

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Regulatory Committee
Date:	20 April 2022
Title:	Extension to the quarry extraction area to the South-West with associated modifications to the approved quarry schemes (No. 30633/041) <u>And</u> Variation of Conditions 1 (Timescale), 4 (Phasing) and 10 (Landscaping) of Planning Permission 30633/039 (No. 30633/040) at Grundon Sand and Gravel Ltd, Frith End Sand Quarry, Grooms Farm Lane, Frith End, Bordon GU35 0QR (Site Ref: EH121)
Report From:	Assistant Director for Waste, Planning and Environment

Contact name: Tim Felstead

Tel: 07761 330557

Email: tim.felstead@hants.gov.uk

Recommendation

1. It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED for planning application, 30633/041 subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A** (30633/041).
2. It is recommended that planning permission be granted for planning application 30633/040, subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix B**.

Executive Summary

3. Two planning applications have been submitted:

- Planning application [30633/041](#) – Seeks permission for a 2.1 hectare extension to the south-west of the existing extraction area at Frith End Quarry on an area known as Ranks Hill. This proposed extension site will be known throughout this report as the ‘Hill Extension’. This is for the extraction of approximately 100,000 tonnes of soft sand and for the restoration of the extension site. This is an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) application; and
 - Planning application [30633/040](#) – Seeks Variation of Conditions 1 (Timescale), 4 (Phasing) and 10 (Landscaping) of Planning Permission [30633/039](#) to enable the proposed extension sought in application 30633/041 by adopting revised phasing for extraction and restoration and to allow the existing site facilities to accommodate the proposed extension.
4. A committee site visit by Members took place on 8 November 2021 in advance of the proposal being considered by the Regulatory Committee.
 5. Key issues raised are:
 - Need for minerals;
 - Flood management and hydrology;
 - Restoration;
 - Ecology;
 - Landscape and visual impact;
 - Arboriculture; and
 - Cumulative impact on residential amenity.
 6. The existing quarry is currently permitted by Planning Permission [30633/039](#) to extract sand until 31 December 2022 and to complete restoration by 31 December 2024. It is proposed that this proposed extension will be extracted and restored within the current agreed restoration deadline for the quarry, 31 December 2024. The lifespan of the quarry will remain unchanged.
 7. The existing site is stated to have approximately 120,000 tonnes of soft sand left to be extracted (as of the submission date of April 2021). A portion of the mineral extracted at the quarry is also classified as silica sand as it can be used for silica uses such as horticulture and recreational uses.
 8. The applications seek to allow the extraction of the proposed Ranks Hill area once extraction of minerals on the existing site is completed on or before the existing deadline of 31 December 2022. The proposed extension will provide approximately 100,000 tonnes of soft sand. The timing of the potential extraction of Ranks Hill before the remaining reserves in existing quarry and

the site closes, would ensure that as much of the safeguarded mineral at the quarry site is extracted. The Rank Hill area would be too small an area to be viably extracted as a stand-alone site once the quarry has closed. The extraction of this area would take place over 15-18 months during the 24-month period currently conditioned for the restoration of Frith End Quarry. The proposal would see the completion of the restoration for the entire site completed within the existing deadline of 31 December 2024.

9. Planning application [30633/040](#) is directly linked to planning application [30633/041](#) and are essentially dependant on each other. They are being considered by the Regulatory Committee as application [30633/041](#) is a major extension of an existing minerals site which is an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#) (EIA Regulations). Councillor Kemp-Gee also requested that the application be considered by the Regulatory Committee.
10. As both applications have been processed alongside each other, both applications were subject to a formal re-consultation following submission of further information (in response to EIA *Request 1*) as set out in the [EIA Regulations 2017](#) between 4 October 2021 and 8 November 2021. A further stage of consultation on hydrological information (in response to EIA *Request 2*) also took place between 18 February 2022 and 28 March 2022.
11. On balance, it is considered that the proposals would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan](#) (2013) (HMWP). It is considered that the benefits of the proposed developments outweigh the impacts to amenity, ecology and the surrounding countryside landscape. The development provides an additional 100,000 tonnes of soft sand mineral resource incidental to the 120,000 tonnes that are currently due for permitted extraction at the existing Frith End Quarry. It is considered that the proposal will provide an additional contribution to Hampshire's soft sand landbank (currently approximately 0.72 years based on the [2021 Local Aggregate Assessment](#) (LAA)) and this contribution does not cause, on balance, any significant additional detrimental impacts to the environment, landscape or neighbours to that generated by the existing, permitted quarry activities. This is particularly when taking into consideration that the proposed development does not seek to change the approved restoration deadline for the quarry as a whole. Hampshire is currently significantly below the 7 year landbank requirement for soft sand. The proposal will also contribute silica sand resources at the site, which requires a site landbank of 10 years. The site currently has less than the 10-year landbank requirement. The cumulative impacts are also considered acceptable. The proposed

revised Restoration Plan for the entire site is considered satisfactory with respect to biodiversity net gain, protection of protected species, flood management, public access, visual impact and landscape.

12. It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED for planning application [30633/041](#) subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A**.
13. It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED for planning application [30633/040](#), subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix B**.

The Site

14. Frith End quarry is an active sand quarry that comprises approximately 17.4 hectares of land located to the north of Bordon, Hampshire. The quarry is accessed by means of a purpose-built access road direct off the A325 and the site has good access onto the strategic road network. The quarry has been in operation for approximately 30 years.
15. The quarry is identified in the adopted [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan \(2013\)](#) (HMWP) as a safeguarded site for the extraction of soft and silica sand through Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure). The site is also identified as an existing quarry for local land won aggregate and silica sand through Policies 20 (Local land-won aggregate) and 21 (Silica sand development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) respectively.
16. The current planning permission ([30633/038](#)) allows for the extraction of sand until 31 December 2022 and the completion of restoration by 31 December 2024. The quarry has been extended a number of times, both in terms of area and the length of time to complete operations.
17. Planning permission [F30633/012/CMA](#) established the current operational site and access, including extraction of sand for export from its southern area, and gault clay from the northern quarry fields, the latter is solely for onsite restoration and not for export. That permission allowed a southern extension towards the River Slea and for the deepening of the quarry to some six metres below the water table to 55 metres above ordnance datum (AOD). This gave a total site reserve of one million tonnes.
18. The quarry produces building sand for the building, construction and civil engineering industries as well as a range of products, such as high-quality silica sand products for the golf, equestrian and leisure markets. The sand extracted is in majority sold as a building sand, with the remaining sand (up to a third) sold for industrial uses. For the past few years, the site has

provided a steady supply of sand to the local market of approximately of 80,000 tonnes of per annum.

19. Current on-site operations comprise of:

- The overarching planning permission [30633/039](#), for extraction, processing and exportation of minerals until 31 December 2022 and approved restoration and five year aftercare scheme to be completed by 31 December 2024, as previously permitted by planning permissions [30633/034](#), [30633/031](#) and [F30633/012/CMA](#);
- The Frith End Quarry scheme generally comprises of two areas; to the south of public right of way (PROW) 26, the extraction area for sand to export from site to market; and an area to the north of PROW 26, from which clay is extracted solely for the purpose of lining the southern excavation area prior to restoration. This will create a barrier between the imported restoration material and the hydrology and hydrogeology of the site – as it is upon a protected aquifer and adjacent to the River Slea;
- Planning permission [30633/033](#) gave temporary permission until 31 December 2022 for the relocation of the ancillary activity of the importation, handling and re-sale of aggregates, as previously permitted by planning permission [30633/030](#); and
- Planning permission [30633/035](#) gave temporary permission until 31 December 2022 to import recovered sand from development projects in Bordon and surrounding area for processing, storage and sales from the Frith End quarry.

20. The overarching planning permission [30633/039](#) includes a phased programme of working and restoration. Areas referenced below are identified on working plans submitted with the applications (see [Phasing Plan- Mineral Extraction and Site Restoration](#)). The approved Restoration and Aftercare Scheme comprises:

- The approved Restoration Scheme is to agriculture, amenity and nature conservation as per approved schemes and plans;
- The approved aftercare period is five years from the completion of restoration;
- Material imported for restoration of the sand extraction area is restricted to naturally occurring earth spoils. This is due to its proximity to the River Slea and lying upon a protected aquifer and water source;
- The retention of public right of way (PROW) 26;
- The creation of a lake in the south of the quarry site (areas B1 and R4), with a surface level of approximately 61 metres (m) above ordnance datum (AOD);

- The southern area of the existing quarry (areas A1 to A4) is to be restored to grazing at a level of 62-70m AOD using the gault clay (to act as an appropriate liner for infilling below water table and provide a geological barrier) extracted from land lying to the north of the sand extraction area (areas C1 to C4); and
 - New woodland will be planted along the east and west of the site (areas A1 and R1).
21. The void created by clay extraction, the aforementioned northern area of the quarry, is to be infilled to original ground levels using 500,000 tonnes of imported earth spoil. The sand extraction and importation of infill material was envisaged to require one hundred Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements per day, including a significant number associated with infill operations.
22. The most recent planning permissions for the quarry site have been to:
- Allow to increase the height and length of an existing soil bund to the north of the site to improve screening to local housing (Planning Permission [30633/039](#)); and
 - An extension of time for the quarry to allow for the quarry to recover from flooding of the main extension basin when the River Slea burst its banks in February 2020 (Planning Permission [30633/038](#), granted in October 2020).
23. Repair work and floodwater pumping out of the quarry commenced in March 2021. The operator confirms that the repair of the river breach is complete as per the Environment Agency (EA) specification, the water has mostly been pumped out of the quarry and sand extraction has resumed.
24. The proposed Hill Extension site lies to the south-west of the existing extraction area. It is commonly referred to as 'Ranks Hill'. It rises to around 80m AOD and comprises exposed sand, in the form of the face of the quarry extraction basin (east side), heathland scrub, and scattered trees. Although of some elevation, it is currently only intermittently prominent in the landscape given the surrounding woodland and mature tree belts, and the undulating nature of the landscape generally. An existing access track defines the western and southern perimeters of the proposed extraction area. A line of 12m high popular trees run along the track and southern boundary of the proposed site, and there are scattered mature oak trees (20m tall) just beyond the southern boundary. There is a single, semi-mature oak on the western boundary.

25. The following constraints and distances relate specifically to the proposed extension site:

- Four public right of way (PROW) footpaths converge just outside the main entrance on the existing quarry, approximately 100 metres (m) north-west of the site. PROW 26 runs east-west through the wider quarry separating the sand and clay extraction areas running parallel to an internal site road. PROW 48 runs north-south towards Trottsford Farm and lies 150m west of the site. PROW 23 and 25 run north away from the quarry. On the east side of the quarry is PROW 36, a Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) that runs north-south, 450m east of the site. PROWs 26 and 36 are those that are significant, having views of the proposed extraction and restoration site;
- Groom Farm Sandpit Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) is located adjacent to the north perimeter of the site within the existing quarry. Abbots Wood Inclosure (800m north), Mellow Farm Meadows (480m south-east), Heath Hill (890m east) and Bordon Sandpit (430m south-west) are other SINC in the site's surroundings. With respect to European designations, Broxhead & Kingsley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located 340m to the south of the site;
- The River Slea and associated riparian/woodland corridor run around Ranks Hill, along the western and southern boundaries of the site. Environment Agency Flood Zones 2 and 3 run along this corridor and both flood zones run in a strip through the northern part of the site. The quarry site is in an area prone to ground water flooding. It also encompasses several areas prone to surface water flooding. The site is on a principle aquifer, and the south eastern corner of the wider quarry lies within Groundwater Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. In February 2020, the River Slea broke its banks and caused flooding of the quarry and fields to its southern edge;
- The South Downs National Park boundary is located 800m to the north of the site;
- The site lies within the Wealden Greens and National Character Area (Natural England, 2016) which is characterised by extensive belts of woodland with open areas of heath on acidic soils, river valleys and mixed farming. Whilst the site is not the subject of any statutory ecological or environmental designations, it does have a small Great Crested Newt population currently subject to a Natural England licence which allows them to be relocated and contained in ponds to the north east of the quarry. The site also has a House Martin nesting site; and
- Farnborough Airfield Safeguarding Zone starts 550m to the north of the site.

26. The closest residential properties to the proposal site are:
- Grooms Farm, 250m north of the site and 90m from the haul road;
 - Five dwellings at Kites 400m north of the site;
 - Six dwellings located in the Holt Farm area 950m north-east of the site;
 - Mellow Farm 890m to the east;
 - Headley Park Hotel is located 400m to the south;
 - Two dwellings at Baigents Copse 350m south of the site;
 - Two dwellings at Harrington House 500m west of the site; and
 - Three dwellings at Trottsford Farm 320m south-west of the site.
27. There is a historic landfill at Trottsford Farm which 320m south-west of the site.
28. The Alice Holt Forest, Romano-British kiln sites are located 800m to the north of the site. There are also various Grade II listed buildings located in proximity to the site at:
- Grooms Farmhouse, 250m north-west of the site;
 - Trottsford Farm (cluster), 320m south-west of the site;
 - Kites, 400m north of the site;
 - Mellow Farm (cluster), 890m east of the site; and
 - Huntingford Bridge & Others (cluster), 1100m east of the site.
29. The quarry has an active Liaison Panel. This meets four times a year, with the last meeting taking place on 3 February 2021.

