

**HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**Decision Report**

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b>Decision Maker:</b> | Regulatory Committee   |
| <b>Date:</b>           | 14 December 2022   |
| <b>Title:</b>          | An extension of mineral working at Roke Manor Quarry, to extract circa 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel from the Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, including continuation of on-site mineral processing, backfilling with inert material and progressive restoration to agriculture with increased nature conservation and biodiversity enhancements at Roke Manor Quarry - Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, Salisbury Road, Shootash SO51 6GA (No. 21/01274/CMAS) TV226 |
| <b>Report From:</b>    | Assistant Director of Minerals, Waste and Environment  |

**Contact name:** Amy Dales

**Tel:** 0370 779 6283

**Email:** [planning@hants.gov.uk](mailto:planning@hants.gov.uk)

### **Recommendation**

1. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A** and completion of a section 106 agreement in relation to submission and approval of an Environmental Management and Mitigation Plan.

### **Executive Summary**

2. The planning application is for an extension to the currently permitted (permission ref: 10/02615/CMAS) quarry extraction area at Roke Manor Quarry to the west of the existing operations known as 'Stanbridge Ranvilles'. The proposal is to extract circa 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel including continuation of on-site mineral processing, backfilling with inert material and progressive restoration to agriculture with increased nature conservation and biodiversity enhancements at Roke Manor Quarry, Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, Salisbury Road, Shootash SO51 6GA.
3. The proposed development is an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#). An Environmental Statement was submitted as part of the planning application.
4. This application is being considered by the Regulatory Committee as it is a major minerals and EIA development.
5. Key issues raised are:
  - Impacts on neighbouring amenity;
  - Noise;
  - Landscape and visual impacts;

- Air quality and dust;
  - Ecological impacts; and
  - Arboricultural impacts.
6. A committee site visit by Members took place on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2022 in advance of the proposal being considered by the Regulatory Committee.
  7. It is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). In summary it is considered that the proposal would:
    - be a time limited mineral extraction which is subject to a requirement for restoration and aftercare;
    - contribute to maintaining an adequate and steady supply of sharp sand and gravel for Hampshire through the extension of an existing quarry;
    - be acceptable in terms of highway capacity and safety;
    - not cause adverse public health and safety impacts or unacceptable adverse amenity impacts;
    - not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact;
    - not have a significant adverse effect on designated or important habitats and species;
    - protect water quality and surface water drainage and will cause no additional flood risk;
    - ensure that the amenity of residents is protected; and
    - safeguard the surrounding public rights of way.
  8. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A** and completion of a section 106 agreement in relation to submission and approval of an Environmental Management and Mitigation Plan.

## The Site

9. The proposed Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension is located in central southern Hampshire, approximately two kilometres (km) to the west of the market town of Romsey. Approximately 300 metres (m) to the west of the Site is the village of Shootash; a small, linear settlement extending along the A27 Salisbury Road and the western end of Old Salisbury Lane (see **Appendix B – Committee Plan**).
10. The site would be worked as an extension to the existing Roke Manor Quarry. The site operations ceased in 2022 due to exhausting the mineral supply.
11. The land is currently predominately comprised of pasture and arable fields in agricultural use, with hedgerows and interspersed individual trees demarking field boundaries.
12. The ground levels typically fall from 71 metres Above Ordnance Datum (mAOD) in the northwest to 56mAOD in the valley features to the east. These valley features comprise the headwaters of two un-named tributary streams

(North and South stream) which flow eastwards, eventually adjoining the River Test.

13. Old Salisbury Lane borders the extension area to the north, with residential dwellings; namely Homeview which is adjacent to the north-western corner of the site, and Croylands and Roke Manor Farm Cottages which are both approximately 150 metres away in the north-eastern corner of the site. The mineral processing plant and stockyard is situated to the east of the reserve. A remnant strip of Squabb Wood separates the two areas.
14. Squabb Wood lies to the south of the site with residential properties of Troy House and Longdown Cottage being closest to the southern site boundary. Stanbridge Ranvilles Farm borders the western margin of the site.
15. The existing site entrance which directly accesses the A27 would be retained. This purpose-built access is located between two properties (Ashness and Bramblewood). There is a surfaced internal haul road (approximately 600m in length) intersecting the reserve which leads directly to the existing processing plant and aggregate stockyard. The internal haul road is screened by existing soil bunds to provide visual and noise mitigation for all site traffic.
16. A Public Right of Way (Romsey Extra Footpath 5) runs immediately along the southern border of the proposal and eventually joins the Test Way.
17. There are existing hedgerows along Old Salisbury Lane to the north and Stanbridge Ranvilles Farm to the west of the proposal that will be retained. The eastern hedgerow leads to a valley feature which contains remnant strip of woodland (Squabb Wood) which will also be retained and enhanced by additional planting. It is proposed to run the conveyor through the remnant woodland strip and therefore a tree survey has been undertaken to ensure protection to trees and soils.
18. The existing mineral processing plant and stockyard area is surrounded by woodland. The area is actively managed as part of the Woodland Management Plan and accompanying Section 106 agreement for Roke Manor Quarry.

## **Planning History**

19. Planning permission for the extraction of 780,000 tonnes of sand and gravel at Roke Manor, followed by progressive restoration to agriculture by landfilling with inert construction waste, was originally granted by Hampshire County Council in 2009 ([07/02771/CMAS](#)). Extraction of mineral at the site commenced in 2015 and currently takes place under overarching planning permission [10/02615/CMAS](#), as well as planning permissions [15/00826/CMAS](#) for the re-alignment of the site's causeway crossing and [18/00040/CMAS](#) for an extension to the site's existing stockyard.
20. Roke Manor Quarry is a safeguarded site for the production of sharp sand and gravel as specified by Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013) ([HMWP \(2013\)](#)). The mineral

resources in the proposed extension area are also safeguarded by Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

21. The planning history of the wider existing site is as follows:

| <b>Application No</b>         | <b>Proposal</b>   | <b>Decision</b> | <b>Date Issued</b> |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| <a href="#">SCO/2020/0566</a> | Stanbridge Ranvilles Farm Extension to Roke Manor Quarry  | Advice          | 02/12/2020         |
| <a href="#">18/00040/CMAS</a> | Extraction of sand and gravel as an extension to the existing stockyard, backfilling with inert materials and restoration to agricultural use   | Granted         | 11/10/2018         |
| <a href="#">SCR/2017/0189</a> | Request for Screening and Scoping Opinion: Extension to plant site area   | EA not required | 07/04/2017         |
| <a href="#">15/00826/CMAS</a> | Planning application for the re-alignment of the haul road crossing relating to mineral working   | Granted         | 22/05/2015         |
| <a href="#">10/02615/CMAS</a> | Variation of condition 2 of Planning Permission 07/02771CMAS to vary the red line planning boundary   | Granted         | 03/11/2011         |
| <a href="#">07/02771/CMAS</a> | Extraction of sand and gravel, landfilling with inert construction, demolition and excavation waste and restoration to agriculture, erection of minerals processing plant and ancillary buildings and equipment, construction of new access off A27, including demolition of bungalow | Granted         | 22/06/2009         |
| <a href="#">SCO/2005/0193</a> | Request for Scoping Opinion - Proposed sand and gravel extraction, landfilling with inert waste and restoration to agriculture  | Granted         | 02/09/2005         |

### **The Proposal**

22. All documents associated with the planning application can be found on the planning application [webpage](#).

23. The proposal is for an extension of an existing mineral working at Roke Manor Quarry, to extract sand and gravel from the Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, including continuation of on-site mineral processing, backfilling with inert

material and progressive restoration to agriculture with increased nature conservation and biodiversity enhancements

24. The proposal site measures approximately 32.9 hectares, of which 14.3 hectares forms the extraction area containing circa 600,000 tonnes of saleable sand and gravel.
25. The proposal will use the existing purpose-built site entrance/access, surfaced internal haul road, in-situ mineral processing plant and weighbridge/offices. The feed hopper and field conveyors used for mineral transference will be relocated to serve the extension area as Roke Manor Quarry will be exhausted. On-site mobile plant and machinery will also be used at the proposed extension (see **Appendix C – Layout Plan**).

#### *Duration*

26. The application site contains circa 600,000 tonnes of saleable sand and gravel. It is proposed that this will be extracted at a rate of approximately 125,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) over a period of approximately 5 years.
27. Progressive backfilling of residual silts from mineral washing and importation of inert construction arisings will be used to restore the quarry. The proposed progressive extraction and restoration are due to take place in five main phases over the course of 8 years. It is anticipated that the extraction process will be carried out over 5 years and backfilling to full restoration would take approximately 3 years. Planning permission is therefore sought for a period of 8 years. The extraction area extent is shown on **Plan RM-254-14**.

#### *Site layout*

28. As shown in **Plan RM-254-17**, the plant site layout and site office compound will remain as existing. Ancillary buildings will also remain as per **Plan AV-CAN-3210**, previously granted Permission 07/02771/CMAS. There are no proposed changes to building elevations onsite.

#### *Operations, phasing and restoration:*

29. The existing plant site layout (Ref: **RM-254-17**) will remain as existing. There are no proposed changes to the processing plant layout, site offices, car park and ancillary buildings or building elevations. Furthermore, there are no proposed changes to site lighting.
30. It is proposed that this will be extracted in five main phases (see **Appendix D**) (see **application phase plans - Phase 1/2/3a/3b/4**)).
31. Site operations will commence in Phase 1 with the stripping of soils and overburden from the conveyor route and silt storage cell. These soils will be used to create a 4 metre (m) high screening bund at Stanbridge Ranvilles Farm. This bund will remain for the duration of the working as it will serve a

useful amenity function throughout the life of operations. Soils and overburden from the rest of Phase 1 will be used to create the 5m high screening bund near Homeview. The feed hopper and field conveyor route will be installed. Phase 1 mineral will be progressively extracted and transferred by conveyor for processing at the existing mineral processing facility. The residue silt generated from the mineral washing will be stored in Phase 1, ready for restoration. Perimeter drainage ditches will be created in Phase 3A and Phase 4. Initial planting will be undertaken.

