill material if permission is granted. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is therefore satisfied, on this matter, that this can be adequately controlled. Any fill material would also be controlled by an Environmental Permit.

868. Natural England initially advised that if Hampshire County Council, as competent authority, is satisfied that the [Flood Risk Assessment](#) is robust then Natural England raise no comments on this aspect of the proposals in relation to hydrology. It's noted that groundwater level and quality will continue to be monitored at the site throughout the operational lifetime of the site and for at least five years of aftercare and this could be controlled via planning condition with consideration to appropriate remedial measures if required. The applicant provided a response (see response from Stantec dated 24th May 2022) to address consultee queries. This states that the relatively small flow of groundwater towards the northeast would enter the Badnam Creek and flow into the Hamble. This would prevent any impacts occurring at the Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI which lies beyond the creek. The response states that hydrological impacts from hydrocarbon contamination is very unlikely to pose any significant risk to groundwater away from their source area, as the types of contaminant noted (in very low concentrations) are not mobile in groundwater. Natural England therefore advised that monitoring of contaminants within groundwater should be undertaken during the works to identify any increases in groundwater contaminants and if required, suitable remedial measures are undertaken. This could be controlled by planning condition in the event permission is granted.

869. The HPRG allege that the applicant has failed to seek the necessary drainage permissions from Southern Water. They stated (in their response dated 30/01/2023) that when HPRG consulted Southern Water on their views on the proposal, and in particular Cemex's plan to utilise the drainage network

to alleviate water runoff to the east of the site, Southern Water had not been formally consulted. Southern Water were consulted on the planning application and their views have been considered when coming to a decision. Southern Water would also require consultation and written agreement regarding appropriate measures and/or mitigation that will protect their existing infrastructure in this location at the appropriate time. This agreement would be required in advance of the commencement of any works on site and could also be subject to conditions and informatives in the event permission were granted.

870. The HPRG commissioned Water Environment Ltd to carry out a review of the possible hydrological impacts of a proposal. The findings of the initial review were presented in Water Environment Report (dated 31st March 2023). The HPRG submitted a further report from Water Environment (dated 16 February 2024) which considered a qualitative assessment of the Stantec response on behalf of the applicant, specifically to understand whether the impacts on the surrounding ecological sites have been considered in sufficient detail to conclude that there will be no likely significant effect on the flow in the surrounding groundwater-fed streams which flow into the surrounding designated sites. It concludes that *“it remains our opinion that the impacts of the proposed quarrying on both the local groundwater flow regime and the local stormwater runoff regime will result in a profound and irreversible change in the hydrology and hydrogeology of the site itself and the surrounding area. This, in turn, will likely result in significant changes to stormwater runoff, and in spring flow, and a reduction in drought resilience for the baseflow of the surrounding streams which discharge into designated ecological sites in Southampton Water and the River Hamble”*. This report is acknowledged. It should be noted that the LLFA are a statutory consultee in relation to surface water drainage only so do not comment on specific groundwater impacts. The concerns raised were in relation to the ability of surface water to be effectively managed.

871. As already set out, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority requested additional clarification from the Environment Agency (EA) on their position in relation to hydro-connectivity with the designated sites (March 2024). Their re-assessment of the *hydrological assessment concluded overall that the findings were fit for purpose and as the applicant plans to install attenuation ponds and infiltration swales, runoff will be directed to these. It was noted that “these should be developed in the appropriate places to mimic the current groundwater flow discharge to the springs. Surface runoff should be directed in the correct proportions to these attenuation ponds. If the attenuation ponds are located in the correct locations, (they) believe that the scale of impacts would be small and not sufficient to have any detrimental impacts on the designated*



*site although (they) would defer to Natural England on this as the lead authority”.*

872. No concerns have been raised by Natural England in relation to hydro connectivity. Natural England did note in their response that *while we tentatively agree with the Environmental Statement’s conclusion in that changes in hydrology are unlikely to impact nearby designated sites, they would advise further consideration of the Lincegrove and Hackett’s marshes SSSI in particular informs your decision making’*. As noted in the [Ecology](#) section of this report, following the initial responses received by the Environment Agency, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority sought additional guidance from the agency on hydro connectivity.
873. Changes proposed to the Restoration Scheme at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage have resulted in further concerns being raised by the LLFA and a holding objection remains in place. The proposals for the restored site were shown to have a different profile to the existing site, which means that adjacent ditch networks would receive disproportionate amounts of runoff from the restored site. This was not considered acceptable, and the LLFA require that the restored site be profiled to mimic the existing site. The consultation on the [Updated Drainage Design](#) did not resolve the LLFA’s concerns. It was noted that *“a change in the distribution of overland flows between the pre and post development situation was still apparent”*. Furthermore, the concern relating to post restoration ground profiles was considered to be significant given the impacts of the change in hydrology and therefore the assessment and conclusions within the Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulation Assessment. It was also noted that this may also affect other submitted documents i.e. landscape strategy as well interrelationships with other areas of the ES. It should be noted that the LLFA are a statutory consultee in relation to surface water drainage only so do not comment on specific groundwater impacts. The concerns raised by the LLFA are in relation to the ability of surface water to be effectively managed.
874. The applicant chose to submit a [Clarification Response to LLFA Comments \(19 February 2024\)](#) to address the LLFA’s objection. In terms of the proposed Restoration Plan, the applicant asserts that the plan demonstrates that restoration ground levels would be changed from the existing ground levels, but that these changes are relatively minor. An appendix document was provided which indicates the extent of these changes, in terms of the depth difference between the existing ground levels (taken from the LiDAR Digital Terrain Model (DTM)) and the proposed restoration ground levels. This document did not present any new information but focussed on its interpretation. With the exception of the proposed attenuation basin, where proposed ground levels are 2m below the existing ground level, across most of

the site the proposed changes equate to a change of  $\pm 0.4\text{m}$  with a few sparse areas at  $>0.4\text{m}$  higher.

875. Furthermore, in relation to the proposed drainage strategy, the applicant asserts that this allows for surface water in all events up to and including the design 1 in 100 year + Climate Change event, to infiltrate to ground, through the use of infiltration features at the Site boundary. The applicant acknowledges that there will be a change in surface water flows across the Site (due to the topographic changes). However, the applicant argues that there will not be a detrimental effect on the distribution of onward overland flow routes. Furthermore, the applicant anticipates that the management of surface water runoff through the use of SuDS features at the Site, would lead to a net benefit to those areas which are currently shown to be at risk of surface water flooding according to the EA's Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map. The applicant argues that *"given the Site's former use as an airfield, [...] it stands to reason that the surface has the potential to be already compacted / impermeable and a significant amount of rain falling on the Site leads to onward surface water flow. Hampshire County Council's "Reducing Flood Risk in Planning" guidance recommends the use of SuDS to "encourage the most natural disposal of surface water back into the ground, as close to the source as possible. The updated drainage strategy accounts for infiltration rates which have been obtained following soakaway testing carried out by Stantec; in line with BRE365 guidance for soakaway testing"*. They also indicate that the updated drainage strategy considers maximum groundwater levels and that a minimum 1m unsaturated zone between the base of any infiltration feature and the maximum groundwater level has been built into the infiltration feature design, in line with CIRIA guidance for SuDS design. Therefore, the proposed drainage strategy may lead to a "change in distribution of overland flows" in the sense that the surface water flood risk may be reduced as a result of implementing SuDS features at the Site. However, the proposed drainage strategy will not lead to an increase in surface water flood risk for any event up to and including the design 1 in 100 year + Climate Change rainfall event, as is required by the [NPPF \(2023\)](#).

876. The LLFA have indicated that the proposed drainage can be considered to be in accordance with the [NPPF \(2023\)](#), pending further details that can be addressed by planning condition in the event that permission is granted. However, they continue to raise concerns about a risk of blockage or storms exceeding design criteria ([PPG](#)) based on the current design. It is concluded that if this occurs, flows would be distributed across the site with the overland flow directions being changed from the current scenario due to the level changes. This poses an increased risk, however small, in relation to adjacent residential properties and in line with paragraph 041 (Reference ID: 7-041-

20220825) of [PPG](#) (Flood risk and coastal change) this has to be taken into account. This is considered to be unacceptable based on the current design. There are also wider concerns that these areas interrelate with other areas of the ES including the HRA.

877. In addition, the LLFA notes that the infiltration features are likely to contribute to baseflow within the adjacent ditches so the change in catchment may still result in alterations to the distribution of surface water. However, whilst these comments are noted, it is acknowledged that this matter is beyond the LLFA's remit and expertise to quantify.

878. The LLFA noted that in the event their outstanding concerns could be rectified, that they would require planning conditions relating to a pre-commencement requirement for a detailed surface water drainage scheme, detailed drainage strategies for the development phase as well as a detailed drainage strategy for each phase of restoration phase. These conditions could be applied in the event that planning permission is granted.

879. Southern Water provided a revised response in February 2024 which fully supported the LLFA's recommendations as set out in their response to the information provided at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage. Southern Water also requested that the detailed surface water drainage scheme to be produced takes note of comments provided by Southern Water and that the design of drainage should ensure that no groundwater or land drainage is to enter public sewers. A number of conditions were requested in the event that permission is granted relating to SUDS, protection of public sewers and informatives relating to the protection of the public sewers and SUDS. These could be included as planning conditions in the event that planning permission were to be granted.

880. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority sought KC's advice on the LLFA position and the proposed reason for refusal. KC endorsed the proposed recommendation for refusal. It was noted that as matters stand, there remains a serious objection from the LLFA which is supported by Southern Water. The applicant has had extensive opportunity to overcome that objection but has not done so. In these circumstances, the Council's only realistic option is to refuse permission on this ground".

881. As noted under the section in relation to [Impact on public strategic infrastructure](#), significant concerns were initially raised by Network Rail about the proposal having the potential to cause subsidence at the railway cutting. The applicant's supporting information acknowledges that there is likely to be an increase in ground water levels beneath the railway following restoration of

the site with lower permeability materials. This objection has now been resolved subject to the imposition of conditions.

*Conclusion on impact on surface or groundwaters and flooding:*

882. It is clear from the response from the LLFA, that there are still outstanding concerns with the proposed scheme in relation to drainage and flooding. This is despite a number of submissions from the applicant being submitted and previous advice being provided from the LLFA. Based on the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this time, it is not possible to be satisfied that the proposal can be approved without it having an unacceptable impact on drainage and/or flooding. It is therefore concluded that on the basis of the scheme before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this current time, the scheme is not in accordance with part 'h' of Policy 10 Part h of Policy 10 (Protecting health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022). There is a lack of certainty that the proposal will not result in an increased flood risk elsewhere and that the proposed drainage systems will not lead to an increase net surface water run-off. The required development consideration in relation to the *'protection of the water quality and recharge of the groundwater and surface water'* is therefore not considered to be met.

Links to environmental permitting

883. Given the applicant is proposing to restore the site by importing inert waste materials, the proposed development would require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency.

884. Planning and permitting decisions are separate but closely linked. The Environment Agency has a role to play in both. It is noted that paragraph 194 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that *"the focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes)"*.

885. Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 27-012-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) states that *"Planning permission determines if a development is an acceptable use of the land. The planning system controls the development and use of land in the public interest and, as stated in paragraphs 204 and 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework, this includes ensuring that new development is appropriate for its location – taking account of the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or*

*general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution”.*

886. Environmental permitting determines if an operation can be managed on an ongoing basis to prevent or minimise pollution. The scope of an environmental permit is defined by the activities set out in the [Environmental Permitting Regulations \(England and Wales\) 2016](#) (EPR). The aim of the EPR regime is to protect the environment from potential impacts associated with certain liable facilities or installations. The permitted activities may form a part of, but not all, of the development needing planning permission. In these cases, the planning application will need to address environmental considerations from those parts of the development that are not covered by the permit.
887. As clearly set out in paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 27-012-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals), the focus of the planning system “*should be on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and the impacts of those uses, rather than any control processes, health and safety issues or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under regimes. Mineral planning authorities should assume that these non-planning regimes will operate effectively*”.
888. The need for an environmental permit is separate to the need for planning permission. The granting of planning permission does not necessarily lead to the granting of an environmental permit. An application for an environmental permit will include an assessment of the environmental risk of the proposals including the risk under both normal and abnormal operating conditions. The Environment Agency will assess the application and the adequacy of the impact assessment including whether the control measures proposed by the operator are appropriate for mitigating the risks and their potential impact.
889. The infilling of material will require an environmental permit. Issues such as emissions to surface water, sewer and air, odour, noise and vibration, monitoring and reporting of emissions will be considered by the Environment Agency when assessing any application for an environmental permit.
890. The Environment Agency carries out unannounced inspection visits to ensure sites are operating in accordance with permit conditions and scrutinise data associated with the development. The Environment Agency has the powers to suspend any permits it considers are not being fully complied with and are creating an unacceptable risk.

891. If a permit is granted for the operation, it will be monitored and enforced in the same manner as any other regulated site by the Environment Agency. Several mechanisms are put in place for such monitoring such as audits, site visits, data analysis and compliance checks carried out by the regulator.

892. It is not appropriate for the planning process to condition operational issues which relate to the remit of the environmental permit.

### Highways impact

893. Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development to have a safe and suitable access to the highway network and where possible minimise the impact of its generated traffic through the use of alternative methods of transportation. It also requires highway improvements to mitigate any significant adverse effects on highway safety, pedestrian safety, highway capacity and environment and amenity.

894. As a site allocation, the following development considerations (as set out in Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#)) are of relevance in relation to highways:

- Phasing programme and working to protect local businesses and the amenity of local residents;
- Safe and satisfactory access to ensure provision is made for vulnerable highway users and the impact on peak flows is managed; and
- Traffic issues including consideration of school traffic and pedestrians, particularly at Hamble Community Sports College and Hamble Primary, and management of traffic and congestion on Hamble Lane.

895. Strategic Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that the Council will work with the highway authorities... and developers to minimise transport emissions, pollution and congestion by ensuring new developments:

- I. “encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport; and*
- II. minimise congestion and support safety on the highway network; as informed by appropriate transport assessments; and*
- III. safeguarding the routes and securing the funding to deliver new and improved transport infrastructure”.*

896. Policy DM13 (General development criteria – transport) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that all new development must have safe and convenient access to the highway network and make provision for access to, and by, other transport modes including public transport and cycle and pedestrian routes as appropriate. It sets out criteria for access arrangements (a-c), requirements for a Transport Assessment and other matters.

897. Paragraph 114 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) advises that when assessing planning applications it should be ensured that:

- a) *“appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) *the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and*
- d) *any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree”.*

898. In addition, paragraph 115 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.’ Within this context, paragraph 116 goes onto say that applications for development should:

- a) *‘give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;*
- b) *address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;*
- c) *create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;*
- d) *allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and*
- e) *be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations”.*

899. Hampshire County Council has a statutory requirement to have in place a [Hampshire Local Transport Plan 4 \(2024\)](#) (LTP4). Eight outcomes are identified grouped under four key themes as already set out in the [Development Plan and Other Relevant Policies and Guidance](#) section. LTP4 also includes a number of policies relating to aspects such as sustainable travel, managing health effects of poor air quality and noise disturbance due to transport and protecting the environment.

900. [ES Chapter 13 Transport](#) was prepared as part of the application. This was supported by Appendix 7.1 Transport Assessment [Parts 1, 2 and 3](#), [Transport Safety Audit](#) and [Transport Safety Audit Plan](#) submitted under Regulation 25 (part 1). Additional information was submitted at the Regulation 25 (part 2) including a [supplementary transport note](#) and [Appendix 7.4 Technical Note Vehicle Movement Conditions](#).

901. It is proposed that the site will be operational between 0700-1700 hours Monday to Friday and 0700-1200 hours on Saturdays.

902. Locally, significant concerns about a wide range of highway related matters including the existing highway condition, highway safety, congestion, highway width and associated pollution alongside concerns over the safety of pavement users and cumulative impacts of proposed movements with existing and other HGV movements. Many representations noted that the current road infrastructure is not suitable to safely accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and heavy traffic. Concerns were raised that increased HGV movements will put local children and other highway users at risk. Hamble Lane is the only road in and out of Hamble peninsular. Many representations also noted that the proposal would have an impact on Satchell Lane and the Hound Road, Portsmouth Road and the Tesco superstore junctions which are already heavily impacted at peak traffic flow times. The closure of the Lowford Surgery in Bursledon meaning that patients have to travel to Blackthorn Surgery for care was also raised by Bursledon Parish Council. All of these matters are acknowledged. Other concerns about Satchell Lane becoming a rat run are acknowledged. It is important to note that it is not proposed to use Satchell Lane as part of this development, so concerns raised about its use are unsubstantiated. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

**Access:**

903. Access to the Site is proposed to be taken from a new priority access junction directly onto Hamble Lane (see **Appendix E – Access Plan** and drawings within the Transport Statement). All HGVs arriving and departing the site will arrive and depart to the north (towards the M27). The proposed access to the site crosses the Dani King Cycle path.

904. The access has been designed with a width of 7.3m and a kerb radius of 4.0m to the left / south of the access. This is to prevent HGVs from turning left out of the site whilst still allowing smaller vehicles to make this manoeuvre. The applicant has indicated that the proposed location of the access has been determined following discussions with the Highway Authority and the provision



of a road safety audit, in order to find the safest point of access and in a location that minimises the impact on trees.