Planning History

30. The planning history of the site is as follows:

Application no.	Proposal	Date issued
30633/039	Variation of condition 12 of Planning Permission 30633/038 to improve the noise bund in both length and height	02/03/21
30633/038	Variation of condition 1 of Planning Permission 30633/034 to extend the time period of extraction to 31 December 2022 and completion of restoration within a further period of two years	21/10/20

SCR/2020/0309	EIA Scoping for a proposed south-west (Rank's Hill) extension to the current mineral working	22/07/20
30633/035	Sand recovery from development projects in Bordon and surrounding area.	29/10/18
30633/034	Variation of conditions 5 (Phasing), 11 (Landscaping), 24 (Restoration) and 27 (Plans) of Planning Permission 30633/031 to revise the approved working and restoration schemes within the approved timescales	29/10/18
30633/033	The relocation of the ancillary activity of the importation, handling and re-sale of aggregates as previously permitted by pp 30633/030	29/10/18
30633/031	Variation of condition 2 of planning permission F30633/012/CMA to extend the approved time for extraction of sand and clay	28/02/17
30633/030	Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 30633/019 to allow the continued importation, handling and re-sale of aggregates until 31 December 2022	28/02/17
30633/019	Use of land for the importation, handling and re-sale of aggregates (retrospective application)	11/01/12
F30633/012/CMA	Winning & working of sand with restoration at low level to nature conservation uses to include a southern extension to the existing extraction area, and the retention of the processing plant	07/02/07
F20310/11C	Revised Phasing	30/07/96
F20310/10C	Vertical extension of existing mineral working	12/12/95
F20310/9C	Variation of conditions to consent F20310/6 to allow for sand washing and construction	23/03/93

	of temporary silt beds	
F20310/6	Winning and working of minerals, infilling with controlled waste and creation of an access from the site to the A325	05/09/90

31. Relevant district planning application history:

Application no.	Proposal	Date issued
30633/036	Detached hotel guest annexe (Class C1) to provide a total of three additional guest rooms and four covered parking spaces at Grooms Farm, Frith End Road, Frith End, Bordon, GU35 0QR	18/11/19
30633/032	Variation of conditions 4,10,11 and 18 of permission 30633/026 to enable the implementation of the planning permission without prejudicing the council's ability to review and approve details reserved by condition at an appropriate stage at Grooms Farm, Frith End Road, Frith End, Bordon, GU35 0QR	22/11/17
30633/026	Ancillary building for events associated with existing hotel, together with landscaping, parking, works (including waste water treatment plant) and retention of Frith End Quarry Haul Road for access to the site and hotel at Grooms Farm, Frith End Road, Frith End, Bordon, GU35 0QR	16/02/15

32. Frith End Quarry is safeguarded for the production of soft sand and silica sand through Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) for the duration of its planning permission.

The Proposal

33. Two planning applications have been submitted and are considered by this report:

- [30633/041](#) seeks permission for an extension to the quarry extraction area to the South-West of the existing Frith End Quarry, an area known as Ranks Hill; and
- [30633/040](#) seeks associated variations of conditions of the current overarching planning permission (30633/039) for Frith End Quarry to enable the extension.

Planning Application [30633/041](#)

34. The Hill Extension site comprises a 2.1 hectare area of elevated ground centred on Ranks Hill, contiguous with the main quarry. The proposed extraction area is 1.2 hectares of which approximately 0.3 hectares lies outside the existing red line boundary of the existing quarry site, the remainder being the creation of additional area permitted for extraction within the existing site area of the quarry (see drawing [DG/QO/FRI/HE/02, the Application and Land Ownership Area plan](#)).
35. It is proposed to extract approximately 100,000 tonnes of soft sand. Some of this sand could be used as silica sand. This is in addition to the remaining sand permitted for extraction from the adjacent Frith End Quarry site (approximately 100,000 tonnes as of April 2021).
36. The proposal seeks to use the existing plant, machinery, storage, haul road and other facilities of the existing quarry. The extracted minerals would be added to those of the existing quarry.
37. The proposal seeks to carry out and complete the extraction and restoration of the site within the existing, approved deadline for the restoration of the Frith End Quarry. Extraction of the proposed extension would commence once extraction of minerals on the existing site was complete, on or before the existing, conditioned deadline of 31 December 2022. This extraction on the extension would take place over 15-18 months until a proposed cessation date of 30 June 2024. The proposal sees the completion of the restoration for the entire site, including the proposed extension, completed within the existing deadline of 31 December 2024.
38. The access to and from the quarry would stay unaltered, as would the operational activities and the conditions to control those. Soil would be stripped and stored along the south boundary of the extension and replaced during restoration. It is proposed to remove the shrubs and the poplar trees, and two stumps, but protect and retain the oak trees. Extraction would occur in steps from east to west down to a level of approximately 61m AOD.

39. No extraction will occur below the groundwater table.
40. All extracted minerals would be moved by vehicle to the adjacent existing storage and processing area within the existing quarry.
41. The application proposes a **Restoration Scheme** for the extension site in keeping with that of the approved restoration of the wider quarry site (see drawing [DG/QO/FRI/HE/05/RES/FULL/revA, Restoration Plan](#), dated July 2021). The majority of the proposed site would be restored to neutral grassland and wetland grassland to the lower slopes. A short section of hedgerow is proposed along the southern boundary. The proposed ground level would be approximately 61m AOD, rising in slopes back up to surrounding ground levels to the north and west. It does not seek to restore the form of Ranks Hill back up to its existing height of 80m AOD. This alteration in the landscape and its affect has been considered and assessed in the application and its supporting Environmental Statement.
42. Considering the wider quarry restoration scheme, the following are proposed feature levels relating to that of the River Slea (see drawing [DG/OQ/FRI/HE/06/Res/CS, Proposed Hill Restoration Cross Section](#)):
- Restoration of proposed extension area (Ranks Hill) = 61m rising up to ~72m AOD;
 - Typical level of existing quarry restoration = 62- 64m AOD;
 - Water surface level of restoration lake (approx.) = 61m AOD;
 - Deepest level of restoration lake (approx.) = 55m AOD;
 - Level of ground around retained Oak trees on southern boundary to proposed extension area = 65m AOD;
 - Level of PROW 26 = 76m falling to 66m AOD;
 - Approximate level of Slea River = 61m AOD;
 - Highest point of boundary between Slea River and quarry boundary = 66m AOD; and
 - Typical level of field between Slea River and quarry boundary = 63m AOD.
43. The submitted, revised **Restoration Plans** incorporate some revisions to the existing, approved scheme for the wider Frith End Quarry site. The proposed revised Restoration Plan (see [DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/RevA, Restoration Proposal Revised](#), revision A, dated July 2021) includes three modifications to the currently approved plan. These are:

- A proposal that the acid grassland would be entirely substituted with the natural grassland meadow, to reflect the views of County Ecology that acid grassland could be difficult to achieve;
 - Some of the rough grazing area, shown on the currently approved restoration plan in the northern quarry fields, is to be replaced by neutral wildflower meadow; and
 - Relating to the new hedgerow planting; new sections are now proposed to the southern quarry boundary to fill in/connect the gaps between the existing trees/vegetation.
44. The submitted **Planning Statement** states that *'the proposed hill restoration and improvements to the approved restoration plan are considered to uplift the site's ecological value, provide an overall biodiversity net gain (a 25.13 habitat units gain and 1.88 hedgerow units gain) and enhancement to the approved restoration scheme.'*

Planning application [30633/040](#)

45. Planning application [30633/040](#) seeks to vary conditions to the existing overarching planning permission [30633/039](#) for Frith End Quarry. It seeks to vary conditions 1 (Timescale), 4 (Phasing) and 10 (Landscaping) to allow the permission's conditions to accommodate the proposed Hill Extension presented in application 30633/041. The main change being to seek to reorder the phased areas for extraction and restoration at the quarry to allow the existing site facilities to accommodate the proposed extension.

46. The existing wording of Condition 1 (Timescale) is:

The extraction of sand and clay shall cease on or before 31 December 2022 and the site office, all foundations and hardstandings, access roads, all plant (including processing plant and ancillary washing facilities), machinery and stockpiles shall be removed and the site restored in accordance with the schemes approved under Condition 23 (Restoration) within a further period of two years.

47. The proposal is to revise the wording of Condition 1 to:

The extraction of sand and clay shall cease on or before 31 December 2022, except for extraction from the south-west extension area, (as per PP Ref. no 'xx', dated 'xx'), that shall cease on or before 30 June 2024. The site office, all foundations and hardstandings, access roads, all plant (including processing plant and ancillary washing facilities), machinery and stockpiles

shall be removed and the site restored in accordance with the schemes approved under Condition 23 (Restoration) on or before 31 December 2024.

48. The following wording has been adapted in the proposed conditions in the **Appendix B** of this report to:

The extraction of sand and clay shall cease on or before 31 December 2022, except for extraction from the south-west Hill Extension area, as granted for extraction and restoration on or before the date conditioned by Planning Permission 30633/041, or any subsequent planning permission, as identified on drawing DG/Q0/FRI/HE/02, Application and Land Ownership Area, dated December 2020.

The site office, all foundations and hardstandings, access roads, all plant (including processing plant and ancillary washing facilities), machinery and stockpiles shall be removed and the site restored in accordance with the schemes approved under Condition 23 (Restoration) on or before 31 December 2024.

Reason: To secure the satisfactory and timely restoration of the site in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

49. The existing wording of Condition 4 (Phasing) is:

The phased extraction and restoration shall be in accordance with the following plans as approved under 30633/038, or any subsequently revised plans approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

- DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/01, titled WORKING PLAN_2020, dated November 2020;*
- DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/02 – titled WORKING PLAN_2021, dated November 2020;*
- DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/03 titled WORKING PLAN_2022, dated November 2020;*
- DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/1, titled RESTORATION SOLEY_2023, dated November 2020;*
- DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/2 titled RESTORATION SOLEY_2024, dated November 2020;*
- DG/Q0/FRI/PHASINGPLAN/RES/FULL, titled RESTORATION PROPOSAL, dated July 2018; and*
- DG/Q0/FRI/RES/CS, titled RESTORATION PROPOSAL CROSS SECTIONS, dated July 2018.*

50. The proposal is to revise the wording of Condition 4 to the below. This is to allow the proposed revised working and restoration drawings to become the conditioned drawings the development shall be carried out in accordance with:

The phased extraction and restoration shall be accordance with the following approved plans, or any subsequently revised plans approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority:

- *DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/02/Rev, Working Plan 2021 revised, dated December 2020;*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/03/Rev, Working Plan 2022 revised, dated December 2020;*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/1/Rev, Restoration Solely (Excluding Hill) 2023 revised, dated December 2020;*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/2/Rev, Restoration Solely (Excluding Hill) 2024 revised, dated December 2020;*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/RevA, Restoration Proposal Revised, revision A, dated July 2021;*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/Res/CS/Rev, Restoration Proposal Cross Sections Revised, dated December 2020; and*
- *Figure 2 RevA, Aftercare Plan, revision A, dated July 2021.*

Reason: To secure satisfactory control over working in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

51. The existing wording of Condition 10 (Landscaping) is:

The landscaping and restoration shall be implemented according to the following schemes and plans as approved under 30633/038, or any subsequently approved revision by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. It shall then be implemented in a phased process in accordance with Condition 4 (Phasing) throughout the duration of operations at the site.

- *Landscape Management and Aftercare document - dated November 2020;*
- *Restoration Proposal Plan - DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/FUL rev 0, - dated July 2018; and*
- *Figure 2 - Final Restoration Plan, dated July 2018.*

52. The proposal is to revise the wording of Condition 10 is to allow the proposed revised landscaping documents and restoration plan to become

the conditioned drawings in which the development shall be carried out in accordance with. The proposed wording is as follows:

Landscaping and restoration shall be implemented according to the following approved schemes and plans, or any subsequently approved revision by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. It shall be implemented in a phased process in accordance with Condition 4 (Phasing) throughout the duration of operations at the site.

- *Landscape management and Aftercare document revision, dated November 2020*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/RevA, Restoration Proposal Revised, revision A, dated July 2021.*
- *DG/Q0/FRI/Res/CS/Rev, Restoration Proposal Cross Sections Revised, dated December 2020*
- *Figure 2 Rev, Aftercare Plan, dated July 2021.*

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and quality restoration in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)).

