

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL, NEW FOREST NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY,
PORTSMOUTH CITY COUNCIL, SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY &
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL

2020 Review of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013)

Version 2 – November 2020



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 1 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 10 |
| 2018 Review of the HMWP..... | 11 |
| Structure of this review..... | 12 |
| Duty to Cooperate..... | 12 |
| 2. Effectiveness of Plan Policies (review of Monitoring Reports)..... | 13 |
| Policy 1: Sustainable minerals and waste development..... | 14 |
| Policy 2: Climate change..... | 16 |
| Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species..... | 17 |
| Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape..... | 19 |
| Policy 5: Protection of the countryside..... | 21 |
| Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt..... | 22 |
| Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets..... | 23 |
| Policy 8: Protection of soils..... | 24 |
| Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments..... | 25 |
| Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity..... | 26 |
| Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention..... | 28 |
| Policy 12: Managing traffic..... | 29 |
| Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development..... | 30 |
| Policy 14: Community benefits..... | 31 |
| Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources..... | 32 |
| Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure..... | 34 |
| Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source..... | 36 |
| Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development..... | 38 |
| Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots..... | 39 |
| Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates..... | 41 |
| Policy 21: Silica sand development..... | 44 |
| Policy 22: Brick-making clay..... | 46 |
| Policy 23: Chalk development..... | 48 |
| Policy 24: Oil and gas development..... | 49 |
| Policy 25: Sustainable waste management..... | 51 |
| Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure..... | 53 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development | 54 |
| Policy 28: Energy recovery development | 56 |
| Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management..... | 58 |
| Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development | 60 |
| Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management | 62 |
| Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill..... | 64 |
| Policy 33: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste development | 67 |
| Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure | 69 |
| Summary of Monitoring status..... | 70 |
| 3. Issues requiring review | 72 |
| Protection of countryside (Policy 5) | 73 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 73 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 73 |
| Safeguarding: Mineral resources (Policy 15)..... | 74 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 74 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 74 |
| Aggregate supply – capacity and resource (Policy 17) | 76 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 79 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 80 |
| Recycled and secondary aggregate (Policy 18)..... | 82 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 82 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 83 |
| Chalk (Policy 23)..... | 84 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 84 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 84 |
| Sustainable waste management (Policy 25) & Capacity for waste management (Policy 27) | 86 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 87 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 87 |
| Energy recovery (Policy 28) | 89 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 89 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 90 |
| Locations and sites for waste management (Policy 29) | 91 |
| Relevant national policy updates | 91 |
| Should this issue be addressed?..... | 91 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| | Construction, demolition and excavation waste development (Policy 30)..... | 92 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 92 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 92 |
| | Long-term safeguarding (Policy 34)..... | 93 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 93 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 93 |
| | Summary of Review status | 94 |
| 4. | Issues to be reviewed and may need to be addressed | 95 |
| | Community benefits (Policy 14)..... | 96 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 96 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 96 |
| | Aggregate wharves and rail depots (Policy 19) | 97 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 98 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 98 |
| | Local land-won aggregate (Policy 20)..... | 100 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 103 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 103 |
| | Silica sand (Policy 21)..... | 105 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 106 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 106 |
| | Brick-making clay (Policy 22) | 107 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 107 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 107 |
| | Non-hazardous landfill (Policy 32)..... | 109 |
| | Relevant national policy updates | 110 |
| | Should this issue be addressed?..... | 110 |
| | Summary of Review status | 111 |
| 5. | Effectiveness of the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy & Key Diagram..... | 112 |
| | Vision | 112 |
| | Plan Objectives | 112 |
| | Spatial Strategy & Key Diagram | 113 |
| 6. | Policy change drivers | 114 |
| | NPPF (2019) | 114 |
| | National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)..... | 115 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| | Planning Practice Guidance (2014 onwards)..... | 115 |
| | River Basin Management Plan (2016) | 115 |
| | Clean Growth Strategy: Leading the way to a low carbon future (2017)..... | 116 |
| | The 25 Year Environment Plan (2018)..... | 116 |
| | Industrial Strategy: Building a Britain fit for the future - White Paper (2018)..... | 117 |
| | Resources and Waste Strategy (2018)..... | 117 |
| | Review of Designated Landscapes (2019) | 117 |
| | South Inshore and South Offshore Marine Plan (2018) | 118 |
| | The Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019 | 118 |
| | Environment Bill (2020)..... | 118 |
| | Biodiversity Net Gain | 119 |
| | Fixing our broken housing market – Housing White Paper (2017) | 119 |
| | Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations | 120 |
| | The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015... | 120 |
| | Community Infrastructure Levy..... | 120 |
| | Court Rulings..... | 120 |
| | Government Oil and Gas Consultations | 121 |
| | Planning for the future - White Paper (2020)..... | 121 |
| | Changes to the Current Planning System consultation 2020 | 122 |
| 7. | Review Workshop Outcomes | 124 |
| | Key messages..... | 124 |
| | General messages..... | 125 |
| | Minerals messages | 125 |
| | Waste messages | 125 |
| 8. | Compliance with National Policy | 126 |
| | Key outcomes | 126 |
| 9 | Conclusion | 127 |
| | Review limitations | 129 |
| | Next Steps..... | 130 |
| | Appendix 1: Plan Objectives / Policy Table..... | 131 |
| | Appendix 2: Review Workshop – Notes from Event..... | 133 |
| | Appendix 3: National Policy Checklist..... | 150 |
| | National Planning Policy Framework (2019) | 151 |
| | National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)..... | 179 |