905. At the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage, the applicant was asked to demonstrate that the proposed location of the site access and the form of junction arrangement and its impact on ecology and arboriculture had been considered in detail via an optioneering report. An Access Options Report was subsequently submitted, and the Highway Authority has indicated that they are satisfied that the proposed site access location is generally acceptable. RPG, who were employed by Hamble Parish Council to consider highway issues associated with the application, noted that "*The proposed site access junction is forecast to operate well within capacity post development, and this is not disputed*" (RPG Highways review January 2023).
906. Following discussions in relation to arboriculture, amendments to the access were proposed at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage ([see Vol 2 Appendix 7.2 drawing no ITB13040-SK-006](#)).
907. The HPRG questioned the reliance on the Pre-application Design Review (PADR) as a basis for the Highway Authority response due to the fact that the same officer in the Highway Authority was involved in the report and also responded on the planning application. It is important to note that the PADR was for the design of the new site access. Hampshire Engineering Services Consultancy are happy with the principle of the proposed access and as stated in the Highway Authority response, the details can be worked through at the Section 278 stage if permission were to be granted. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority does not raise an issue with the same officer being involved in both stages of the process as this usual practise from a scheme going through PADR to the planning application stage. In addition, the access design has also now been altered as part of the processing of the planning application.
908. Concerns that the site would lead to disruption to Hampshire Constabulary's access to and from their campus via Hamble Lane were also raised as well as access to Hamble Aerostructures Limited. These are acknowledged. The proposed access is located to the north of the accesses to the Hampshire Constabulary and Hamble Aerostructures Limited. There is no evidence before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to suggest that there will be any impact on the ability of these sites to continue to operate normally in terms of vehicle movements. Indeed, this issue has not been raised by the Highway Authority.

909. A [Stage 1 Road Safety Audit](#) for the site access proposal has been undertaken. This was reviewed by the Highway Authority who indicated that the matters highlighted in the audit can be addressed through the detailed design work for the access which could be secured through a planning condition. Any works will be subject to the County Council's design checking process and a Section 278 Agreement in the event that permission is granted.

910. Planning conditions could also be applied to ensure additional signage is installed on the access, as well as ensuring that the access remaining clear (including visibility splays, sheeting of vehicles, maintenance of the haul road and that the highway is kept clear of mud / debris. These could be applied in the event that permission is granted. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that a safe and suitable access can be delivered as part of the development.

*Speed of vehicles and Pedestrian and Cycle Visibility Splays:*

911. The speed of traffic on Hamble Lane was also raised as an area of concern alongside other safety factors such as the crash barrier on the embankment to the north side of Hamble Lane rail bridge.

912. The location of the site in proximity to sensitive receptors in particular the location of the primary school and secondary school was raised as an area of particular concern. The HPRG in particular provided an assessment of the location of other minerals and waste sites in proximity to receptors like Hamble School and Hamble Primary School.

913. The applicant has considered the matter of traffic speed in the application, and this has been considered by Highway Authority as part of the response. An Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) was undertaken from 25th April to 2nd May 2022 along Hamble Lane. The Count showed that the 85th percentile speeds northbound were 39.6 miles per hour (mph) and southbound were 39.4mph. On this basis, the Highway Authority advised that the visibility splays for the site access are required to be 2.4m x 80m in both directions (see Vol 2 Appendix 7.2 drawing [ITB13040-SK-006F](#)). On the request of the Highway Authority, the visibility splay to the south (left) was amended to the centreline, as part of the Regulation 25 (part 2) submission, due to the presence of a pedestrian refuge which prevents overtaking.

914. Pedestrian and cycle visibility splays for pedestrians and cyclists crossing the site access are provided (see [Vol 2 Appendix 7.2 drawing no ITB13040-SK-006](#) and [SK-011A](#)). The Highway Authority has acknowledged that vehicles turning into the proposed site will not be travelling at the speed limit on Hamble Lane and it has been agreed with the applicant that a provision of a

y-distance (the distance you need to be able to see to your left and right when you reach a junction and is based on the measured speed of traffic on that road) of 25m (commensurate with a 20mph speed) for vehicles turning into the proposed development would be acceptable.

*Swept Path Analysis:*

915. Vehicle tracking at a speed of 10mph was requested at the Regulation 25 (part 1) stage and it was suggested that a lock-to-lock time of 6 seconds would be more appropriate than the 3 seconds proposed for HGVs. Following internal advice received from the County Council's Engineering Consultancy, the 3 second lock-to-lock times have been deemed acceptable by the Highway Authority. Swept path analysis of the proposed access arrangements has been undertaken at a speed of 10mph as requested (see updated drawings in [Vol 2 Appendix 7.2](#) (ITB13040-SK-002D – Swept Path Analysis – 16.5m Articulated Vehicle, ITB13040-SK-004C – Swept Path Analysis - Fire Tender; and ITB13040-SK-005C – Swept Path Analysis – Panel Van and Car)).

*Site Layout:*

916. Swept Path Analysis of the proposed site layout for a 14.1m articulated vehicle was previously provided and additional swept path analysis for a 16.5m articulated vehicle was requested under Regulation 25 (Part 1). Swept Path Analysis for the internal layout has been updated to demonstrate that a 16.5m articulated vehicle can manoeuvre around the internal site layout (see [Vol 2 Appendix 7.2](#) ITB13040-GA-001B). This is considered to be acceptable by the Highway Authority.

*Car parking:*

917. The proposed allocation of car and cycle parking is considered to be acceptable. This is agreed by the Highway Authority.

*Highway safety and vulnerable road users:*

918. As already noted, significant local concerns about a wide range highway safety were raised in representations alongside concerns over the safety of pavement users and cumulative impacts of proposed movements with other HGV movements.

919. [Updated Personal Injury Accident \(PIA\) data](#) (see appendix E of [Vol 2 Appendix 7.2](#)) was requested under Regulation 25 (part 1) and data has been provided which covers the period between 1 December 2016 and 30 November 2021 (for the same study area which covers Windhover Roundabout to the north, and to the priority junction with Kings Avenue to the south). As this is not the latest data, additional data has been analysed for the period from November 2021 to June 2022 by the Highway Authority. The

Highway Authority notes that a total of 72 collisions were recorded comprising 61 classified as 'slight' and 11 as 'serious' accidents. It was also noted that two slight incidents were recorded along Hamble Lane within the vicinity of the site access, and eight slight accidents and four severe accidents were recorded to north of the railway line up to the Hamble Lane / Hound Road roundabout (including its approach). It is noted that there have been no accidents involving large vehicles (3.5T and over). The Highway Authority is satisfied that the [Personal Injury Accident \(PIA\) data](#) has not identified any patterns that are likely to be exacerbated by the planning application.

920. The proposed access design has been designed to LTN1/20 Design Standards and provides a 3.0m wide shared footway / cycleway around the bell mouth of the proposed access and a refuge island with a length of circa 7.5m and width of 4.0m (inside the pedestrian guard railing).
921. As already noted, a [Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review](#) (WCHAR) was requested and has been provided by the applicant. Reference has also been made to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). Both documents outline that there is existing provision of walking and cycling facilities in the vicinity of the proposed access. The LCWIP also identifies a number of potential improvements to the Hamble Lane corridor that could encourage more active travel, many of which are relevant to the requirement for a legal agreement on highway matters. Concerns were raised by RPG on behalf of Hamble Parish Council about the status of the WCHAR and the timescale of the site visit associated with its preparation. The HPRG also raised concerns about the adequacy of the WCHAR. The findings of the WCHAR have been accepted by the Highway Authority and considered when preparing their response. The contribution identified for highways mitigation measures (see later in this section) will help to address some of the improvements identified in the LCWIP.
922. Mud and debris on the highway were raised as areas of concern. These are acknowledged. In the event that permission is granted, a planning condition could be applied on this issue. This is standard for all mineral quarry permissions.
923. Concerns raised about the stability of the Hamble Lane railway bridge are covered in [Public safety safeguarding zones](#).

*Trip Generation:*

924. It is acknowledged that the HPRG, Hamble Parish Council and a large proportion of representation received argued that "*the impact of the proposed traffic increase would be severely negative*".

925. Initially, the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) indicated that there would be 7 people employed at the site and therefore 7 trips to the site and 7 trips from the site. The updated [TA](#), submitted under Regulation 25 (part 1), states that there will also be visitors to the site. As there will be 20 car parking spaces, a robust assessment assumes that 10 of the 20 staff / visitors will arrive in the AM peak (07:30 – 08:30) with the other ten arriving prior to the AM peak as the site will open at 07:00. It is assumed that all staff / visitors will leave during the PM peak period as the development is planned to close at 17:00.

926. The proposed development is expected to generate (as a worst-case scenario) 90 two-way HGV movements per day (45 in and 45 out) in years 1 and 2 and years 8-11 and 144 two-way HGV movements (72 in and 72 out) in years 3-7 across the working day (0700-1700 hours Monday to Friday and 0700-1200 hours on Saturdays). Further information was requested under Regulation 25 (part 1) to evidence both the proposed HGV trip generation and the hourly profile of those trips to ensure that this reflects the operational requirements of the proposal. The applicant has provided updated information as follows:

- Phase 1: Year 1-2 (Export only) – Export of aggregates at a rate of 250,000 tpa on assumption that each HGV would carry 20t of aggregate and site being worked 278 days pa. This equates to 45 HGVs arriving and departing the site (90 two-way movements);
- Phase 2: Years 3 – 7 (Export and infill)– Export aggregates at a rate of 250,000 tonnes pa and infill rate of circa 150,000tpa on assumption that each HGV would carry 20t of aggregate and site being worked 278 days pa. This equates to 45 HGVs arriving and departing the site (90 two-way movements) associated with the export activity and 27 HGVs arriving and departing the site (54 two-way movements) associated with the importations of infill; and
- Phase 3: Years 8 – 11 (Infill only)– Importing infill only to the site for restoration at a rate of 250,000tpa equating to 45 HGVs arriving and departing the site on average per day (90 two-way movements).

927. The Highway Authority is satisfied with the number of vehicles proposed when assessed against potential highway capacity impacts.

928. It is noted that some of the exports and deliveries could use larger vehicles, with greater capacity, and that some vehicles will be backloaded which will reduce the number of HGVs travelling to and from the site. The figures above therefore represent a worst-case scenario.

929. The applicant has interrogated data from the aggregate dispatch system, which provides information on the number of vehicles arriving and departing

from a number of Cemex's existing quarries that have similar activities, extraction rates and operating times. These include quarries in Hampshire including Hamer Warren Quarry near Ringwood and Bramshill Quarry, near Yateley. This comparison to other sites is considered to be acceptable by the Highway Authority. The data analysed to provide a traffic profile across a typical weekday was from the period January to May 2017. It is noted that this whilst this data is now a number of years old, the period covers a time when all quarry sites were operating at full capacity prior to the covid pandemic. This assessment is set out in [Table 5.2 of the TA](#) and shows that during the morning peak there will be a maximum of 26 HGV two-ways trips during Phase 2. There will be a maximum of 5 HGV two-way trips in the evening peak hour. In the event that permission is granted, a planning condition could be applied, capping the number of HGV movements.

930. The HPRG provided information on HGV movements associated with other minerals and waste sites in Hampshire as part of a representation. This information has been considered by the Highway Authority when preparing their responses. Whilst this information is recognised, the focus of decision making has to be on the HGVs proposed for this planning application. It is also important to note that HGV movements associated with quarry's will often be higher than those for smaller waste sites, as set out in the assessment provided.

931. HGVs are defined for the purposes of this permission as a commercial vehicle over 7.5 tonnes unladen weight. The HPRG provided information on other waste sites where Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCV) are in use. An HCV is a goods vehicle whose operating weight (ascertained in accordance with subsection (1B) above as originally enacted) does not exceed 7.5 tonnes as defined in the [Heavy Commercial Vehicles \(Controls and Regulations\) Act 1973](#). The focus of the decision making has to be on whether the use of HGVs is acceptable.

*Traffic Distribution:*

932. All HGV traffic arriving at the site will travel to and from the north of the site along Hamble Lane, arriving and departing from the site via the M27 Junction 8. It has been assumed that all staff will also enter the site from the north via Hamble Lane due to the proposed configuration of the junction.

933. The Highway Authority is satisfied with the proposed traffic distribution subject to a lorry routing agreement restricting HGVs to a right turn out / left turn in manoeuvre being included within a s106 legal agreement if permission is granted. A routing agreement is a common feature of mineral quarry planning permissions.

*Traffic Flows and impacts:*

934. The applicant provided Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) surveys of the Hamble Lane corridor for 2016 and 2017 when the application was submitted. More recent baseline survey data was requested under Regulation 25 (part 1) alongside operational assessments for the following junctions:
- Hamble Lane / Satchell Lane Simple Priority Junction;
  - Hamble Lane / Portsmouth Road Ghost Island Junction;
  - Hamble Lane / Lionheart (Jurd) Way Roundabout;
  - Hamble Lane / Tesco Roundabout;
  - Windhover Roundabout; and
  - M27 Junction 8 Roundabout.
935. The initial TA included an assessment of traffic impact for the morning and evening peak hours for the future years of 2023, 2030 and 2034 which coincided with the proposed 'year of opening' and end of traffic Phases 2 and 3 respectively. It is acknowledged that 2023 has now passed.
936. Traffic flows for a number of nearby developments were included within the forecasted flows such as Land at Berry Farm (Planning Ref: F/17/79863), Land at Satchell Lane (Planning Ref: O/17/80319), Land to the south of Mallards Road (Planning Ref: O/15/76491), Land to the North of Cranbury Gardens (Planning Ref: O/15/76883) and Land South of Bursledon Road (Planning Ref: O/15/77121). The Highway Authority acknowledges that the proposal for Mallards Road was dismissed at appeal and Satchell Lane application has lapsed. The remaining development sites were completed by the time of the more recent traffic counts.
937. The assessment no longer includes a future design year as it has been demonstrated that traffic growth is relatively stable (although high) and that planned development had now largely been completed and the resulting trips included in the updated traffic surveys.
938. The TA outlines the following impact of the development, as the recorded network peaks are now slightly different to the previously identified peaks (now 07:30 to 08:30 and 16:15 to 17:15) the HGV traffic associated with peak operations during Phase 2 has been added to the surveyed traffic on the local highway network as follows:
- HGV traffic for 07:00-08:00 has been added to the survey flows between 07:30-08:30 and
  - HGV traffic for 16:00-17:00 has been added to the survey flows between 16:15-17:15.

939. Table 5.3 of the TA outlines that the traffic associated with the proposed development would have a maximum impact on two-way total traffic flows on the local highway network of 3% in the morning peak (On Hamble Lane in the vicinity of the site access) with 2% for the evening peak. Furthermore, Table 5.4 of the TA sets out the impact of HGVs on the morning and evening peak hours. This shows that the proposed development would have a maximum impact on two-way HGV flows on the local highway network of 137% in the morning peak and 38% in the evening peak. The HGVs in the morning peak will increase from 19 to 45 on Hamble Lane north of Hound Road.
940. Additional traffic survey data has been provided for Hamble Lane (for April 2022) under Regulation 25 (part 1). The survey data shows that the AM and PM peak baseline traffic flows are mostly lower than the 2017 data presented in the previous TA, and all are lower than the 2021 factored flows. The Highway Authority has indicated that the traffic flow data used in the Transport Assessment is robust and acceptable.
941. The applicant submitted a technical note on 28 February 2023 which considered the potential restriction of HGV movements and specific times of the day. Based on an assessment of the opening times of Hamble Primary School and the Hamble School and the time of the pedestrian/cycle movements along the site frontage, it was suggested that vehicles are restricted from leaving the site between 08:00am – 08:45am and 14:30pm– 15:15pm. The morning restriction covers the half hour period when there are the highest number of pedestrian/cycle movements along the site frontage and encompasses the school opening times (i.e. between 08:25 – 08:45). The afternoon restriction covers the 15-minute period when there are the highest number of pedestrian/cycle movements along the site frontage and the preceding 30-minute period. The proposed restrictions consider that on Monday, the Hamble School finishes earlier and the peak in movements would also be earlier (i.e. at circa 14:40 five minutes after the school day ends). The proposed restrictions by the applicant are considered to be acceptable by the Highway Authority. This also addresses one of the areas of mitigation proposed by Hamble Parish Council in relation to managing access. A planning condition could be applied restricting HGV movements in the school AM and PM peak times (drop off and pick up) in the event that permission is granted. In addition, conditions could also be applied in relation to further driver briefing related to school drop-off / pick-up in the event that permission is granted.



*Junction Impact Assessment:*

942. It is recognised that there are concerns from the local community in relation to the capacity of local roundabouts and some junctions. These concerns are acknowledged.

943. [Junction Assessments](#) have been undertaken. This has looked at aspects such as Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC). The RFC outputs assess the demand against the theoretical capacity of a junction. LINSIG traffic modelling software outputs show Degree of Saturation (DoS) rather than RFC to determine the percentage of the junction capacity that is currently being used. Queue length surveys were also undertaken at the same time as the updated manual classified counts (October 2022) and provide data on the queue length on each arm of the junctions at 1-minute snapshots across the peak periods. The following has been concluded:

- Site Access / Hamble Lane: The maximum Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) is 0.13 which occurs on the proposed access road arm in the AM peak. This results in a queue of less than one vehicle and an estimated average delay of some 39 seconds;
- Hamble Lane / Satchell Lane: A maximum RFC of 0.84 is observed on the Satchell Lane arm during the morning peak 'with development' scenario (as compared to 0.77 without development). The development is also anticipated to increase the queue length from 3 to 4 vehicles and increase the delay by 37 seconds (from 83 to 120 seconds);
- Hamble Lane / Hound Road Roundabout: A maximum RFC of 0.87 is observed on the Hamble Lane north arm during the morning peak 'with development' scenario, which represents an increase in RFC of 0.04 when compared with the 'without development' scenario and an additional 7 seconds of delay;
- Hamble Lane / Portsmouth Road: This junction already operates close to capacity in the AM peak (0.96 RFC) and the RFC is anticipated to increase to 0.98 on Portsmouth Road during the morning peak 'with development' scenario. The delay will be increased by 23 seconds (from 117 seconds without development to 140 seconds with development). In the evening peak period, the Portsmouth Road RFC will increase from 0.83 (without development) to 0.85 (with development) with an additional 5 seconds of delay;
- Hamble Lane / Lionheart Way: The Hamble Lane North arm of the junction is currently operating close to capacity in the morning and evening peaks (0.82 RFC). The 'with' development scenarios will see the morning peak RFC increase to 0.85. The Lionheart Way arm has an RFC without development of 0.93 increasing to 0.97 with development. The delay to traffic will increase from 79 seconds to 119 seconds;
- Tesco Roundabout: The Hamble Lane North arm of the junction has an RFC of 0.80 in the morning peak rising to 0.84 with development with an additional 3 second queue delay. In the evening peak the RFC is 0.94 and will remain at 0.94 with development;

- Windhover Roundabout: As it is a signalised junction, the operation of the Windhover roundabout has been assessed using LINSIG traffic modelling software. The Providence Hill arm of the junction shows a DoS of 97.6% in the morning peak and 101.2% in the evening peak. LINSIG shows that the development will increase the DoS to 103.3% in the morning peak and 102.7% in the evening peak. The queue length on this arm of the junction is also shown as increasing by 14 vehicles in the morning and one vehicle in the evening. The Transport Statement correctly states that when a junction reaches capacity, junction models become very sensitive to small increases in flows, showing an unrealistic impact on modelled queue lengths and delay. As traffic increases associated with the proposed development are only anticipated on the Hamble Lane and Bert Betts Way arms of the junction it is unlikely that the impact shown in the LINSIG model on Providence Hill is accurate; and
- M27 Junction 8 Roundabout: This junction has been evaluated using 'Junctions 10' software. It is noted that the junction operates close to capacity during the morning and evening peak periods in both the design year 'with' and 'without' development traffic. As noted above, the impact of the development is shown to increase the RFC from 0.94 to 0.96 at the M27 and Dodwell Lane from 0.95 to 0.97 in the AM peak which is unlikely given the direction the traffic associated with the development will be travelling.