53. It is not proposed to change the following existing conditioned elements of the quarry's operations:

- The date of the completion of restoration and the end of the quarry;
- Hours of working (0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0700-1300 Saturdays, with no working on Sundays of recognised public holidays);
- HGV movements (no movement limits, but accordance to the hours of working);
- Protection of the water environment;
- Management, monitoring and mitigation for noise, dust and odour;
- Access to and facilities at the quarry; and
- Access for the public to the Public Rights of Way (PROWs).

Environmental Impact Assessment application process

54. Planning application proposal [30633/041](#) is an Environmental Impact Assessment development under the [Town & Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017](#). The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority issued two formal requests for further information (Regulation 25 request) in accordance with the EIA Regulations:

55. *EIA Request 1: [4 August 2021](#)* - A request was sent for further information on landscape, arboriculture and visual impact; ecology and protected species; and hydrology and flood risk, and restoration - the applicant submitted that information on 29 September 2021. The required full re-consultation ran between 4 October and 8 November 2021.
56. The applicant submitted the following further information and revisions in response to *EIA 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:
- The following parts of the Environmental Statement are revised:
 - [Contents page](#) (Chapter 15 added), Drawings & Appendices List (3 drawings updated, 4 Appendices added);
 - [Chapter 1](#): (updated) para. 1.4.2;
 - [Chapter 3](#): (updated): Drawing list, sections: Vegetation clearance, Restoration concept, Protected species, Variations to the quarry working, restoration and landscape schemes;
 - [Chapter 5](#): para. 5.6.5 (updated), section Landscape Management and Aftercare Plan (added);
 - [Chapter 6](#): (updated) sections: Bat Activity Survey, Consultation, table 6.8 /Legally Protected & Priority Species and associated appendices such as [Sand Martin Status](#);
 - [Chapter 7](#): Section Flood Modelling (added) and associated appendices such as Appendix 7.3: [Flood modelling](#) (supplement);
 - [Chapter 15](#) (supplement) and associated appendices such as Appendix 15.1: [Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment and Method Statement \(supplement\)](#);
 - [Non-Technical Summary](#) (updated).
 - Regulation 25 Response Letter
 - Drawings (updated to show shrub planting to north side of the restoration lake):
 - [Revised Restoration Plan](#), DG/QO/FRI/HE/05/Res/Full/rev, dated July 2021 (this replaces Restoration Plan, DG/QO/FRI/HE/05/Res/Full, December 2020);
 - [Revised Restoration Proposal Plan](#) – Revision A, DG/QO/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/revA, dated July 2021 (this replaces Restoration Proposal Plan-Rev, DG/QO/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/rev, December 2020); and
 - [Aftercare Plan](#) - Revision A, Figure 2/revA, dated July 2021 (this replaces Final Restoration Plan-rev, Figure 2/rev, December 2020).

57. *EIA Request 2 - [10 February 2022](#)*: A request was sent for further information on hydrology and flood risk – the applicant submitted the information 11 February. The required full re-consultation ran between 18 February to 28 March 2022.
58. The applicant submitted the following further information and revisions in response to *EIA 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:
- Regulation 25 response letter
 - Revised Environmental Statement. The following parts are revised:
 - Chapter 7: Section Flood Modelling (updated) and Appendix 7.4 (supplement) including:
 - [Detailed flood modelling cover letter](#), dated 11.02.2021;
 - [Detailed Flood Modelling Report](#), dated February 2022 (ref.: P2112002_FrithEndQuarry_ModellingReport_v1-1_FINAL);
 - [Appendix 7.4 The responses to the Modelling & Hydrology Reviews](#);
 - [Environmental Statement - Appendix 7.4 Hydrology Review Template](#);
 - [Environmental Statement - Appendix 7.4 The Hydrological Calculations Record](#); and
 - [Environmental Statement - Appendix 7.4 Model files](#) - The responses to the EA modelling and hydrology reviews (EA Excel spreadsheets).

Development Plan and Guidance

59. Paragraph 47 of the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (2021) (NPPF) requires ‘applications for planning permission (to) be determined in accordance with the 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.
60. The following plans and associated policies are considered to be relevant to the proposal:

[National Planning Policy Framework](#) (2021) (NPPF)

61. The following other sections and paragraphs are relevant to this proposal:

- Paragraph 11 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development);
- Paragraph 47 (Determining application);
- Paragraphs 55 and 56 (Planning conditions)
- Paragraph 81 (Support of sustainable economic growth);
- Paragraph 85 (local business and community needs in rural areas);
- Paragraph 100 (Public rights of way and access);
- Paragraph 120 (Making effective use of land in planning decisions);
- Paragraphs 130 and 131 (Achieving well-designed places);
- Paragraphs 153-154, 157 (Planning for climate change);
- Paragraph 167 (Flood risk);
- Paragraphs 174, and 180 to 182 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment); and
- Paragraphs 211 to 214 (Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals).

[National Planning Practice Guidance \(Live\)](#)

62. Elements of [National Planning Practice Guidance \(Live\)](#) are also relevant to the potential proposal. In particular the section on [Minerals](#). The following paragraphs are relevant to the proposal:

- What is the relationship between planning and other regulatory regimes? (Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 27-012-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014);
- What are the environmental issues of minerals working that should be addressed by mineral planning authorities? (Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 27-013-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014);
- What issues are for other regulatory regimes to address? (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 27-014-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014);
- How should mineral operators seek to minimise the impact of development upon properties and the local environment in close proximity to mineral workings? (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 27-015-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014);
- How should mineral planning authorities assess the cumulative impact of minerals development? (Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 27-017-20140306 -Revision date: 06 03 2014);
- Are separation distances/buffer zones appropriate? (Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 27-018-20140306 -Revision date: 06 03 2014)
- How should minerals operators seek to control noise emissions? (Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 27-019-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014);
- What are the appropriate noise standards for mineral operators for normal operations? (Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 27-021-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014); and

- How should mineral operators seek to minimise dust emissions? (Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 27-023-20140306 - Revision date: 06 03 2014).

Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) (HMWP)

63. 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 5 (Protection of the countryside);
 - Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets);
 - Policy 8 (Protection of soils);
 - Policy 9 (Restoration of quarries and waste developments);
 - Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity);
 - Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention);
 - Policy 12 (Managing traffic);
 - Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development);
 - Policy 14 (Community benefits);
 - Policy 15 (Safeguarding - mineral resources);
 - Policy 16 (Safeguarding - minerals infrastructure);
 - Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source);
 - Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates); and
 - Policy 21 (Silica sand development).

East Hampshire Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted 2014) (EHLPC)

64. The following policy is relevant to the proposal:
- Policy CP25 (Flood risk).

Consultations

65. The below consultation responses incorporate all responses received at time of writing this report, including for the Regulation 25 re-consultations. Full copies of the responses received can be found at on the application [webpages](#).
66. **County Councillor Kemp-Gee:** Objection due to danger of flood risk from the River Slea, harm to habitat of nesting sand martin colony, the loss of Ranks Hill as an important local landscape feature and the loss of rare commons habitat.
67. **East Hampshire District Council:** Was notified.

68. **East Hampshire District Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO):** No objection subject to conditions on noise and work hours.
69. **Dockenfield Parish Council:** Objects on the grounds of adverse cumulative, noise, dust, amenity, visual, landscape and environmental impacts.
70. **Headley Parish Council:** Objects on the grounds of detrimental effect on the surrounding area, particularly visual and landscape impacts.
71. **Kingsley Parish Council:** Objects on the grounds of visual and landscape impact by the loss of Ranks Hill, cumulative impact and the absence of flood risk reduction in the proposed development.
72. **Natural England:** No objection.
73. **Environment Agency:** No objection based on additional flood modelling submitted following Reg 25 request.
74. **Farnborough Airport:** No objection.
75. **Defence Infrastructure Organisation:** Was notified.
76. **TAG Aviation UK Ltd:** No objection.
77. **Local Highway Authority:** No objection.
78. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** No objection.
79. **Landscape Planning and Heritage (Landscape) (HCC):** No objection subject to conditions to secure landscape management and aftercare reflecting the revised restoration scheme, details of the specification for planting, seeding and maintenance operations and to establish timelines for the implementation of the landscape planting, seeding and maintenance works.
80. **County Arboriculture (HCC):** No objection subject to pre-commencement conditions to changes to the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to ensure it is enforceable and amendments to aspects of the proposed restoration and aftercare.

81. **County Ecologist (HCC):** No objection subject to a pre-commencement condition to have submitted and approved a revised Ecology and Landscape Management Plan and an increased aftercare period to allow habitats to successfully establish.
82. **Landscape Planning and Heritage (Archaeology) (HCC):** No objection subject to a condition to secure archaeological monitoring and detail how archaeological evidence will be sought, recognised and recorded.
83. **Rights of Way Manager (HCC):** Was notified.

Representations

84. Hampshire County Council's [Statement of Community Involvement \(2017\)](#) (SCI) sets out the adopted consultation and publicity procedures associated with determining planning applications.
85. In complying with the requirements of the SCI, the County Council:
- Published a notice of the application in the [Hampshire Independent](#);
 - Placed notices of the application at the application site;
 - 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.
86. As of 29 December 2021, a total of 16 representations (from 10 respondents) has been received. The majority objected to the proposal but there were two representations in support of the proposal. The main areas of concern raised in the objections related to the following areas:
- The proposed extension site expands the approved quarry site;
 - The loss of Ranks Hill as a local landmark;
 - The loss of biodiversity, including acid heathland;
 - Impact to protected species (sand martins);
 - Noise;
 - Landscape and visual amenity impact;
 - Development creep, in area and in time;
 - Cumulative impact, in magnitude and duration;
 - Adverse community impact; and
 - Impact on flood risk.

87. All representations received are available to view, in full, on the applications [webpage](#) during the processing of the planning application.
88. The planning applications were also discussed at the site Liaison Panel.
89. The above issues will be addressed within the following commentary, (except where identified as not being relevant to the decision).

Habitats Regulation Assessment [HRA]

90. The [Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017](#) (otherwise known as the 'Habitats Regulations') transpose European Directives into UK law.
91. In accordance with 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 (SPA);
 - Special Areas of Conservation (SAC); and
 - Ramsars.
92. Collectively this assessment is described as 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA). A HRA needs to be carried out unless the project is wholly connected with or necessary to the conservation management of such sites' qualifying features.
93. It is acknowledged that the proposed development includes environmental mitigation essential for the delivery of the proposed development regardless of any effect they may have on impacts on European designated sites.
94. The HRA screening hereby carried out by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority considers the proposed development to have **no likely significant effect** on the identified European designated sites due to It not being located at a distance to be considered to have proximity to directly impact on the European designated sites nor have any functional impact pathways connecting the proposed works with any European designated sites. The consultation response from Natural England raises no objection and confirms this position.

Climate Change

95. Hampshire County Council declared a [climate emergency](#) on 17 June 2019 and has implemented the [Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2020-2025](#). This aligns with the [UK government amendment to the Climate Change Act 2008 \(June 2019\)](#) that introduced a net-zero greenhouse gases target by 2050. East Hampshire District Council has also declared a [climate change emergency](#) aligned to the UK Government of net-zero by or before 2050.
96. The proposed development has been subject to consideration of paragraphs 153-154 and 157 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) as well as Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adoption) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
97. **Chapter 12** of the **Environmental Statement** (ES) discusses the issue of climate change. No detailed assessment of climate change adaption or mitigation was included in the application. The application documentation states that the proposals impact on local climate change is negligible. There is a reliance on heavy fossil fuelled plant and HGVs to extract and export mineral from the site. No suggestion of alternative technologies or mitigation has been suggested to try and address this. The proposed **Restoration Scheme** does not provide a significant net benefit to climate change mitigation nor would compensate for the emissions of the proposed development. However, it is recognised that the overarching restoration of the site has been determined by the grant of previous permissions and that site. Furthermore, national minerals policy supports the provision of an adequate and steady supply of aggregate so the sites contribution to this is of significance. The existing quarry site is also allocated and safeguarded in the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan](#) (2013) for soft and silica sand uses. The overarching proposal under planning application [30633/041](#) is for an extension to an existing quarry, and so allows use of established facilities and markets, reducing the need to open a new quarry site to meet the need for soft and silica sand. Extending an existing quarry is typically more efficient, with less emissions, than the creation of a new extraction site.
98. With respect to adaption, climate change impacts to hydrology have been considered in the submitted Flood Risk Assessments and associated modelling.