32. Soils and overburden will be stripped from Phase 2 to create a 2m high screening bund along the southern boundary and a 5m high bund to screen Troy House, Longdown Cottage and the properties situated along the A27. Following mineral extraction, onsite clays, silts and overburden will be deposited for restoring Phase 2. The water body will be constructed at the eastern end of Phase 2 to manage surface water runoff.
33. Quarry operations will then move to Phase 3a, where soil stripping will be directly placed to aid restoration of Phase 1 and Phase 2. The southern stretch of central hedgerow/trees adjacent to Phase 1 will be removed. Two water bodies will be created in Phase 4 to aid water management in the northern part of the site. Mineral extraction will take place in Phase 3a and will remain open to store washed residue silts (similar to Phase 1), ready for restoration. As restoration is progressing in Phase 2, the southern screening bunds will be removed to reinstate the land. These properties will continue to be screened by the in-situ haul road bunds which will remain for the life of the operations.
34. Phase 3b will then be stripped of soils to create a 3m high screening bund along Old Salisbury Lane. Excess soils and overburden from Phase 3b will be directly placed to restore the remaining areas within Phase 1 and Phase 2. The northern section of central hedgerow/trees will be removed at this stage.
35. Working in a northerly direction, progressive mineral extraction will then take place in Phase 3b. Similar to previous phases, the mineral will be extracted and transferred by conveyor to the existing mineral processing facility. The residue silts will be stored in Phase 3a. Phase 3b will be prepared with a clay liner for acceptance of imported inert construction materials for restoration.
36. Soil stripping will then take place in Phase 4 to create a 5m high bund in the northeastern corner to serve as a screen to Croylands and Roke Manor Cottages. Excess overburden will be directly placed to complete the restoration of Phase 1. The residue silts from the mineral washing process of Phase 4 material will be directed into Phase 3a. Following exhaustion of mineral, a cell liner will be constructed in Phase 4 for the importation of inert materials for restoration (similar to Phase 3b). Extraction of the Phase 1 north (under the conveyor) will be progressed and the conveyor route progressively removed.
37. Backfilling of Phase 4 using imported, inert construction arisings will be progressed whilst Phase 3B and Phase 1 north are restored (see **Appendix D**). The central hedgerow abutting Phase 3b will be replanted. The screening

bunds containing the soils and overburden within each of these phases will be used to return land to current ground levels as part of the restoration scheme.

38. Planting has been proposed (see **Appendix E**).
39. The narrow strips of mineral under the screening bunds adjacent to the internal haul road will be worked as part of the final restoration of the site. The material from the internal haul road screening bund will be used for the plant site area restoration. Final planting of hedgerows, scrubs and trees will be undertaken as per the Proposed Restoration Scheme **RM-254-18** (see **Appendix F**) and all restoration works are completed.
40. The full **Arboricultural Assessment** is included within **Chapter 4 of the ES**. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is present within the proposal area (Ref: TP.48) and has been considered as part of the ecological, landscape and Arboricultural Assessment within the ES.

#### *Access and transport*

41. The Site will be operated in conjunction with and under the existing access and routing planning conditions for planning permission 07/02771/CMAS. There are no proposed changes to access or traffic management.
42. All Heavy Goods Vehicle's (HGVs) enter and leave the site bellmouth access directly onto the A27. The A27 operates as a strategic link road between Romsey, Salisbury and other villages along the route.
43. The principal market for minerals from the site is within the Urban South Hampshire area. The overwhelming majority of vehicles turn left and travel eastward along the A27 towards Romsey, using the A3090 to access Southampton or the M27. The only exception to this is for local deliveries. Vehicles are not able to travel westwards through Whiteparish because of the 7.5 tonne weight restriction, nor are they permitted to use Gardeners Lane (1.5km to the south-east) to cut through to the M27 because of a similar weight restriction on that road.
44. Material imports and exports will continue being transported on HGV lorries (as existing). The proposal will not generate any new or additional lorry movements on the public highway network beyond that already approved for Roke Manor Quarry, albeit extending the duration for a further eight-year period.
45. The site access and internal haul road with the in-situ screening bunds either side will remain until Phase 4 has been worked. Following this, the screening bunds will be removed and the bund material will be used to restore the plant site area. The underlying mineral of the screening bunds will be extracted to avoid any sterilisation. The area will then be restored and planted with hedgerows in accordance with the proposed Restoration Scheme.

### *Hours of working*

46. The Site will be operated under the existing operating hours contained within the planning conditions for planning permission 07/02771/CMAS. Working hours will therefore be:
- No vehicle shall enter or leave the site and no operations shall take place except between the hours of 07.00 and 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 and 12.30 on Saturday; and
  - There shall be no working on Sunday or recognised Public Holidays (except for essential maintenance) unless previously agreed with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

### *Other matters:*

47. The site has an existing site liaison panel which has been operational since the existing quarry was established. The last meeting took place on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2022.
48. This proposal is a new separate planning application (to previous permissions granted) and as such will require a new S106 agreement relating to Ecological Management and Mitigation if permission were granted.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

49. A Scoping Report for this site was issued on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2020 ([SCO/2020/0566](#)) which required a number of additional issues to be scoped into any future planning application. These included Socio-Economics, Sustainability and Climate Change, Vibration, Air Quality, and Impacts to human health.
50. The proposed development has been assessed under [The Town and Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#) and is considered to be an Environmental Impact Assessment development. Screening under the EIA regulations has been carried out on the proposed development as supplied. The development is classified under Schedule 1, Part 19 as a quarry where the surface of the site exceeds 25 hectares. An Environmental Statement (ES) has been supplied by the applicant and has been considered alongside the application documents.
51. Following the initial round of public consultation, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority concluded that further information was required for the purposes of determining 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 14 September 2021 (hereafter referred to as Reg 25 Request 1). This additional information was considered to be necessary to enable the full and proper consideration of the likely environmental effects of the proposed development. The request asked for further information on a number of matters including arboriculture, landscape, ecology, water environment, noise, and



dust. Full copies of all requests are available to view on the applications website.

52. The applicant submitted the following further information and revisions in response to Reg 25 Request 1. The applicant provided a response letter that clearly sets out the revisions and additional information, and all revisions are clearly highlighted in the submitted documents:

- Cover letter
- Revised drawings:
  - Outline Layout Plan RM-254-11D
  - Phase 1 Extraction RM-254-15-1E
  - Phase 2 Extraction RM-254-15-2F
  - Phase 3A Extraction RM-254-15-3F
  - Phase 3B Extraction RM-254-15-4F
  - Phase 4 Extraction RM-254-15-5F
  - Phase 3B and Phase 1 North Restoration RM-254-15-6C
  - Phase 3A and 4 Restoration RM-254-15-7E
  - Proposed Restoration Scheme RM-254-13M
  - Restoration Planting Plan RM-254-18E
- Revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan incorporating amendments to the design of the proposed quarry and including a full five-year young tree maintenance regime.
- A Landscape Specification.
- A Gantt chart setting out the timescales involved with each phase of the development, based on anticipated aggregate production and tipping rates.
- Revised ecological assessment work, comprising:
  - Ecology and Nature Conservation Environmental Statement Chapter
  - Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report
  - Phase 2 Protected Species Report
  - Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan
- Revised noise assessment work, comprising:
  - Noise Environmental Statement Chapter
  - Noise Impact Assessment
  - Noise Management Plan
- Further information - item 4. Water Environment, details required by Lead Local Flood Authority.
- Dust Assessment Report including appendix C
  - Dust Management Plan.

53. This information was submitted by the applicant on 12 November 2021 and was subject to a public consultation between 26 November 2021- 17 January 2022 in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

54. Following Regulation 25 Request 1, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority issued a further Regulation 25 request on 03 March 2022 (hereafter referred to as Reg 25 Request 2). The request asked for further information on Arboriculture, Landscape, Ecology, and noise.

55. The applicant submitted the following further information and revisions in response to Reg 25 Request 2. The applicant provided a response letter that

clearly sets out the revisions and additional information, and all revisions are clearly highlighted in the submitted documents:

- Cover letter
- Revised drawings:
  - Outline Layout Plan RM-254-11E
  - Initial Planting Plan RM-254-16B
- Updated supporting text to accompany the application:
  - ES Chapter 2 – The Proposal
  - Section 3 – Non-Technical Summary
  - Appendix PS.7 - Summary of Phasing
- Amended Arboricultural Method Statement.
- Amended Landscape Specification document.
- An updated Gantt chart setting out the indicative timescales involved with each phase of the development.
- Revised ecological assessment work, comprising:
  - Ecology and Nature Conservation Environmental Statement Chapter
  - Phase 2 Protected Species Report
  - Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan
  - Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Metric 3)
  - A shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

56. This information was submitted by the applicant on 12 August 2022 and was subject to a public consultation between 19 August 2022- 19 September 2022 in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

57. 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 Guidance**

58. 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. Therefore, consideration of the relevant plans, guidance and policies and whether the proposal is in accordance with these is of relevance to decision making.

59. 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 and which are material to the determination of the application.

60. For the purposes of this application, the statutory development plan comprises the following:

### **[Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan \(2013\) \(HMWP\)](#)**

61. 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 15 (Safeguarding - mineral resources);
- Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure);
- Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source);
- Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates);
- Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management);
- Policy 26 (Safeguarding - waste infrastructure);
- Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development);
- Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management); and
- Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development).

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

62. Hampshire County Council and its partner Authorities (Southampton City Council, Portsmouth City Council, New Forest National Park Authority and South Downs National Park Authority) are working to produce a partial update to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (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 Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (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. Plan making is currently at the [Regulation 18 draft plan consultation stage](#). The update to the Plan and its associated policies are only emerging policy. This means that the policies can only be given very limited weight at this stage and cannot be fully taken into account in decision making. However, the report will reference the emerging policies were relevant.
63. The following emerging policies are of the relevance 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 5: Protection of the countryside;
  - Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets;
  - Policy 8: Water resources;
  - Policy 9: Protection of soils;
  - Policy 10: Restoration of minerals and waste developments;
  - Policy 11: Protecting public health, safety, amenity and well-being;

- Policy 12: Flood risk and prevention;
- Policy 13: Managing traffic;
- Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources;
- Policy 16: Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure;
- Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source;
- Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates;
- Policy 25: Sustainable waste management;
- Policy 26: Safeguarding - waste infrastructure;
- Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development;
- Policy 28: Energy recovery development;
- Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management; and
- Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development.

### **Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2011 - 2029) (2016) (TVBLP (2016))**

64. The following policies are relevant to the proposal:

- Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development;
- Policy COM2: Settlement Hierarchy;
- Policy E1: High Quality Development in the Borough;
- Policy E2: Protect, Conserve, and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough;
- Policy E5: Biodiversity;
- Policy E6: Green Infrastructure;
- Policy E7: Water Management;
- Policy E8: Pollution;
- Policy E9: Heritage;
- Policy LHW4: Amenity; and
- Policy T1: Managing Movement.

65. Other areas of policy and guidance of relevance of to the proposal include:

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF)**

66. 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;
- Paragraphs 57: Planning obligations;
- Paragraphs 81: Support of sustainable economic growth;
- Paragraphs 84-85: Rural economy;
- Paragraph 92: Healthy, inclusive and safe places;
- Paragraph 100: Public rights of way and access;
- Paragraphs 104, 110-113: Sustainable transport;
- Paragraph 120: Types of land;
- Paragraphs 126-136: Design;
- Paragraphs 153-158; Planning and climate change;
- Paragraphs 159-169: Planning and flood risk;

- Paragraphs 174, 176-178: Contributions and enhancement of natural and local environment;
- Paragraphs 180-181: 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 Policy for Waste (2014) (NPPW)**

67. The following paragraphs are relevant to the proposal:

- Paragraph 1: Delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency; and
- Paragraph 7: Determining planning applications.