944. RPG, who were employed by Hamble Parish Council provided an assessment of junction capacity (RPG review January 2023). In summary, this concluded the following:

- Site Access / Hamble Lane: The proposed site access junction is forecast to operate well within capacity post development, and this is not disputed;
- Hamble Lane / Satchell Lane: The junction is forecast as close to operational capacity as is possible;
- Hamble Lane / Hound Road Roundabout: The junction is forecast to operate over capacity, furthermore the maximum RFC reported for the Design Year 'Without Development' scenario is 0.83. Consequently, it is the proposed development that would cause the junction to go over capacity during the design year. It would therefore be the proposed development that would cause the associated 'impact' in terms of a material detriment of the operation of the surrounding highway network;
- Hamble Lane / Portsmouth Road: The junction is forecast to operate well over capacity with queues in excess of 16 vehicles;
- Hamble Lane / Lionheart Way: The junction is forecast to operate significantly over capacity with queues in excess of 15 vehicles and delays of 119 seconds or 2 minutes;
- Tesco Roundabout: The junction is forecast to operate well over capacity with queues in excess of 12 vehicles;
- Windhover Roundabout: The Bert Betts Way, Hamble Lane, Bursledon Road and West End Road arms of the junction operate within capacity

in the morning and evening peak in both the 'with' and 'without' development scenarios. Very modest increases in queue length are anticipated on these arms of the junction (one – two vehicles)'; and

- M27 Junction 8 Roundabout: The junction is forecast to operate well over capacity with queues in excess of 17 vehicles.

945. Overall, RPG concluded that the junction capacity results demonstrate that the proposed development would result in a negative impact on local resident amenity by further exacerbating a pre-existing over capacity highway network.

946. The Highway Authority reviewed the RPG assessment. Indeed, some of the areas identified by RPG were also addressed in subsequent submissions by the applicant under Regulation 25. Taking all information into account, the Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed site access junction would operate within capacity during the weekday morning peak hours. The Highway Authority notes that the analysis of the junctions further north demonstrates the impact of the proposed development traffic on the capacity operation of each junction. It is acknowledged that there are several junctions which operate at or approaching theoretical capacity and above optimum capacity which results in the delays recorded. The development traffic, particularly in the AM peak does worsen the position and therefore appropriate mitigation will be required to offset this impact. This is addressed by the proposed financial contribution via a proposed legal agreement.

947. As noted above, a planning condition could be applied restricting HGV movements in the school drop off and pick up times in the event that permission is granted. This will have the added benefit of reducing the impact on local roundabouts and some junctions at these times.

*Quality of the data:*

948. Many representations, including representations from Paul Holmes MP, Hamble Parish Council, RPG (on behalf of Hamble Parish Council), Motion (on behalf of a consortium of companies including Hamble Yacht Services, Ancastea Marine and other marine businesses) questioned the adequacy of the ES information on highway matters and the quality of the data contained in the TS and accompanying documentation.

949. Concerns were also raised that consideration of the site allocation in the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#) was flawed due to the differences in highway movements proposed and what has been submitted. These concerns are also acknowledged. The application, as it stands, will be considered based on what is proposed and against up-to-date evidence submitted as part of the application.

950. Parties such as the HPRG questioned the age of some of the data which has been submitted, as well as the length of time it has taken to determine the planning application as factors which undermine the evidence base. Initial data provided by the applicant was pre-pandemic which did show a worse picture than the later data that the applicant submitted following a request from the Highway Authority under Regulation 25. Traffic levels are still down from pre pandemic levels, and the Highway Authority has indicated that they are not predicted to grow significantly in the near future (based on projections). Following advice from consultees, the information submitted by the applicant has been found to be acceptable.

951. The Highway Authority has considered the application documentation, as submitted, at all stages of the consultation process and have raised no concerns about the quality of the data provided on highway matters. The Highway Authority have sought advice from the County Council's Engineering Services Consultancy on the quality of the information provide, as they provided comments which fed into the discussions on highway matters.

952. Some interested parties, including the HPRG have questioned the validity of the data presented as a 2-year period had passed. The Highway Authority have revisited the design throughout the planning consultation period and assessed it against the relevant current design standards.

953. No evidence has been provided to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority from other parties which brings the quality of the final information on highway matters into question.

*Highway Improvement Works:*

954. National Highways were aiming to deliver capacity enhancements to the M27 junction 8 and Windhover Roundabout. National Highways stated at the time of announcing the plans that *"Congestion at Windhover roundabout is currently caused by a combination of localised peak time traffic (7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm) and rat-running to avoid M27 junction 8 tailbacks. The scheme improvements will help alleviate traffic congestion which will benefit the community in terms of better air quality for local residents and support the economy by providing improved journey times for local businesses using the route. The improvements will lead to a reduction in the number of casualties."*

955. The Highway Authority noted in their response that this scheme was anticipated to start in autumn 2023 and will alleviate the impact of the development on these two junctions. Work has yet to commence on this scheme.

956. The County Council has also previously set out potential wider improvements to the top of Hamble Lane / Windover roundabout. These improvements have not been delivered to date. There was also a Hampshire County Council scheme for the Portsmouth Road / Hamble Lane Junction that formed part of the wider Hamble Lane improvement scheme (this was subject to public consultation in 2019 but has subsequently been unable to secure adequate external funding to be delivered in whole). There is criticism in many representations on the lack of delivery of these schemes. It is the understanding of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority that at this time, there is no certainty about the funding to allow delivery. It is also understood that the Highway Authority has been assessing alternative measures that would improve access on Hamble peninsula. This more broadly reflects [LTP4](#), as well as the Transport Assessment which supports the emerging partial update to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.

957. It is noted that a number of Active Travel and Sustainable Transport schemes are currently being developed for the area that include greater provision for cyclists and pedestrians on Hamble Lane, and with a specific focus on improving access to Hamble Rail Station. This is to encourage more longer distance trips to be taken by train, as well as improving walking and cycling for local trips. The Highway Authority has noted that this area would be an appropriate form of mitigation for this development, given the increase in HGV trips proposed. This is considered in more detail below.

*Highway Authority policy position on development of Hamble Lane and the Satchell Lane appeal:*

958. Hamble Parish Council included a reference to the 'policy position' taken by the Highway Authority to object to further development which would result in placing additional traffic onto Hamble Lane. It is acknowledged that the Highway Authority has taken this position on wider developments proposed via Eastleigh Borough Council's jurisdiction as Local Planning Authority. Many representations referred to a recent residential development proposal at Satchell Lane that was refused (application F/20/89488) and dismissed at appeal with comments included in documentation which suggested that Hamble Lane was already operating above capacity AM and PM. The Highway Authority notes in its response to Satchell Lane that its position in relation to previous planning applications since 2019 has been steered by a presumption against new development trips being permitted on the peninsula without mitigation being in place to offset this impact. At the time, a scheme was identified to improve capacity at the northern end of Hamble Lane, subject to funding being secured. At this time, there is no certainty about the funding and therefore delivery of this scheme.

959. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has been advised that the Highway Authority has always recognised that Hamble Airfield is allocated in the \_ so was therefore excluded from any policy position.

960. It is noted that the Inspector, in dismissing the appeal, noted that “*the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe because of the delays that would result at the junctions where traffic modelling would be carried out*”. The Inspector was clear in this case that paragraph 111 (now paragraph 115) of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) does not require that there should be no impact on the road network from a proposal, or indeed any adverse impact – it must be severe.

**AQMA:**

961. The potential for HGVs to impact the nearby AQMA is covered in [Emissions to the atmosphere \(air quality\) and dust](#).

**Site location and transportation:**

962. Section 8 (Benefits of the proposal) of the [Planning Statement](#) highlights the applicant’s view that providing the mineral from the site, close to where the material is required to meet market demand, is more sustainable than providing it from sites where HGVs have to travel further on the road, which results in increased emissions and other associated environmental and amenity effects. The applicant notes that “*even if Hamble does not supply these projects directly, supplying them from other local sites will leave a gap in the general market which has to be met locally to minimise HGVs coming from further afield and the additional environmental impacts that would arise from that*”. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority acknowledges that the site provides an opportunity to serve the South Hampshire market area.

**Alternative transport:**

963. Conveyors will be used to transport the material from the excavation areas to the processing area. This helps to reduce potential environmental impacts compared to the movements of vehicles between these two areas. Conveyors are used on many of Hampshire’s quarry sites. The possibility of extending the conveyor along the route of the branch rail line and along the BP jetty were raised as options by some interested parties but this is not within the scope of the application.

964. Many representations received noted that the use of rail or barge should be considered and/or enforced. The use of rail or barge has been considered in the planning application. The site is adjacent to the railway line, however there are a large number of factors restricting the use of the railway to transport mineral from this site. There is currently no rail siding, so this would have to be

built into the site to take mineral by rail, as well as the associated infrastructure. There would have to be a suitable window for using the siding provided by Network Rail, and often it is not within daytime hours that these windows are available, and nighttime loading is not likely to be possible, given the proximity of properties to the north of the railway along Hamble Lane, as well as those in Satchell Lane towards the north of the site. Associated noise issues with the use of a siding are also a consideration. Furthermore, in order to transport mineral by rail, there also has to be suitable facilities at the receiving end for it to go to and the applicant has indicated that they are not aware of any suitable locations for it to be unloaded at nearby linked stations. The use of rail is also potentially limited by the market for the mineral within South Hampshire. It is also acknowledged that the cost of setting up a railway siding is significant which would not make the project financially viable. These factors are acknowledged by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. Some representations criticised that the ES did not consider the branch line along the southwest boundary, where the old rails still exist. The costs of bringing this line back into use are considered to be prohibitive by the applicant. The experience of the Planning Authority where this has been explored elsewhere supports this assumption.

965. The applicant has indicated that using barges to transport the mineral would also not be possible, given that the site is not directly adjacent to a river, and as such the same number of HGVs would have to leave the site to transport the mineral to the nearest barge facilities. These factors are also acknowledged by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

966. There was criticism in some representations about the lack of information on electric/hybrid vehicles. This is considered in more detail in the [Climate Change](#) section.

967. Some representations called for a feasibility study to be conducted to see if a combination of rail and waterborne solutions could be used to minimise the environmental impact as Cemex have an aggregates wharf at Southampton. This idea is acknowledged. However, the Minerals and Waste Authority considers the applicant's assessment of options to be acceptable and based on the costs and level of viability achievable for the proposed development. Therefore, no further assessment work is considered to be required.

*Legal agreement:*

968. The Highway Authority has indicated that the off-site highway impacts have been assessed and demonstrate that the additional vehicle movements, though temporary in nature, would impact the operation of the highway network which is already operating at or close to capacity. Therefore, the

Highway Authority requires that a suitable level of financial contribution is provided to enable access improvement schemes to come forward to help offset this impact. The Highway Authority recommends that a contribution towards active travel measures for the Hamble Lane corridor should be secured via a s106 legal agreement if planning permission is granted.

969. The Highway Authority's response (dated June 2023) highlighted that an agreement has been reached between the Highway Authority and the applicant for a contribution of £500,000 for a scheme to improve active travel measures in the vicinity of the site, most notably by improving walking and cycle access to Hamble Station. The response states that *"the improvement of active travel provision, in particular to Hamble Station, will increase the attractiveness of using alternative modes of transport and potentially off-set the development impact on the Hamble Lane corridor. The scheme consists of footway widening to shared-use standard on the western side of Hamble Lane from the station southwards, crossing improvements and targeted improvements within Hamble village"*. The route for the scheme is identified within the County Council's [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan](#) (LCWIP) for Eastleigh Borough Council. The Highway Authority also advised that the scheme features within the feasibility work undertaken by Hampshire County Council in 2019 as part of the County Council's bid for funding from the Government for wider [Hamble Lane Improvements](#). The focus of the proposed agreement would also help to support the policies and outcomes of [LTP4 \(2024\)](#). It is also proposed that a lorry routeing agreement (stipulating right turn out left turn in) should also be secured via a s106.

970. The HPRG have argued that the £500,000 proposed will not have the impact required to offset impacts. They quote the Atkins [Hamble Lane Traffic Study](#) which estimated that the cost of upgrading Hamble Lane to be in the region of £6.1m. The HPRG have estimated this cost is now in the region of £9m (in 2023). The [Hamble Lane Traffic Study](#) is acknowledged. It is important to note that this was for a much wider scheme for the whole of Hamble Lane. It would be unreasonable to expect a contribution to pay for this estimate due to the temporary nature of the proposal and the level of HGV movements proposed.

971. Many representations criticised the lack of information on what is proposed by way of highway improvements associated with the proposed financial contribution. This included responses from Hamble Parish Council and Paul Holmes MP. Hamble Parish Council included ideas for proposed mitigation (response dated 20 March 2023), which included highway mitigation measures such as improvements to Windhover roundabout), managing access to the site (times), additional public transport measures, modal shift measures,



improvements to the Mallard – Hound roundabout, speed reduction measures, routing strategy and the installation of safety barriers.

972. Hamble Parish Council has highlighted that the lack of detail or indication of what a suitable level of contribution would be, or more importantly the nature of the access improvement schemes for which it is necessary to secure funding, means that the Highway Authority has failed to provide any explanation to the community - or to the planning authority - to enable assessment on whether this mitigation has been achieved. These concerns are acknowledged. In addition, the HPRG also raised significant concerns that the proposed mitigation will do nothing to alleviate the added pressures on Hamble Lane resulting from the development. As the exact schemes are not known in detail, they allege that there is an *“inability to be able to quantify, in any way, the impact of the proposed mitigation and this is a serious failing”*.

973. Information on the exact mitigation schemes proposed to be included in the legal agreement were not submitted directly to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority as part of the Highway Authority representations on the planning application. However, it is clear that the Highway Authority has scoped out potential schemes for the provisions of the legal agreement to deliver and that they consider these to be reasonable. Additional clarification on this matter was sought from the Highway Authority by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. This was in order to understand the basis of calculations of the proposed contribution and how the proposed mitigation schemes fit with mitigating the proposed development. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority understands that this information was issued by the Highway Authority under a Freedom of Information request relating to proposed works. Proposed costs are as follows:

|  |  |  |             |
|--|--|--|-------------|
| Cost of Work (including clearance etc) - 200m of new shared surface plus crossings |  |  | £300,000.00 |
| Preliminaries and Traffic Management 15%   |  |  | £45,000.00  |
| Statutory Undertakers Diversions 10%   |  |  | £30,000.00  |
| Optimism Bias/Contingency 40%  |  |  | £120,000.00 |
| Total  |  |  | £495,000.00 |

Figure 8 - Proposed costs of highway works

974. **Appendix J (Highway mitigation feasibility design)** provides more details of the schemes as they stand. These are summarised in the following table:

|  | <b>Approximate location of proposed works</b>                 |   |  |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|
|  | <i>Between railway station to just beyond the site access</i> | <i>From just beyond site access to location of residents on Hamble Lane</i> | <i>From residents to just past Hamble Primary School</i> | <i>Hamble Primary School to just past Verdon Avenue</i> |
| <b>Proposed works</b>  |   |   |  |   |
| Improved signage   | X   |   |  | X   |
| Bike storage   | X   |   |  |   |
| Investigation into the removal of trees and overgrown vegetation | X   |   |  |   |
| Relocation of utility pole / lamps / bollards                    | X   | X   |  | X   |
| Replacement of kerbs with full height kerbs                      | X   |   | X  |   |
| Footpath widening to 3m  | X   | X   |  |   |
| New raised kerbs   | X   |   |  |   |
| Further consideration of lighting requirements                   | X   |   |  |   |
| Potential for new route to the station                           |   | X   |  |   |
| Introduction of variable width                                   |   | X   |  |   |
| Crossing widened   |   | X   |  |   |
| Relocation of post box   |   | X   |  |   |

|   | <b>Approximate location of proposed works</b>                 |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
|   | <i>Between railway station to just beyond the site access</i> | <i>From just beyond site access to location of residents on Hamble Lane</i> | <i>From residents to just past Hamble Primary School</i> | <i>Hamble Primary School to just past Verdon Avenue</i> |
| Need for topographic survey                   |   | X   | X  |   |
| Tree / vegetation clearance if required       |   |   | X  | X   |
| Toucan signalised junction                    |   |   | X  |   |
| Existing layby converted for parallel parking |   |   | X  |   |
| Proposed raised table and widening            |   |   | X  | X   |
| Relocation of feeder pillar                   |   |   |  | X   |
| Widening of signalised junction               |   |   |  | X   |
| On road cycleway                              |   |   |  | X   |

*Table 8 – Proposed mitigation works (summary)*

975. Whilst it is recognised that the Highway Authority consider the obligation to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is not currently satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to ensure compliance with the regulation 122(2) of the [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#). This follows KC advice which was sought on the viability of the proposed legal obligation. This advice identified that there was insufficient detail of how the requested contribution towards mitigation schemes has been calculated and how it relates to the proposal and therefore how it complies with the tests in regulation 122(2) of the [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#), in particular the test that the contribution is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development (regulation 122(2)(c)). Without compliance with

regulation 122(2), the planning obligation cannot be considered as mitigation against the identified impact of the planning application. On this basis, without the mitigation required by the Highway Authority to offset the impact on the highway, it would be necessary to consider that the proposal was contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) and paragraph 114 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) in so far as it does not encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have not been taken up as part of the development. It is therefore considered to be a ground for refusal.