Commentary

Principle of the development

99. The use of Frith End Quarry for mineral extraction, ancillary operations and restoration has been long established through the granting of several mineral-related planning permissions for a number of years (see **Planning History**). The combination of the two proposals seek to both extend the existing quarry to the south west with associated modifications to the approved quarry schemes ([30633/041](#)) and associated variations of Conditions 1 (Timescale), 4 (Phasing) and 10 (Landscaping) of Planning Permission 30633/039 ([30633/040](#)).
100. The local planning context includes a number of planning permissions at Grooms Farm. Grooms Farm is located adjacent to the quarry and its haul road. In 2015, East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) granted planning permission for an events venue on a site adjacent to and using the Frith End Quarry haul road (see **Planning History**). It sought permission to retain the haul road beyond the planning permission of the quarry. The quarry's planning permission conditions the requirement to remove the haul road as part of the restoration of the site. This planning permission was granted a variation of conditions in 2017. These activities are potentially not compatible with the quarry. However, it is assumed that the diurnal pattern of the activity of the event venue would be evenings and weekends, and therefore the activities of the quarry would rarely overlap the activities of the events venue.
101. Site visits by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in 2021 and 2022 confirm that there is no evidence to suggest this venue development has commenced on that site, and so the permission has not been implemented within the three-year deadline, and so the planning permission has lapsed. Therefore, any impacts of the proposed quarry extension and its use of the existing quarry haul road on that events venue do not need to be considered.
102. National planning and minerals policy is translated into policies [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan](#) (HMWP) (2013) through its policies relating to sustainable minerals and waste development (Policy 1), the environment (Policies 2-9), amenity (Policies 10-14) and the economy (Policies 15-24). The [HMWP \(2013\)](#) emphasizes the importance of striking a careful balance, focussing on sustainable minerals and waste development, whilst protecting Hampshire's environment, maintain its communities and supporting the local economy. It calls for ways of the extraction of minerals to have as little impact on the environment and communities as possible.
103. The minerals industry is reporting a shift in demand following the easing of lockdown restriction as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. It is being reported that local quarries are struggling to meet the surge in demand for

aggregates, in particular, for development and major construction projects in Hampshire and in nearby market areas.

104. Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states a positive approach to minerals and waste development will be taken 'that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the [NPPF \(2021\)](#). Minerals and waste development that accords with policies in the Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no policies relevant to the proposal or the relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, planning permission will be granted unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account whether:
- *Any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or*
 - *Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.*
105. It is generally considered that the winning of remaining minerals in an existing quarry is more sustainable than the creation of a new quarry. No development is proposed to sterilise the minerals on the proposed site. However, this application represents the opportunity to acquire the minerals in an effective way utilising the existing facilities of the wider quarry and with lesser impacts compared to if quarrying to cease at the wider site and then recommence again in the future.
106. The compliance with the overarching Policy 1 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is addressed across this commentary section of the report.

Need for minerals

107. Soft sand and silica sand are two different sands, defined by their use. Soft Sand (also referred to as building sand) is used by the building, construction and civil engineering industries. Silica sand (also referred to as industrial sand) is used for high-quality silica sand products for the golf, equestrian and leisure markets, and well as for industrial manufacturing.
108. As already set out, the sand from the Frith End Quarry is approximately two-thirds building sand (soft sand) and a up to a third silica sand. Soft sand is used for the building, construction and civil engineering industries and silica sand is used for uses such as horticulture and recreation / leisure. Paragraph 6.89 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that silica sand is also known as

industrial sand, marketed for purposes other than for direct use in the construction industry (i.e. non-aggregate uses).

109. Hampshire's most widely worked local mineral is land-won sand and gravel. This is comprised of minerals resources of sharp sand and gravel and soft sand. In Hampshire, sharp sand and gravel is much more common than soft sand and there are fewer opportunities for extracting soft sand locally and in neighbouring areas. Accordingly, soft sand is a relatively scarce resource which is significant not just for Hampshire but also for surrounding areas. There are no viable alternatives for soft sand, meaning that it can only be sourced from the land. For the past few years, the site has provided a steady supply of sand to the local market. This was at the range of some 80,000 tonnes of minerals per annum prior to the flood event in 2019.
110. Sand and gravel resources are safeguarded though Policy 15 (Safeguarding- mineral resources) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The existing quarry is also safeguarded under Policy 16 (Safeguarding- mineral infrastructure) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).
111. Paragraph 211 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) states that great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction to the economy.
112. The [NPPF \(2021\)](#) requires a minimum landbank of seven years for sand and gravel. Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out the need for a supply of land-won primary aggregate supply in Hampshire alongside marine-won aggregates, recycled and secondary aggregates and importation of minerals (particularly limestone) from outside of Hampshire. It states that an adequate and steady supply of aggregates will be provided from local sand and gravel sites at a rate of 1.56 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) for the period ending 2030. Of this, 0.28mtpa shall be soft sand.
113. The [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is supported by the annual [Local Aggregate Assessment](#) (LAA) report, produced by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. The 2021 [LAA](#) gave an annual sales rate of 0.23mtpa, and a landbank of currently approximately 0.72 years for soft sand. Therefore, Hampshire is currently significantly below the national set landbank target of 7 years for soft sand. The [LAA](#) notes that sales have reduced significantly due to temporal supply issues at existing soft sand sites and the landbank at these sites are low.

114. At this time, there are only two sites producing soft sand in Hampshire, Frith End Quarry and Kingsley Quarry.
115. Planning application [30633/041](#) focuses on the extension of the existing site (see **Appendix D**). The applicant notes that the Ranks Hill extension area is expected to yield approximately 100,000 tonnes of sand (15-18 months of production) . At the time of the submission of the application, it was estimated that the existing quarry had 120,000 tonnes (18 months production) of remaining reserved although it was noted that the flooding of the existing void may have resulted in some of this sand being lost.
116. Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) sets out the sites and criteria for mineral extraction to meet the requirements of Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source). Policy 20 lists the extraction of remaining reserves at existing sites in part 1 of the policy. Part 1 includes Frith End Quarry for soft sand. This current proposal, as an unallocated extension to an existing site. It therefore falls under part 4 of Policy 20. This proposal meets part 4 (a), in that, it maximises the use of existing plant and infrastructure and available mineral resources at an existing associated quarry. Paragraph 6.83, in support of Policy 20, states that the Plan expects to provide contingency in aggregate supply through unplanned opportunities, including extensions to permitted local and active mineral extraction sites. The extension is therefore supported by this policy.
117. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is currently considering a planning application for Purple Haze which is a site allocation under part 3 of Policy 20 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). This was submitted on 23 March 2021 (planning application [21/10459](#)). The proposed development is for the extraction of approximately 4.5 million tonnes of building (soft) sand with incidental sharp sand and gravel, over a period of 25-35 years, at a rate of 150-200,000 tonnes per annum. The application does not differentiate any silica sand component. The planning application is yet to be determined and so the potential reserves from Purple Haze cannot be given significant weight and are not considered to form part of Hampshire’s permitted reserves. Should it be granted permission, it would make a significant contribute to the soft sand landbank. However, even if permission were to be granted, it is likely that it would not commence exporting soft sand to market until 2024-2025 at the earliest, meaning that the extraction at Frith End would be completed by the time the site comes on stream.
118. An extension to Kingsley Quarry, the other soft sand quarry in Hampshire, was granted planning permission in 2020 (planning application [51188/003](#)).

This was for the extraction of approximately 1,000,000 tonnes of soft sand, equal to a 4.35 year contribution to the soft sand landbank (at the 2021 LAA sales rate of 0.23 Mtpa – 2020 sales rate was exceptionally low due to incidents at two soft sand quarries preventing sales). This permission is yet to be implemented and the extraction at Kingsley Quarry is also currently mothballed, meaning there is a further reduction in soft sand supply currently.

119. The minerals from the quarry are also used for silica uses (silica sand). The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority acknowledges that the minerals extracted from the Frith End Quarry is suitable for silica sand as identified in Policy 21 (Silica sand development).
120. Paragraph 6.94 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) acknowledges that Frith End and Kingsley quarries did not meet the 10-year landbank requirement at the time of the Plan in 2013. It discusses that options for potential extension of both Frith End and Kingsley Quarry sites were considered as part of the Plan preparation process. The exploration carried out, found options for extension of the two sites were not considered to be deliverable options at that time. It goes on to state *'it is therefore conceivable that the operators of these sites will require further permissions to extend the timescales for extracting remaining reserves and if deliverable opportunities come forward these will be considered against the criteria set out in Policy 21.*
121. Paragraph 214 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) states that Minerals Planning Authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by maintaining a stock of permitted reserves to support the level of actual and proposed investment required for new or existing plant, and the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment. For silica sand, these reserves should be at least 10 years for each individual silica sand site. This is translated into Policy 21 (Silica sand development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). The Policy identifies Frith End Quarry as one of two sites with silica sand in Hampshire in part 1 (i). As a silica sand site, there is a requirement for a 10-year landbank for each site.
122. Paragraph 6.95 states that *'it is expected that production of silica sand will primarily be from existing quarries, but could require new sites or extensions to existing sites when the need arises'*. Paragraph 6.94 of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#), acknowledges that Frith End and Kingsley quarries did not meet the 10-year landbank requirement at the time of the Plan in 2013. It discusses that options for potential extension of both Frith End and Kingsley Quarry sites were considered as part of the Plan preparation process. Options for extension of the two sites were not considered to be deliverable options at that time. It goes on to state *'It is therefore conceivable that the operators of*

these sites will require further permissions to extend the timescales for extracting remaining reserves and if deliverable opportunities come forward these will be considered against the criteria set out in Policy 21. Any potential discussion about further extension to the quarry (over and above what is currently proposed) is not relevant to the applications currently being considered.

123. As a silica sand site, Policy 21 (Silica sand development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is of relevance. The existing quarry is already identified in part 1 of the policy which states that an adequate and steady supply of silica sand will be provided by maintaining a landbank of permitted reserves sufficient for at least 10 years the site. In terms of the extension proposal, part 2 of Policy 21 is of relevance. Part 2 of Policy 21 (Silica sand development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that proposals for silica sand extraction within the Folkstone bed formation and outside the permitted silica sand sites will be supported where:
- (a) the availability of deposits with properties consistent with silica sand uses is demonstrated; and*
 - (b) monitoring indicates that there is a need to maintain a 10-year landbank; and*
 - (c) the proposals do not have an unacceptable environmental or amenity impact either alone or in combination with other plans or projects; or*
 - (d) prior extraction is necessary in order to avoid sterilisation of the deposits due to planned development.*
124. Section 2.5 of the **Planning Statement** describes how test holes both in, and in the immediate vicinity of, the extension area confirms that the geology underlying the proposed extension comprises of the same lithology as that worked in the existing quarry which includes the silica sand. Furthermore, section 3.1 of the **Planning Statement** also states that the existing site, and the proposed site, would produce building sand as well as approximately a third of the material going to silica sand, non-construction/industrial uses. On this basis, the proposal is considered to meet part 2 (a) of Policy 21.
125. As already set out, monitoring of site reserves also shows that the site is below the 10-year landbank requirement for the site meaning the proposal meets part (b) of Policy 21.
126. The acceptability of the proposal in terms of ensuring any unacceptable environmental or amenity impact either alone or in combination with other plans or projects is covered by the remaining parts of this commentary. The consultation process and this report consider that the impact of the proposed extension, alone or in combination with other plans or projects, is not, on

balance, unacceptable to the environment or amenity, as per part 2 (c) of Policy 21.

127. Part 2 (d) of Policy 21 is not relevant to this application as there is no planned other developments that could sterilise the deposit.
128. Paragraph 6.96 states that the acceptability of extending existing mineral extraction sites will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and will include an assessment of cumulative impacts which may be associated with continued working and other economic considerations. It is acknowledged that a notable number of public objections on this issue have been submitted. This has been further discussed in the **cumulative impact** section below.
129. Taking into account the clear need to ensure an adequate and steady supply of minerals as well the requirement for a 7-year landbank for sand and gravel and a 10-year landbank for silica sand specifically at the quarry, it is considered that the proposed development is in accordance with Policies 17 (Aggregate supply and source), 20 (Local land-won aggregate) and 21 (Silica sand development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Safeguarding – infrastructure and minerals

130. The application's **Planning Statement** states that the safeguarding of the minerals on the site would be at risk if this proposed development did not occur, resulting in the mineral resource being sterilised. This would not be the case as the minerals would continue to be safeguarded under Policy 15 (Safeguarding – mineral resources) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and this should be considered in any further proposals for the site. However, it is acknowledged that the potential ability to extract mineral in the future may be impacted as it is unlikely that a stand along proposal would come forward for his small piece of land. Should permission not be granted for the extension of the quarry, the mineral safeguarding status would continue although it is acknowledged that this area of mineral could be an area that is economically unviable to extract it were not to come forward as part of the existing site.
131. Policy 16 (Safeguarding- minerals infrastructure) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that '*infrastructure that supports the supply of minerals in Hampshire is safeguarded against development that would unnecessarily sterilise the infrastructure or prejudice or jeopardise its use by creating incompatible land uses nearby.*' And that '*minerals sites with temporary permissions for minerals supply activities are safeguarded for the life of that permission*'. It is considered that the proposed development does not constitute incompatible

land use but is rather a utilisation of the existing temporary minerals supply infrastructure of Frith End Quarry. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 16 (Safeguarding- minerals infrastructure) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Countryside and Landscape

132. 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. In this case, the proposal to extend the quarry meets part (a), being a time-limited mineral extraction of Policy 5.
133. 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.
134. Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) requires that minerals waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape. The design should be appropriate and should be of high-quality and contribute to sustainable development. This reinforces the requirement of Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) for highest-quality design. In addition, Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) protects residents from unacceptable adverse visual impact.