### **National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)**

68. The following paragraphs are relevant to the proposal:

- Paragraphs 005, 006 and 008: [Air quality](#) (November 2019);
- Paragraphs 002, 003 and 004: [Appropriate assessment](#) (July 2019);
- Paragraphs 001, 002, 004, 009: [Climate change](#) (March 2019);
- Paragraphs 001-024: [Determining a planning application](#) (June 2021);
- Paragraphs 001-007: [Effective use of land](#) (July 2019);
- Paragraphs 001-053: [Environmental Impact Assessment](#) (May 2020);
- Paragraphs 001-068: [Flood risk and coastal change](#) (August 2022);
- Paragraphs 001-002, 006-064: [Historic Environment](#) (July 2019);
- Paragraphs 001-043: [Natural environment](#) (July 2019);
- Paragraphs 001-017: [Noise](#) (July 2019);
- Paragraph 001-038: [Planning obligations](#) (September 2019);
- Paragraphs 001-030: [Use of planning conditions](#) (July 2019).

### **Planning Practice Guidance for Minerals (March 2014):**

69. The following are paragraphs relevant to the proposal:

- 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 015: How should mineral operators seek to minimise the impact of development upon properties and the local environment in close proximity to mineral workings?
- Paragraph 017: How should mineral planning authorities assess the cumulative impact of minerals development?
- Paragraph 018: Are separation distances/buffer zones appropriate?
- Paragraph 019: Noise emissions;
- Paragraph 021: What are the appropriate noise standards for mineral operators for normal operations?
- Paragraph 022: What type of operations may give rise to particularly noisy short-term activities and what noise limits may be appropriate?
- Paragraph 023: Dust emissions;
- Paragraph 036: Restoration and aftercare of minerals sites; and
- Paragraph 082: Using aggregate landbanks.

### **[Planning Practice Guidance for Waste \(15 October 2015\) \(PPGW\)](#)**

70. The following are paragraphs relevant to the proposal:

- Paragraph 001: Who is the planning authority for waste development?
- Paragraph 002: What matters come within the scope of 'waste development'?
- Paragraphs 008 and 009: Who contributes to moving waste up the Waste Hierarchy;
- Paragraph 046: When can unallocated sites be used?

### **[Waste Management Plan for England \(2021\) \(WMPE\)](#)**

71. The following are sections are relevant to the proposal:

- The Waste Management Plan and the objectives of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011;
- Waste management in England;
- Waste hierarchy; and
- Waste arisings.

## **Consultations**

72. The following responses have been received from consultees. A summary is provided below. A full record of all consultation responses is available to view

on the planning application [webpages](#) under 'consultee responses'.

73. **Awbridge Parish Council:** Objection. Concerns regarding the proximity to residences and PROW, location and phasing of bunds, destruction of hedgerows and removal of TPO trees, inadequacy of ecological information provided, flood risk, availability of inert fill, and amenity issues of noise, dust and light pollution.
74. **County Arboriculture (Hampshire County Council):** Initially objected to the proposal. They are satisfied with new planting to mitigate for the loss of hedgerows but they have serious concerns regarding the removal of high quality, mature Oak trees (T13, T14, T15 and T18) and do not agree with the assertion in the AIA that the loss would be 'short term'. Mitigation planting for the loss of these trees has also not been evaluated and justified. An updated response is awaited and will be reported to committee.
75. **County Archaeologist (Hampshire County Council):** No objection subject to conditions.
76. **County Ecologist (Hampshire County Council):** No objection subject to conditions and a S106 agreement to secure EMMP.
77. **County Councillor Adams-King:** Was notified.
78. **County Landscape Architect (Hampshire County Council):** No objection.
79. **Defence Infrastructure Organisation:** No objection.
80. **Environment Agency:** No objection subject to conditions.
81. **Highways Authority:** No objection.
82. **Historic England:** No objection.
83. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** No objection.
84. **Natural England:** No objection.
85. **Public Health (Hampshire County Council):** No objection.
86. **Rights of Way Manager (Hampshire County Council):** No objection.
87. **Romsey Extra Parish Council:** Objection on the grounds of amenity impacts of noise, dust and light pollution, proximity to residents, wellbeing, and inadequate hydrological and ecological information provided.
88. **Romsey Town Council:** Objection.

89. **Test Valley Borough Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO):** Initially provided comments on noise, air quality and dust issues. However, following the receipt of further information, raised no objection subject to conditions.
90. **Test Valley Borough Council:** Object on the basis of first EHO comments. These have subsequently been altered following further submitted information but Test Valley have not provided an updated response.
91. **Wellow Parish Council:** Objection, concerned about noise and dust impacts to nearest residents, increased traffic and significance of hedgerows to be removed.

## Representations

92. Hampshire County Council's [Statement of Community Involvement \(2017\)](#) (SCI) sets out the adopted consultation and publicity procedures associated with determining planning applications. In complying with the requirements of the 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;
    - 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 and beyond.
93. As already set out earlier in the **Environmental Impact Assessment** section of the report, further rounds of public consultation took place as part of Regulation 25. All information was re-consulted upon in accordance with the SCI.
94. As of 5<sup>th</sup> December 2022, a total of 99 representations (from 84 individuals) to the proposal have been received. All of the representations received raise objections to the proposal.
95. The main areas of concern raised in the objections related to the following areas:
  - impact on wildlife and ecologically designated sites;
  - removal of tree protection order trees;
  - loss of, and damage to, countryside land;
  - visual amenity and landscape impact;
  - light pollution;
  - proximity to residential properties;
  - noise impacts;
  - dust impacts;
  - impact on air quality;
  - associated health impacts;
  - odour associated with the development;
  - pollution and emissions associated with the development;



- surrounding highways/local roads not suitable for additional HGV movements;
- lorry routeing;
- highways safety and amenity
- impacts to Rights of Way and its users;
- adequacy of the proposed restoration;
- aggregate supply disproportionate to the impacts of the development;
- proposal is not allocated in the HMWP;
- effects on groundwater levels and hydrology;
- lack of community benefits;
- loss of views; and
- impact on house prices.

96. The above issues will be addressed within the following commentary except where identified as not being relevant to the decision). Such matters may be covered in [Non-material planning issues raised in representations](#).

### **Habitats Regulation Assessment:**

97. In accordance with [Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017](#) (the Habitats Regulations), Hampshire County Council (as a 'competent authority') must undertake a formal assessment of the implications of any new projects we may be granting planning permission for e.g. proposals that may be capable of affecting the qualifying interest features of the following European designated sites:
- Special Protection Areas [SPAs];
  - Special Areas of Conservation [SACs]; and
  - RAMSARs.
98. Collectively this assessment is described as '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.
99. The applicant provided a shadow HRA as part of Regulation 25 Request 2 (4 March 2022) as the proposed Roke Manor Quarry extension is located 4 kilometres to the south of the Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC), which falls within the 7.5 km buffer zone around the SAC in which to identify plans and projects likely to have an impact upon habitats used by the bats from the Mottisfont Bats SAC.
100. The proposed Roke Manor Quarry extension will result in the temporary loss of agriculturally improved grassland, hedgerows and some trees. It will also result in the construction of a new conveyor through an area of woodland in which barbastelle bats have been recorded. Agriculturally improved grassland is not a key habitat for the conservation of barbastelle bats although it is used by them for foraging. This habitat is however widespread within the 7.5km buffer around the Mottisfont Bats SAC and the temporary loss of a relatively small area of this

habitat is not considered likely to have a significant effect on the conservation objectives for the SAC.

101. Hedges can also be important habitat features to allow barbastelle bats to move through the landscape and for foraging. The proposed development will result in the temporary loss of hedgerows within the application site. However, bat surveys of the site have not recorded any use of these hedges by barbastelle bats and it is concluded that they are not important supporting habitat for the SAC. The temporary loss of the hedges from within the application site is therefore not likely to have a significant effect on the conservation objectives of the SAC.
102. The strip of woodland within Squabb Wood through which the conveyor will be constructed is used by barbastelle bats for commuting and foraging. However, the operating times of the quarry will not conflict with the times of year and times of darkness when this woodland strip is visited by the bats. The construction of the conveyor will also have no impact on the structure and function of this woodland strip for feeding and commuting bats.
103. The **shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment** (dated 28 July 2022) provided by the applicant and assessed by Hampshire County Council as the 'competent authority' concludes the temporary habitat loss resulting from proposal will have no likely significant effect upon the Mottisfont Bats SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
104. The shadow HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England. Natural England is in agreement that the proposed development will not have likely significant effects on the Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation and has no objection to the proposed development.
105. Links to the emerging requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements are covered in the [Ecology](#) section of the commentary section of this report, where they are relevant to the proposal.

## Climate Change

106. 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 preparing 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 so are not material to decision making. However, it is true to say that 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.
107. The Scoping Report issued (SCO/2020/0566) required a number of things to be scoped into the planning application. This included more information on the impacts and effects on climate change.

108. In terms of the carbon impact of the proposal, **Chapter 12- Sustainability and Climate Change** was included as part of the submitted **ES** documentation and considers how mitigation and adaptation measures have been incorporated into the design. It also concludes that the working practices adopted by the applicant mean that the existing Roke Manor Quarry operates at 5.64 Kgs' CO<sub>2</sub>e/ Tonne of aggregate sold which is 27% more carbon efficient than the UK Government Industry Average of 7.7 Kgs' CO<sub>2</sub>e / Tonne.
109. It is therefore considered that as long as the new extension area proposal continues to adhere to the same processes and practices such as using the electrified field conveyor and processing plant, sourcing site electricity from renewables, and maintaining the water management system on site, and taking into account the Biodiversity Net Gains that the site restoration will provide, the proposal would be in accordance with Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adoption) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Paragraph 152-158 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#).

## **Commentary**

### Principle of the development

110. The existing Roke Manor Quarry is identified as a permitted sand and gravel site under Part 1 of Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This means the existing quarry already contributes towards meeting the demand for aggregates. Whether the need for the development has been demonstrated is set out later in this commentary. The existing quarry is also a safeguarded site under Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure) [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The mineral resources in the proposed extension area are also safeguarded against sterilisation by Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
111. The proposed extension area was previously considered as a potential site allocation for the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) but was not included in the final list of site allocations. Although the proposed extension area was not allocated within the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), the site has been put forward as a site allocation in the [emerging Draft Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan](#) (Reg 18) and identified in updated Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) which supports proposals which maximise the use of existing infrastructure and available mineral resources at existing quarries.
112. The proposal will contribute towards an adequate and steady supply of aggregates through time-limited extraction of 600,000 tonnes of sharp sand and gravel. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
113. The mineral resources in the proposed extension are safeguarded. By extending the life of the existing quarry site, the unextracted mineral reserves can be extracted, preventing sterilisation of the mineral. Therefore, the proposal

is considered in accordance with Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources). Furthermore, the extension will utilise existing mineral infrastructure in accordance with Policy 16 (Safeguarding – mineral infrastructure).