976. In the event that permission were granted, the importance of the delivery of any proposed works and the timescales would be an important area for the s106 to cover, to give certainty to the applicant and the local community on the allocation of the funds for schemes by the Highway Authority.

*Consideration by the Highway Authority:*

977. Many parties, including Hamble Parish Council and the HPRG have criticised the consideration of the planning application by the Highway Authority. In their response dated 14 December 2023, Hamble Parish Council reiterates *“their considerable concerns at the way the Highway Authority has approached assessing the impacts and the mitigation requirements for this proposal”*. This includes the lack of detailed information on what the financial contribution would be used for.

978. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has considered the Highway Authority response as part of determining the planning application alongside all other responses received and KC advice.

*Conclusion on highways impact:*

979. It is recognised that the potential and perceived highways impact of the proposal is one of the biggest areas of concern for the local community. It is acknowledged that many representations have noted concerns over existing congestion on Hamble Lane and the potential impacts of the proposal. Paragraph 115 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) is clear that *“development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”*. The additional information submitted under Regulation 25 (parts 1 and 2) has satisfied the Highway Authority, and the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, that the proposed access would provide safe access to the site subject to the detailed design process. The off-site impacts have been assessed and it has been demonstrated that the additional trips, though temporary in nature, would impact the operation of the network which is already operating at or close to capacity. Whilst it is

recognised that the proposal will add HGV's onto the highway network, the level of impact is not considered to be unacceptable with mitigation measures applied. Mitigation measures to manage pedestrian safety have also been included. Planning conditions which could be applied in the event that permission is granted include the limitation of HGV movements at school start and finish times, HGV movements, mud on the road, sheeting of vehicles and other associated matters. However, it is clear that to make the development acceptable, a highway contribution is required to enable access improvement schemes to come forward to help offset this impact, together with planning conditions to manage environmental and amenity impacts. As set out above, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is not currently satisfied that sufficient information has been available to ensure compliance with the regulation 122 of the [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#). On this basis, the proposal is recommended for refusal as without the required mitigation in place, the proposal is not acceptable in planning terms and would be contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) and paragraph 114 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#).

#### Restoration and aftercare

980. Restoration of mineral quarry's is essential. Paragraph 221 (Reference ID: 27-221-20140306) of the [NPPG](#) (Minerals) focuses on the *"the return of land following mineral extraction to an acceptable condition, whether for resumption of the former land use or for a new use"*.
981. Policy 9 (Restoration of quarry's and waste developments) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires temporary minerals and waste development to be restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with the development plan. It states that *"temporary minerals and waste development should be restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with the development plan. Restoration of minerals and waste developments should be in keeping with the character and setting of the local area and should contribute to the delivery of local objectives for habitats, biodiversity, or community use where these are consistent with the development plan. The restoration of mineral extraction and landfill sites should be phased throughout the life of the development"*.
982. The site allocation in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) clear that the site should be restored to a combination of grazing, nature conservation, open space, public access and woodland.
983. Policy HA3 (Hamble Airfield) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) states that *"if permission is granted for the extraction of sand and gravel at Hamble Airfield and the extraction takes place, the site shall be restored in accordance with the*

*Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and it shall be retained as an area of accessible countryside and open space with grazing, public access and outdoor recreation facilities laid out to the satisfaction of the Borough Council". Paragraph 6.2.57 of the Local Plan goes on to say that "the restored site would be used appropriately as an area for public recreation and countryside uses as well as for general grazing of agricultural and domestic animals including horses. The Borough Council will be prepared to consider the use of parts of the site for outdoor sports as well as for general public amenity space"* It is important to note that this would be separate to any mineral permission granted at the site. The focus here is whether the restoration of the site is in accordance with the provisions of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

984. Paragraph 216 (h) of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states in relation to the restoration of mineral workings, that it should be ensured that "*worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place*". It goes on to state that at paragraph 217 (e) that mineral planning authorities should "*provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity, to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions. Bonds or other financial guarantees to underpin planning conditions should only be sought in exceptional circumstances*".

985. The [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) provides more detailed guidance on restoration and aftercare of mineral workings. In particular, to ensure that applicants deliver sound restoration and aftercare proposals, paragraph 041 (Reference ID: 27-041-20140306) of the [PPG \(Minerals\)](#) states that "*mineral planning authorities should secure the restoration and aftercare of a site through the imposition of suitable planning conditions and, where necessary, through planning obligations*". There is therefore an inherent policy requirement that mineral workings should have a high standard of restoration.

986. The restoration and aftercare of mineral sites involves a number of key stages including:

1. stripping of soils and soil-making materials and either their storage or their direct replacement (i.e. 'restoration') on another part of the site;
2. storage and replacement of overburden;
3. achieving the landscape and landform objectives for the site, including filling operations if required, following mineral extraction;
4. restoration, including soil placement, relief of compaction and provision of surface features; and
5. aftercare.

*Restoration:*

**987. Appendices H – Concept Restoration Plan and I - Phased Restoration**

**Plan** provide an overview of the proposed restoration. Initially the applicant submitted Vol 1 Appendix 2 Method of Working (parts 1 and 2), Vol 1 Appendix 2 Restoration Plan alongside wider [landscape](#), [ecological](#), [soils](#), [public access](#) and [arboricultural](#) submissions to which the restoration of the site is heavily linked. These areas are covered in more detail in the relevant parts of this commentary section.

988. Additional information was submitted under Regulation 25 (part 1) including [Appendix 2 Restoration Plan](#), [Appendix 2 \(New\) Aftercare & Management Area](#), [Appendix 2 Outline landscape, restoration and aftercare scheme](#), [Appendix 2, Landscape Layout Operational Phase](#), [Phased Restoration Part 1](#), [Phased Restoration Part 2](#), [Appendix 3.2 Outline Landscape Restoration & Aftercare Scheme](#) [Appendix 3.3 \(New\) Estimate for Planting & Restoration Costs](#), [LVIA & Restoration Sections](#) and [LVIA & Restoration Sections \(LVIA2C\)](#). A [Concept Restoration Plan](#), [Phased Restoration Part 1 \(5 Plans\)](#) and [Phased Restoration Part 2 \(5 Plans\)](#) have also been submitted under Regulation 25 (part 2).

989. The Applicant proposes a 5-year aftercare period for each phase of the development. The submitted Aftercare Scheme shows an example of a 5-year period, pending a more detailed scheme being submitted by condition or pursuant to a section 106 (s106) legal agreement.

990. Many concerns were raised in relation to how the site will be restored. These are acknowledged. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

991. There will be new native hedgerows, scrub, and woodland, with existing boundary vegetation remaining and being enhanced.

992. In responding to Regulation 25 (part 1), the County Landscape Architect noted that the revised restoration plans were an improvement on the earlier plan as they now included a line of groups of scrub vegetation across the site linking west to east. However, it was noted that there were still some areas that needed to be addressed. The County Ecologist also initially raised concerns in relation to the restoration of the site.

993. Following the Regulation 25 (part 1) consultation, there were still outstanding concerns related to the wider ecological, landscape and arboricultural aspects of the scheme which had a direct link to the proposed

restoration of the site. Specifically, the applicant requested informal discussion with the County Ecologist and the County Arboriculturist about outstanding concerns. It was clear that any proposed change to the restoration scheme, by association, would go to the heart of the ES. To ensure due process was followed, a further Regulation 25 request was issued which requested amendments to Restoration Scheme to reflect any changes proposed to the ecological scheme, scrub planting distribution and reptile management measures.

994. Following the changes made to the Restoration Scheme, it can be summarised that the restoration is proposed to be to parkland and grazing land, with two small ponds for drainage. The parkland area will be open for public access and the remainder of the site for grazing. There will be new native hedgerows, scrub, and woodland also proposed, with existing boundary vegetation remaining and being enhanced. The restoration specification comprises a mixture of the following elements:

- a mixture of lowland acid grassland;
- lowland mixed deciduous woodland;
- mixed scrub with some smaller areas comprising shallow drainage ponds and fens;
- would also comprise over 1.7km of native hedgerow and over 18,000 trees and shrubs would be planted;
- The north-eastern corner of the site would be restored to an area for community access, with a hedge separating it from the rest of the site. Trees would be planted in this area and the grassland would be managed by cutting. It would be created by a combination of natural plant colonisation, hay strewing and wildflower seeding, and managed via annual livestock grazing and mowing;
- The remainder of the site would be restored to acid grassland with moderate botanical value, created by a combination of natural plant colonisation, hay strewing, wildflower seeding, and managed via annual livestock grazing and mowing;
- There would also be wood edge/dry heath shrub scrub which would be a combination of hawthorn, gorse, and other species, across the site;
- There would be 0.48ha of retained woodland and 2.87ha of new broadleaved woodland, and shallow ponds and marshy grassland for surface water drainage;
- There would also be over 1.7 linear km of hedgerow planted. Retained and new planting would help to screen existing properties; and
- As well as the public access created in the northern corner, the footpath from the south-eastern corner adjoining Satchell Lane would remain and be extended to further south along Hamble Lane, just north of no 108.

995. The applicant has indicated that the restoration scheme has been *“designed with the dual objectives of establishing land uses which are appropriate to this landscape, and also creating new features and habitats of*



*biodiversity value, and of value to the species found in and around the site, contributing to the objectives of the UK, Local and Cemex's own Biodiversity Action Plans".*

996. Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is clear in the fact that it sets out that the site should be restored to “*a combination of grazing, nature conservation, open space, public access and woodland*”.
997. Appendix A of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) also includes a development consideration relating to the phasing programme and working of the site. This has been met by the proposed progressive phasing of the development as documented in the [Method of Working](#). It is estimated that it would take a further six years approximately after cessation of mineral extraction to complete restoration. Restoration phasing will follow an approved phasing plan.
998. The applicant has indicated that all restoration planting will be carried out in the first planting season (November to March) following final placement of soils and reinstatement within each phase. The application also includes information on weed management and planting management e.g. weed free spaces around each tree and shrub.
999. Hamble Parish Council raised concerns about the physical distinguishment between the north and the south of the restoration proposed. It is acknowledged that the northern parts of the site include more complexed features of the scheme including ponds. It is not uncommon for restored sites to be designed with a variety of different areas being focused for specific end uses. The focus here is whether what is proposed is acceptable or not. However, it is also recognised that some of the local concerns relate to the wider site ownership and future potential aspirations for development in this location.
1000. Concerns have been raised about the nature of the proposed restoration and the 5-year aftercare period. This included comments about the 'Community Access Meadow' being too far from the village.
1001. Hamble Parish Council also raised concerns about the impacts of the landowners aspirations on the nature of the restoration proposed. The proposal to restore the site is an essential part of any mineral development. Its location is clearly tied to the proposal to extract mineral in this location.
1002. The HPRG have argued the proposed plans for the restoration of the site once quarrying activities are concluded are insufficient to meet the needs of

existing endangered species. They argue that in the cases of the Skylark, Dartford Warbler and Grasshopper Warbler, the failure to provide adequate grassland, gorse, heather, and other appropriate conditions, will mean these species will be unlikely to return to the airfield. No such concern has been raised by the County Ecologist or Natural England.

1003. The restoration of the site is tied to the availability of inert material. This is covered in more detail in [Need for waste management provision](#).

1004. Planning conditions could be applied to ensure the restoration of the site. The restoration of the site is also linked to requirements for a [Legal agreement](#).

1005. The restoration is proposed to be to parkland and grazing land, with two small ponds for drainage. The parkland area will be open for public access and the remainder of the site for grazing. Therefore, the proposed restoration meets the requirements of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). In response to concerns previously raised in relation to aftercare, the applicant amended the restoration plan at the Regulation 25 (part 2) stage. In response, the County Ecologist conclude that the revised scheme addressed previous comments and was therefore satisfied that post-development, a mosaic of better-quality habitats will be created and retained on site through the restoration of the site.

*Aftercare:*

1006. 'Aftercare' is the operations necessary to maintain restored land in a condition necessary for an agreed afteruse to continue. The proposed afteruse is what the site is used for following restoration.

1007. The applicant initially proposed a 5-year aftercare period for each phase of the development. The submitted Aftercare Scheme shows an example of a 5-year period. The applicant would be responsible for implementing the restoration and aftercare scheme in accordance with any permission granted or associated legal agreement. Assuming soil placement, seeding and planting operations are completed in the first phase of working by 30 September 2025, the expected programme of aftercare for the first restored areas is expected to run as follows (it is acknowledged that there may be some slippages to the below dates given the anticipated start date of 2023 has passed). The below is therefore only an indication.

| <b>Year of Aftercare</b> | <b>Dates</b>                       |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1                        | 1 October 2025 – 30 September 2026 |
| 2                        | 1 October 2026 – 30 September 2027 |

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| 3      | 1 October 2027 – 30 September 2028                       |
| 4      | 1 October 2028 – 30 September 2029                       |
| 5      | 1 October 2029 – 30 September 2030                       |
| Year 5 | 1 October 2030 – potential day of release 1 January 2023 |

*Table 9 – Indicative aftercare periods*

1008. In the event that permission is granted, a planning condition would be included for the submission of a more detailed aftercare scheme. An alternative is that this could instead be made pursuant to the proposed s106 legal agreement which will require a 30 year management period.

1009. The applicant has set out general aftercare objectives in the [Landscape, Restoration and Aftercare Scheme](#). This will include:

- Maintenance visits to be kept to a minimum;
- Soil analysis to be undertaken where deemed necessary due to performance of restoration planting and seeding;
- No fertiliser or soil ameliorant applications within the acid grassland and wetland areas unless required by results of soil analyses;
- Applications of herbicides or pesticides only to be carried out by prior agreement; and
- Where required, post and wire fencing will be erected and maintained to all areas of tree and shrub planting.

1010. Furthermore, an annual programme of management is proposed. Any plants dying during the five-year aftercare period will be replaced during the next planting season. A planning condition would be applied relating to this requirement in the event that permission is granted.

- Fencing - Will be comprised of treated timber, galvanised steel plain wire, galvanised steel barbed wire to discourage climbing over (see);
- Vegetation clearance / Tree, hedgerow, and other planting (see **Appendix F – Landscaping Plan**);
- Reptile fencing; and a
- New permissive grass footpath.

1011. An [Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement](#) was also submitted alongside a number of other documents including a [Tree Survey Constraints & Protection Plan](#) and a [CAVAT Valuation Rev A](#).

1012. [Soils Vol 2 Chapter 14 - Soils and ALC \(Reg 25 28 November 2022\)](#) and associated appendices [9.1](#) and [9.2](#) were also prepared. Soil [Boreholes](#) and [Soil Analysis](#) was also undertaken.

1013. [Lighting Layout - Aggregate Processing Plant](#) and [Lighting Layout - Haul Road Car Park & Weighbridge](#) have been submitted as part of the application. The site will only require lighting during the evenings in winter, until 5pm. Lighting is proposed on the access road to the plant site and within the plant site itself, both of which are away from sensitive receptors. No flood lighting would be used, and all lighting would be angled downwards with low lux levels and be sensitive to ecological corridors. In the extraction areas, the only lighting would be that of vehicles.
1014. The new access to the site will remain in the long term for site maintenance purposes. The field access gates located around the site will be 3.6m wide five-bar gates. Timber chicanes to control access on and off site from the footpaths will be constructed. Fencing within the restored site will be undertaken as set out as specified on the restoration plans. Post and timber rail fencing will be installed alongside post and stockproof wire fencing is detailed on the [Timber Posts & Stockproof Wire Fence](#) Plan. As set out in [Visual impact and landscape](#) and [Arboriculture](#), planning conditions could be applied on fencing and their long term maintenance would also need to be included in the s106 agreement.
1015. The HPRG highlighted their view that the proposal for the land to be *“managed by grazing shows a total lack of understanding and planning”*. They argue that cattle will destroy young scrub and other plants before they can become established. It is important to note that conservation (managed) grazing is proposed and fencing is proposed to address this issue.
1016. The aftercare of the site also relates to the maintenance of public access. Permissive access is proposed as part of the scheme. This is covered in more detail in [Public Access](#).
1017. To ensure the delivery of aftercare, an annual site meeting between the applicant, any tenant of the restored land, and the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority will be held each year of the aftercare period. Each of these aspects would be conditioned if permission is granted.
1018. Concerns were raised about who is paying for the management of this site after the site has finished. Paragraph 036 (Reference ID: 27-036-20140306) of the [PPG](#) (Minerals) is clear. The *“responsibility for the restoration and aftercare of mineral sites, including financial responsibility, lies with the minerals operator and, in the case of default, with the landowner”*. The responsibility for post restoration matters will be covered by the s106 if permission is granted and will be the responsibility of the applicant. This will ensure that all restoration and aftercare requirements are completed in accordance with the legal agreement.

1019. Concerns were also raised about the delivery of the restoration and aftercare in relation to the potential for the site to be used for housing at some point in the future. These are acknowledged. It is widely known that the airfield site is owned by Persimmon Homes. The responsibility of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is to ensure a suitable and sustainable restoration and aftercare of the site based on the mineral proposal. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority cannot consider any potential future use of the site.

*Legal agreement:*

1020. As already identified, the long term ecological management of the site is essential and there will be a requirement for a s106 agreement for the long-term management and fencing of the site in the event that permission is granted. This will have clear links to the restoration and the aftercare of the site. It is anticipated that 30-year management of the site following the aftercare period will be secured via s106 agreement so logically a more detailed restoration and aftercare scheme would align better with the s106 agreement. This approach would be taken forward in the event that permission was granted and will cover the entire site addressing concerns previously raised by Hamble Parish Council and other parties. More information on this aspect is covered in the [legal agreement](#) section of the report.