135. The ES included a **Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment** and **associated appendices**. Further information was also provided under Regulation 25 (29 September 2021).
136. A number of the public representations received object on the grounds of landscape and visual impact and these are acknowledged. Concerns about the loss of Ranks Hill as a local landmark are also acknowledged.
137. The County Landscape Architect raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions being imposed. The conditions largely addressed restoration but also included requirements for planting along PROW26 to filter views of the extension area. In their initial consultation response the County Landscape Architect stated that although Ranks Hill is of some elevation the surrounding vegetative screening and undulating landscape means the hill is only intermittently prominent. The perception of the removal of the hill from the surroundings should be limited.
138. A condition is included in **Appendix B** about crossing points with public rights of way and signs warning heavy good vehicles drivers of the presence of public rights of way shall be maintained for the duration of the development.
139. More information on the **Restoration and aftercare** of the site is set out later in this commentary.
140. The proposal is a temporary and time limited and the proposed restoration scheme proposes beneficial after uses fitting with the site's surroundings in the open countryside is considered in accordance with Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#). It is also 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. Even though the scheme does propose the removal of Ranks Hill, and restoration without reinstating Ranks Hill, the impacts to landscape and visual impact are not considered to be unacceptable. Therefore, on balance it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policies 5 (Protection of the countryside), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to the countryside, visual impact and design.

Ecology

141. 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.

142. The existing quarry site includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and includes mitigation to make acceptable the impacts to a number of protected species, of particular note are great crested newts and sand martins. Sand Martins are significant for the proposed hill extension, as the nested sand banks for the sand martins is on the exposed face that forms the boundary between the existing quarry extraction area and the proposed extraction site, and therefore would be removed from the site.
143. A number of public representations object on the grounds of impact to the environment and protected species and these are acknowledged.
144. In particular, one member of the public raised concerns that the Ranks Hill site was a lowland acid grassland with specific characteristics and as such should be considered a priority habitat or Habitat of Principal Importance (HPIs). Ecological information submitted by the applicant, and reviewed by the County Ecologist, did not identify lowland acid grassland within the extension site. The identified habitat types were Poor Semi-improved (acid) Grassland, Scattered Trees – broadleaved, Dense/scattered scrub, and Quarry and Bare ground – none of these habitats were identified as HPIs.
145. The potential impact of removal of the Ranks Hill face on nesting sand martins was also raised as a concern and this concern is acknowledged. The provision sand martin nesting faces and protection of nests within the existing quarry site is already a condition of the extant planning permission. This condition has been carried forward in the recommended conditions for planning application 30633/040 as set out in **Appendix A**. This in turn is attached, through a condition for planning application 30633/041, as set out in **Appendix B** as it is an ancillary development to the existing quarry. The condition has been strengthened to require that the sand martin faces that are provided are protected from predators at all times. A detailed

management scheme for the provision sand martin nests during development and restoration (both the existing site and the Ranks Hill extension) are also included as a recommended condition. The **Appendix 6.5** of the **Environmental Statement** describes how previous nesting faces on Ranks Hill would to be made unsuitable for nesting prior to arrival of sand martins on site to make other suitable faces on the existing site more favourable nesting locations for the colony. The excavation of the nesting faces on Ranks Hill will occur in the 2nd and 3rd phases of the extraction. The operator will have to implement phasing at times that allow for the required management of across the site.

146. The application was supported by **an Ecological Impact Assessment** (and associated appendices), a **Biometric** and a **Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) statement**.
147. The first consultation period identified a number of area of additional information required to address ecology matters. This information was submitted by the applicant in response to the first Regulation 25 request.
148. The consultation response from the County Ecologist states that the additional details addressed earlier concerns and that the proposal is within the constraints of Policy 3. It is recommended that a condition be added that requires a detailed ecology management scheme. The scheme would ensure that the measures put forward in the **Environmental Statement** to manage ecological impacts are implemented as development progresses (e.g. Reasonable Avoidance Measures for Great Crested Newts and mitigation of the loss of the sand martin face on Ranks Hill). It is also recommended that this is combined with the update to the existing **Landscape Management and Aftercare Scheme**. The scheme would be used to implement all of the protected species measures as well as the detail of the habitat establishment and ongoing management phases. IT would also include a detailed phase by phase provision of the extent, location and management of the sand martin faces, ensuring protection from predation at all times. These conditions are included in **Appendices A** and **B**.
149. The consultation response from Natural England states that they do not view the application as likely to have a significant effect on designated sites and has no objection. They did note 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 **Appendices A** and **B**.
150. On the basis of the proposed mitigation, the relatively low importance of habitat being impacted, and the conditions set out in **Appendices A** and **B**,

the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Arboriculture

151. The material consideration of arboriculture in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) is shared between Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development).
152. The application was supported by an **Arboricultural Report** as part of the ES. A further **Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment & Method Statement** was submitted under Regulation 25 (29 September 2021).
153. Seven individual trees and one tree group are identified within the site and within 15m of red line boundary. None of the trees are subject to a tree preservation order or are within a conservation area. The proposed development would result in two low value trees (stumps) in the centre of the extension area to allow extraction. In addition, a group of Poplar trees would be removed. The retained trees will be subject to protection measures to ensure they survive during the extraction phases and also following restoration.
154. The restoration of the entire site includes planting of hedgerows and woodland – similar hedgerow features are proposed for the southern boundary of the extension area.
155. The County Arboriculturist's final consultation response raised no objection, subject to conditions to ensure the development accords with the proposed **Tree Management Plan** to ensure protection of remaining trees during excavation and restoration, and that the plan contains robust enough language for it to be enforceable (e.g. 'shall' instead of 'should'). This condition is included in **Appendix A**. While the response notes that the Poplar group that will be removed are a notable landscape feature, the County Landscape Architect's initial consultation response states that their loss is not unacceptable as they are a relatively recent introduction to the landscape.

156. Conditions are also included to ensure the development takes place in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan in **Appendix A**.
157. The County Landscape Architect's final consultation response raised no objection subject to conditions. As already set out, conditions relating to a **Landscape Management and Aftercare** are set out in **Appendices A and B**.
158. Subject to the proposed conditions in **Appendices A and B**, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) with respect to arboriculture.

Restoration and aftercare

159. Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of [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.
160. The applications include details of the proposed restoration for the proposed Hill Extension. Planning application [30633/040](#) seeks variations to the existing permission for the wide Frith End Quarry site to enable alteration of the sequencing, and some details, of the approved restoration scheme to accommodate the proposed extension. The Restoration Scheme to the proposed extension is of a similar quality to that of the existing quarry. It proposes that the site is restored back to agriculture and ecological habitat (see drawings [DG/Q0/FRI/HE/05/Res/Full/Rev, Hill Extension Restoration, dated July 2021](#) and [Figure 2 RevA, Aftercare Plan, revision A, dated July 2021](#)) (see **Appendix F**).
161. In comparison to the approved restoration for the existing quarry site, the additional restoration of the extension area would add an area of wet grassland to the west of the lake with the remainder being returned to grassland. The proposed restoration also includes a change to the restored grassland type around the lake area from acid grassland to neutral grassland

meadow. Following review of the proposed restoration by the County Ecologist, a recommendation for some acid grasslands to be integrated into the restoration design, if possible, to provide additional habitat benefits was set out. However, there is uncertainty around the suitability of the soils for acid grasslands. As a result, as part of the detailed landscape management and restoration scheme update which will be required as a condition, a decision point will be required where the type of grassland within the restoration will be approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority based on soils testing across the site. The Restoration Plan drawing will also be required to be updated to reflect the uncertainty on the grassland type.

162. Natural England raised no objection to the proposal.
163. In addition, a 10-year aftercare period was recommended for the sand martin habitat and grassland areas of habitat identified by the County Ecologist as requiring this to have a good chance to successfully establish. Conditions to this effect are recommended for both planning applications. Other remaining areas would be subject to a 5-year aftercare period as currently applies to the existing quarry site (see **Appendix G**).
164. The County Landscape Architect has no objection to the proposed restoration subject to the existing landscape management and aftercare scheme being updated to reflect the proposed restoration plan and details provided in the **Environmental Statement**.
165. The proposed **Restoration Scheme** addresses the requirements of Policy 8 (Protection of soils) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and to ensure the protection and suitable reuse of the soil assets on the existing site, a condition has been included in **Appendix A** for the Hill Extension. Soil conditions are also included in **Appendix B**.
166. On the basis of the schemes submitted and proposed conditions set out in **Appendices A and B**, the proposal is considered in accordance with Policies 8 (Protection of soils) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Flooding and water resources

167. 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.

168. Policy CP25 (Flood risk) of the [East Hampshire Local Plan Core Strategy](#) also considers flood risk.
169. Public comments raised concerns about the risk of flooding of the site from the River Slea.
170. The application was supported by a **Hydrogeological and Hydrological Assessment** as well as a **Flood Risk Assessment**.
171. Although the majority of the development area is identified as Flood Zone 1, the Environment Agency (EA) identified that the redline area also include areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The EA initially objected to the proposal and requested further detailed modelling be undertaken to determine if the development would increase flood risk both on and outside of the site during development and following restoration.
172. Detailed flood modelling submitted was February 2022 in response to a Regulation 25 request. The modelling demonstrated (reported in **Appendix 7.4 of the Environmental Statement**) that there was no risk of flooding of the extension area from the River Slea from the west in a 1 in 100 year flooding event (+35% climate change allowance) nor in a 1 in 1000 year flooding event. While the southern area of the existing site was inundated following a collapse of the bank in 2020 the modelling, which has been subject to review by the Environment Agency, demonstrates that the risk of the Ranks Hill extension being inundated is extremely low.
173. Annex 3 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) identifies sand and gravel working as water-compatible development which can be situated in Flood Zones 2, 3a, and 3b.
174. Regarding concerns about alterations to floodplain storage, the Environment Agency responded that *'it has been demonstrated there will be no impact on floodplain storage, and restoration will ensure ground levels are lower than original, so we are satisfied with the proposed quarry extension'*, removing a previous objection.
175. The Lead Local Flood Authority's raised no objection to the proposal.
176. Conditions are included in **Appendix B** relating to the protection of the water environment, dewatering, depth of working and the retainment of a buffer zone alongside the River Slea.

177. On the basis of the proposed mitigation and proposed conditions, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and Policy CP25 (Flood Risk) of the [East Hampshire Local Plan Core Strategy](#).

Cultural and Archaeological Heritage

178. 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.

179. **Chapter 8.1** of the **ES** focused on cultural heritage. This assessment concludes that there would be no direct effects upon statutorily designated heritage assets. The assessment, based upon Historic England guidance, has also concluded that the proposed development would have no adverse effects upon the setting of Grooms Farmhouse. The only impacts would be views of HGVs entering and leaving site, a situation that has existed since quarrying commenced so there would be no change to the existing situation. Working may be visible from upper storey windows of Trottsford Farm, filtered by trees. As working descends there would be no views. There would be no effect upon the historical or contextual setting. The overall effect is a temporary one of small magnitude. No mitigation additional to that proposed is required in relation to the effects upon the setting of designated heritage assets.

180. The County Archaeologist's raised no objection subject to conditions to secure archaeological monitoring as set out in paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the Environmental Statement by means of the submission and approval of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). The WSI should also include details as to how archaeological evidence of Mesolithic date will be sought, recognised and recorded. These are included in **Appendix A**.

181. Work shall also continue in accordance with the Programme of Archaeological Work and any associated Scheme of Investigation as issued by the appropriate archaeological contractor under permission F30633/012/CMA and as set out under **Appendix B**.

182. Subject to the proposed conditions in **Appendices A and B**, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Impact on amenity and health

183. Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 27-015-20140306) of the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) (NPPG) considers minimising the impact of development upon properties and the local environment in close proximity to mineral workings. In addition, Paragraph 019 Reference ID: 27-019-20140306 of the NPPG covers appropriate noise standards for mineral operators for normal operations. Furthermore, Paragraph: 023 (Reference ID: 27-023-20140306) of the NPPG considers how mineral operators seek to minimise dust emissions.