DRAFT

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) was adopted in October 2013¹.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that Local Plans should be reviewed to assess whether they require updating at least once every five years².

An initial Review was carried out in 2018 and this concluded that whilst a number of issues had been identified, the policies were effective in that they enabled development and the Vision was being implemented. Following the 2018 Review there was a commitment to undertake a Review Workshop and a further review in 2020.

The Workshop was held on 25th September 2019 and this is the 2020 Review of the HMWP.

In 2019, the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) issued a toolkit to assist with plan reviews and this is incorporated. As such, this Review considers in more detail the Vision, Plan Objectives and Spatial Strategy (and the Key Diagram). In addition, compliance with national policy is assessed.

Effectiveness of Plan Policies

This section considers each of the 34 policies contained within the HMWP in turn. The trends over the past seven years are reviewed based on information set out in the Monitoring Reports which support the HMWP.

A RAG (Red, Amber, Green) Monitoring status is provided for each of the policies and is determined as follows:

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

¹ Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>

² National Planning Policy Framework (Para. 33) - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

The summary of the RAG Monitoring status of each of the policies is outlined below.

Summary of Monitoring status

| Policy Number & Title | RAG status | |
|---|------------|-------|
| | 2020 | 2018 |
| Policy 1: Sustainable minerals & waste development | Green | Green |
| Policy 2: Climate change – mitigation and adaptation | Green | Green |
| Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species | Green | Green |
| Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape | Green | Green |
| Policy 5: Protection of the countryside | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt | Green | Green |
| Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets | Green | Green |
| Policy 8: Protection of soils | Green | Green |
| Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste sites | Green | Green |
| Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity | Green | Green |
| Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention | Green | Green |
| Policy 12: Managing traffic | Green | Green |
| Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste | Green | Green |
| Policy 14: Community Benefits | Red | Red |
| Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure | Green | Green |
| Policy 17: Aggregate supply - capacity and source | Amber | Red |
| Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots | Red | Red |
| Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates | Red | Red |
| Policy 21: Silica sand development | Red | Red |
| Policy 22: Brick-making clay | Red | Red |
| Policy 23: Chalk Development | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 24: Oil and gas Development | Green | Green |
| Policy 25: Sustainable waste management | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure | Green | Green |
| Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development | Green | Green |
| Policy 28: Energy recovery development | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management | Amber | Amber |

| | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development | Amber | Green |
| Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management | Green | Green |
| Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill | Red | Red |
| Policy 33: Hazardous and low level waste development | Green | Green |
| Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure | Green | Green |

Issues requiring review

This section explores in more detail the policies with issues identified through the Monitoring Reports (i.e. policies with an Amber 'Monitoring' status).

Consideration is given to the circumstances around the short-term breaches that may have occurred or the trends that have raised an issue with delivery.