*Conclusion on restoration and aftercare:*

1021. Phased working and restoration has been proposed by the applicant. It is acknowledged that the proposed restoration of the site has evolved since the planning application was submitted. This is not uncommon for quarry sites as consultees often provide comment and guidance on aspects relating to restoration. It is considered that the condition of the existing site would be improved through the restoration of the site. The evolution of the restoration scheme has ensured that the proposal is in keeping with the character and setting of the local area, providing ecological enhancement in particular. Permissive access is also proposed to ensure more formalised community use takes place in the future. The proposed legal agreement will ensure the delivery of the restoration and aftercare of the site, alongside other matters such as the enhancement of [Ecology](#) and [Public Rights of Way and access](#). The restoration scheme before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this stage is considered to be acceptable and meets the requirements of the site allocation. On this basis, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of quarry's and waste developments) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). It is acknowledged that through the proposed restoration of the site, wider hydrological concerns have been raised. These are covered separately in [Impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters and flooding](#).

## Socio-economic impacts

1022. Paragraph 7 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that achieving sustainable development is the primary objective of the planning system. Paragraph 8 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that the “*purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives (economic, social and environmental), which are independent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways, so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives*”. In particular, the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) sees the economic role of planning as “*to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure*”. Furthermore, the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) incorporates planning policy in relation to the socio economic effects of development. Specifically, paragraph 85 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that: “*Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development*”.
1023. Paragraph 193 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) advises that “*planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities. Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established*”.
1024. With specific reference to minerals policy, paragraph 215 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*it is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation*”. Paragraph 217 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*When determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy*”.
1025. [Chapter 8 of the Planning Statement](#) includes the applicant’s assessment of the economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal. These can be summarised as follows:
1. Sustainable supply of local building materials;
  2. Helping Hampshire meet the demand for aggregates;
  3. Employment;
  4. Business rates;

5. Aggregate Levy;
6. Biodiversity Benefits;
7. Public Access and New Footpath; and
8. Flood Storage capacity.

1026. Many socio-economic issues were raised as part of representations. This included concerns raised by Hamble Parish Council and Paul Holmes MP. These are acknowledged. A summary of the issues raised in relation to this area are documented in the [Representations](#) section of the report.

*Social impacts:*

1027. Specific concerns were raised by some local businesses such as the Inspiration Marine Group / Michael Schmidt & Partners about the impact on employee and customer travel times caused by an increase in traffic on Hamble Lane as a result of the proposal. It is stated that any notable increase in traffic using Hamble Lane is likely to make “a dramatic difference” to travel times. In terms of employees, it is suggested that longer commutes to work (in this case typically +45 mins) will have a negative impact on employee mental health. It is argued that an increase in journey times for customers could affect the business level and viability.

1028. As stated above in the section on [Highways impact](#), the TA addendum demonstrates that the traffic associated with the proposed development, albeit temporary, for the lifetime of the development, would have a maximum impact on two-way total traffic flows on the local highway network of 3% in the morning peak (On Hamble Lane in the vicinity of the site access) and 2% for the evening peak. In addition, it has been suggested by the applicant that HGV movements could be restricted during peak hours (am and pm) associated with the school day which would ameliorate the impact of increased traffic at this peak period. This could be secured by planning condition. Further mitigation would be secured through a planning obligation to secure active travel improvement schemes to offset the highways impacts of the development.

1029. In relation of the impact of the development on mental health, this is dealt with in more detail in the [Human Health](#) section of this report. The submitted [HIA](#) does refer to ‘journey distress’ which can result in feelings of discomfort, annoyance, frustration and tension. The [HIA](#) concludes that there are no highway safety or transport objections to the proposal, and the proposal will not have a ‘severe’ residual highways or unacceptable road safety impact. On this basis, the [HIA](#) concludes that in terms of journey distress, the proposal will have no significant adverse effect.

*Economic impacts:*

1030. The importance of mineral working in relation to the economy is clearly set out in the [LAA](#).

1031. Paragraph 5.96 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) confirms that the Borough has a reasonably prosperous economy and that there is a need to maintain the prosperity and make provision for future growth. Paragraph 6.2.44 confirms that Hamble has areas of employment with a major aviation business, a large industrial estate and an oil storage depot fronting Southampton Water, Boatyards and marinas front the River Hamble estuary.

1032. The HPRG noted (response dated 4 May 2023) that they felt that the County Council has failed in its duty to consider the impact of the planning application on the existing and, currently, thriving business community. They states that *"to ignore the views of these businesses and risk the negative financial implications declared would go against planning policy and also the obligation of the council in their duty of care towards these businesses"*. All views submitted to the County Council as part of the planning process have been considered when preparing this officers report. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has a duty to consider whether the proposal is a sustainable minerals development and that means considering all environmental, social and economic aspects when coming to a recommendation.

Sustainable supply of local building materials and helping Hampshire meet the demand for aggregates:

1033. It is acknowledged that the extraction of sand and gravel has a role in the economy. The potential need for the proposal has already been set out in [Demonstration of need for mineral resource](#). The [LAA](#) identifies a significant increase in planned infrastructure, with a number of housing and transport projects planned which are expected to result in increased aggregate demand within Hampshire. These include major residential development, a number of bypass projects planned or under construction, junction improvements and upgrades to the M27, and the Junction 9 improvement to the M3. The applicant indicates that the location of Hamble Airfield will help to supply these projects.

1034. It is noted that the Minerals Product Association estimates that *"the construction of a typical new house uses up to 50 tonnes of aggregates - from the foundations through to the roof tiles"*. Further aggregates are required for the construction of any supporting infrastructure and in the maintenance and refurbishment of the existing housing stock and other types of development. But broadly, based on this figure of 50 tonnes, the proposed development



would provide enough aggregate for the construction of approximately 30,000 homes.

1035. Many representations noted that the proposal is focused on profit and the perception that this is at the expense of the local community and environment. It is acknowledged that as a business, the applicant will have some financial benefits associated with the proposal. Whether the proposal is acceptable from an environmental, social and wider economic perspective is addressed in the relevant parts of this commentary section of the report.

Employment and business rates:

1036. The proposal would result in full time jobs for around seven staff at the quarry. Hamble is not proposed to replace another Cemex site in the vicinity and as such these will be new jobs that are created in this area, with staff sourced locally. The applicant has also indicated that during operation, there is further opportunity for indirect employment, which includes contract drivers exporting aggregate from the site and importing inert restoration materials, and contractors associated with site set up, maintenance and repairs on the site. There will be further contractors associated with restoration again once the proposal reaches this stage. The applicant has also indicated that induced employment is another type of indirect employment which would also be created, by those employed by the site spending their wages received on local goods and services, thereby sustaining local businesses such as shops and garages. As the employees are likely to live locally to the site, the majority of their income is likely to enter the local economy, further sustaining other employment.

1037. The HPRG claimed that the quarry would be of no lasting economic benefit to the local community. As mineral quarrying is a temporary activity, it is acknowledged that any impact in terms of jobs is potentially temporary. Whilst the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority accepts that the proposed development would not provide significant employment, there is no policy requirement to govern this.

Business rates and Aggregate Levy:

1038. The site would contribute business rates annually, which would be paid to the local authority in which the application site is located. In addition, the applicant would pay an aggregate levy of approximately £2 for each tonne of aggregate extracted which would contribute approximately £500,000 in aggregate levy per year to HM Revenue and Customs.

1039. Paragraph 193 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that planning “*decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing*

*businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established”.*

1040. Significant concerns were raised as part of the consultation in relation to potential negative economic impacts. This included concerns over the significant and lasting damage to the economy and established businesses, and disruption to businesses. Concerns were also raised that the quarry would discourage investment in the area which would impact the long-term future sustainability of the village and make Hamble a less desirable place to live, work and visit. Other impacts were also noted in relation to the impact on Hampshire Police Headquarters, nearby farm shops, the marinas and wider marine economy and tourism. All these issues are acknowledged.

1041. There has been some criticism from the HPRG that the County Council has failed in its duty to consider the impact of the planning application on the existing and, currently, thriving business community. For clarity, there is not a statutory duty for the planning authority to consult directly with nearby businesses unless it is considered they fall within the scope of neighbourhood notification. In this instance, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority increased the areas of public consultation to make sure that they included known businesses like the marinas. As with all consultation responses, the views of the marinas and all other businesses who have engaged in the planning process have been considered when formulating this report.


1042. The HPRG commissioned Neuron Capital Ltd to prepare a business survey (Hamble Business Survey 2023) of local business on the Hamble Peninsula. The survey was sent to 198 businesses, and there were 62 responses (31%). The survey was sent in batches between 21 March and 27 April 2023. In summary:

- Those responding represent £148m of annual turnover and 1800 employees;
- Extrapolated this could mean an economic impact of over £450m;
- Whilst known for its marine industry, Hamble is home to a significant number of large manufacturing and scientifically important businesses.
- 9 respondents (15%) employ over 50 employees and 2 respondents employ over 200 employees. 7 businesses report a turnover of more than £10m;
- 48% of businesses, representing 420 employees and £44m of turnover said they would consider relocating if the quarry goes ahead (a number already have plans in place);
- 69% of respondents say sales will be negatively or very negatively impacted;

- 76% of respondents say they expect costs to be negatively or very negatively impacted;
- 85% say they expect business operations to be negatively or very negatively impacted;
- 76% say they expect employee recruitment and retention to be negatively or very negatively impacted.

1043. The survey highlighted what the study group thought would be the most impact of the quarry to the business as noted below.

Q5a - Thinking about the possible impacts of the proposed quarry, which are the areas of most concern to your business? Select all that apply - Selected Choice



Q6a - impact

58 Responses




Figure 9: Extracts from the Hamble Business Survey 2023 in relation to impact of quarry operations on local business

1044. It was noted through the survey that *“businesses already report difficulties in recruitment related to the already congested route onto the Hamble Peninsula. The additional traffic congestion is a significant concern for existing businesses on the peninsula, not just those that marine related. The additional congestion will increase travel times for staff, deliveries, boat owners/visitors, and persons carrying out vessel maintenance and cleaning etc. This will reduce business efficiency, staff recruitment and retention of most businesses on the peninsula, and the overall attractiveness of the area to boat owners, other businesses and visitors, which play an important part in the local economy throughout the year”*.

1045. The survey results are noted. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority welcomes the survey as part of the evidence base for the planning application.

1046. A significant number of representations considered that the presence of an open quarry in the area would have a potentially significantly impact on the viability of nearby local businesses and the economy. This is because of the perception of visual harm and harm to health due to the proximity of the proposed development to existing local businesses, in particular the local marinas, and the perception that a quarry will inevitably make the area less attractive to visit and thereby have a detrimental effect on the tourist economy. Many mineral extraction operations occur in areas or tourism or in designated areas such as National Parks whose economies are particularly reliant on tourism and there are examples of this already operated in Hampshire.

1047. Representations, including those received from Genesis Planning, argue that this lack of direct consultation with local businesses is an important omission in the assessment of the planning application and, as such, the ES does not present an accurate position of the likely full economic effects, both positive and negative, arising from the proposed development. Drawing on the findings of the Neuron Capital Ltd business survey, it is stated that the main concern to local business is traffic related particularly congestion on Hamble Lane and the effect this has on staff recruitment and retention, deliveries, visitors/clients access etc. Traffic and highways issues have been dealt with in more detail in the [Highways impact](#) section of this report. Whilst the concerns about the lack of direct consultation with local businesses, referred to in the Genesis Town Planning submission and other third party correspondence, is acknowledged, it is considered that the points raised in these letters of representation have been addressed in the appropriate chapters of the ES.

Marine industry:

1048. In relation to the marine economy, paragraph 5.107 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) makes specific reference to the boatyards on the River Hamble. It goes onto

confirm that these *“make an important contribution to the economy of the borough and the sub-region and are an important for tourism and recreation. It is important that they are retained in this use, and that they do not have an adverse impact on the sensitive environment of the river.”* Paragraph 6.2.40 confirms that the village had its origins in marine related activities and its connections to River Hamble remain very strong with boat building and repair and considerable sailing activity remaining major influences on the local economy and a valued part of local heritage. Paragraph 6.2.48 confirms that the village is also popular with tourists and the sailing community but suffers from inadequate parking, particularly for regattas or other events. This limits the economic benefits that could arise from its river frontage, marine activity and heritage interest.

1049. British Marine highlights the potential impact of the proposal on the historic village of Hamble-le-Rice and the River Hamble. It was noted that *“both the village and the River Hamble are of huge importance to the UK’s growing leisure marine industry and the associated leisure, retail and tourism sector”*.

1050. It was also noted that the Covid pandemic led to a surge in staycations with more people choosing to take up boating and other watersports benefiting areas such as the Hamble. It was noted that *“this has been a significant boost to the leisure marine industry”*. Members of the British Marine remain very concerned the application, in particular with regards to impacts on the highway network. Concerns were also raised that potential noise and dust will deter people from wanting to keep their boats on Hamble which could jeopardise the economic sustainability of well-established local marine and leisure businesses that are so important to the economy. Taking leisure marine businesses alone, they estimate that *“115 businesses stretching along the two miles from Hamble Point Marina (accessed via Hamble Lane) to Mercury Yacht Harbour would be adversely affected by this proposed development. Currently those businesses provide 479 FTE jobs and generate £59.91m in revenue, contributing around £23.96m in GVA to the local economy”*.

1051. It is acknowledged that there is a significant concern from the marine industry and wider businesses in relation to the potential and perceived disruption associated the proposal. With the relevant mitigation measures set out for amenity this is considered not to cause a significant impact. The acceptability in terms of highways impact is covered in the [Highways impact](#) section.

1052. It is acknowledged that the [HILCA](#) notes that *“a sensitive approach to marketing the Hamble valley as a tourist destination so as to retain its natural*

*charm and wildlife interest with visitor demands.*” This was noted for the whole of the Hamble River Valley area.

*Environmental Impacts:*

1053. More information on *Biodiversity, restoration and public access benefits* can be found in the sections on [Ecology](#), [Restoration](#), [Public Access](#).

*Other matters:*

1054. Concerns have been raised that the proposal may be a detractor to parents who may be considering enrolling pupils at the nearby schools. However, there is no clear evidence that these concerns would be likely to translate into material land use considerations if permission were to be granted. In addition, the proposal was regulated in accordance with the suggested planning conditions and an Environmental Permit issued by the Environment Agency if permission were to be granted.

1055. Policy HA2 of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) allocates approximately 4.7 hectares of land at the Mercury Marina and the Mercury Yacht Harbour and Holiday Park, Satchell Lane, Hamble/Hound as a marina, a range of holiday accommodation and car parking and boat storage. This site is approximately 150m to the east of Hamble Airfield on the other side of Satchell Lane. Whilst acknowledged as a site allocation, a planning application for such uses has yet to be submitted to Eastleigh Borough Council.

1056. Local businesses including the marinas raised concerns that the public consultation undertaken with local businesses has been very limited. It was noted that the applicant had not had direct and meaningful consultation with the main employers to ascertain the nature of their businesses and their potential concerns. As such a full understanding of the operational activities and concerns of existing businesses has not been established. Whilst this point is recognised, local businesses have had an opportunity to provide comments as part of the planning process and indeed these have been considered by the Minerals Planning Authority.

*Conclusions on socio-economic impacts:*

1057. Paragraph 217 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) states that “*When determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy*”. Mineral quarry plays an important role in the economy. Taking all economic matters into account, whilst the perception of harm to the local economy can be a material planning consideration, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that, in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, there would be no material harm to economic development interests in the locality. Experience elsewhere also

shows this to be the case. Whilst the information submitted for consideration on economic matters is welcomed, there is no conclusive evidence to make any counter judgement of the effect of the proposal on existing economic development in the local area. The addition of employees at the quarry for the duration of the development would in the view of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority make a modest contribution to the local economy with some secondary or multiplier economic effects alongside wider business rates. The consideration of wider social impacts are set out in more detail in other aspects of this commentary.

### Community engagement

1058. Community engagement in the planning process was encouraged as part of pre application discussions, prior to the application being submitted. More information on the pre application process is set out in the section on [Other matters raised](#).

1059. There was significant concern reported through representations about the lack of engagement from the applicant as part of the planning process. This included a lack of opportunity to engage with the applicant, a lack of information, a lack of time for the local community to engage, and a lack of communication from the applicant to homeowners regarding how the proposal will affect them. Concerns were also raised by Hamble Parish Council and Paul Holmes MP on this matter.

#### *Pre-application engagement:*

1060. The applicant held four meetings with stakeholders between 2018 and 2021, prior to the submission of the planning application in December 2021. These were with Hound Parish Council, Hamble Parish Council and with Councillor Keith House (in capacity as County Councillor and Eastleigh Borough Council member).

1061. An additional stakeholder meetings took place in November 2021 in order to provide an opportunity to meet with the project team and discuss the initial proposals.

1062. The applicant ran a virtual consultation exercise between 11th November 2021 and 25th November 2021 prior to the application being submitted. It is also acknowledged that virtual briefings of nearby Parish Councils were organised by the applicant following the submission of the application (in early 2022).

*During the application process:*

1063. The applicant prepared a [Statement of Community Involvement](#) and associated appendices as part of the submission. These documented a number of factors such as:

- Engagement with Planning Officers;
- Initial stakeholder meetings;
- Dedicated application [website](#);
- Virtual public exhibition and how comments received were considered in the application; and
- Post-Application Consultation.

1064. All residents / businesses within 100 metres of the proposal were sent a direct neighbourhood notification letter by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. This neighbourhood notification area was then significantly extended by case officers to account for the known interest in the site after the preparation of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). As previously set out, consultation was in excess of requirement set out in the adopted [Hampshire Statement of Community Involvement](#). It is acknowledged that even by extending the neighbourhood notification area, this would not capture all of those who previously responded during the plan preparation process.