184. 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. Also, any proposal should not cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between mineral, waste and other forms of development.

185. The proposed extension area is located further away from the closest quarry's nearest receptors to the North (Grooms Farm/guesthouse and Stannards View), some 300m and 470m respectively than the recent and future working area. To the South the nearest receptor is Trottsford Farm, some 320m, which is no nearer than the recent working area.

186. The quarry has established site management practices and environmental controls. The quarry planning permission includes conditions that control environmental impacts. The application proposes to maintain the same practices and limits to activity on the proposed Hill Extension as to that already practiced on the existing quarry site. Only extraction and restoration works are proposed on the extension site. All extracted material is to be brought back to the existing processing and storage area in the existing quarry.

Noise:

187. The site benefits from the 'Noise Monitoring Scheme' approved under planning permission 30633/038. The noise monitoring at the closest residential properties is being regularly undertaken by the applicant. The

results of noise monitoring indicate that the site complies with the noise limits.

188. The quarry benefits from a 2m high noise bund erected along partial western and northern quarry boundaries which will be improved.
189. The **ES** included a **Noise Assessment Report**. The report sets out a summary of results of background noise levels at the nearest dwellings to the existing quarry and proposed extension area, having regard to measurements contained within noise assessment reports for other applications. The report provides calculated noise levels arising from the workings and a comparison of the calculated noise levels with suggested site noise limits at the nearest dwellings to the proposed extension area.
190. The majority of public representations objected on the grounds that the existing quarry affects the amenity of those local residents, particularly through noise and visual impacts, and concerns that the proposed extension will exacerbate this. These are acknowledged.
191. The hours of working would be 0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0700-1300 Saturday and there shall be no working on Sundays or recognised Public Holidays. This is set out in a condition in **Appendix B**.
192. To ensure control of pollution such as noise, conditions have been included in **Appendix A** and **B** to make it subject to the relevant existing conditions of the overarching planning permission for the main Frith End Quarry site.

Dust:

193. The operator is responsible to monitor, control and minimise dust emissions, in accordance with the relevant documents/plans and to the best available techniques to prevent releases of dust in such quantities or concentrations that are likely to cause pollution of the environment or harm to human health or serious detriment to the amenity of the locality.
194. The quarry has established site management practices and monitoring of dust for the operation and mitigation methods for the site. The 'Dust Suppression scheme' is adopted as part of the planning permission (Ref. no 30633/038, Condition 14) and the 'Dust and Emission Management Plan' is adopted as part of the Environmental Agency Recovery Activity Permit as part of Environmental Permitting.

195. The consultation response from East Hampshire District Council Environmental Health officer raised no objection, subject to extending the conditions controlling dust, noise and working hours from the existing quarry to the proposed extension. These are included in **Appendix A**. Therefore, there is not considered to be an unacceptable impact on public health as a result of the development. To ensure control of pollution such as dust, odour, noise and lighting, conditions have been included in **Appendix A and B** to make it subject to the relevant existing conditions of the overarching planning permission for the main Frith End Quarry site. Therefore, the proposed extension will be subject to the same controls for noise, lighting, dust and operation hours as the rest of the quarry.
196. Like with noise, dust conditions have been included in **Appendix A and B** to make it subject to the relevant existing conditions of the overarching planning permission for the main Frith End Quarry site.

Odour and lighting:

197. To ensure the control of pollution such odour and lighting, conditions have also been included in **Appendix A and B** to make it subject to the relevant existing conditions of the overarching planning permission for the main Frith End Quarry site.
198. On the basis of the proposed mitigation measures and conditions included in **Appendices A and B**, the proposal is considered in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) in relation to amenity.

Potential pollution associated with the development

199. 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.
200. Planning decisions and environmental permitting are separate regimes but are 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. The environmental permit determines if an operation can be managed on an ongoing basis to prevent or minimise pollution.

201. 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.
202. 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.
203. The proposed facility is acceptable in terms of planning. 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

204. The working and restoration of the extension will be carried out within an 18-month period during the time the existing quarry's restoration is ongoing. Therefore, the extension will not represent an intensification in the use of the site and traffic generation from the site is expected to remain unchanged from current levels.
205. Frith End Quarry is accessed by means of a purpose-built access road directly off the A325 with a right turn lane in to the site from the south. The current access arrangement for the quarry will stay unaltered. The current haul road within the site will be extended into the proposed extension area.
206. The **Planning Statement** outlines that when full extraction of sand resumes at the quarry, vehicular movements will return to their typical daily numbers

and that the working of the extension area would not increase these daily movements. There are no proposed changes to the level of output, operating hours, types of vehicles, access road or market area. The proposed site access and traffic movement would be as existing. The proposal is a continuation of existing activities, and as such there would be no increase in traffic.

207. **Chapter 9** of the **ES** covered transport issues. The ES also included a **Transport Technical Note**. The assessment work undertaken concludes that any traffic from the proposed extension would not result in any additional impacts.
208. A condition on hours of working is set out in **Appendix B**.
209. The Highways Authority is satisfied that the proposal would have no significant impacts on the highway and raises no objections to the to the application subject to retention of the highways conditions applicable to the existing quarry. These are included in **Appendix B**.
210. On the basis of the proposed conditions, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 12 (Managing traffic) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Cumulative impacts

211. Paragraph 211 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#) states what Minerals Planning Authorities (MPAs) should consider when determining planning applications. Point (f) states that MPAs should '*ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality;*'
212. Paragraph: 017 (Reference ID: 27-017-20140306) of the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) also covers the issue of cumulative impacts.
213. National policy and guidance is built upon in Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) states that a proposal should not cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between minerals and waste developments, and between mineral, waste and other forms of development. It also states that the potential cumulative impacts of minerals and waste development and the way they relate to existing developments must be addressed to an acceptable standard.

214. Policy 21 (Silica sand development) states that proposals will be supported where they do not have an unacceptable environmental or amenity impact either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
215. Paragraph 6.96 states that the acceptability of extending existing mineral extraction sites will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and will include an assessment of cumulative impacts which may be associated with continued working and other economic considerations.
216. Cumulative impacts are raised as an issue by the majority of public representations as a significant reason for objection. The potential impacts of the extension area development need to be considered together with the current impacts of the existing quarry site. This issue relates to considering cumulative impact due to both magnitude and duration.
217. The cumulative impact of development on its locality is considered with respect to the baseline of those developments around it. In this case, the issue is whether the proposed extension makes a significant contribution to the levels of impact in its locality to the point where the net total is considered unacceptable. The following table highlights key areas of consideration, with particular focus on the existing development of Frith End Quarry as the major local contributor.

Table 1: Key areas of consideration – cumulative impacts

Issue	Comment
<i>Landscape and visual impact:</i>	There is a notable increase in impact to the landscape from the proposed extension. It has a more elevated position than the bowl of the existing quarry and will also be visible from different neighbouring properties. It should be noted that the extraction phase is temporary and only during the existing lifespan of the wider quarry. The proposed restoration of the extension site will see a change in landscape, with the loss of Ranks Hill. The consultation response from the County Landscape Architect raised no objection, and therefore the landscape and visual impact is not considered unacceptable.
<i>Ecology and protected species:</i>	The existing quarry site has required management of various protected species, including Great Crested Newts and Sand Martins. The Sand Martins are a significant consideration for the proposed extension and the extension does increase the impact on ecology and protected species by virtue of increasing consumption of undeveloped greenfield land. The Restoration Scheme includes biodiversity net gain,

	and the County Ecologist's consultation response raises no objection. It is therefore considered that the proposal is not unacceptable and is in accordance with policy and relevant ecology and protected species legislation and regulation;
<i>Development of the countryside:</i>	National and local planning policy both consider that temporary minerals activities, such as extraction, are acceptable in the open countryside. Upon the proposed completion date of December 2024 for restoration of the site, the extension and existing quarry sites would return to a status of undeveloped, greenfield, open countryside.
<i>Pollution – noise, dust, odour:</i>	It is proposed that the conditions for the existing quarry, and so the management of noise, odour and dust are extended to cover the proposed extension site and activities. The consultation response from the local district Environmental Health Officer raises no objection subject to these conditions. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed extension and the existing site is considered acceptable.
<i>Flood risk:</i>	The proposed site is in closer proximity to the River Slea that the existing quarry site, that itself, did recently experience a significant flood event. It should be noted that flood risk management is predominately concerned with development not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. This does not mean that surface water management is not an important part of highest quality design. The proposed extension site does also include a strip on land within flood zones 2 and 3, highlighting potential for flood risk. The consultation response from the Lead Local Flood Authority raises no objection, demonstrating that the cumulative impacts to flood risk from the proposal is considered acceptable;
<i>Impact on the aquifer:</i>	Chapter 7 of the Environment Statement includes a review of potential ground water impacts. Both the existing quarry and the extension lie outside the source protection zone for public water supplies. No adverse impacts as a result of the existing quarry works have been reported on local water supply abstraction. The existing site operation has mitigation measures in place to prevent accidental hydrocarbon release and these would be extended to the proposed extension area. No concerns have been raised by the Environment Agency regarding impacts to the aquifer during consultation.
<i>Highways:</i>	The proposed development does not propose any

	increase in HGV movement to and from the quarry. The Highways Authority response raises no objection.
<i>Residential amenity and health:</i>	It is evident that the existing quarry does affect the amenity of those local residents that have made representations, and there is notable concern that the proposed extension will increase this. The consultation response from the local district Environmental Health Officer raises no objection subject to extending the conditions controlling dust, noise and working hours are extended from the existing quarry to the proposed extension. This suggests that the proposed extension cumulative with the existing quarry will not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity and health.

218. There is also a cumulative impact relating to the duration of the continued development. In this context the impact is being caused by the planning history pattern of Frith End Quarry, that is resulting in a perception of a rolling completion date and health impacts from failed expectations. The concerns of local residents with regards to the completion of the quarry are acknowledged. The quarry first commenced approximately 30 years ago, and the quarrying activities have continued as a result of planning permissions which have extended the lifespan of the development. It is not uncommon for this to be an issue at many quarries due to the nature of operations, the markets and the need to maximise the extraction of minerals in the vicinity in terms of safeguarding them from sterilisation. Delays in the completion of the site has resulted in mistrust from the quarry's neighbours that the quarry will not cease operations and be restored in a timely manner. This application does not seek an extension to the lifespan of the quarry. It proposes to ccess activities and complete restoration of the quarry, including the proposed extension site, by the previously agreed date of 31 December 2024, as conditioned by Planning Permission [30633/039](#).
219. The potential for future development at the quarry is not a material consideration to this decision. However, it is acknowledged that the prolonged duration of development, in this case a procession of minerals developments, can have a cumulative impact on the neighbouring residents; in particular on amenity, health and the ability to enjoy the domestic residences.
220. Cumulative impacts of the development need to be considered in the balance of the determination of these applications and the level of

significance of that impact needs to be established. In the context of this application, the proposed development:

- Does not seek to increase the duration of the minerals activity at Frith End Quarry and does not delay the restoration of the quarry;
- Does not seek to increase the intensity of site activities, nor alter the form or pattern of those activities;
- Does not include for any change in HGV movements to or from the site;
- Does widen the area on which extraction occurs at the quarry, although this will occur after extraction ceases elsewhere at the quarry, therefore becoming an additional extraction phase, rather than increasing the intensity of activities;
- Does allow for an existing quarry to produce approximately 100,000 tonnes more soft sand, reducing the need to source this mineral from another site; and
- Would see an altered restoration scheme for the quarry, resulting in a significant reduction in height for Ranks Hill, although, this is not considered an unacceptable reduction in landscape and visual impact terms (see **landscape section** of the commentary).

221. It is clear that there is a cumulative impact from the history of Frith End Quarry on the amenity of a number of local residents. However, this needs to be considered relative to the local and national need for minerals and the level of impacts caused by the options to supply it. Generally, an extension to an existing quarry is likely to have greater sustainability than the alternative, a new quarry. In the context of this planning application for the Hill Extension, its cumulative impact contribution to the existing Frith End Quarry is not considered to be significant. Therefore, in relation to cumulative impacts, on balance, this report concludes that the proposal is in accordance with Policy 10 (Protection of public health, safety and amenity) in the adopted [HMWP \(2013\)](#), and with paragraph 211 of the [NPPF \(2021\)](#).

Economic benefits

222. 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. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation'*. Paragraph 211 goes on to say that *'when determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy'*.