A RAG (Red, Amber, Green) Review status and review update requirement is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Review shows that the policy does not need to be updated. | Green |
| Review shows that the policy does need to be updated with additional allocations, where possible. | Amber |
| Review shows that the policy requirements need to be updated. | Red |

The summary of the RAG Review status of each of the policies is outlined below.

Summary of Review status

| Policy Number & Title | RAG status |
|--|------------|
| Policy 5: Protection of the countryside | Green |
| Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources | Green |
| Policy 17: Aggregate supply - capacity and source | Red |
| Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development | Red |
| Policy 23: Chalk Development | Green |
| Policy 25: Sustainable waste management | Amber |
| Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development | Amber |
| Policy 28: Energy recovery development | Green |
| Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management | Amber |
| Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development | Red |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure | Green |
|--|-------|

Issues to be reviewed and may need addressing

This section explores in more detail the policies with issues identified through the Monitoring Reports (i.e. policies with a Red 'Monitoring' status).

Consideration is given to the circumstances around the short-term breaches that may have occurred or the trends that have raised an issue with delivery.

A RAG (Red, Amber, Green) Review status and review update requirement is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Review shows that the policy does not need to be updated. | Green |
| Review shows that the policy does need to be updated with additional allocations, where possible. | Amber |
| Review shows that the policy requirements need to be updated. | Red |

The summary of the RAG Review status of each of the policies is outlined below.

Summary of Review status

| Policy Number & Title | RAG status |
|--|------------|
| Policy 14: Community Benefits | Red |
| Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots | Amber |
| Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates | Amber |
| Policy 21: Silica sand development | Amber |
| Policy 22: Brick-making clay | Amber |
| Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill | Amber |

Effectiveness of the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy & Key Diagram

Due to the generic nature of the Vision, this is generally being achieved although the issues regarding delivery of minerals could impact the support of the economy. As some of the policies are not meeting their aims, the Plan Objectives are not all being achieved.

In line with the need to update some of the policies, the Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram need to be further reviewed to ensure they are fit-for-purpose. This includes ensuring all policies are represented and there is no ambiguity.

Whilst the Vision represents the pillars of sustainability which meets the objectives of the NPPF, it is recognised that the Vision would benefit from an update to be more geographically representative and less generic. Aligning with the 2050 Hampshire principles and the climate change agenda would strengthen it further.

Policy drivers

There have been a number of Government policy publications and announcements since 2013 which have an impact on the HMWP policies.

The policy drivers and the policies they impact are summarised in the Table below.

Summary of Policy Drivers

| Policy Driver | HMWP Policy |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| National Planning Policy Framework (2019) | All policies. |
| National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) | Policies 25 – 34. |
| Planning Practice Guidance (2014 onwards) | All policies. |
| River Basin Management Plan (2016) | Policies 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 and 31 |
| Clean Growth Strategy (2017) | Policies 1 and 2. |
| The 25 Year Environment Plan (2018) | Policies 2 – 6, 9 and 25. |
| Industrial Strategy (2018) | Policies 1, 2, 18, 25, 28 and 30. |
| Resources and Waste Strategy (2018) | Policies 1, 18, 30 and 32. |
| South Inshore and South Offshore Marine Plans | Policies 17 and 24. |
| Review of designated landscapes | Policy 4. |
| Climate change Act 2008 Order 2019 | Policy 2. |
| Environment Bill (2020) | All policies. |
| Biodiversity net gain | Policy 3. |
| Fixing our broken housing market – Housing White Paper (2017) | Plan-making. |
| Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations | Policy 29. |
| The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2016 | Policy 16 and 26. |
| Community Infrastructure Levy | Policy 1. |
| Court rulings | Plan-making. |
| Government Oil and Gas Consultations | Policy 24. |
| Planning for the future – White Paper (2020) | Plan-making. |
| Changes to the current Planning system consultation (2020) | Plan-making |

Review Workshop Outcomes

A Review Workshop was held on 25th September 2019 to explore the issues raised in the 2018 Review.

The Workshop was attended by approximately 60 participants including representatives from the minerals and waste industry, statutory consultees, neighbouring minerals and waste planning authorities and from the wider south east, districts and boroughs, and Members.