1065. There has been significant criticism that the applicant had failed to effectively engage with the community in many representations received since the application has been formally submitted. This includes comments from Hamble Parish Council, the HPRG and Paul Holmes MP. A lack of engagement and willingness by the applicant to consult with the community face-to-face and to allow residents and parish councils the opportunity to scrutinise their proposal were factors raised in many representations. Hamble Parish Council noted in their response (dated 13 February 2023) that they had offered to arrange a public meeting which was declined by the applicant. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority have been advised that the applicant approached Hamble Parish Council for a meeting and to offer a site visit to another quarry in January 2023, towards the end of the Regulation 25 (part 1) consultation but this was not taken forward as a public meeting was requested which was not agreeable to the applicant.

1066. It is recognised that the Covid-19 pandemic has impacted the applicant's ability to engage at earlier stages in the planning process. The [Statement of Community Involvement](#) notes that *"In light of the ongoing public health risks associated with the pandemic, and in line with the company's global policy on avoiding public gatherings of more than ten people given COVID-19, Cemex deployed virtual methods to consult the community regarding its proposals for*



*the former Hamble Airfield. Given the emergence of the Omicron variant and the Government's imposition of work-from-home orders and other measures, Cemex is reassured that its precautionary public health approach to this robust consultation was advisable and justified".*

1067. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is disappointed that further consultation exercises were not arranged in a timely fashion, despite advice, since the relaxation of Covid-19 measures. However, it is noted that pre-application advice is not statutory and the acceptability of what has taken place is not an area which can be considered in decision making.

1068. Concerns were also raised about the length of the public consultation period. All consultation periods have been undertaken in accordance with the [adopted Hampshire Statement of Community Involvement](#). There has been some criticisms of the timings of the Regulation 25 (part 1) consultation in December 2022. It is acknowledged that the consultation period ran over the Christmas period. As a result, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority extended the consultation period by a further 2 weeks prior to its commencement. Furthermore, Regulation 25 consultation (part 2) was also extended slightly as the period was on the lead-up to the Christmas break.

1069. There was criticism that the Harbour Authority were not approached or informed of the proposal. The HPRG raised concerns about the lack of consultation and commitment on a position from the River Hamble Harbour Master. It was noted that the group has concerns about the welfare of the river and the due diligence of the Harbour Master in managing this and communicating with the berth holders. Following receipt of the planning application, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority discussed the application with the Harbour Master, and this resulted in correspondences being submitted from the Harbour Master in relation to the planning application.

### Community benefits

1070. A frequent concern of communities that host or might host minerals and waste development is that there are no immediate benefits to 'compensate' for the inconvenience that occurs. In Hampshire there is already a precedent for minerals or waste operators to contribute to local communities' funds. However, this process lies outside of the planning system.

1071. Policy 14 (Community Benefits) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) encourages negotiated agreements between relevant minerals and waste

developers/operators and a community as a source of funding for local benefits. These benefit packages can comprise bilateral arrangements between the main parties. Agreements can be between operators and local bodies such as Parish Councils or residents' associations. Whilst the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority encourages these agreements, it cannot be party to such agreements and the agreements cannot be considered in decision making. The lack of benefits for the local community was raised as a matter of concern in some representations.

1072. Paragraph 5.59 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that there is an expectation that all 'major' minerals and waste development will be accompanied by a site Liaison Panel. Panels should be setup between the site operator, Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, other interested parties and community representatives to facilitate effective engagement with stakeholders in the interests of promoting communication between the site operator and local community. If permission is granted there would be an expectation that a Panel would be set up. An informative would be included to this effect.

#### Other matters raised

##### *Links to other National and International documentation:*

1073. Many representations received highlight a Private Members' Bill sponsored by Paul Holmes MP entitled [Planning \(Quarries\) Bill](#) which seeks to introduce a presumption in planning decision-making against approving quarry development close to settlements and that the decision on a quarry application will only be made by the Secretary of State. To date, this Bill has had its first reading in Parliament at this time. Therefore, no weight can be applied in the current determination process.

1074. A number of representations also raised concerns that the proposal does not meet Defra Policy Paper and UN Development Goals, in particular numbers 3, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. These documents do not form current planning advice. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has assessed this application in light of the relevant planning policy and guidance.

##### *Principle of the site allocation:*

1075. The principle of the sites allocation in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) has been questioned by parties including Paul Holmes MP, Hamble Parish Council and the HPRG. The allocation of the site was subject to an independent public examination by a Government appointed planning inspector in 2012/2013. Comments have been received about how much further development along Hamble Lane since the adoption of the plan and that the information has been

that the allocation was based on is now out of date. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority acknowledge that there has been a number of new developments off Hamble Lane and towards the Windover roundabout since the plan's adoption. It is important to note that the site remains a site allocation in the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The focus now is whether the planning application (and its associated supporting documentation) submitted in response to this site allocation is acceptable or not.

*Pre application discussions:*

1076. Paragraph 39 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) state that “*early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community*”. It goes onto say at paragraph 40 that “*local planning authorities have a key role to play in encouraging other parties to take maximum advantage of the pre-application stage. They cannot require that a developer engages with them before submitting a planning application, but they should encourage take-up of any pre-application services they offer. They should also, where they think this would be beneficial, encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community and, where relevant, with statutory and non-statutory consultees, before submitting their applications*”.

1077. The County Council has a [pre application service](#) which is actively promoted. In this case, pre application discussions took place in 2016 in advance of the planning application being submitted.

*ES content:*

1078. Many representations noted that there were perceived flaws in the evidence submitted to support the application. As already noted, this decision report provides an assessment on the ES submitted.

*Officers' visits:*

1079. The HPRG requested further information on the number of visits planning and highway officers have made to Hamble. This information was provided. From the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority perspective, the case officer (s) and support staff have visited the site on a number of occasions since the application has been submitted. Some visits have related specifically to the planning application, others have involved the display of sites notices. It is the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's understanding that Highway Officers have also visited the site on a number of occasions

*Regulation 25 (part 2) submissions:*

1080. A number of responses received from the HPRG questioned the timescale for the submission of the Regulation 25 documentation in accordance with the original Regulation 25 letter. There is no legislative requirement to set a timeframe for submission of additional information and it very much depends on the nature of information that has been requested. Notwithstanding this, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority maintains it is useful to include a timeframe in the Regulation 25 letter to provide a focus for all parties. In this case, it was not possible for the applicant to submit all the information within that exact timeframe. It would have been unreasonable to refuse additional time to allow the applicant to provide this information or to refuse an application based on lack of information which could be reasonably provided and would be provided at the appeal stage. Similarly, some of the additional information was requested by consultees, which meant it was necessary to reconsult formally and await those comments.

1081. The HPRG criticised the format of the Regulation 25 (part 2) submissions and associated consultation. They noted that *“over 40 documents (were) published – However it is quite difficult to track them all the way they have been published across two tabs on the website”*. ES documentation is complexed by its nature. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority tried to organise the website tabs to make it as easy for users to view as possible, so that the documents linked to the relevant parts of the ES. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority also asked the applicant to provide a list of documents to help this process. Electronic copies of the documentation was also sent to the HPRG.

*Clarification responses:*

1082. The applicant has the ability to submit clarification responses as part of the planning process. Indeed, the applicant has submitted a number of clarification responses during the planning process as well as responses to consultation responses received. Some clarification responses were received alongside the submission of Regulation 25 documents, some were stand alone. There has been criticism of this by the HPRG on the grounds that these responses have not been subject to formal public consultation. Where clarification was received alongside Regulation 25 document, these were published as part of the consultation. It is important to note that a formal public consultation is only required on matters which have been requested under Regulation 25 of the [EIA Regulations](#). Any clarification responses received by the applicant have been published on the application webpage for completeness. Interested parties had the opportunity to provide comment on these documents should they have wished to do so. Indeed, in the case of the HPRG, representations received often touched on clarification matters.

*Lateness of consultee responses:*

1083. Many representations, in particular from Hamble Parish Council raised the fairness of the consultation process given the late arrival of consultation responses, in particular from the Highway Authority. Whilst responses outside of the consultation periods are not ideal, the response focus are for the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to consider. However, for some parties, including Hamble Parish Council and the HPRG, they may have wanted to have sight of the responses before preparing their responses. Any further comments or observations on late consultation responses from other parties have been considered when they have been made to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority outside of the dedicated consultation period.

*Lack of evidence of issues being raised by the group and other consultees being dealt with:*

1084. The HPRG raised concerns that there was a lack of evidence of issues they raised and other consultees being dealt with. In accordance with the [adopted Statement of Community Involvement](#) (2023), it is not a requirement of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to respond to representations received. However, officers do have a duty to consider all those which are received as part of the processing and determining of the planning application. The preparation of the officer's report sets out what issues have been raised, what the planning authorities' judgement on these are and what impact this has on the decision.

*Length of time to determine the planning application*

1085. The length of time to determine the planning application has been raised as an area of concern. The planning application was submitted on 29 December 2021. Following validation, the application was subject to public consultation in accordance with the [adopted Statement of Community Involvement](#). The concerns raised by many, including Hamble Parish Council about the amount uncertainty caused by the planning application and the length of time it has taken to determine it are noted.

1086. It is acknowledged the timescale for determining the planning application gives a degree of uncertainty to local communities when major planning applications are being determined. Mineral proposals by their very nature are complexed Environmental Impact Assessment applications that take time to move through the planning process. They often include stages of further information requests (Regulation 25) to ensure that a robust recommendation can be set out for the Regulatory Committee to consider. Paragraph 38 [NPPF \(2023\)](#) requires that planning authorities approach decisions on proposed development in a positive way and “*work proactively with applicants*”. The

applicant engaged in pre-application discussions with the Minerals and Waste Authority, as already detailed. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority exercised its duty under Regulation 25 of the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#) in requesting further information to enable its full and proper consideration of the likely environment effects of the proposed development.

1087. In the case of the proposal at Hamble Airfield, this application has also resulted in an unprecedented level of public representations which have all needed to be processed and reviewed by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority to ensure due process has been followed.

1088. Any new quarry proposal (as a major minerals development) will be determined by the Regulatory Committee. A proposal for a new quarry or extension to a quarry would not be determined under delegated powers. This is because the scale and complexity of such proposals are significant. As is that case with Hamble Airfield, there is also a significant level of public interest which warrants a Regulatory Committee decision.

1089. The focus of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has been to prepare a robust report and associated recommendation for the Regulatory Committee to consider. The last stage of public consultation was completed on 19 February 2024. Updates to the report was made and KC advice has been sought. The planning application has been reported to the first available committee after this process has been completed.

*Potential for the site to be worked over a much longer period*

1090. Minerals developments by their very nature are temporary developments. It is acknowledged that in some instances they can be worked over a significant period of time. The timescales for the proposal are clearly set out in the planning application. Concerns have been raised through representations about the fact that there is no guarantee that the timescale could not be further extended. These concerns are acknowledged. However, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority can only consider the proposal before it at this time, and on its merits. What could or may happen in the future cannot be considered. In the event that the timescales for the development would need to be extended, a variation of any permission granted or indeed a further planning application (if required) would be required.

*Potential for the site to be developed for other users:*

1091. The potential for the site to be developed for other uses e.g. housing was raised by many representations. Concerns included that the area has seen significant housing developments in recent years and could not sustain any further housing. These concerns are noted. The Minerals and Waste Planning

Authority can only consider the planning application before it. What the site could be developed for at a later date cannot be taken into consideration when considering this current proposal.

*Schools and doctor surgery places:*

1092. Concerns were raised in some representations that there are not enough school places or doctors' surgeries locally. These concerns are recognised. However, it is not considered to be directly relevant to the proposal to extract mineral.

*Increase in Council Tax for the roads:*

1093. Some representations included the demand to increase Council Tax for the roads. Whilst these comments are noted, they are not considered to be directly relevant to the planning application.

*Collaboration between the applicant and the local community:*

1094. Some comments noted that the local community should work with the applicant to make the development work for the residents. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority supports applicants and communities collaborating. Paragraph 5.54 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) highlights that the "*Hampshire Authorities would support minerals and waste development being subject to bilateral arrangements between developers and communities for local funding benefits*". Policy 14 (Community benefits) states that the "*Hampshire Authorities encourage negotiated agreements between relevant minerals and waste developers/operators and a community as a source of funding for local benefits*". These benefit packages will comprise bilateral arrangements between the main parties. Agreements would be between operators and local bodies such as Parish Councils or resident's associations. The relevant planning authority cannot be party to such agreements because planning decisions must be impartial and made on planning grounds alone.

1095. Another opportunity for parties to come together is a liaison panel. More information on this aspect is set out in [Community benefits](#).

*Prior notification:*

1096. In the event that permission is granted, a condition could be applied to ensure the applicant provides prior notice (14 days) of the commencement of operations. The Minerals and waste Planning Authority would also expect that members of a Liaison Panel to be informed of the commencement of works.

*Monitoring of minerals and waste permissions:*

1097. If permission were granted, the Site would be inspected by officers in the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's Monitoring and Enforcement team to ensure compliance if permission is granted. The Environment Agency would

also inspect the site as part of monitoring the Environmental Permit.

### Non-material planning issues raised in representations

1098. A number of representations have raised concerns as part of the planning process which although acknowledged, are not material to the planning process. These include the following matters:

#### *Weight of public opinion:*

1099. As set out in the [Representations](#) section, there is significant public opposition to the proposal. The weight of public opinion (level of objections) is not material to decision making. Material planning matters raised in objections are, where they are relevant, have been documented in this report.

#### *Applicant reputation:*

1100. Concerns were raised that the applicant cannot be trusted to abide by regulations, rules, legislation. Some indicated that the applicant has a poor reputation at other Hampshire quarry sites for not keeping to their obligations. This opinion is not shared by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority with Cemex being one of the most established mineral operators working in the county. An application has to be considered on its merits.

#### *Impact on house prices:*

1101. Matters such as the potential impact on house prices or the saleability of properties have been raised in representations. These are acknowledged and the concerns of residents noted. However, as set out in national planning guidance, the impact of a development on these aspects cannot be considered a material consideration in decision-making.

#### *Health and other compensation:*

1102. Representations relating to the request for compensation due to the perceived health issues associated and other associated impacts. Compensation matters are not material to this decision.

#### *Threat of Judicial Review:*

1103. Eastleigh Borough Council and the HPRG have threatened to judicially review the decision on a number of grounds. The potential threat of judicial review of any decision made is not a material consideration in decision-making.

#### *Site ownership:*

1104. Representations included comments that the site is owned by Persimmon Homes and therefore, it is inevitable that even more development will ensue following extraction and restoration of the site. The Minerals and Waste



Planning Authority can only determine the planning application as submitted and on its merits. The potential for the site be to be used for other and future uses is not relevant.

*Site use:*

1105. Many comments received related to the desire to turn the airfield into a country park. This is not relevant to the decision as it is not part of the current proposal.

Legal agreement

1106. Paragraph 57 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#). This states that “*Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:*

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- b) directly related to the development; and*
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development”.*

1107. Section 122 of the [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations \(2010\)](#) also translates these tests.

1108. A [Draft Heads of Terms for S106](#) was submitted by the applicant under Regulation 25 (part 1) alongside an associated [Access Plan](#). This covered the ongoing aftercare and management of restored land and traffic management during mineral extraction.

1109. In light of the matters raised by consultees, in the event that planning permission is granted, a legal agreement should cover the following areas:

- A lorry routing agreement restricting HGVs to a right turn out / left turn in manoeuvre;
- An appropriate contribution towards active travel measures for the Hamble Lane corridor;
- Long-term ecological and restoration management;
- The location of fencing and its long term maintenance; and
- Delivery of permissive access for 30 years.

1110. Some comments received from parties including the HPRG indicate that the applicant have no rights over a Section 106 agreement as they are not the landowner. It is important to note that whilst the landowner will be a signatory, all other interested parties including the applicant (as well as highways, countryside service etc) will also be a signatory. A section 106 is a legally binding document, for all signatories, for the term it is signed for.

1111. For the reasons outlined in the [Highways impact](#) section of the report, the acceptability of the proposed contribution for highways is questioned at this stage.

## Conclusions

1112. The proposal is for the extraction of sharp sand and gravel with restoration to grazing land and recreation using imported inert restoration materials, as well as the erection of associated plant and infrastructure and the creation of a new footpath and an access onto Hamble Lane at the former Hamble Airfield. The proposal also relates to a site allocation for mineral extraction as set out in Part 3 of Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

1113. The proposal is considered to meet a need for sharp sand and gravel in the South Hampshire market area. Great weight is given to minerals extraction as set out in paragraph 217 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#), bearing in mind they can only be worked where they are found. It is recognised that the 7 years landbank requirement for Hampshire is currently met by capacity at permitted sites. However, it is important to note that the landbank is only a minimum requirement and that the majority of permitted supply is currently located in the New Forest market area. There is concern that the landbank of permitted reserves is currently made up of a number of permissions which are currently not active or yet to be implemented. This is identified as an area of concern in the most recent Hampshire LAA. The site provides an opportunity to feed aggregate directly into the South Hampshire market where there is a known demand.

1114. The proposal, with mitigation, is considered to be acceptable from a landscape, ecological, archaeological and visual impact perspective. The proposed restoration and aftercare scheme is also considered to be acceptable. On balance, with mitigation measures and the application of planning conditions, impacts on public health, safety and amenity are considered to be acceptable.

1115. Changes proposed to the restoration scheme at Regulation 25 (part 2) have resulted in further concerns being raised by the LLFA and a holding objection remains in place. The current proposals for the restored site are shown to have a different profile to the existing site, which means that adjacent ditch networks would receive disproportionate amounts of runoff from the restored site. This is not considered acceptable and the restored site should be profiled to mimic the existing site. On this basis, the proposal is not considered to be in accordance with part 'a' of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the

[HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#).

1116. It is recognised that the perceived potential highway impact is one of the main areas of local concern. The evidence before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority does not indicate that the development would result in an unacceptable impact on the local highway network. However, at this time, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has concerns on the lack of detailed mitigation schemes identified by the Highway Authority associated with the proposed legal agreement. On the basis of the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) and paragraph 114 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#) in so far as it does not encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have not been taken up as part of the development.