114. The [HMWP \(2013\)](#) identifies 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 NPPGW 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.
115. Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that the Hampshire Authorities will take a positive approach to minerals and waste development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the [NPPF \(2021\)](#). The development of the site will be supporting economic growth by maintaining a reliable source of minerals, required to build and repair homes and roads, and are important to the local economy. Whether this proposal is considered to be a sustainable minerals development will be considered in the remaining sections of this commentary.

#### Demonstration of need and capacity for mineral resource

116. 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.
117. The proposal would be worked as an extension to the existing quarry.
118. The extension site was considered as a potential allocation in the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#) but was not allocated. The [HMWP \(2013\)](#) associated Minerals Proposal Study and [Integrated Sustainability Appraisal](#) (ISA) noted that although the site performed quite well in terms of the ISA, the site was not considered to be suitable for allocation at that stage as the permitted workings at Roke Manor had yet to commence. The Minerals and Waste Plan includes a commitment to only permit the extension of existing sites where it can be demonstrated that the existing site works adequately within the local community and environment, so the Stanbridge Ranvilles extension would need to demonstrate it meets these requirements.
119. However, Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregate) includes criteria which will allow for further extension proposals to come forward if they are considered to be suitable and sustainable within the plan period. Furthermore, the proposed extension has been put forward as a site allocation in the emerging [updated HMWP](#) and is included as a draft site allocation under updated Policy 20. The [update to the HMWP](#) is at very early stages and can only be given very limited policy weight.

120. When looking at the issue of need, it is important to consider aggregate supply and demand. The focus of this is on the performance of Policy 17 (Aggregate – supply and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) through annual monitoring. A landbank is the number of years of reserves remaining at an annual rate of aggregate supply. Hampshire has a requirement to ensure a 7-year landbank to meet paragraph 213 of [NPPF \(2021\)](#). The [NPPF \(2021\)](#) supports mineral extraction and recognises the importance of ensuring a long-term supply through a 7-year landbank. There is no theoretical maximum landbank that a minerals authority can achieve and paragraph 209 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) 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'* which supports the proposed development assuming that there is an identified local need and market for the minerals. Landbank requirements are translated into Policy (17) (Aggregate – supply and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
121. 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. A landbank is the number of years of reserves remaining at an annual rate of aggregate supply. Hampshire has a requirement to ensure a 7-year landbank to meet Paragraphs 213 - 214 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#). This is a minimum requirement.
122. The [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is supported by the annual [Local Aggregate Assessment \(LAA\)](#). The [LAA](#) details the current and predicted situation in Hampshire with respect to all aspects of aggregate supply. The calculated [LAA 2021](#) rate gives total supply at 1.15 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) (for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand). This is below the total aggregated requirement of Policy 17 of 1.56 mtpa (for sharp sand and soft sand combined). In terms of the landbank, this accounts for 5.25 years (see Table 3 of the LAA) which is below the 7-year landbank requirement.
123. For sharp sand and gravel specifically, the local requirement gives a landbank of 6.26 years. This means that currently Hampshire is below the requirement of a minimum seven-year landbank for sharp sand and gravel and as a result is not meeting the policy requirements of Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
124. When considering the [LAA 2021](#) rate, it is acknowledged that the landbank rises to 8.71 years for sharp sand and gravel. This is above the 7-year landbank requirement but as already indicated, this is only a minimum requirement. The [LAA 2021](#) also notes that 53% of the current sand and gravel reserve in Hampshire is contained in one site (Blashford Quarry (Plumley Wood)) which could have implications for the future supply if any issues with extraction are encountered.
125. The existing quarry site already helps to contribute towards the requirement for sand and gravel. It is expected the proposal, should permission be granted, will also help to contribute to meeting the need for aggregates. The location of the quarry means that it will largely serve local markets. It is anticipated that the

principal markets for this site will be South-Hampshire and potentially into the New Forest and Wiltshire.

126. The [LAA 2021](#) indicates that the supply of all local sand and gravel is currently in decline but that there has been a recent (2020) increase in the sales of sharp sand and gravel.
127. The [LAA 2021](#) also notes potential future need for aggregates, noting the number of housing and transport projects planned and the fact that to be able to meet this further demand, Hampshire will greatly need to increase its land-won aggregate landbank. Other future infrastructure projects are also likely to place an additional demand of future aggregate demand.
128. In terms of the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#), since the plan's adoption, sharp sand and gravel proposals at Roeshot and Forest Lodge Home Farm have achieved planning permission. Forest Lodge is currently operational and is due to be completed by 2027. Roeshot has not been implemented to date. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority are also currently considering proposals at Hamble Airfield and Purple Haze but these will not be determined until 2023. To date, no proposal has been submitted for Cutty Brow.
129. As the site was not previously allocated, Part 4 of Policy 20 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is of relevance. Part 4 sets out the criteria for new sites including extensions to those identified in Part 1 of the policy, which includes Roke Manor. The proposal is considered a compatible development and does not sterilise or prejudice the existing minerals operations. The proposal utilises the use of existing plant and infrastructure and available mineral resources at an existing associated quarry, meeting Part b. It is also proposed that the site would be worked with the same annual tonnage rate (125,000 tonnes per annum), vehicle movements and operating hours as for the existing Roke Manor Quarry site (before the site operations were mothballed).
130. The proposed extension allows for the extraction of further safeguarded mineral resources, thereby avoiding its sterilisation (meeting Policies 15 and 16) and contributing to the need for an adequate and steady supply of aggregates as set out under Policy 17 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The proposal also meets Part B of Policy 20. Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) to the can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policies 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources), 16 (Safeguarding – mineral infrastructure), 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) and 20 (Local land-won aggregate).

#### Need for waste management provision

131. Following the extraction of sand and gravel, the site will provide a void capacity which will be progressively backfilled, with inert materials, to restore the site back to the existing topographic levels and return it to an agricultural use through the restoration of the site.

132. Policy 25 (Sustainable waste management) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) supports development which encourages sustainable waste management and reduces the amount of residual waste currently sent to landfill. This development uses inert waste 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.
133. Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out arisings of 2.49mtpa of inert waste by 2030. The [AMR \(2020\)](#) shows that the amount of inert waste put to beneficial uses has decreased by 10.2% from 1.18mt in 2019 to 1.06mt in 2020. The proposed development will utilise inert waste to restore the site, providing additional recovery capacity which will contribute towards reversing this trend and achieving objectives set out Policy 27 in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
134. 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. It is considered that this requirement could be secured by the inclusion of a condition, which is included in **Appendix A**.
135. Subject to a condition limiting the type of inert fill to be used, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 27 (Capacity for waste management development) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) of [HMWP \(2013\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management), 27 (Capacity for waste management development) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development).

#### Suitability of site location and alternatives

136. Paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 to [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 applicant or appellant 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.”*
137. Whilst Paragraph 041 of the NPPG (Environmental Impact Assessment) states that “the EIA Regulations 2017 do not require an applicant to consider

alternatives”, it subsequently adds that “if it has been specified that alternatives should be considered within a Scoping Opinion, then they should be”. The applicant proposed the consideration of alternatives in their scoping submission.

138. The applicant has considered alternatives within **Chapter 14 – Alternatives** of the **ES**. It has considered alternative sources of supply, methods of working (including other extension opportunities), means of transport and the restoration scheme.
139. The consideration of alternatives also considered scenarios to ‘Do Nothing’ and complete the current working at Roke. It was concluded that this would result in the premature loss of a number of direct and indirect jobs and the associated input to the local economy and effectively leave unworked mineral reserves at Stanbridge Ranvilles. The proposed extension forms a logical extension to the existing adjacent operations. Given the size of the site it was also concluded that it would not be economically viable to work this area in isolation.
140. The applicant concludes that the proposal as submitted represents the best scheme for both the sustainability and commercial viability points of view as well as the most environmentally acceptable.
141. It is the view of the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority that the applicant has demonstrated that alternatives have been adequately assessed in this instance. Whilst it is recognised that the applicant’s interest in the existing site has governed its selection, the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority does not consider that a more thorough assessment of alternatives would be necessary in this case. Policy compliance with the policies within the development plan will also govern the sites acceptability going forward.

#### Development in the countryside

142. The site lies outside the settlement boundary defined within the Test Valley Local Plan, and as such is located in Countryside under Policy COM2 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#).
143. 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, will not be permitted unless it is a time-limited mineral extraction or related development or the nature of the development is related to countryside activities, meets local needs or requires a countryside or isolated location or the development provides a suitable reuse of previously developed land, including redundant farm or forestry buildings and their curtilages or hard standings. The policy also includes an expectation that the highest standards of design, operation and restoration will be met and there will be a requirement that it is restored in the event it is no longer required for minerals and waste use.
144. Supporting this are Policies 9 (Restoration of quarries and waste developments), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High



quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). These all require temporary minerals development to be restored in a phased manner to beneficial after-uses that are in keeping with the character and setting of the local area, and which contribute to the delivery of local objectives for habitats, biodiversity or community use where applicable.

145. Policy COM2 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) does not permit development outside the settlement boundaries unless it has an essential need to be located in the countryside. Given that minerals must be worked where they are found
146. A number of public representations raised concerns regarding the destruction/removal of countryside land. These are noted.
147. Minerals development is a temporary change to the landscape. In this case, the proposal will be completed within 8 years. As a time limited development, the proposal is considered to meet Part A of Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The policy also states that where appropriate and applicable, development in the countryside will be expected to meet highest standards of design, operation and restoration. Whether the development meets these standards is discussed in more detail within a number of other sections of the commentary below. Conditions relating to restoration will be included in **Appendix A**.
148. As a time limited minerals development and subject to a condition that the site is restored in accordance with the submitted details which is included in **Appendix A**, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 5 (protection of the countryside) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside).

### Visual impact and landscape

149. Paragraph 130 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) 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 174 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.
150. Part d of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) states that minerals development should not have an unacceptable visual impact.