The Workshop was structured around presentations and round table discussion sessions on the following issues:

- The 2018 Review of the HMWP outcomes
- The changed policy landscape: NPPF, 25 Year Plan, Waste & Resources and Brexit etc.
- Sustainability issues: Climate change, biodiversity net gain, horizon scanning etc.
- Biodiversity net gain
- Waste & Resources Strategy
- Soft sand
- Marine aggregates.

A number of key messages were highlighted at the Workshop which can be used to inform this Review and the scope of the Plan update:

General messages

A number of general issues were raised which impact the whole Plan:

- Climate change.
- The need to future proof the Plan and make it flexible.
- On-going Government updates and the need for implementation guidance.
- The need for Duty to Cooperate and liaison with industry.
- Consideration of the monitoring indicators as well as the policies themselves.

Minerals messages

A number of minerals issues were raised including:

- Safeguarding, particularly in relation to prior extraction and wharves.
- Consideration of regional-level supply issues.
- Greater emphasis on the Local Aggregate Assessment.
- Demand should take into account Local Plan delivery and infrastructure.

Waste messages

Issues raised regarding waste including:

- The need to consider all waste streams, not just household waste.
- Review of the data, types of site (not just facility type) and how they are delivered.
- The need for more waste sites, such as resource parks.

Compliance with National Policy

This section applies the PAS toolkit to determine compliance with national policy. As the toolkit is geared towards all Local Plans, some parts have been struck out and highlighted as 'not applicable'. In addition, the toolkit does not include compliance with the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) (2014) which is relevant to Waste Local Plans and therefore, the requirements have been included.

The review of Local Plan Content compliance has demonstrated that overall, the HMWP is compliant and is not silent on any policy requirement. However, there are several policy areas where the general policy approach is in conformity, but the specific wording may need to be refreshed to ensure that the policy is fully compliant.

The key policy areas requiring a policy refresh include:

- Reference to government policy (post 2013);
- The Vision and its relevance to minerals and waste;
- The removal of some areas of ambiguity in policies;
- Clearer identification of the Strategic Policies;
- Reference to net gain, natural capital, and the agent of change;
- Clearer climate change measures;
- Clearer delivery of the waste hierarchy; and
- An update on terminology, such as 'sustaining' rather than 'protecting' historic assets.

Conclusion

This 2020 Review has considered the effectiveness of the HWMP since its adoption in 2013. Unlike the 2018 Review, consideration has been given not only to the monitoring data but compliance with national policy. In addition, the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram have been taken into account.

Development Management Policies

The monitoring data suggests that most of these policies are performing well with Policy 14 (Community benefits) as the exception. However, reviewing national policy compliance, highlights that the policies would benefit from a refresh in their terminology and in some cases, their delivery.

In addition, Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaption) needs to be strengthened and Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) needs to ensure that climate change is suitably imbedded in its implementation.

Minerals Policies

The 2018 Review highlighted that the required 7-year landbank for sand and gravel (for both sharp sand and soft sand) was not being met along with other mineral requirements. The situation remains in 2020 as well as an increasing risk to recycled and secondary aggregate delivery and capacity issues at the wharves.

The aggregate delivery requirements (Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) would benefit from being updated. This would help ensure the requirements of the NPPF were being met.

Whilst the policies are enabling suitable development to come forward, they would benefit from outlining any additional sustainable opportunities to help meet requirements and provide certainty to industry and communities.

Waste Policies

The 2020 Review shows that in general, the waste forecasts continue to be relatively accurate and additional capacity is coming on stream albeit focused more on recovery than recycling. However, to ensure compliance with the NPPW, they would benefit from an update to enable greater alignment with the waste hierarchy.

Landfill capacity continues not to meet the forecasted need. Therefore, the policy would benefit from considering possible sustainable options alongside other sites for waste management.

Monitoring Indicators

This Review has not assessed these in detail but it is recognised that not all indicators obtain the information required to monitor the effectiveness of the Policies. However, any update of the policies should include a further review of the monitoring indicators to ensure that they are SMART³.

Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram

The issues identified through this Review could suggest that the economy was not being supported adequately. The current Vision could be considered to be lacking in spatial identity and specificity in its aims in relation to minerals and waste. The Vision would also benefit from aligning itself with the visionary Hampshire 2050 work and the climate change agenda.