1117. Taking all matters into account and based on the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this time, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable flooding impact contrary to the requirements of Part 'h' of Policy 10 (Protecting health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#). It is also considered that the proposal is not in accordance with Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) and paragraph 114 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#). For these reasons, the proposal is not considered to be a sustainable minerals development in accordance with Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and paragraph 11 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#). It is therefore recommended that planning permission is REFUSED for the reasons outlined in **Appendix A**.

## **Recommendation**

1118. That subject to confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call-in the planning application for determination, planning permission be REFUSED for the reasons set out below and as outlined in **Appendix A**:

- a) On the basis of the information submitted and notwithstanding the proposed mitigation, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable flooding impacts contrary to the requirements of Part h of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) as well as Policy DM5, (Managing flood risk) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022);

- b) On the basis of the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022) and paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in so far as it does not encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have not been taken up as part of the development.

1119. On the basis of the above reasons, the proposal, in its current form, is considered to be contrary to Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). Therefore, the proposal does not constitute a sustainable minerals development.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Reasons for Refusal

Appendix B – Committee Plan

Appendix C – Layout Plan

Appendix D – Phasing Plan

Appendix E – Access Plan

Appendix F – Landscaping Plan

Appendix G – Drainage Design

Appendix H – Concept Restoration Plan

Appendix I - Phased Restoration Plan

Appendix J - Highway mitigation feasibility design

Other documents relating to this application:

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/Planning/Display/HCC/2021/0787>

**REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:**

**Links to the Strategic Plan**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:</b> | No |
| <b>People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:</b>              | No |
| <b>People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:</b>                  | No |
| <b>People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:</b>     | No |

**OR**

**This proposal does not link to the Strategic Plan but, nevertheless, requires a decision because:**  
the proposal is an application for planning permission and requires determination by the County Council in its statutory role as the minerals and waste or local planning authority.

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents</b>  |                          |
| <p><b>The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)</b></p> |                          |
| <u>Document</u>  | <u>Location</u>          |
| HCC/2021/0787<br>EA112<br>Hamble Airfield<br>(Proposed extraction of sand and gravel, with restoration to grazing land and recreation using imported inert restoration materials, the erection of associated plant and infrastructure and the creation of a new footpath and access onto Hamble Lane   | Hampshire County Council |



## **EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:**

### **1. Equality Duty**

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

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

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

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Reasons for refusal**

Taking all matters into account, and on balance, based on the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority at this time, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable flooding impact contrary to the requirements of Part 'h' of Policy 10 (Protecting health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022). It is also considered that the proposal is not in accordance with Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the [EBLP \(2022\)](#) and paragraph 114 of the [NPPF \(2023\)](#). The proposal is therefore not considered to be a sustainable minerals development in accordance with Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) and paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

## **Recommendation**

Subject to confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call-in the planning application for determination, that planning permission be REFUSED for for the reasons set out below:

- a) On the basis of the information submitted and notwithstanding the proposed mitigation, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in unacceptable flooding impact through the working and restoration of the site contrary to the requirements of Part 'h' of Policy 10 (Protecting health, safety and amenity) and Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) as well as Policy DM5 (Managing flood risk) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022);
- b) On the basis of the information before the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S11 (Transport infrastructure) of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2022) and paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in so far as it does not encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport and appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have not been taken up as part of the development.


On the basis of the above reasons, the proposal, in its current form, is considered to be contrary to Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) and paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) due to the uncertainty in relation to flood risk impacts. Therefore, the proposal does not constitute a sustainable minerals development.

### **Note to Applicants**

1. In determining this planning application, the Minerals Waste Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner in accordance with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012.
2. This decision does not purport or convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or any other Acts, including Byelaws, orders or Regulations made under such acts.

0 150 300 600 M

# Location Plan



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016

**Proposed extraction of sand and gravel, with restoration to grazing land and recreation using imported inert restoration materials, the erection of associated plant and infrastructure and the creation of a new footpath and access onto Hamble Lane, Hamble Airfield**

Regulatory Committee

Date: 15 May 2024

1:12,000




Application No: CS/22/92277 Site Ref: EA11P **Page 323**



**Hampshire**  
County Council

Universal Services

This page is intentionally left blank




**NOTES**

- X
- 

**LEGEND**

DEFINITIVE LINE OF FP1 - ABANDONED



**REFERENCE DRAWINGS**

| DRAWING No.     | REV     | DESCRIPTION          |
|-----------------|---------|----------------------|
| 17813040-SK-006 | 313A23  | PROPOSED SITE ACCESS |
| SP21756         | 2758P21 | UTILITY REPORT       |
| 0520            | XXX     | ORDNANCE SURVEY DATA |

**REVISIONS**

| REV | DESCRIPTION                     | DATE    | DRN | CKD |
|-----|---------------------------------|---------|-----|-----|
| P   | SITE ENTRANCE LOCATION ADJUSTED | 08AUG23 | MJM | AG  |
| N   | COMMENTS INCORPORATED           | 24NOV22 | MJM | AG  |
| M   | COMMENTS INCORPORATED           | 24NOV22 | MJM | AG  |
| L   | SCREENING BUND UPDATED          | 07DEC21 | MJM | AG  |

Based on Ordnance Survey Land Line data with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown copyright. Licence N° 100018131

**ENGINEERING SERVICES**  
 CEMEX UK Operations,  
 CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,  
 Harry Weston Road, Coventry, CV3 2TY,  
 Telephone 01788 517000

|              |              |             |                            |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Drawn By     | MJM          | Company     | CEMEX UK MATERIALS LIMITED |
| Date         | 14 JULY 2021 | Site        | HAMBLE QUARRY              |
| Scale(s)     | 1:2000 @ A1  | Project     | AGGREGATE PROCESSING PLANT |
| Chd/Model(s) | AG           | File        | SITE PLAN                  |
| Site Ref.    | XXXXX        | Drawing No. | TD 21030                   |
|              |              | SHT         | 1 OF 3                     |
|              |              | Rev         | P                          |

The information contained in this drawing is the property of CEMEX. It should not be reproduced partially or totally without written authorisation from CEMEX

This page is intentionally left blank



- Legend**
- Site Boundary
  - Extraction Boundary
  - Phase Boundary
  - Conveyor Alignment
  - Perimeter Path
  - Area To Be Extracted
  - Plant Site / Haul Road
  - Undergoing Extraction
  - Undergoing Restoration Infilling
  - Restored / Final Levels
  - Soils Storage Screening Bunds
  - Definitive line of FP1 (abandoned)



|                |                               |                                   |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Models         | Drawn from                    | 21-12_HAMBLE_PHASING OVERVIEW.LSS |
|                | Overlay 1                     | OS Vector.IPF                     |
|                | Overlay 2                     |                                   |
|                | Overlay 3                     |                                   |
|                | Overlay 4                     |                                   |
| Revision Notes | Method of Working : Version 7 |                                   |

Based on Ordnance Survey data with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown copyright 2021. Licence N° AL100005237

**FISHER GERMAN**  
 Minerals Department  
 Fisher German LLP  
 The Estate Office, Norman Court  
 Ivanhoe Business Park  
 Ashby de la Zouch, LE65 2UZ  
 Telephone 01530 412821

|          |                         |
|----------|-------------------------|
| Drawn By | Client                  |
| TRG      | CEMEX UK Operations Ltd |

|          |                         |
|----------|-------------------------|
| Date     | Site                    |
| 03.10.23 | Land at Hamble Airfield |

|           |                          |
|-----------|--------------------------|
| Scale(S)  | Project                  |
| 1:4000 A3 | Sand & Gravel Extraction |


|               |                                    |
|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Chkd/Model(s) | Title                              |
| FP 129936-028 | Method of Working Phasing Overview |

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| Site Ref. | Drawing No.                       |
| HAM       | 21-12_HAMBLE_PHASING OVERVIEW.LSS |


This page is intentionally left blank



**KEY:**  
— SITE BOUNDARY  
- - - HIGHWAY BOUNDARY  
● TREES TO BE REMOVED



BH 21.01  
O 20.06



REPRODUCED FROM THE ORDNANCE SURVEY MAP WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE. THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE. © CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED.

DRAWING ISSUED FOR FEASIBILITY CONSIDERATION AND PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY. DRAWING NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION. I-TRANSPORT LLP ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR ERRORS MADE BY CLIENTS OR CONTRACTORS. DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE TAKEN FROM FIGURED DIMENSIONS ONLY. COM REQUIREMENTS CONSIDERED AT FEASIBILITY STAGE ONLY. FURTHER CONSIDERATION REQUIRED BY DETAILED DESIGN TEAM.

| REV | DATE     | BY | DESCRIPTION                   | CHK | APP |
|-----|----------|----|-------------------------------|-----|-----|
| F   | 01.09.22 | JB | TREE SURVEY UPDATED           | IN  | IN  |
| E   | 13.06.22 | JD | VISIBILITY SPLAYS AMENDED     | IN  | IN  |
| D   | 06.05.22 | JB | TOPO ADDED AND ACCESS AMENDED | IN  | IN  |
| C   | 07.04.22 | JB | VISIBILITY SPLAYS AMENDED     | IN  | IN  |
| B   | 30.11.21 | SH | VISIBILITY SPLAYS AMENDED     | IN  | IN  |

| FOR INFORMATION |             |           |      |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|------|
| SCALE @ A2:     | CHECKED:    | APPROVED: |      |
| 1:500           | IN          | IN        | IN   |
| FILE REF:       | DRAWN:      | DATE:     |      |
| ITB13040        | JB          | 10.08.21  |      |
| DRAWING No:     | PROJECT No: |           |      |
| ITB13040-SK-006 | ITB13040    |           |      |
| PROJECT No:     |             |           | REV: |
| ITB13040        |             |           | F    |

CEMEX


PROPOSED SITE ACCESS

HAMBLE AIRFIELD



The Square, Basing View,  
 Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4EB  
 www.i-transport.co.uk  
 Tel: 01256 637940

This page is intentionally left blank



**KEY:**

- APPLICATION BOUNDARY
- EXISTING Public Right of Way
- PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH: Operational + Post-Restoration
- PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH (A-G) - at final restoration
- NEW NATIVE HEDGEROW (Hawthorn, Hazel, Blackthorn, Holly) Includes a proportion of Feathered trees
- RETAINED AREA OF GRASSLAND / SCRUB For Habitat Enhancement
- SOIL STORAGE / SCREEN MOUNDING (Seeded with grassland, farmland bird mix or nectar mix)
- PROPOSED SECURITY FENCING (For new vehicular access only)
- PROPOSED STOCKPROOF FENCING (For operational quarry boundary) - refer to detail L/FE/2
- PROPOSED TIMBER POST AND RAIL FENCING (For improvement of boundary to Spitfire Way Playground) - refer to detail L/FE/21
- PROPOSED TIMBER POST AND RAIL CHICANE (For Access points A, B, C, E, G, H and I) - refer to detail L/FE/27

**PLANTING SCHEDULE**

| TREES  | SIZE              | NOTES   | New Woodland          |         | New Hawthorn Scrub |                       | New Gorse   |                       | New Hedge   |                       | Advance east of site | Restoration NE site | Total  |
|--|-------------------|---|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------|
|  |                   |   | Area - m <sup>2</sup> | Advance | Restoration        | Area - m <sup>2</sup> | Restoration | Area - m <sup>2</sup> | Restoration | Area - m <sup>2</sup> |                      |                     |        |
| <i>Acer campestre</i> (Field Maple)          | 0.45-0.6m t/s     |   | 4                     | 49      | 89                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     |        |
| <i>Betula pendula</i> (Silver Birch)         | 0.35-0.4m c/g     | Woodland (75% area) to be planted at 2.5m c/s | 10                    | 123     | 222                |                       |             | 5                     | 200         |                       |                      |                     | 545    |
| <i>Betula pubescens</i> (Downy Birch)        | 0.35-0.4m c/g     |   | 2                     | 25      | 44                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 69     |
| <i>Carpinus betulus</i> (Hornbeam)           | 0.45-0.6m t/s     | Scrub (50% area) at 2.0m c/s                  | 1                     | 12      | 22                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 34     |
| <i>Malus sylvestris</i> (Crab Apple)         | 0.35-0.45m t/s    |   |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 270                 | 82     |
| <i>Prunus avium</i> (Wild Cherry)            | 0.45-0.6m t/s     | Tubex tree shelters                           | 2                     | 25      | 44                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 2                    | 108                 | 33     |
| <i>Quercus robur</i> (Pendunculate Oak)      | 0.35-0.45m t/s    | c/g denotes cell                              | 45                    | 554     | 1,000              |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 270                 | 82     |
| <i>Sorbus aucuparia</i> (Rowan)              | 0.45-0.6m t/s     | grown stock                                   | 6                     | 74      | 133                |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 412    |
| <i>Sorbus torminalis</i> (Wild Service Tree) | 0.45-0.6m t/s     |   | 2                     | 25      | 44                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 69     |
| <b>TOTAL TREES</b>                           |                   |   | 72                    | 887     | 1,598              | 15                    | 615         | 5                     | 200         | 22                    | 1,188                | 362                 | 4,850  |
| <b>SHRUBS</b>                                |                   |   |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     |        |
| <i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)              | 0.45-0.6m t/s     | *denotes species to be planted as a           | 12                    | 149     | 266                |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 8                    | 432                 | 132    |
| <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> (Hawthorn)         | 0.45-0.6m t/s     |   | 8                     | 99      | 178                | 60                    | 2,460       |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 200                 | 660    |
| <i>Cytisus scoparius</i> (Broom)             | 0.45-0.6m t/s     | shrub edge field side                         |                       |         |                    |                       |             | 25                    | 1,000       |                       |                      |                     | 1,000  |
| <i>Euonymus europaeus</i> (Spindle)          | 0.45-0.6m Trans.  | Hedgerow interplanting                        |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 270                 | 83     |
| <i>Fraxinus alnus</i> (Alder Buckthorn)      | 0.35-0.45m Trans. | at 5 plants per linear metre, double          | 1                     | 12      | 22                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 34     |
| <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> (Holly)               | 0.45-0.6m c/g     |   | 3                     | 37      | 66                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 3                    | 162                 | 50     |
| <i>Prunus spinosa</i> (Blackthorn)           | 0.45-0.6m Trans.  | staggered row                                 |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 8                    | 432                 | 132    |
| <i>Rosa canina</i> (Dog Rose)                | 0.35-0.45m Trans. |   |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 270                 | 83     |
| <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> (Bramble)            | Self set          |   |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 558    |
| <i>Sambucus nigra</i> (Elder)                | 0.45-0.6m Trans.  |   | 2                     | 25      | 44                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 270                 | 82     |
| <i>Salix caprea</i> (Goat Willow)            | 0.45-0.6m Trans.  |   | 1                     | 12      | 22                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 2                    | 108                 | 33     |
| <i>Salix cinerea</i> (Sallow)                | 0.45-0.6m Trans.  |   | 1                     | 12      | 22                 |                       |             |                       |             |                       | 5                    | 200                 | 234    |
| <i>Viburnum opulus</i> (Guelder Rose)        | 0.35-0.45m Trans. |   |                       |         |                    |                       |             | 60                    | 2,375       |                       | 2                    | 108                 | 33     |
| <i>Ulex europaeus</i> (Gorse)                | 0.35-0.45m c/g    |   |                       |         |                    |                       |             |                       |             |                       |                      |                     | 2,375  |
| <b>TOTAL SHRUBS</b>                          |                   |   | 28                    | 345     | 620                | 85                    | 3,485       | 95                    | 3,775       | 78                    | 4,212                | 1,288               | 13,725 |
| <b>TOTAL TREES &amp; SHRUBS</b>              |                   |   | 100                   | 1,232   | 2,218              | 100                   | 4,100       | 100                   | 3,975       | 100                   | 5,400                | 1,650               | 18,575 |

CR denotes species for Climate Resilience within Planting Areas. A denotes Climate Resilience species for Additional or Alternative - final mixes to be confirmed in detail prior to phase restoration planting

**Programme of Implementation**

To be carried out in November-March planting season for bare root stock. Prior to planting, any areas of compaction to be broken up to a depth of 450mm. Trees and shrubs to be notch planted.

| Revisions | By | Description                                    | Date     |
|-----------|----|--|----------|
| B         | AW | Planting schedule amended                      | Nov 2023 |
| A         | AW | Buffer Zone Dimensions added, planting amended | Jul 2022 |

Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131

**CEMEX**

Planning Department  
CEMEX UK Operations Limited  
CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,  
Harry Weston Road, Coventry  
Warwickshire CV3 2TY  
www.cemex.com

Drawn By: A W Company: CEMEX UK Operations Limited  
Date: 1 Nov 2023 Site: HAMBLE AIRFIELD  
Scale(s @A1): 1 : 2,500 Project: SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION  
Chkd: Title: LANDSCAPE LAYOUT PLAN (OPERATIONAL PHASE)  
Site Ref: Drawing No: 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-LAND Rev B

This page is intentionally left blank

**Linear Drainage Feature**


- Drain
- Infiltration Trench
- Restored Surface Water
- Catchment Boundaries

**Esso Pipeline**

- Esso Pipeline
- 20m Easement
- MP gas pipe

**Infiltration Test Location**

- Infiltration Test Location
- Infiltration Basin
- Attenuation Basin (no infiltration)
- Site Boundary



|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| 1:5,000 @ A3 | Date: 03/11/2023 |
| Drawn: RP    | Checked:         |
| Appendix A   | Rev: B           |

0 250 500 m

Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2023  
Contains data from OS 2023