223. One of the key elements of the vision of the is *'helping to deliver an adequate supply of minerals and mineral-related products to support new development, deliver key infrastructure projects and provide the everyday products that we all use in Hampshire, as well as in neighbouring areas'*. The economic role of minerals is therefore of importance. Paragraph 2.28 of the Plan's spatial strategy states that *'the overall strategic priority is that enough minerals and waste development is provided to support the economies of Hampshire, as well as economies in other areas influenced by Hampshire throughout the Plan period'*.
224. Frith End Quarry is a long-established operation which has been carried out in the area for many years.
225. An assessment of the potential socio-economic impacts arising from the workings of the extension area at Frith End quarry is set out in the **Chapter 11** of the **ES**. The **ES** concludes that the proposed extension to the quarry working would have a number of positive, short term, socio-economic effects. These include the continuation of employment and financial expenditure within in the local economy and generation and support of local economic activity through provision of building and industrial sands, at the level currently provided.
226. The quarry currently offers 5 direct employment positions, which are full time jobs and not seasonal, and provides a number of indirect employment through the use of local suppliers where possible, e.g. in connection with ecology and maintenance of vehicles and equipment.
227. The **ES** sets out that without the small extension area the quarry operations would be, as from January 2023, limited to the restoration activities only, which would in turn reduce both employment levels and financial input into the local economy. If the hill extension area was not developed the local supply of high quality soft and silica sand would be affected and such mineral would need supplying from other sites potentially further from the market. This would cause an increase in cost to local developers/builders due to the need for materials importation from farther afield.
228. No significant adverse socio-economic effects are anticipated as a result of the proposed development and therefore no specific mitigation measures in terms of socioeconomic effects are proposed.

229. The role that mineral extraction plays in the economy is recognised in [NPPF \(2021\)](#) and the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Community benefits

230. A frequent concern of communities that host minerals development is that there are no immediate benefits to 'compensate' for the inconvenience that occurs. In Hampshire there is already a precedent for minerals or waste operators to contribute to local communities' funds. However, this process lies outside of the planning system.

231. 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. 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.

232. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority encourages the applicant to engage with the local community. The continuation of the existing Liaison Panel is important and it provides opportunity for all local residents and interested parties to engage with the operator and environmental regulators, including the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority, as well as elected County Councillors. An informative is included on this issue in **Appendices A and B**.

Conditions

233. For the most part conditions in the extant planning permission ([30633/039](#)) for the existing quarry site have been carried forward into the recommended conditions for Planning Permission [30633/040](#). However, there have been some changes to numbering to reflect the insertion of some additional conditions. In some instances the wording of the a condition has been amended slightly:

- *Condition 1* – Extant Condition 1 updated to reflect that work on the Ranks Hill area can continue once extraction ceases in the existing quarry area;
- *Condition 2* – Extant Condition 2 updated to reflect updated plans submitted;

- *Condition 10* – Extant Condition 10 updated to reflect need for revised Landscape Management and Aftercare document which addresses specific County Landscape Architect and County Ecologist requirements;
- *Conditions 11 and 12* – these are new conditions to address further information required to determine soil suitability for restoration to specific grassland types. Impacts numbering of subsequent extant conditions in new recommended conditions;
- *Condition 22* – this was extant Condition 20. Updated to allow for some limited clearance of trees or shrubs under supervision of ecologist;
- *Condition 23* – this was extant Condition 21. Amended to include a requirement that provided sand martin faces are protected from predation;
- *Condition 25* – new condition that requires information required by County Ecologist regarding details and timings of habitat provision be added to the revised Landscape Management and Aftercare document with title amended to include ‘Ecology’. Impacts numbering of subsequent extant conditions in new recommended conditions;
- *Condition 26* – this was extant Condition 23. Updated to reflect new restoration plans;
- *Condition 27* – this was extant Condition 24. Updated to reflect new aftercare documents and plans submitted;
- *Condition 28* – this was extant Condition 24. Updated to reflect extend aftercare period being required for sand martin mitigation face and acid grasslands included as part of restoration;
- *Condition 29* – this was extant Condition 26. Updated to reflect new plans submitted.

Conclusion

234. The two applications which are the focus of this report are interrelated. Planning application [30633/041](#) relates to a proposed extension of the existing quarry for a further 100,000 tonnes of soft sand and planning application [30633/040](#) related to seeks vary Conditions 1 (Timescale), 4 (Phasing) and 10 (Landscaping) of Planning Permission [30633/039](#) to enable the proposed extension sought in application 30633/041 by adopting revised phasing for extraction and restoration and to allow the existing site facilities to accommodate the proposed extension.
235. In relation to planning applications [30633/041](#) and [30633/040](#), it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the [Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan](#) (2013). On balance, the

benefits of the proposed development, in particular with regards to meeting the need for minerals (Policies 17 (Aggregate supply and source), 20 (Local land-won aggregate) and 21 (Silica sand development)) and associated economic benefits outweigh its impacts. The need for soft sand is clearly identified in the [HMWP \(2013\)](#) and the [2021 Local Aggregate Assessment \(LAA\)](#) is showing the need for further resources to meet the landbank requirements for sand and gravel. There is also a need to provide a 10-year landbank requirement for the site for silica sand although it is recognised that this proposal can only contribute to this. The proposed development provides an additional 100,000 tonnes of soft sand mineral resource incidental to the 120,000 tonnes that is currently permitted for extraction at the existing Frith End Quarry. This is a contribution of approximately 0.43 years to Hampshire's soft sand landbank, currently approximately 0.72 years. The site would contribute to ensuring an adequate and steady supply of minerals and support the local economy.

236. The principle of extending existing minerals extraction sites, to utilise the use of existing plant and infrastructure, is considered to be acceptable, provided this does not cause unacceptable impacts either on its own or cumulatively with existing plans or developments. Generally, an extension to an existing quarry is likely to have greater sustainability than the alternative, a new quarry. The cumulative impact of extending the existing quarry is not considered to be significant and on balance is therefore considered to be acceptable.
237. On balance, the impact of the two applications are not considered unacceptable, with respect to amenity, pollution, flood management, landscape and visual impact, ecology or climate change and conditions proposed are considered to mitigate any impacts.
238. It is considered that, as the extraction of the proposed extension is to be carried out after the extraction of the existing site and the proposed development is to be completed within the lifespan of the existing quarry, it will not have an adverse impact upon the effective restoration of the quarry site. The proposed revised **Restoration Plan** for the entire site is considered satisfactory with respect to biodiversity net gain, protection of protected species, flood management, public access, visual impact and landscape. Additional aftercare requirements for grassland establishment and sand martins are also delivered.

239. Taking all matters into account, on balance, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the relevant national and local planning policy and is considered to be sustainable in accordance with Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) of the [HMWP \(2013\)](#).

Recommendation

240. It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED for planning application [30633/041](#) subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix A**.

241. It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED for planning application [30633/040](#), subject to the conditions listed in **Appendix B**.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Conditions for 30633/041

Appendix B – Conditions for 30633/040

Appendix C – Regulatory Committee site plan

Appendix D – Extension (working area)

Appendix E – Phasing Plan

Appendix F – Restoration Plan

Appendix G – Aftercare Plan

Other documents relating to this application:

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/Planning/Display/30633/041>

REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Strategic Plan

Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:	No
People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:	No
People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:	No
People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:	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.	

Other Significant Links

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

30633/041

Hampshire County Council

EH121

Grundon Sand And Gravel Ltd, Frith End
Sand Quarry, Grooms Farm Lane, Frith End,
Bordon GU35 0QR
(Extension to the quarry extraction area to
the South-West with associated
modifications to the approved quarry
schemes

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.

CONDITIONS for 30633/041

Timescale

1. The extraction of sand hereby permitted on the Hill Extension, as identified on drawing DG/Q0/FRI/HE/02, Application and Land ownership Area, dated December 2020, shall cease on or before 30 June 2024.

All machinery, plant, structures, stockpiles and hardstandings shall be removed and the site restored in accordance with the schemes approved under Condition 5 (Restoration) on or before 31 December 2024.

Reason: To ensure the restoration of the site is delivered in a timely manner and shall not prejudice timely restoration of the wider quarry in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Pre-commencement Condition – Archaeology

2. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, the operator shall submit to and have approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the site. This shall include details as to how archaeological evidence of Mesolithic date will be sought, recognised and recorded.

The development hereby permitted shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure the activities hereby permitted do not cause unacceptable impacts to or loss of archaeology in accordance with Policy 7 (Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This condition is pre-commencement to ensure sufficient precautions are taken to prevent damage and/or loss of heritage assets from soil stripping and mineral excavation hereby permitted.

Pre-commencement - Arboriculture

3. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, the operator shall submit to and have approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority an update to the document titled '*BS 5837:2012 Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment and Method Statement Frith End Quarry for Grundon Sand and Gravel Ltd. CRM-049-016-ENZ-XX-00-RP-AR-45-001.D*', dated July 2021, and associated Tree Protection Plan (Appendix 4).

The updated document shall incorporate all changes requested by the County Arboricultural Officer in their consultation response 'RE: Amendments/ Additional Information Frith End Sand Quarry, Grooms Farm Lane, Frith End, Bordon GU35 0QR (application number 30633/041) dated 18 February 2022.

The development hereby permitted shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved Tree Protection Plan, including implementation of tree protection prior to any activity effecting arboriculture.

Reason: To ensure adequate and enforceable tree retention and protection in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013). This condition is pre-commencement to ensure sufficient precautions are taken to prevent damage and/or loss of arboriculture from excavation and soil storage hereby permitted.

Landscape

4. Within three months of the date of permission being hereby granted, the operator shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, a revised Landscape Management and Aftercare document addressing both the extension area (Planning Permission 30633/41) and the existing quarry (Planning Permission 30633/40).

This shall include:

- confirmation of details listed in the consultation response from the County Landscape Officer, dated 4 November 2021, excepting that acid grassland mix as well as neutral grassland and wildflower meadow mix may still be used.
- a provision for soils testing, and its timing, to allow locations suitable for restoration to acid grassland, or neutral grassland meadow, to be approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.
- Details of the specification for planting, seeding and maintenance operations and associated timelines for implementation.

The development hereby permitted shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape Management and Aftercare document and the following associated drawings, or any subsequently revised scheme or drawings approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

Associated drawings:

- 'Hill Extension Restoration' (DG/QO/FRI/HE/05/Res/Full/rev), dated July 2021
- 'Hill Extension Restoration Cross Sections' (DG/OQ/FRI/HE/06/Res/CS), dated December 2020
- and 'Aftercare Plan', Figure 2/RevA', dated July 2021'

Reason: To ensure adequate restoration and aftercare in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

5. Within three months of the date of permission being hereby granted, the operator shall submit to and have approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority a revised versions of drawings '*Restoration Proposal Plan Rev DG/QO/FRI/PHASINGPLAN/RES/FUL/RevA dated July 2021*' and '*Aftercare Plan, Figure 2/RevA, dated July 2021*' to reflect that areas currently shown as 'neutral grassland meadow' may be restored to either acid grassland, or neutral grassland meadow.

Reason: To ensure adequate restoration and aftercare in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

6. Soils testing to allow suitability of locations for restoration to acid grassland, or neutral grassland meadow, shall be implemented as required in the revised Landscape Management and Aftercare Plan to be approved under Condition 4.

Results of the soils testing, and a further revised version of the drawings required by condition 5, which delineates which grassland areas are to be acid grassland and which will be neutral grassland meadow, shall be submitted to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority for approval in writing.

The restoration shall then be implemented according to this revised restoration plan drawing.

Reason: To ensure adequate restoration and aftercare in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Ancillary development

7. The development hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes ancillary to Planning Permission 30633/040, or any subsequent primary planning permission that supersedes 30633/040 on the site. It shall be implemented, operated and restored in accordance with the following conditions applying to Planning Permission 30633/040, or any subsequent primary planning permission, for the duration of the development:

Conditions 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24.

Reason: To ensure the activities hereby permitted do not cause unacceptable impacts cumulative with the existing quarry in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste development), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity), and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Phasing

8. The phased extraction of the Hill Extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, or any subsequently revised plans approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority:
- DG/Q0/FRI/HE/04A, Hill Extension Working Scheme Stage 1, dated December 2020;
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/04B, Hill Extension Working Scheme Stage 2, dated December 2020;
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/04C, Hill Extension Working Scheme Stage 3, dated December 2020;
 - DG/QO/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/1/rev, Phasing Plan 2023 Restoration REV, dated December 2020;
 - DG/QO/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/2/rev, Phasing Plan 2024 Restoration REV, dated December 2020.

Reason: To secure satisfactory control over working in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Restoration

9. The landscaping and restoration of the Hill Extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, or any subsequently revised plans approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority under condition 4 (Landscape):
- DG/Q0/FRI/HE/05/Res/Full/Rev, Hill Extension Restoration, dated July 2021.
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/06/Res/CS, Hill Extension Restoration Cross Sections, Dated December 2020; and
 - Figure 2 RevA, Aftercare Plan, revision A, dated July 2021.

Restoration shall be implemented in a phased process in accordance with Condition 8 (Phasing).