The Plan Objectives generally align with the policies and would help achieve the current Vision. As some of the Policies are currently not delivering their aim, this would

³ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely.

suggest the Plan Objectives are not being met. An update of the Policies and/or Vision would need to include a review of the Plan Objectives to ensure they align.

Any update to the Policies would need to be reflected in both the Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram. To ensure compliance with national policy, the Policies, Spatial Strategy and key Diagram need to be unambiguous.

Review limitations

It is recognised that there are limitations to this Review. However, the application of the PAS Guidance has enabled a more thorough assessment.

The monitoring indicators were set when preparing the Plan and were an attempt to quantify the impacts of the decisions made within the framework of the HMWP. Any update to the policies should include a further investigation of the indicators and triggers.

The 2018 Review highlighted that there were at the time several uncertainties which could have an impact on future supply and capacity requirements of minerals and waste. However, uncertainty has only been increased due to the national pandemic, which is impacting on the economy; the longevity of these impacts is unknown.

The Government continues to drive forward changes to boost the housing market. Whilst an increase in development will have a direct impact on demand for construction aggregates, the rate of this increase is unclear.

Duty to cooperate correspondence has been issued to minerals and waste planning authorities who have a relationship with Hampshire in terms to minerals and waste movements to inform this Review. However, it is recognised that the minerals data is out-of-date (2014) as the new data was not available at the time. Further focussed liaison can be addressed as part of the Plan update.

Next Steps

It is recommended that a partial update of the HMWP is undertaken to ensure compliance with the NPPF and NPPW but also to ensure that the Plan is delivering a steady and adequate supply of minerals and enabling sustainable waste management provision.

In addition, the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram will need to be further reviewed to ensure that all requirements of the Plan are delivered but also that the Vision aligns with the 2050 principles for Hampshire and the climate change agenda.

To support the partial Plan update, an assessment of mineral and waste site options would ensure any suitable sites for enabling sustainable minerals and waste development are included in the Plan helping provide certainty to the industry and local communities.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) was adopted in October 2013⁴.
- 1.2 The Plan covers the administrative areas of Hampshire County Council, the unitary authorities of Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council, the New Forest National Park Authority, and the area of the South Downs National Park Authority within Hampshire (the Hampshire Authorities).
- 1.3 The Plan is based upon the principle of ensuring we have the right developments to maintain a reliable and timely supply of minerals and excellent management of our waste, whilst protecting the environment and our communities. It contains policies to enable minerals and waste decision-making, as well as minerals and waste site allocations (rail depots, land-won sand and gravel quarries, brick-making clay quarries and landfill) which support Hampshire's 'vision and objectives' for minerals and waste development to 2030.
- 1.4 The effectiveness of the policies in the HMWP have been reviewed through Monitoring Reports on an annual basis from 2012/13 to 2018 (please note we latterly changed to calendar year reporting to standardise data collection and make all the data comparable).
- 1.5 The annual Monitoring Reports (MRs) can be viewed here:
<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>
- 1.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local Plans should be reviewed to assess whether they require updating at least once every five years⁵. A recent update to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) suggests that if a local planning authority decides not to update their policies, they should publish the reasons within 5 years of the adoption date of the plan⁶.
- 1.7 Having been adopted in 2013, the HMWP was due a review in 2018 to assess if the intended outcome (the Vision; '*Protecting the environment, maintaining communities and supporting the economy*') of land use for minerals and waste development in Hampshire is supported by the correct 'direction of travel' and whether the Plan policies are effective.

⁴ Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) -

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/strategic-planning/hampshire-minerals-waste-plan>

⁵ National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (Para. 33) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

⁶ Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 051 Reference ID: 61-051-20180913) (Revision date: 13 09 2018) - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/plan-making>

- 1.8 Elements of national and regional minerals and waste policy have also been under review by Government since the adoption of the HMWP, further indicating that a review now would be timely.