151. 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.
152. Policy E2 (Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) permits development as long as it does not have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area within which it is located, is designed and located to ensure that the health and future retention of important landscape features is not likely to be prejudiced, the existing and proposed landscaping and landscape features enable it to positively integrate into the landscape character of the area, arrangements for the long term management and maintenance of any existing and proposed landscaping have been made, and does not result in the loss of important local features such as trees, walls, hedges or watercourses.
153. A **Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)** was submitted as part of Chapter 6 of the ES.
154. The site and surrounding area are not located within any national or local landscape designation. The nearest designated landscape is the New Forest National Park, which lies some 3.5km to the south-west. However, the **LVIA** specifies that there is no intervisibility with the National Park and it is unlikely that the proposed development will have any direct or indirect impact upon this designated area.
155. The site's zone of visual influence is generally restricted to locations which are within relatively close proximity of the site due to dense woodland and tall continuous hedgerows being prevalent on the site boundaries and within the surrounding landscape.
156. It is acknowledged that the main visual impact of the development is likely to be upon the property known as 'Homeview', which is located to the immediate north-west of the site and has open views across the north-western field (proposed extraction Phase 3B). Although it is proposed to construct a screening bund to the south-east of the property which will preclude views of the quarrying operation, the construction and subsequent taking down of the bund will have a major visual impact. Moreover, the bund itself will cause a significant change in the view from this property which is likely to have a moderate to major adverse impact.
157. However, it is also considered that due to the mostly enclosed nature of the site the effects of the proposal will have a relatively minor impact on the wider area. The design and layout of the site and proposal has been thought out to try and minimise visual impacts with measures such as using the existing location of the plant area which is located further away from residential development, to help reduce its visual and amenity impact.

158. The phasing of the works and restoration will mean that the screen bunds will generally only be created for the time scale of each phase of operation and they will be removed as the individual phases are restored. This will be beneficial to users of PROW footpath no 5 and to properties where their view is foreshortened during the extraction period.
159. The County Landscape Architect considers that although there would be major adverse impacts on landscape character during the works phase, it would be limited to the site area and not affecting the wider landscape. It is considered that the **LVIA** has drawn accurate conclusions on the landscape impacts of this development and the mitigation suggested has been designed to minimise the visual effects for those properties and views that would be most affected. Subject to appropriate restoration of the site, which is secured in **Appendix A** by way of condition, they raise no objection to the development.
160. On the basis that the proposal is a time limited extraction, making adverse impacts short term, and the fact that restoration proposals are sympathetic to the landscape and reflect the existing character of relatively small fields with hedgerows and woodland edges of the site it is considered that the impact to landscape and visual amenity is acceptable on balance, on the basis for the need for the mineral and the assessment made by consultees on these matters. Therefore, the proposal is 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 \(2013\)](#) and EM2 (Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the borough) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging update to the HMWP can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policies 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and wellbeing) and 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development).

### Arboriculture

161. The application was supported by an **Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)**, **Arboriculture Appraisal**, **Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)** and **Tree Protection Plans (TPP)** as part of the **ES**. The **AIA** was updated as part of the first Reg 25 request (14 Sept 21) and the **AMS** was updated as part of the second Reg 25 request (3 March 22).
162. There are 4 Category B trees proposed to be removed and most of the central hedgerow running from north to south.
163. The **LVIA** mentions that there is an extant, but somewhat historic, Tree Preservation Order within the site (Order No. 48) dating back to 1953. This appears to cover the central hedgerow within the proposed extension area and parts of the remnant hedgerow to the south and south-west of Stanbridge Ranvilles Farm. However, the original Order includes other tree belts to the east of the central hedgerow which are no longer present on site.

164. The proposal includes mitigatory planting of 0.46 hectares of tree planting, as well as scrub and hedgerow planting.
165. Public representations raised concerns regarding the removal of hedgerows and trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders. These are noted.
166. The County Arboriculturist initially objected to the development on the grounds of the removal of the 3 Category B trees as following a site visit on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2021 it was considered that the trees were potentially of higher value than they'd been assessed in the submitted **ES** and could be considered Category A Veteran trees.
167. Since this meeting further ecological surveys have been carried out which have identified that none of the oak trees are being used for bat roosting and all 3 have fallen victim to some storm damage. There has also been an improvement in the level of proposed mitigatory planting proposed.
168. A further site visit was carried out on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022 by the County Arboriculturist who has further examined the trees to be removed and is now in agreement with the categorisation of the 3 trees as B rather than A. They are therefore satisfied that subject to conditions requiring works be carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural information, which has been included in **Appendix A** the development is acceptable and they raise no objection.
169. Whilst the loss of these trees is regrettable, they are not of significant enough value to refuse planning permission and it is also considered that the applicant is providing suitable mitigation for their loss as the proposed planting will increase the biodiversity of the existing site by 19.03%
170. Therefore, on balance, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 13 (High quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy EM2 (Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the borough) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policy 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development).

## Ecology

171. Paragraph 174 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) states that planning decisions '*should contribute to and enhance the natural environment*'. In addition, paragraph 175 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) 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.

172. Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out a requirement for minerals and waste development to 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.
173. An **Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, Protected Species Survey**, and an **Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP)** were submitted as part of the **ES** supporting the application. These were then updated as part of both Reg 25 requests 1 & 2. Following Reg 25 2 a **shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)** was also provided.
174. The nearest designated ecological site is the River Test SSSI, which is situated approximately 1.4 km to the east of the site.
175. The **Habitat Survey** states that the majority of the habitat types on site are common and widespread in the national and local context, and as such, are considered to be of low ecological value at the local level. The exceptions are the hedgerows and woodland which are of moderate ecological value and contain a diverse range of botanical species and offer suitable habitat for a range of species. These should be retained and protected where possible. A section of the central hedgerow will be removed to allow works access across the site. As this is of moderate ecological value, this will be compensated for by enhancing existing hedgerows as well as planting new hedgerows.
176. The proposal includes the removal of:
  - 24 hectares of improved grassland including the fields and bunds either side of the haul road;
  - 0.35km of hedgerow; and

- Four oak trees including three mature and one younger tree within the hedgerows.
177. The habitats to be retained and protected as part of proposals are:
- 0.86 hectares of broad-leaved woodland (priority habitat);
  - 0.1 hectares of plantation woodland; and
  - 0.73km of native species rich hedgerow (including enhancements to 0.42km of hedgerow through infilling and management).
178. The habitats to be created/reinstated as part of proposals are:
- 2km of new hedgerow planting;
  - 1.00 hectare of mixed scrub planting;
  - 0.46 hectares of tree planting;
  - 24 hectares of improved grassland;
  - 0.28ha of semi-improved grassland (wildflower meadow); and
  - Three ponds (total 0.13 hectares).
179. The existing Roke Manor field conveyor will be relocated to serve the extension area through a small strip of Squabb Wood. The conveyor route has been designed so that it passes through a natural clearing in the woodland and no trees or vegetation will need to be removed for its installation, with the exception of some minor pruning to the trees.
180. The achievement of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is not currently mandatory, although maximising the net gain from all developments is encouraged by the Minerals Planning Authority and is considered to be best practice. The proposal has used the DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain Metric 3.0 to calculate the gains and the site has the potential to exceed the expected 10% BNG target and should achieve 19.03% for habitats and 71.47% for hedgerows.
181. The County Ecologist and Natural England initially raised concerns over omissions in the submission relating to the assessment of the sensitive designated ecological receptors within the vicinity, and the quality of surveys concerning protected species and their habitats.
182. Following the submission of the applicant's Regulation 25 further information both the County Council's Ecologist and Natural England were able to fully assess the proposal and all potential and actual impacts on the locality. With the County Council being the 'competent authority' in relation to Habitats Regulations, the assessment of the applicant's shadow HRA could also be undertaken too as set out earlier in this report. They concurred with the applicant's findings that the temporary habitat loss resulting from proposal will have no likely significant effect upon the Mottisfont Bats SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
183. The County Ecologist is now satisfied that the proposal has addressed all previous comments and raise no objection to the proposed extension subject to conditions requiring the submission of a Dust Management Plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan, restricting the lighting on site to vehicle movement headlights only, and a requirement to check the tree with low

potential bat roost feature immediately prior to works to the tree including felling or limb reduction/removal – to prevent impacts to European species. These conditions are all included in **Appendix A**.

184. Natural England has no objection to the development provided that the measures included within the EMMP can be effective for the lifetime of the proposal. The County Ecologist is satisfied that the EMMP provided can be used as a basis for a more detailed EMMP that will be secured by a S106 agreement. These measures will secure ecological management for long term biodiversity benefits.
185. Natural England also noted that best practice techniques should be used for soil management and storage. Soil management practices are already conditioned as part of the extant planning permission for the existing quarry and will be applied to the extension, as set out in **Appendix A**.
186. Based on the provision of the restoration scheme and ecological mitigation proposed, and subject to satisfactory restoration and aftercare being maintained and achieved via planning condition/s and/or s106 agreement for the extended period, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy E5 (Biodiversity) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species).

#### Soil Protection

187. Soil issues are particularly relevant for minerals developments as extraction usually involves disturbance to land and soils over large areas. Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development 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 and gives provisions for the protection of soils during construction.
188. The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system classifies land into five grades, with Grade 3 subdivided into Subgrades 3a and 3b. The best and most versatile land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a.
189. The site is currently used as agricultural land and is proposed to be restored to the same land use.
190. Of the 32.9 hectare (ha) site, only 3.2 ha of the site has been identified as Grade 3a 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land. In view of the size of area and ALC grading of land affected, Natural England did not object to the proposal but confirmed that it would be appropriate to specify agriculture as an afteruse and suggested that mitigation measures contained within **Chapter 3 –**

**Soils** of the submitted **ES** would help to safeguard soil resources and achieve a satisfactory standard of agricultural reclamation.

191. The proposed restoration scheme (**RM/254/13M**) has the potential to restore a greater area of Subgrade 3a ACL land (i.e., approximately 19ha) than before mineral extraction (i.e., 3.2 ha). Following the successful restoration of agricultural land to ALC Subgrade 3a, and the implementation of a five-year Agricultural Aftercare and Drainage Scheme (see **Appendix 5 of Chapter 3 – Soils** of the **ES**).
192. The site intends to utilise the existing soils on site to construct the screening bunds around the perimeter of the site, and so when the use of the site ceases and is restored, there will be negligible loss of and impacts on soils.
193. On the basis that following restoration of the site it is considered that the soils and land quality will be returned to a comparable or improved standard than the baseline setting, there will therefore be no residual effects on the soils and land quality beyond the project timescales and in the longer term. It is considered that securing this improvement can be managed through soil management and restoration conditions applied to the development in **Appendix A**. Therefore, subject to the suggested conditions related to soil management and handling, and appropriate conditions on restoration of the site which are included in **Appendix A**, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and paragraph 174 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policies 9 (Protection of soils) and 10 (Restoration of quarries and waste developments).