Reason: To secure satisfactory restoration of the site in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Aftercare

10. The aftercare of the Hill Extension hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the following approved schemes and plans, or any subsequently approved revisions by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority as required by Condition 4 (Landscape):

- Landscape management and Aftercare document revision, dated November 2020;
- Figure 2 Rev A, Aftercare Plan, dated July 2021.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and quality restoration in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)).

11. The Hill Extension site shall be subject to a 5-year aftercare period except for any acid grasslands to be established as required by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority which will be subject to a 10 year aftercare period.

The aftercare period shall commence upon the completion date of the restoration of the Hill Extension, as approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, of the restoration hereby approved by Condition 9 (Restoration).

Reason: To ensure quality restoration and aftercare in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Arboriculture

12. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out for the duration of the development in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan as approved under Condition 3 (Pre-commencement).

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 and Waste Plan (2013).

Ecology

- 13.** Measures shall be taken to ensure sand extraction does not damage sand martin nests in the sand faces during the operational life of the site, and a suitable face which is protected from predation at all times be maintained for nesting during the operational life, restoration and aftercare.

Reason: In the interests of protecting sand martins in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

- 14.** The revised Landscape Management and Aftercare document as required under Condition 4 shall include details and timings of:
- all of the protected species measures to implemented; and
 - the ongoing management of existing habitats and establishment of new habitats operational, restoration and aftercare phases including a detailed phase by phase provision of the extent, location and management of the sand martin faces.

To reflect the inclusion of ecology details into the revised scheme, the document shall be renamed '*Ecology and Landscape Management, and Aftercare*'.

Reason: To ensure the protection of ecology and biodiversity in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Soils

- 15.** All topsoil and overburden stripped from the areas to be excavated shall be removed and stored separately before operations commence for use in site restoration. Topsoil shall only be handled when dry and friable. Following tipping and during restoration, overburden shall be replaced and graded in accordance with the final levels hereby approved. The overburden shall in turn be covered with the topsoil in original sequence and to even depths.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory restoration of the land to agriculture in accordance with Policies 8 (Protection of soils) and 9 (Restoration of quarries and waste) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Plans

16. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, , or any subsequently revised plans approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority:
- DG/Q0/FRI/HE/01,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/02,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/03,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/04A,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/04B,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/04C,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/05/Res/Full/Rev,
 - DG/Q0/FRI/HE/06/Res/CS,
 - Figure 2 RevA

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

Note to Applicants

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 (2019), as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
2. For the purposes of matters relating to this decision Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) are defined as vehicles over 3.5 tonne un-laden).
3. The Liaison Panel for Frith End Quarry 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.
4. 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.

CONDITIONS for 30633/040

Timescale

1. The extraction of sand and clay shall cease on or before 31 December 2022, except for extraction from the south-west Hill Extension area, as granted for extraction and restoration on or before the date conditioned by Planning Permission 30633/041, or any subsequent planning permission, as identified on drawing DG/Q0/FRI/HE/02, Application and Land ownership Area, dated December 2020.

The site office, all foundations and hardstandings, access roads, all plant (including processing plant and ancillary washing facilities), machinery and stockpiles shall be removed and the site restored in accordance with the schemes approved under Condition 23 (Restoration) on or before 31 December 2024.

Reason: To secure the satisfactory and timely restoration of the site in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

2. Dewatering at the site shall only occur in accordance with Environment Agency permits, other than that consented for sand washing.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

3. Sand extraction shall not exceed a depth of 55 metres AOD.

Reason: To prevent pollution to water environment and control extraction in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Phasing

4. The phased extraction and restoration shall be in accordance with the following approved plans, or any subsequently revised plans approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority:
 - DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/02/Rev, Working Plan 2021 revised, dated December 2020;

- DG/Q0/FRI/WORKING PLAN/03/Rev, Working Plan 2022 revised, dated December 2020;
- DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/1/Rev, Restoration Solely (Excluding Hill) 2023 revised, dated December 2020;
- DG/Q0/FRI/PHASING PLAN/RES/2/Rev, Restoration Solely (Excluding Hill) 2024 revised, dated December 2020;
- DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/RevA, Restoration Proposal Revised, revision A, dated July 2021;
- DG/Q0/FRI/Res/CS/Rev, Restoration Proposal Cross Sections Revised, dated December 2020; and
- Figure 2 RevA, Aftercare Plan, revision A, dated July 2021.

Reason: To secure satisfactory control over working in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Hours of Working

5. No heavy goods vehicles (HGVs are vehicles over 3.5 tonnes gross weight) shall enter or leave the site and no plant or machinery shall be operated except between the following hours: 0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0700-1300 Saturday. There shall be no working on Sundays or recognised Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Restoration Material

6. The material imported for restoration shall be restricted to naturally occurring earth spoils.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

7. Records of the clay extracted from the site and details of the deposits shall be retained on site and made available on request to the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority for inspection. The clay extracted shall be used for restoration purposes within the quarry only. No clay shall be exported from the quarry.

Reason: To monitor the extraction and deposit of clay within the site to ensure available material for the restoration of the site throughout the phasing of restoration and in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Protection of Water Environment

8. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The bund capacity shall give 110% of the total volume for single and hydraulically linked tanks. If there is multiple tankage, the bund capacity shall be 110% of the largest tank or 25% of the total capacity of all tanks, whichever is the greatest. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses and overflow pipes shall be located within the bund. There shall be no outlet connecting the bund to any drain, sewer or watercourse or discharging onto the ground. Associated pipework shall be located above ground where possible and protected from accidental damage.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 11 (Flood risk and prevention of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)).

9. An 8-metre-wide undisturbed buffer zone shall be retained alongside the River Slea.

Reason: To maintain the character of the water course and for the benefit of wildlife in accordance with Policies 3 (Protection of habitats and species) and 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Landscape

10. Within three months of the date of permission being hereby granted, the operator shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, a revised Landscape Management and Aftercare Scheme addressing both the extension area (Planning Permission 30633/41) and the existing quarry (Planning Permission 30633/40).

This shall include:

- confirmation of details listed in the consultation response to Planning Permission 30633/04 from the County Landscape Officer, dated 4

November 2021, excepting that acid grassland mix as well as neutral grassland and wildflower meadow mix may still be used;

- a provision for soils testing, and its timing, to allow locations suitable for restoration to acid grassland, or neutral grassland meadow, to be approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority; and
- details of the specification for planting, seeding and maintenance operations and associated timelines for implementation.

The development hereby permitted shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape Management and Aftercare Scheme and the following associated drawings, or any subsequently revised scheme or drawings approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.

Associated drawings:

- DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/RevA, Restoration Proposal Revised, revision A, dated July 2021;
- DG/Q0/FRI/Res/CS/Rev, Restoration Proposal Cross Sections Revised, dated December 2020; and
- Figure 2 RevA, Aftercare Plan, dated July 2021.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and quality restoration in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)).

11. Within three months of the date of permission being hereby granted, the operator shall submit to and have approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority a revised versions of drawings 'Restoration Proposal Plan Rev DG/Q0/FRI/PHASINGPLAN/RES/FUL/RevA dated July 2021' and 'Aftercare Plan, Figure 2/RevA, dated July 2021' to reflect that areas currently shown as 'neutral grassland meadow' may be restored to either acid grassland, or neutral grassland meadow.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and quality restoration in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)).

12. Soils testing to allow suitability of locations for restoration to acid grassland, or neutral grassland meadow, shall be implemented as required in the revised Landscape Management and Aftercare Plan to be approved under Condition 4.

Results of the soils testing, and a further revised version of the drawings required by condition 5, which delineates which grassland areas are to be acid grassland and which will be neutral grassland meadow, shall be submitted to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority for approval in writing.

The restoration shall then be implemented according to this revised restoration plan drawing.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and quality restoration in accordance with Policies 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments), 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)).

Noise, Dust and Odour

13. Noise from operations carried out on the site, measured or predicted as dB LAeq, 1 hour levels, shall not exceed the background noise level at the boundary of any residential property (measured as dB LA90) by more than 10 dBA during hours of operation with a maximum allowable noise level of 55 dB LAeq, 1 hour at the boundary of any residential property during the same hours. Temporary works necessary to the operation of the site for creating baffle mounds and construction of new permanent landforms may only exceed the noise control criteria set out above with the prior agreement in writing of the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority and implementation of agreed noise mitigation measures.

Reason: To minimise noise disturbance to the residents of nearby houses. in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

14. A 3-metre-high bund shall be maintained along the Phase C4 area's northern, western and partial eastern boundaries and the Phase C1 area's northern boundary for the duration of works in those phases, in accordance with Condition 4 (Phasing).

Reason: To minimise noise disturbance to residents of nearest houses in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

15. The Noise Monitoring Scheme (as submitted 21 March 2007) as approved under F30633/012/CMA, shall be implemented as approved for the duration of operations at the site.

Reason: To monitor noise levels to ensure noise disturbance for local residents is minimised in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

16. The Dust Suppression Measures (as submitted 21 March 2007) as approved under F30633/012/CMA, shall be implemented as approved for the duration of operations at the site.

Reason: In the interests of local amenities in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Highways

17. Access to the quarry shall be from the existing entrance onto the A325 only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and local amenity in accordance with Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 12 (Managing traffic) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

18. The sight lines of 4.5 metres by 210 metres at the site entrance with the A325 shall be maintained for the duration of working and restoration.

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

19. Measures shall be taken to ensure that no heavy good vehicles shall leave the site unless its wheels have been cleaned sufficiently to prevent mud being carried onto the highway.

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

Rights of Way

20. The crossing points with public rights of way and signs warning heavy good vehicles drivers of the presence of public rights of way shall be maintained for the duration of the development.

Reason: To safeguard public rights of way in accordance with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Archaeology

21. Work shall continue in accordance with the Programme of Archaeological Work and any associated Scheme of Investigation as issued by the appropriate archaeological contractor under permission F30633/012/CMA.

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

Ecology

22. No tree or shrub clearance should be carried out in the bird nesting season (1 March to 31 August). In the event that limited clearance cannot be avoided, no active birds nests shall be disturbed and any clearance shall be undertaken under the supervision of a suitably qualified Ecologist.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

23. Measures shall be taken to ensure sand extraction does not damage sand martin nests in the sand faces during the operational life of the site, and a suitable face which is protected from predation at all times be maintained for nesting during the operational life, restoration and aftercare.

Reason: In the interests of sand martins in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

24. The Great Crested Newt mitigation strategy set out in the Method Statement (dated April 2006) shall be fully implemented as approved under F30633/012/CMA.

Reason: In the interests of protecting Great Crested Newts in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

25. The revised Landscape Management and Aftercare document as required under Condition 10 (Landscape) shall include details and timings of:
- all of the protected species measures to be implemented;
 - the ongoing management of existing habitats and establishment of new habitats operational, restoration and aftercare phases including a detailed phase by phase provision of the extent, location and management of the sand martin faces.

To reflect the inclusion of ecology details into the revised scheme, the document shall be renamed '*Ecology and Landscape Management, and Aftercare*'.

Reason: To ensure the protection of ecology and biodiversity in accordance with Policy 3 (Protection of habitats and species) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Restoration

26. The site shall be restored to a mixture of agriculture, amenity and nature conservation in accordance with the Restoration and Landscape Scheme approved under Condition 10 (Landscape), the Restoration Proposal Plan - revised (DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/revA), or any subsequently approved revision under Condition 10 (Landscape). Restoration shall be implemented in a phased process in accordance with Condition 4 (Phasing).

Reason: To ensure satisfactory restoration in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

After-Care

27. The approved Aftercare Scheme, as detailed in the Revised Landscape Management and Aftercare document (dated November 2020), and Aftercare Plan (Figure 2/revA), or any subsequently approved revision under Condition 10 (Landscape), shall be implemented as approved.

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

28. The site shall be subject to a 5-year aftercare period except for:
- any acid grasslands to be established as required by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, and

- the sand martin faces required by the approved restoration,

both of which will be subject to a 10-year aftercare period.

The aftercare period shall commence upon the completion date, as approved by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, of the restoration hereby approved by Conditions 10 (Landscape) and 24 (Restoration).

Reason: To ensure quality restoration and aftercare in accordance with Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Plans

29. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

DG/QO/EST/FRI/01, DG/QO/EST/FRI/02, DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/Full/RevA, DG/Q0/FRI/Res/CS/Rev, Figure 2 RevA, DG/Q0/FRI/Working Plan/02/Rev, DG/Q0/FRI/Working Plan/03/Rev, DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/1/Rev, DG/Q0/FRI/Phasing Plan/Res/2/Rev, DG/QO/FRI/Noise Bund

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

Notes 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 (2019), as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
2. For the purposes of matters relating to this decision Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) are defined as vehicles over 3.5 tonnes un-laden.
3. The Liaison Panel for Frith End Quarry 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.

4. 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.