2018 Review of the HMWP

- 1.9 A Review of the HMWP took place in 2018 (5 years since adoption) and considered the performance of the 34 policies against the monitoring indicators and data. Where the data suggested there was an issue, this was investigated, and the Review concluded whether policies required an update or not.
- 1.10 The 2018 Review concluded that the policies were working effectively to achieve the Vision and there is no requirement to update the HMWP. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

Waste

- In general, the waste forecasts have been relatively accurate.
- Landfill capacity is identified as not meeting the forecasted need. However, Policy 32 allows for additional landfill capacity and there is also reserve capacity.
- The implications of the Britain's exit from the European Union ("Brexit") on the waste industry are unknown at this time.

Minerals

- The landbank and permitted reserves of sand and gravel, silica and brick-making clay are not meeting their required levels. However, review of the mineral supply policies has highlighted that these do not exclude further development proposals to come forward and would be supported where a shortfall in supply is identified. The policies are considered to be flexible and enable development, where required.
 - The allocations in the HWMP are coming forward (relatively to the timescales set out in the Plan) as well as unplanned opportunities.
 - The landbank is being impacted by a delay in decision-making which is not the result of policy.
- 1.11 It was determined that the effectiveness of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan should be reviewed again in 2020 to test whether the delays in decision-making can be overcome, the remaining allocations are submitted as applications and the implications of Brexit are better understood.
- 1.12 A commitment was made to undertake a Stakeholder Workshop in 2019 to investigate the issues raised within the 2018 Review and how the trends in minerals supply and sustainable waste management provision are developing. This is covered in more detail in Section 7 of this Report. It was also determined that the HMWP Local Development Scheme would be updated to reflect the commitment to a future review in 2020 and Stakeholder event in 2019.

Structure of this review

1.13 This 2020 Review has a number of sections:

- Section 2: *Effectiveness of Plan Policies (review of MRs)* – outlines the findings of the review of the annual MRs to provide information and trends over the past five years against each of the 34 policies within the Plan. A Monitoring RAG (Red, Amber and Green) status is provided for each policy.
- Section 3: *Issues requiring review* – explores the policies that have been found to have an ‘Amber’ Review status and what the circumstances were in determining this summary. The review of each policy concludes whether an update of the Plan is required and provides a Review RAG status.
- Section 4: *Issues to be reviewed and may need addressing* - explores the policies that have been found to have a ‘Red’ Monitoring status and what the circumstances were in determining this summary. The review of each policy concludes whether an update of the Plan is required and provides a Review RAG status.
- Section 5: *Effectiveness of the Vision, Plan Objectives and Spatial Strategy* – delineates the findings of the policy review and whether this exposes a lack of delivery in the purpose of the Plan.
- Section 6: *Policy Change Drivers* – reviews the policy legislation and drivers that have been released since the HMWP was adopted and concludes whether any of these indicate whether an update of the Plan is required.
- Section 7: *Review Workshop Outcomes* – outlines the issues raised at the Review Workshop held in September 2019.
- Section 8: *Compliance with National Policy* – assess whether the HMWP is compliant with the National Planning Policy for Waste (produced after the Plan was adopted) and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.
- Section 9: *Conclusion* – outlines a summary of the findings and a proposed way forward in relation to the need for an update of the HMWP.

Duty to Cooperate

- 1.14 To support this Review, letters have been sent to minerals and waste planning authorities with which there are is a strategic movement of minerals and/or waste. This is to determine whether there are any key issues which could impact the continuation of this movement. Unfortunately, due to the delay caused by the current national pandemic, updated minerals data was not available at the time of this Review.
- 1.15 The responses received from the relevant minerals and waste planning authorities, did not raise any issues which need to be outlined in this Review.
- 1.16 Should the Plan be updated, this exercise will be repeated to inform the update and will make reference to the results of the 2019 national Aggregate Survey. Meetings will also take place with neighbouring authorities to discuss the findings of this Review and the planned update. Where necessary, Statements of Common Ground will be prepared.

2. Effectiveness of Plan Policies (review of Monitoring Reports)

2.1 This section considers each of the 34 policies contained within the HMWP in turn. The policy wording is provided as well as trends over the past five years based on information set out in the MRs. Specifically, this considers the monitoring indicators and triggers for each policy.