#### Public Access

194. There is a Public Right of Way (PROW) (Romsey Extra Footpath 5) which runs adjacent to the southern boundary and Phase 2 of the proposed development site.
195. The PROW is mainly screened from public viewpoints into the site by heavy vegetation and tree screening and the proposed development includes the provision of bunding along the southern edge of the Phase 2 extraction area (ranging from 2-5 metres in height) which will add additional screening for both noise and visual impacts.
196. The County Rights of Way Team have no objection to the proposed development but recommend the inclusion of some informatives to protect the rights of way. These are included within **Appendix A**.
197. The proposal is 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 EM2 (Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough) of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan (2016) in relation to public rights of way. Whilst it is recognised that the



emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policies 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and wellbeing).and 14 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development).

### Cultural and Archaeological Heritage

198. Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires minerals and waste development 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.
199. An assessment of the effects of the development on local archaeological and cultural heritage features and resources was undertaken and is contained within **Chapter 5** of the **ES** includes a **Geophysical Survey** and **Archaeological Desk-based Assessment**.
200. There is one listed building close to site, Longdown Cottage, which is Grade II listed. This known heritage asset has been assessed and the quarrying activity and proposed restoration plan poses low risk to the asset and its setting.
201. There are no substantive archaeological sites currently recorded at this location but archaeological monitoring of previous phases of Roke Manor Quarry has revealed a spread of small-scale archaeological activity, particularly prehistoric in date, which has been recognised and recorded during monitoring of topsoil/over burden stripping. This suggests that whilst the proposed site does have some archaeological potential it is not predicted to be overriding. The **ES** recommends continuing to implement the successful mitigation strategy used in the previous phases. This the archaeological supervision of the topsoil and over burden stripping to ensure archaeological remains are recognised, and the recording of those remains prior to any extraction.
202. The County Archaeologist considers that this approach has worked well in the previous phases and the results of the archaeological discoveries have been reported. They recommend conditions to secure archaeological monitoring, recording and reporting during the appropriate stages of implementing the permission, as well as a condition to secure archaeological periodic monitoring of the exposed gravel, to enable recording and reporting during the appropriate stages of extraction to ensure that any Palaeolithic evidence/context is recognised. These conditions have been included in Appendix A.
203. As there is no objection from the County Archaeologist and subject to the above conditions, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy E9 (Heritage) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy

requirements of updated Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets).

#### Impact on public health, safety and amenity

204. Paragraph 174 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) 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'*.
205. 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 waste developments and other forms of development.
206. Policy LHW4 (Amenity) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) allows development that provides privacy and amenity to occupants of neighbouring properties, and requires that development does not reduce levels of daylight and sunlight reaching properties or private open space to below acceptable levels.
207. Policy E8 (Pollution) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) permits development provided that it does not result in pollution which would cause unacceptable risks to human health, the natural environment or general amenity. Development that would or could potentially generate pollution will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that there would not be any adverse impact on human health, the natural environment or general amenity. Development which is sensitive<sup>117</sup> to pollution will only be permitted if the intended users are not subject to unacceptable impact from existing nearby uses having taken account of proposed mitigation measures.
208. 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. The Environment Agency was consulted on the application and raised no objection to the proposal. It is not appropriate for the planning process to condition operational issues which relate to the jurisdiction of the environmental permit. Paragraph 050 of the [NPPG](#) 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) *Air Quality & Dust*

209. **Chapter 10- Dust and Air Quality Assessment** of the **ES** includes consideration of the development's potential 'nuisance' or 'disamenity' dust impacts at residential and ecological receptors within 250 m of the proposed extension. The assessment also considered the potential impacts on the Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) for PM10 and PM2.5.
210. There are no Air Quality Management Area's in Test Valley Borough, and there will not be an increase in Heavy Good Vehicle (HGV) movements travelling to and from the site so emissions would not increase, but continue at the same rate for a further 8 years.
211. Paragraph 5.1 of **Chapter 10** of the **ES** indicates that there would not be significant impacts at sensitive off-site receptors from dust, providing that suitable dust mitigation measures are in practice applied.
212. The Test Valley EHO accepts that suitable dust control mitigation can be applied to control off-site impacts but raised concerns that those measures might not be implemented effectively in practice. They therefore recommended conditions relating to proactive dust monitoring, requiring the submission for approval and implementation of a dust management plan covering a combination of proactive and reactive measures, and to continue with the existing requirement for a wheelwash facility to be retained to prevent the track-out of mud on to local roads. These conditions have been included in **Appendix A** and as such, the development is considered not to give rise to adverse dust and air quality impacts.
213. On the basis of the conditions proposed, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policies LHW4 (Amenity) and E8 (Pollution) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) in relation to dust.

*b) Noise:*

214. There are a number of properties that lie closest to the site (including Homeview, Troy House and Croylands) which are at distances of between 215 m and 350 m from the extraction areas of the site.
215. **Chapter 9** of the **ES** summarises the full **Noise Impact Assessment** which is included as **Appendix 6** of the **ES**. The assessment has considered the noise impact from plant and machinery associated with the proposed soil stripping, sand extraction, backfilling and restoration. This includes HGV movements together with the operation of the sand and gravel screening and washing plant, conveyor and mobile plant movements.
216. Paragraph 021 (Reference ID: 27-021-20140306) of the NPPG states that mineral planning authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive receptors that does not exceed the background noise level LA90,1hour by more than 10 dBA during normal working hours between 07.00 and 19.00 hours. Where it will be difficult not to

exceed the background level by more than 10dBA 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 55 dB LAeq, 1hour (free field).

217. It is recognised that activities relating to mineral extraction sites such as soil-stripping, the construction and removal of baffle mounds, soil storage mounds and spoil heaps, construction of new permanent landforms and aspects of site road construction and maintenance can cause temporary increases in noise level. On this basis Paragraph 022 (Reference ID: 27-022-20140306) of the NPPG specifies that increased temporary daytime noise limits of up to 70 dB LAeq 1 hour (free field) for periods of up to 8 weeks in a year at specified noise-sensitive properties should be considered to facilitate essential site preparation and restoration work and construction of baffle mounds where it is clear that this will bring longer-term environmental benefits to the site or its environs.
218. During soil stripping works and prior to the construction of the earth bunds on site, the noise levels will at times be at the upper end of the guideline value of up to 10 dB above background at three of the receptor locations (Home View, Stanbridge Ranvilles Farm and Ashness) and at times above this guideline value (by up to 3 dB) at a further three receptor locations (2 Roke Manor Cottages, Croyland and Troy House). The maximum level in the absence of soil stripping is predicted to be 9 dB above the background level (at Home View which is the nearest residential property).
219. The predicted noise impact is not expected to exceed the guideline limit of 55 dB(A) at any of the receptor locations.
220. It is considered that it will not be practicable for the applicant to reduce the impact of these short-term noise impacts as this would result in an unreasonable burden on them as the mineral operator. The noise impact at all other times (during excavation and restoration) will be lower than 10 dB above the background noise level.
221. It is anticipated that the noise from the operations will be audible at some receptors and therefore is likely to generate a noise impact which falls between No Observable Effect Level (NOEL) and Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) as defined in the PPG. The impact will be mitigated to a minimum by the provision of the acoustic bund and via good working practices on site and therefore this is considered acceptable.
222. The **NIA** has indicated that the level of noise impact for the proposed scheme at the nearest properties will be within the levels suggested for surface mineral workings within the technical guidance of the NPPG. There is potential for a degree of noise impact at some receptors, however, this will be primarily during soil screening works (prior to the erection of earth bunds which will act as acoustic screens). It is considered that conditions could be used to ensure that these periods are kept to a minimum. Conditions could also ensure that the site operates within the confines of a noise management plan which will ensure that

best practicable means are employed on site at all times to minimise environmental noise emission.

223. Initially the Test Valley Borough Council Environmental Health Officer (TVBCEHO) was concerned about the proposed noise levels, but an error in the calculations relating to one aspect of the works led to an over-prediction at two of the worst-affected receptor positions. The **NIA** was appropriately updated and submitted as part of Reg 25 request 2. The changes were considered to be significant by the EHO as they decreased the severity of possible adverse impacts. On the basis of these changes, the EHO has no objection to the development subject to the inclusion of conditions to limit working hours, the submission and securing of a noise management plan, and the application of noise limits. All of these conditions have been included in **Appendix A** and the development is therefore not considered to cause significant adverse noise impacts.
224. On the basis of the mitigation measures proposed and the inclusion of the proposed conditions, the proposal is seen to be in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policies LHW4 (Amenity) and E8 (Pollution) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#), in relation to noise.

*c) Lighting:*

225. Concerns have been raised in public consultations about light pollution and this amenity impact upon nearby residents. These are noted. However, the proposal does not include any lighting beyond what is on the existing processing plant area and the headlights from HGV vehicles.
226. The County Ecologist did specify that given the surrounding habitats and species which frequent the site, lighting should not be more than that of HGV vehicles and a condition is required to control this.
227. Subject to conditions limiting the lighting which are included in **Appendix A**, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policies LHW4 (Amenity) and E8 (Pollution) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) in relation to lighting.

*d) Odour:*

228. Some concerns were raised in representations regarding odour from the infill material of the proposed development which are noted. The tipping of municipal wastes are not proposed and the site will be restored using inert materials.
229. The Test Valley EHO did not raise any concerns regarding odour and does not object to the development on these grounds.
230. Some of the public representations received raised concerns regarding odour from the fill materials proposed to infill the site with following extraction of sand and gravel. Whilst these are noted, the proposed materials for infill are inert

waste which do not have any odour. It is considered that ensuring the types of material used for restoring the site can be controlled by way of condition.

231. Subject to conditions controlling the nature of waste materials used for restoration infill included in **Appendix A**, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policies LHW4 (Amenity) and E8 (Pollution) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) in relation to odour.

e) *Cumulative impacts:*

232. Part 1 to Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (as amended) provides that an ES may contain a “description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment, which should cover ... cumulative ... effects”.
233. Policy 10 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states “minerals and waste development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impact”, nor should it “j) cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the mineral, waste and other forms of development. The potential cumulative impacts of minerals and waste development and the way they relate to existing developments must be addressed to an acceptable standard”.
234. **Chapter 13 of the ES** addresses potential cumulative impacts arising from the development. It identifies only 2 sites in the local area that could lead to cumulative impacts arising and they are both existing minerals and waste sites, Squabb Wood and the existing Roke Manor Quarry.
235. Squabb Wood is currently a non-operational landfill site (Planning Permission 19/02616/CMAS) and is located to the south of the proposal site and is separated from the proposed site at Stanbridge Ranvilles by mature woodland which provides good screening.
236. The approved Restoration Plan for Squabb Wood (Ref: 005-Rev 2) indicates that the north-western part of the site, known as Shootash-North (nearest part of the site to Stanbridge Ranvilles) is to naturally regenerate and requires low intervention for restoration to lowland heathland. The operations and impacts within this area are therefore minimal. Squabb Wood landfill has a separate site entrance and access road and therefore there are no impacts with regard to traffic management.
237. The extraction on the main Roke Manor quarry site has now ceased and is in the process of being restored, which means that impacts from the extension would not result in an intensification of the minerals working.
238. The operations will result in no increase to the current Roke Manor traffic movements (extraction and tipping) and the shared use of the site entrance/access will not generate any significant cumulative impact with regard to traffic. Some negative landscape and ecological impacts are likely to arise from the development, but following restoration these would be negated and in

fact lead to an increase in biodiversity of the site. There will be increased noise levels to local properties resulting from cumulative operational noise but these will remain below the government's mineral guidance noise limits for normal operations at all times. Overall, it is concluded that with the mitigation measures in place and best practice measures applied that there will be no significant, adverse cumulative impacts from the proposal.