# HAMBLE QUARRY

## Updated Restored Drainage Layout

Client: **CEMEX**

**Stantec**

Page 333

Document Path: C:\Users\puckersgill\Documents\Projects\Hamble\_2\Hamble\_2.aprx

This page is intentionally left blank



| TREES  | SIZE             | NOTES  | New Woodland |         | New Hawthorn |           | New Gorse   |           | New Hedge   |        | Advance east of site |       | Restoration NE site | Total  |
|--|------------------|--|--------------|---------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------|----------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|
|  |                  |  | Area - m2    | Advance | Restoration  | Area - m2 | Restoration | Area - m2 | Restoration | Length | Restoration          |       |                     |        |
| <i>Acer campestre</i> (Field Maple)          | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    |  | 4            | 49      | 89           |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 1,048  |
| <i>Betula pendula</i> (Silver Birch)         | 0.35-0.4m c/g    | Woodland (75% area) to be planted at 2.5m c/s      | 10           | 123     | 222          |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 545    |
| <i>Betula pubescens</i> (Downy Birch)        | 0.35-0.4m c/g    | Scrub (50% area) at 2.0m c/s                       | 2            | 25      | 44           |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 69     |
| <i>Carpinus betulus</i> (Hornbeam)           | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    |  | 1            | 12      | 22           |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 34     |
| <i>Malus sylvestris</i> (Crab Apple)         | 0.35-0.45m 1/s   |  |              |         |              | 5         | 205         |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 210    |
| <i>Prunus avium</i> (Wild Cherry)            | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    | Tuber tree shelters                                | 2            | 25      | 44           |           |             |           |             | 8      | 270                  |       |                     | 82     |
| <i>Quercus robur</i> (Pedunculate Oak)       | 0.35-0.45m 1/s   | c/g denotes call                                   | 45           | 554     | 1,000        |           |             |           |             | 2      | 108                  |       |                     | 331    |
| <i>Sorbus aucuparia</i> (Rowan)              | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    | grown stock  | 6            | 74      | 133          |           |             |           |             | 5      | 270                  |       |                     | 82     |
| <i>Sorbus torminalis</i> (Wild Service Tree) | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    |  | 2            | 25      | 44           |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 69     |
| <b>TOTAL TREES</b>                           |                  |  | 72           | 887     | 1,598        |           |             |           |             | 22     | 1,188                |       |                     | 3,680  |
| <b>TOTAL SHRUBS</b>                          |                  |  |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 4,850  |
| <i>Corylus avellana</i> (Hazel)              | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    | *denotes species to be planted as a                | 12           | 148     | 266          |           |             |           |             | 8      | 432                  |       |                     | 1,183  |
| <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> (Hawthorn*)        | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    | shrub edge field side                              | 8            | 99      | 178          |           |             |           |             | 200    | 40                   | 2,160 |                     | 5,757  |
| <i>Cytisus scoparius</i> (Broom)             | 0.45-0.6m 1/s    | Hedgerow interplanting                             |              |         |              |           |             |           |             | 25     | 1,000                |       |                     | 1,000  |
| <i>Eurostachys scirpoides</i> (Stivale)      | 0.45-0.6m Trans  | at 5 plants per linear metre, double staggered row | 1            | 12      | 22           |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 83     |
| <i>Fraxinus alnus</i> (Alder Buckthorn)      | 0.35-0.45m Trans |  | 3            | 37      | 66           |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 34     |
| <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> (Holly)               | 0.45-0.6m c/g    |  |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 50     |
| <i>Prunus spinosa</i> (Blackthorn*)          | 0.45-0.6m Trans  |  |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 132    |
| <i>Rosa canina</i> (Dog Rose*)               | 0.35-0.45m Trans | Self set   |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 83     |
| <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> (Bramble)            | 0.45-0.6m Trans  | Will seed in from margins                          |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 550    |
| <i>Sambucus nigra</i> (Elder)                | 0.45-0.6m Trans  | Will seed in from margins                          |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 421    |
| <i>Salix caprea</i> (Goat Willow*)           | 0.45-0.6m Trans  | Will seed in from margins                          |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 380    |
| <i>Salix cinerea</i> (Salix)                 | 0.45-0.6m Trans  | Will seed in from margins                          |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 230    |
| <i>Viburnum opulus</i> (Guelder Rose)        | 0.35-0.45m Trans |  |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 141    |
| <i>Ulex europaeus</i> (Gorse)                | 0.35-0.45m c/g   |  |              |         |              |           |             |           |             |        |                      |       |                     | 2,375  |
| <b>TOTAL SHRUBS</b>                          |                  |  | 29           | 345     | 620          |           |             |           |             | 85     | 3,485                |       |                     | 12,888 |
| <b>TOTAL TREES &amp; SHRUBS</b>              |                  |  | 100          | 1,232   | 2,218        |           |             |           |             | 100    | 4,100                |       |                     | 18,575 |

| Broad Habitat Type                          | HABITAT TYPE   | HABITAT POST RESTORATION (ha) |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Woodland and forest                         | Other Woodland (Broadleaved) retained woodland areas           | 0.480                         |
|   | Other Woodland (Broadleaved) - restoration planting            | 2.870                         |
| Heathland and shrub                         | Existing Scrub   | 4.380                         |
| Heathland and shrub                         | Gorse Scrub and Hawthorn Scrub                                 | 6.460                         |
| Grassland                                   | Other Lowland Acid Grassland                                   | 36.740                        |
|   | Other Lowland Acid Grassland - Enhancement to unworked margins | 6.390                         |
| Grassland                                   | Other Neutral Grassland  | 1.840                         |
| Lakes                                       | Temporary lakes, ponds and pools                               | 0.800                         |
| Urban                                       | Bare Ground - Site Access                                      | 0.080                         |
| <b>AREA TOTAL:</b>                          |  | <b>60.040</b>                 |
| Individual Trees                            | Individual Trees   | 0.450                         |
| <b>HABITAT POST RESTORATION (linear km)</b> |  |                               |
| Hedgerow                                    | New Native Species Rich Hedgerow                               | 1.019                         |
| Hedgerow                                    | Enhancement of Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees         | 0.180                         |
| Hedgerow                                    | Enhancement of Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees         | 0.550                         |


| KEY :                | DESCRIPTION   |
|----------------------|---|
| [Red dashed line]    | APPLICATION BOUNDARY  |
| [Green hatched area] | EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland  |
| [Black dashed line]  | PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)  |
| [Blue dashed line]   | EXISTING Public Right of Way  |
| [Yellow dashed line] | Undesignated Footpath Link  |
| [Orange dashed line] | PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface  |
| [Grey hatched area]  | DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE  |
| [Green hatched area] | NEW NATIVE HEDGEROW (Hawthorn, Hazel, Blackthorn, Holly) Includes a proportion of Feathered trees to provide shade for grazing animals  |
| [Green hatched area] | WOOD EDGE / DRY HEATH SHRUB SCRUB - Mix 1: Hawthorn (incl other species eg: Blackthorn, Holly (H), Mix 2: Gorse (incl other species eg: Broom; to deter access, to direct path users. Planted as small 10-100m² clumps within designated areas to give an overall 50% cover |
| [Green hatched area] | WOODLAND AND WOOD EDGE - Broadleaved; Planted as medium 100-1000m² clumps within designated areas to give an overall 75% cover  |
| [Green hatched area] | PROPOSED DRAINAGE INFILTRATION ZONE (Trench backfilled with permeable material or infiltration basin - refer to SWD strategy)   |
| [Green hatched area] | DENOTES UNWORKED BUFFER - SCRUB AND GRASSLAND RETAINED AND MANAGED DURING THE OPERATIONAL PHASE; SOURCE FOR NATURAL RECOLONISATION OF ADJACENT GRASSLAND AREAS  |
| [Green hatched area] | FOOTPATH CORRIDOR - EXISTING AND NEW HEDGEROW WITH WILDFLOWER GROUND FLORA RETAINED AND EXTENDED BY NATURAL COLONISATION  |
| [Green hatched area] | RESTORED ACID GRASSLAND HABITAT OF MODERATE BOTANICAL VALUE created by a combination of natural plant colonisation, hay strewing and wildflower seeding, and managed via annual livestock grazing and mowing  |
| [Green hatched area] | NORTH-EASTERN PARKLAND FOR COMMUNITY ACCESS: Restored Acid Grassland habitat of moderate botanical value created by a combination of natural plant colonisation, hay strewing and wildflower seeding, and managed via annual mowing   |
| [Blue hatched area]  | EPHEMERAL SHALLOW POND (UP TO 1.5-2.0m) For surface water drainage - periodically dry. Marginal vegetation to establish by natural colonisation, seeding and plug planting  |
| [Green hatched area] | MARSHY GRASSLAND / POND-EDGE VEGETATION: Microtopography - Localised Scrapes and Shallows +/- 0.3-1.0m to create additional habitat   |

| Revisions | Drawn By     | Company                                   |
|-----------|--------------|---|
|           |              | CEMEX UK Operations Limited               |
|           | Date         | 6 Nov 2023                                |
|           | Site         | HAMBLE AIRFIELD                           |
|           | Scale(s) @A1 | 1 : 2,500                                 |
|           | Project      | SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                |
|           | Chkd         | Title                                     |
|           |              | CONCEPT RESTORATION PLAN                  |
|           | Site Ref.    | Drawing No. 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-REST Rev B |



This page is intentionally left blank





**KEY:**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM


LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)

PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES



| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY<br><a href="http://www.cemex.com">www.cemex.com</a> |   |
| Drawn By<br><b>A W</b>  | Company<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                  |
| Date<br><b>7 Nov 2023</b>   | Site<br>HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1<br><b>1 : 2,500</b>  | Project<br>SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                   |
| Chkd  | Title<br>AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN<br>(OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 1</b> |
| Site Ref.   | Drawing No.<br><b>21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A</b>                   |



**KEY :**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDED WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM


LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)

PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES



| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>CEMEX</b>   |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY <span style="float: right;">www.cemex.com</span> |   |
| Drawn By<br><b>A W</b>   | Company<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                  |
| Date<br><b>7 Nov 2023</b>  | Site<br>HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1<br><b>1 : 2,500</b>   | Project<br>SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                   |
| Chkd   | Title<br>AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN<br>(OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 2</b> |
| Site Ref.  | Drawing No.<br><b>21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A</b>                   |



**KEY :**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDED WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM


LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)

PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES



| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY <span style="float: right;">www.cemex.com</span> |   |
| Drawn By<br><b>A W</b>   | Company<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                  |
| Date<br><b>7 Nov 2023</b>  | Site<br>HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1<br><b>1 : 2,500</b>   | Project<br>SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                   |
| Chkd   | Title<br>AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN<br>(OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 3</b> |
| Site Ref.  | Drawing No.<br><b>21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A</b>                   |





Revisions

Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY <span style="float: right;">www.cemex.com</span> |  |
| Drawn By   | A W Company CEMEX UK Operations Limited                    |
| Date   | 7 Nov 2023 Site HAMBLE AIRFIELD                            |
| Scale(s) @A1   | Project SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                         |
| Chkd   | Title AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN (OPERATIONAL PHASES) PHASE 4 |
| Site Ref.  | Drawing No. 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A                |

- KEY :**
- APPLICATION BOUNDARY
  - EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland
  - PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)
  - EXISTING Public Right of Way
  - PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface
  - DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE
  - PLANT SITE
  - BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES
  - STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING
  - OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM
  - LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)
  - PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES





**KEY :**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM

LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)

PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES




| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |

**CEMEX**  
 Planning Department  
 CEMEX UK Operations Limited  
 CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,  
 Harry Weston Road, Coventry  
 Warwickshire CV3 2TY www.cemex.com

|              |            |             |   |
|--------------|------------|-------------|---|
| Drawn By     | A W        | Company     | CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                 |
| Date         | 7 Nov 2023 | Site        | HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1 | 1 : 2,500  | Project     | SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                  |
| Chkd         |            | Title       | AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN (OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 5</b> |
| Site Ref.    |            | Drawing No. | 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A                             |

This page is intentionally left blank



**KEY :**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM


LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)

PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES



| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY<br><a href="http://www.cemex.com">www.cemex.com</a> |   |
| Drawn By<br><b>A W</b>  | Company<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                  |
| Date<br><b>7 Nov 2023</b>   | Site<br>HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1<br><b>1 : 2,500</b>  | Project<br>SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                   |
| Chkd  | Title<br>AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN<br>(OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 6</b> |
| Site Ref.   | Drawing No.<br><b>21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A</b>                   |



**KEY:**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM

LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)


PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES



| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>CEMEX</b>   |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY <span style="float: right;">www.cemex.com</span> |   |
| Drawn By<br><b>A W</b>   | Company<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                  |
| Date<br><b>7 Nov 2023</b>  | Site<br>HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1<br><b>1 : 2,500</b>   | Project<br>SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                   |
| Chkd   | Title<br>AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN<br>(OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 7</b> |
| Site Ref.  | Drawing No.<br><b>21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A</b>                   |





**KEY:**

APPLICATION BOUNDARY

EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland

PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)

EXISTING Public Right of Way

PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface

DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE

PLANT SITE


BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES

STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING

OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM


LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)

PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES




| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131 |  |


|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>CEMEX</b>  |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY<br><a href="http://www.cemex.com">www.cemex.com</a> |   |
| Drawn By<br><b>A W</b>  | Company<br><b>CEMEX UK Operations Limited</b>                         |
| Date<br><b>7 Nov 2023</b>   | Site<br><b>HAMBLE AIRFIELD</b>  |
| Scale(s) @A1<br><b>1 : 2,500</b>  | Project<br><b>SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION</b>                          |
| Chkd  | Title<br><b>AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN (OPERATIONAL PHASES) PHASE 7b</b> |
| Site Ref.   | Drawing No.<br><b>21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A</b>                 |



| Revisions  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131   |  |
| <b>CEMEX</b>   |  |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY <span style="float: right;">www.cemex.com</span> |  |
| Drawn By   | A W Company  |
| Date   | 7 Nov 2023   |
| Scale(s) @A1   | 1 : 2,500  |
| Chkd   |  |
| Site Ref.  |  |
| Company  | CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                    |
| Site   | HAMBLE AIRFIELD  |
| Project  | SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                     |
| Title  | AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN<br>(OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>PHASE 8</b> |
| Drawing No.  | 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A                                |







- KEY :**
- APPLICATION BOUNDARY
  - EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland
  - PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)
  - EXISTING Public Right of Way
  - PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface
  - DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE
  - PLANT SITE
  - BOUNDARY SOIL STORAGE AREAS - SEEDING WITH CONSERVATION MIXES
  - STRIPPING AND MINERAL WORKING
  - OPERATIONAL LAGOON SYSTEM
  - LAND UNDER RESTORATION (IMPORTATION OF RESTORATION MATERIALS)
  - PLACEMENT OF SOILS AND PLANTING AND SEEDING WITH APPROPRIATE MIXES






FOR FULL DETAILS  
OF FINAL RESTORATION  
REFER TO CURRENT  
SUBMITTED  
RESTORATION PLAN




- KEY:**
-  APPLICATION BOUNDARY
  -  EXISTING VEGETATION - Trees, Scrub and Grassland
  -  PROPOSED CONTOURS m.A.O.D (1.0m INTERVALS)
  -  EXISTING Public Right of Way
  -  PROPOSED PERMISSIVE PATH - grassed surface
  -  DENOTES PLANTING WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT AS WORKS AT START OF OPERATIONAL PHASE




| Revisions  |   |
|--|---|
| Based on the Ordnance Survey Land Line Data with the Permission of His Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Licence No. 100018131   |   |
| <b>CEMEX</b>   |   |
| Planning Department<br>CEMEX UK Operations Limited<br>CEMEX House, Binley Business Park,<br>Harry Weston Road, Coventry<br>Warwickshire CV3 2TY <span style="float: right;">www.cemex.com</span> |   |
| Drawn By   | A W Company CEMEX UK Operations Limited                                     |
| Date   | 7 Nov 2023 Site HAMBLE AIRFIELD   |
| Scale(s) @A1   | Project 1 : 2,500 SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION                                |
| Chkd   | Title AVAILABLE HABITATS PLAN (OPERATIONAL PHASES) <b>FINAL Restoration</b> |
| Site Ref.  | Drawing No. 21-08-HAMB-1717-P1-PH-HAB Rev A                                 |

This page is intentionally left blank

# Appendix J- Highway mitigation feasibility design – information provided by the Highway Authority





| KEY |                               |
|-----|-------------------------------|
|     | PROPOSED TACTILE PAVING       |
|     | PROPOSED KERB                 |
|     | PROPOSED DROPPED KERB         |
|     | PROPOSED SIGN & POST          |
|     | PROPOSED SHARED SURFACE       |
|     | PROPOSED CYCLEWAY             |
|     | PROPOSED FOOTWAY              |
|     | PROPOSED ON ROAD CYCLEWAY     |
|     | EXISTING NON-2                |
|     | PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF NON-2 |

**NOTES**

1. ALL MEASUREMENTS ARE IN METERS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.
2. TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY REQUIRED TO FULLY UNDERSTAND AND DETERMINE EXACT LOCATIONS OF PROPOSED NEW INFRASTRUCTURE.

| DATE       | NO. | DESCRIPTION            | BY  | CHECKED | DATE | NO. | DESCRIPTION | BY | CHECKED | DATE |
|------------|-----|------------------------|-----|---------|------|-----|-------------|----|---------|------|
| 2024-05-20 | 01  | ISSUED FOR INFORMATION | ATK |         |      |     |             |    |         |      |
| 2024-05-20 | 02  | DESIGN CREATED         | ATK |         |      |     |             |    |         |      |

**FOR INFORMATION**

**SNC-LAVALLIN ATIONS**

Woodside Drive  
Ardley Road  
Epsom  
Surrey  
KT19 6BN  
T: +44 (0)1372 700140  
F: +44 (0)1372 700225  
www.snl.com

**HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

|               |             |               |                  |
|---------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| Project No:   | 5188864     | Issue:        | XX               |
| Project Name: | HAMBLE LANE | Location:     | ATK - HGN        |
| Project Code: |             | Project Code: | DR - CH - 000011 |
| Scale:        | 1:1000      | Scale:        | 1:1000           |
| Sheet No:     | A1          | Sheet No:     | 5188864          |
| Date:         | 2024        | Date:         | 2024             |