239. On the basis of the considerations noted above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policies LHW4 (Amenity) and E8 (Pollution) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#) in relation to cumulative impacts. Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policy 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and wellbeing).

#### Impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters and flooding

240. Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that minerals and waste development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. This includes not releasing emissions to water (above appropriate standards).
241. 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.
242. A full **Hydrological and Hydrogeological Assessment** and **Flood Risk Assessment** has been undertaken and included within **Chapter 8** of the **ES**.
243. Following the removal of exemptions from the need for a water abstraction licence for quarry dewatering, RBQP has applied to the Environment Agency for a transfer licence to continue dewatering of the existing quarry area. This would need to be varied to include the proposal area.
244. Currently at Roke Manor Quarry, the water is pumped into a soakaway. However, the groundwater flow rate and saturated thickness is markedly elevated during the wetter months at Stanbridge Ranvilles, particularly in Phases 3b and Phase 4. It is therefore planned to seek consent to discharge into the North Stanbridge Stream having demonstrated that the existing water management system can provide sufficient silt settlement capacity. It is stated that this application will be submitted to the Environment Agency should planning consent be granted.
245. The Environment Agency raised no objection to the proposed development but advised that the aspects of the proposal such as dewatering and associated discharge of this water and restoration will need permission in the form of Abstraction Licences/Environmental Permit from the EA.

246. The Lead Local Flood Authority initially raised concerns about increased run off from bunding and interception ditches on the site. They sought clarity on depths / dimensions and calculations of ditches to show that they will be of sufficient size and have suitable connectivity. Following receipt of the flood and drainage information included Reg 25 Request 1 they raise no objection to the proposed development.
247. On the basis of the scheme and mitigation measures proposed, the proposal is in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy E7 (Water Management) of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policies 11 (Protecting public health, safety, amenity and wellbeing) and 12 (Flood risk and prevention) as well as new Policy 8 (Water resources).

#### Links to Environmental Permitting

248. Paragraph 012 of the National Planning Practice Guidance 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.
249. Planning and permitting decisions are separate but closely linked. The Environment Agency has a role to play in both. 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.
250. 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.
251. 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.



252. The Environment Agency carry 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.
253. It is likely that the waste disposal element of the development will require an Environmental Permit, and so will the de-watering operations as mentioned above. Should a permit be 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 to monitor to ensure compliance such as audits, site visits, data analysis and compliance checks are carried out by the regulator.

#### Highways impact

254. 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.
255. Access to the site is via an existing bellmouth arrangement from the A27 Salisbury Road. The existing access has geometries of 7.3m wide with 12.5m radii and the **Transport Statement** confirms that the access has visibility splays to 4.5m x 120m in both directions. Access to the site will continue as existing.
256. No changes are proposed to the existing operation of the site or staffing numbers, the proposal is for an extension of time for the continued extraction at the same rate as currently operating. The number of vehicle movements associated with the site would therefore remain unchanged.
257. It is stated that the majority of vehicles will turn eastwards from the site along the A27 towards Romsey, as agreed within previous planning permission 07/02771/CMAS. Signage is already in place to discourage turning west from, However, the applicant has indicated that the occasional vehicle does turn west to deliver to local markets. The application acknowledges the small number of vehicles which will take this route and states that the applicant intends to keep these occurrences to a minimum.
258. The Highways Authority does not consider that this proposal will have a significant impact of the highway and raises no objection to the development subject to the retention of all relevant highways conditions associated with the existing Roke Manor Quarry planning permission which have been included in **Appendix A**.
259. Subject to these planning conditions, the proposal is in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy T1 (Managing Movement)

of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policy 13 (Managing traffic).

## Restoration

260. Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals 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. 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. It also indicates that restoration of mineral extraction and landfill sites should be phased throughout the life of the development.
261. The site is proposed to be restored to the same use as existing, with progressive restoration completed in accordance with the proposed Restoration Scheme, generally returning land to original levels for agricultural use. The Restoration Scheme includes additional areas of scrub, tree and hedgerow planting, drainage ditches and surface water bodies. A variety of different restoration habitats are to be provided within the overall site which have been designed to provide biodiversity enhancement. The habitats include the following elements:
- Three onsite ponds – North pond: 480m<sup>2</sup> / Mid pond: 475m<sup>2</sup> / South pond: 767m<sup>2</sup>;
  - New woodland planting – 0.46 hectares (ha);
  - New Scrub planting – 1ha; and
  - New hedgerow planting – 1990 linear metres.
262. There are also mitigation measures proposed to maintain and protect the integrity and character of the existing landscape and biodiversity of the site. Further details of these are included in the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement (**Arboriculture, Landscape, Ecology**).
263. As already identified, the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) identifies 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 NPPGW as well as Policies 25 (Sustainable waste management) and 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) of the HMWP (2013). Policy 30 of the HMWP (2013) promotes the use of inert material in the restoration of mineral workings where a beneficial outcome can be achieved. Subject to a condition securing the type of waste to be used, which is included in **Appendix A**, the restoration is considered to be acceptable. In addition, as already noted, an ecological mitigation and management plan will be secured through Section 106 Legal Agreement which will ensure ecological management for long term biodiversity benefits.

264. On the basis of the schemes submitted, proposed conditions and the securing of a S106, it is considered that the proposal secures the restoration of a mineral site in the most practical, timely and efficient way without adversely impacting upon the environment, landscape character or the amenity/safety of local residents in accordance with Policy 9 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). Whilst it is recognised that the emerging [duHMWP](#) can only be given very limited policy weight (due to the current early stage in the review process), the proposal is considered to meet the policy requirements of updated Policy 10 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments).

#### Monitoring and enforcement

265. As an operational minerals / waste site, Roke Manor Quarry is subject to regular monitoring by the Councils Monitoring and Enforcement team to ensure compliance with previous permissions granted. If permission were granted, the Site would continue to be inspected by officers in the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's Monitoring and Enforcement team to ensure compliance with any new permission granted.
266. One complaint was received in November 2020 relating to a residential garden flooding and vehicles turning right out of the site. Clearance works of a ditch were undertaken and there has since been no further complaint relating to this issue.
267. A further complaint was received relating to mud on the highway in November 2021. Monitoring Officers reported that the operator sent a highway sweeper out following receipt of the complaint and that officers did not find any evidence on their site visit to investigate.
268. Some concerns have been raised during the operation of the existing quarry about exiting of right turning vehicles. Monitoring Officers have reported that the Raymond Brown have made a concerted effort with their drivers to address this issue.
269. The Environment Agency would also inspect the Site as part of monitoring the Environmental Permit aspects of the proposed 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.
270. The Environment Health Officer raised some concerns about what would happen if complaints about noise were received. These are acknowledged. Any complaints received would be investigated in accordance with the Planning Enforcement and Site Monitoring Plan. The Environment Health Officer also has jurisdiction to investigate noise complaints.

### Non-material planning issues raised in representations

271. 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:

*a) Impact on house prices*

272. 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 to be material consideration in decision making.

*b) Loss of view*

273. Concerns have been raised in representations about the loss of a view. These concerns are acknowledged. The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. However, the overarching visual impact of the development is a material consideration as set out in the Visual impact and landscape section of the report above.

### Legal agreement

274. The Roke Manor Quarry has a separate Section 106 (under permission 07/02771/CMAS) (s106) and a deed of variation (under permission 10/02615/CMAS) relating to woodland management.

275. It is considered that this proposal requires a separate s106 agreement to secure appropriate ecological mitigation and compensation measures. The recommendation reflects this requirement.

### Community benefits

276. 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 resident's 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.

277. 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.

278. A site liaison panel has been in place since 2008/2009. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority support the continuation of this panel. An informative is included on this matter in **Appendix A**.

## Conclusions

279. It is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), subject to the proposed mitigation measures and associated planning conditions and legal agreement. In summary, it is considered that the proposal would:

- be a time limited mineral extraction which is subject to a requirement for restoration and aftercare (Policy 5 of [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and COM2 of [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#));
- be a time limited mineral extraction which is subject to a requirement for restoration and aftercare (Policies 5 and 9 of [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and COM2 of [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#));
- contribute to maintaining an adequate and steady supply of sharp sand and gravel for Hampshire through the extension of an existing quarry identified in Policy 20 (Policies 17 and 20 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#));
- be acceptable in terms of highway capacity and safety (Policy 12 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and T1 of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#));
- not cause adverse public health and safety impacts or unacceptable adverse amenity impacts (Policy 10 of [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and LHW4 and E8 of [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#));
- not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact; (Policy 10 and 13 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#));
- not have a significant adverse effect on designated or important habitats and species (Policy 3 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and E5 of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#));
- protect water quality and surface water drainage and will cause no additional flood risk (Policy 11 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and E7 of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#));
- ensures that the amenity of residents is protected; and
- safeguard the surrounding public rights of way.

280. On balance, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with paragraph 11 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) and Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and the relevant policies of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan (2016). The Policies of the emerging [duHMWP](#) are at too early a stage in the review process to be given weight to decision making at this current time.

## Recommendation

281. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A** and completion of a section 106 agreement in relation to submission and approval of an Environmental Management and Mitigation Plan.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Conditions

Appendix B – Committee Plan

Appendix C – Layout Plan  
Appendix D – Phasing Plans  
Appendix E - Proposed planting  
Appendix F – Restoration Plan

Other documents relating to this application:

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/Planning/Display/21/01274/CMAS>

**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.

**Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents**

**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.)**

Document

Location

21/01274/CMAS  
TV226

Hampshire County Council

An extension of mineral working at Roke Manor Quarry, to extract circa 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel from the Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, including continuation of on-site mineral processing, backfilling with inert material and progressive restoration to agriculture with increased nature conservation and biodiversity enhancements at Roke Manor Quarry - Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension, Salisbury Road, Shootash SO51 6GA

## **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.



## Appendix A - CONDITIONS

### Reasons for Approval

On balance, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan. The proposal will be a time limited mineral extraction which is subject to a requirement for restoration and aftercare (Policies 5 and 9 of [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and COM2 of [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#)). The proposal will contribute to maintaining an adequate and steady supply of sharp sand and gravel for Hampshire through the extension of an existing quarry (Policies 17 and 20 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#)). The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway capacity and safety (Policy 12 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy T1 of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#)). The proposal is not considered to cause adverse public health and safety impacts or unacceptable adverse amenity and visual impacts (Policies 10 and 13 of [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and LHW4 and E8 of [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#)) or unacceptable adverse visual impact. The proposal will not have a significant adverse effect on designated or important habitats and species (Policy 3 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and E5 of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#)). The proposal will not have an impact on water quality and surface water drainage and will cause no additional flood risk (Policy 11 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and E7 of the [TVBCLP \(2016\)](#)).

Taking all matters into consideration, the proposal is in accordance with paragraph 11 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) and Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and is considered to be a sustainable minerals development.

### Conditions

#### Time Limits

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

#### Prior Notification

2. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority should be given 7 days prior written notification of the intention to start felling trees, to start stripping soils, to start extraction and to start infilling.

Reason: To provide local residents and monitoring staff with sufficient notice of the commencement of these operations.

## Hours of Working

3. No vehicle shall enter or leave the site and no operations shall take place except between the hours of 07.00 and 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 and 12.30 on Saturday. There shall be no working on Sundays or recognised Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of nearby residential amenity and in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy E8 (Pollution) of the Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan (2016).

## Highways

4. The only permitted access for vehicles subject of the approved development entering and leaving the site, shall be via the access point onto the A27 as shown on approved drawing no. 1369/1A May 2007 Richard Parker Consultancy (approved under planning permission 10/02615/CMAS).

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

5. The surfacing of the site access shall be kept free of potholes and cracks, and any that occur shall be satisfactorily repaired within seven days of identification. Such maintenance and repair shall continue until such time as it is no longer required for these operations.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and safeguarding the local environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy T1 (Managing movement) and E8 (Pollution) of the Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan (2016).

6. The visibility splays at the site access parallel to the A27, shall be kept clear of undergrowth and any shrubs trimmed back to less than 1.0 metre high where necessary to ensure that forward visibility to the south and north is not obstructed.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety (it is acknowledged that there is only currently grass verge but this condition allows for any vegetation growth that could occur in the future). In accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy T1 (Managing Movement) of the Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan (2016).

7. The public highway shall be kept clear of mud caused by Heavy Goods Vehicles accessing and egressing the site at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 12 of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy T1 (Managing Movement) of the Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan (2016).

8. All Heavy Goods Vehicles exiting the site with minerals and soils, and entering the site with inert material, shall be satisfactorily sheeted to avoid spillage onto the public highway. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Site operations**

9. Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, a Site Environmental Management Plan (SEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

The SEMP should set out an overall strategy for managing environmental impacts which arise during construction. The SEMP should cover the following matters:

- a) Measures to prevent sediment run-off from the site;
- b) provision for emergency vehicles;
- c) 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;
- d) storage 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;
- f) health and safety/site management;
- g) how any waste generated on site will be managed;
- h) measures emergency procedures for pollution events;
- i) details of biosecurity procedures; and
- j) Details on the management of any contaminated material found on site.

The approved SEMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and the approved measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: To ensure there are no impacts to biodiversity in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered to prevent damage to protected habitats and species and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

## Landscape

10. Stockpiles of materials shall not exceed four metres in height above approved operational ground levels, apart from the feed stockpile coming off the conveyor which shall be no more than 7m high above the new lowered temporary base level.

To manage the visual impact of the development in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

## Arboriculture

11. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out for the duration of the development in accordance with the **Environmental Statement Chapter 4 Arboriculture Method Statement (Reg 25 - 12 August 2022)**, **Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Reg 25 - 12 November 2021)**, **Environmental Statement Chapter 4.5 Arboriculture Tree Protection Plan 1 (Reg 25 - 12 November 2021)** and **Environmental Statement Chapter 4.6 Arboriculture Tree Protection Plan 2**.

Reason: To ensure the protection of arboriculture in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013)).

12. Tree **T13** as marked on '**Tree Protection Plan**' – **21.2865.1.TPP Rev1** which has a low potential bat roost feature must be checked by an appropriately qualified ecologist immediately prior to any works to the tree including felling or limb reduction/removal.

Reason: To prevent adverse impacts to European species in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

## Archaeology

13. No development as hereby approved shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological evaluation in accordance with a written specification that has been submitted to and approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition in the interests of the recording of historic environment findings and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

14. No development shall take place until Condition 13 has been complied with and the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation, including geoarchaeological monitoring, in accordance with a written specification that has been submitted to and approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement condition in the interests of the recording of historic environment findings and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

15. Following completion of archaeological fieldwork, a report will be produced by the applicant in accordance with an approved programme including where appropriate post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, publication and public engagement. This will be submitted to and approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Types of Waste**

16. No waste other than inert Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste shall be imported to the site.

There should be no burning of wastes on site.

Reason: In the interests of public amenity and to ensure that the development is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire & Minerals Waste Plan (2013).

### **Noise**

17. Prior to the commencement of development, an updated Noise Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

This should include a details of what would happen if substantiated complaints are received about noise, how operator monitoring (including the scope) will take place (undertaken by an appropriately qualified independent specialist) and include a commitment to submit the details of the monitoring results to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority within one month of being carried out.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity and in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire & Minerals Waste Plan (2013) and Policy E8 (Pollution) of the Test Valley Borough

Council Local Plan (2016). This is a pre-commencement condition as such details need to be considered prior to commencement and thus goes to the heart of the planning permission.

18. The level of noise emitted from temporary site operations, including initial soil removal, formation of screen bunds and works of restoration, shall not exceed 70 dB LAeq, 1hr (freefield) at noise sensitive properties (as set out in the **ES Chapter 9, Appendix 6A – Noise Impact Assessment**) and shall be restricted to no more than 8 weeks in any 12-month period. The noise levels from these temporary operations shall be monitored in accordance with the monitoring scheme approved within the Noise Management Plan under Condition (18).

Reason: In the interests of local amenities in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy E8 (Pollution) of the Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan (2016).

19. The level of noise emitted from all other normal daytime site operations shall not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field) at any nearby residential receptors (as set out in the **ES Chapter 9, Appendix 6A – Noise Impact Assessment**).

Reason: In the interests of local amenities in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy E8 (Pollution) of the Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan (2016).

20. All vehicles, plant and machinery operated within the site shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' specification at all times, shall be fitted with and use effective silencers and shall be fitted with and use only white-noise type reversing alarms.

Reason: To minimise noise disturbance from operations at the site and to ensure the development is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

## **Dust**

21. All silts and fines that accumulate around various parts of the conveyor system linking the extraction area and the washing plant site shall be contained, to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority, so that they are not deposited in the woodland or ecosystem through which the conveyor and haul route pass.

Reason: To protect the existing ecosystem and woodland in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of Habitats and species) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

22. Prior to commencement of development, a Dust Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

The Dust Management Plan should identify all dust risks associated with the operation of the site and ensure they are mitigated as far as reasonably practicable. The content of the Dust Management Plan should include all those components recommended in Appendix 6 of the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning, May 2016.

Reason: In the interests of nearby amenity and to protect the surrounding woodland in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of Habitats and species) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Lighting**

23. There shall be no external lighting on the extraction site or haul road except for vehicle headlights only.

Reason: In the interest of local amenity and for the protection of bats in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of Habitats and species) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

### **Soil stripping and storage**

24. Soil Management of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted **Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Soils**. There shall be no export of topsoil or subsoil from the site. The scheme shall be implemented as approved for the duration of the permission.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the soil resource in accordance with Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013). This is a pre-commencement to ensure that bund construction is carried out appropriately and to minimise loss of best and most versatile ACL quality soils.

### **Restoration**

25. The site shall be restored to agriculture in accordance with a scheme to be agreed by the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall be submitted within six months of the date of this permission and shall include details of:
- (i) the thickness and quality of subsoil and topsoil to be used and the method of soil handling and spreading, including the machinery to be used;
  - (ii) the ripping of any compacted layers of final cover to ensure adequate drainage and aeration, such ripping to take place before placing of topsoil;
  - (iii) measures to be taken to drain the restored land; and
  - (iv) details of proposed seeding.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory restoration in accordance with Policies 4 (Protection of the designated landscape), 5 (Protection of the countryside), 8 (Protection of Soils) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

26. An Aftercare Scheme requiring that such steps as may be necessary to bring each phase of the land restored to the required standard for use for agriculture shall be submitted for the approval of the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority not later than two years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To ensure that the land is satisfactorily restored in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

27. Should works on any part of the site subject of this permission, for any reason, cease to operate for a period of more than twelve months, a revised restoration scheme shall be submitted for approval in writing to the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority within one month of identification by the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority of the said one year closure period.

The revised scheme shall be implemented to a timetable to be agreed in writing with the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority as part of the submission and associated approval process.

Reason: In the interests of the landscape character, amenity and Nature Conservation Interests of the area in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species), 5 (Protection of the countryside) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments).

## Plans

28. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: **RM/254/4, RM/254/14, RM/254/17, RM/254/21-1, RM/254/21-2, 1369/1A, AV-CAN-3210 (TD), RM/254/13RevM, RM/254/15-1RevE, RM/254/15-2RevF, RM/254/15-3RevF, RM/254/15-4RevF, RM/254/15-5RevF, RM/254/15-6RevC, RM/254/15-7RevE, RM/254/18RevE, RM/254/11RevE , RM/254/16RevB**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

## Note to Applicant

1. In determining this planning application, the Minerals and 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 (2021), as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.



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
3. The Environment Agency advised that the aspects of the proposal such as dewatering and associated discharge of this water and restoration will need permission in the form of Abstraction Licences/Environmental Permit.
4. The following informatives relate to Rights of Way:
  - i. If there is likely to be an effect on the footpath (dust, noise or other obstruction) during the period of the works and that if there is deemed to be a risk to users of the footpath, the applicant should contact this the Countryside Service directly to discuss the Temporary Closure of the footpath.
  - ii. If a temporary closure to the right of way is not required, the right of way, must remain available for public use at all times.
  - iii. There must be no surface alterations to a public Right of Way without the consent of Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority. To carry out any such works without this permission would constitute an offence under s131 Highways Act 1980.
  - iv. No builders or contractor's vehicles, machinery, materials, spoil or anything associated with the works should be left on or near the footpath so as to obstruct, hinder or provide a hazard to users.
5. For the purposes of matters relating to this decision Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) are defined as vehicles over 3.5 tonne un-laden).
6. The Liaison Panel for Roke Manor Quarry/Stanbridge Ranvilles Extension should continue between the site operator, Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, interested parties and community representatives at a suitable frequency to facilitate effective engagement with stakeholders in the interests of promoting communication between the site operator and local community. The County Council's guidance on the establishment of panels is available to the applicant.