2.2 Where relevant to the indicator, contextual information is provided on how the statistics compare to the total number of applications or permissions. In the last 7 years (October 2013 to August 2020):

- Hampshire County Council has processed 248⁷ applications;
- A total⁸ of 230 permissions have been granted (49 Minerals / 181 Waste)
- A total of 16 new development sites⁹ have been permitted (6 Minerals / 10 Waste)

2.3 A RAG (Red, Amber and Green) Monitoring status is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

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

2.4 In addition, the content of the policy is reviewed for compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework and/or National Planning Policy for Waste.

⁷ Excludes Environmental Impact Assessments

⁸ Total = Total of all permissions granted by Hampshire County Council.

Policy 1: Sustainable minerals and waste development

Policy wording

The Hampshire Authorities will take a positive approach to minerals and waste development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Minerals and waste development that accords with policies in this 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, the Hampshire Authorities will grant permission 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.


Monitoring indicator

Percentage of Planning Applications processed within 13 weeks.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

60% of planning applications within 13 weeks.

7-year trend for planning applications processed by Hampshire County Council



Over the last seven years (October 2013 to August 2020) around 248 minerals and waste applications were processed. This includes 14 in 2013 (post adoption of the Plan in October), 36 in 2014, 34 in 2015, 58 in in 2016, 34 in 2017, 30 in 2018, 30 in 2019 and 12 until August 2020.

RAG Monitoring status

The number of planning applications processed within 13 weeks (or within an agreed extension of time) has increased over the 7-year period and remained at 100% since 2017.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 2: Climate change

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should minimise their impact on the causes of climate change. Where applicable, minerals and waste development should reduce vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts of climate change by:

- a. being located and designed to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the more sustainable use of resources; or
- b. developing energy recovery facilities and to facilitate low carbon technologies; and
- c. avoiding areas of vulnerability to climate change and flood risk or otherwise incorporate adaptation measures.

Monitoring indicator

Percentage of planning permissions granted against Environment Agency (EA) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted against EA advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against EA advice.

Green

Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should not have a significant adverse effect on, and where possible, should enhance, restore or create designated or important habitats and species.

The following sites, habitats and species will be protected in accordance with the level of their relative importance:

- a. internationally designated sites including Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar sites, any sites identified to counteract adverse effects on internationally designated sites, and European Protected Species;
- b. nationally designated sites including Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves, nationally protected species and Ancient Woodland;
- c. local interest sites including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, and Local Nature Reserves;
- d. habitats and species of principal importance in England;
- e. habitats and species identified in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan or Hampshire Authorities' Biodiversity Action Plans.

Development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon such sites, habitats and species will only be permitted where it is judged, in proportion to their relative importance, that the merits of the development outweigh any likely environmental damage. Appropriate mitigation and compensation measures will be required where development would cause harm to biodiversity interests.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted against Natural England (NE) advice (Planning permissions in designated areas).

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted within designated sites (SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI etc.) against NE advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against NE advice.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape

Policy wording

Major minerals and waste development will not be permitted in the New Forest or South Downs National Parks, or in the North Wessex Downs, the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs, and Chichester Harbour Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), except in exceptional circumstances. In this respect, consideration will be given to:

- a. the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations;
- b. the impact of permitting, or refusing the development upon the local economy;
- c. the cost and scope for meeting the need outside the designated area, or meeting the need in some other way; and
- d. whether any detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and / or recreational opportunities can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Minerals and waste development should reflect and where appropriate enhance the character of the surrounding landscape and natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the designated area.

Minerals and waste development should also be subject to a requirement that it is restored in the event it is no longer needed for minerals and waste uses.

Small-scale waste management facilities for local needs should not be precluded from the National Parks and AONBs, provided that they can be accommodated without undermining the objectives of the designation.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted against Natural England advice (Planning permissions in designated landscape areas).

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted within designated landscape areas (NP / AONB) against NE advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against NE advice.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 5: Protection of the countryside

Minerals and waste development in the open countryside, outside the National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, will not be permitted unless:

- a. it is a time-limited mineral extraction or related development; or
- b. the nature of the development is related to countryside activities, meets local needs or requires a countryside or isolated location; or
- c. the development provides a suitable reuse of previously developed land, including redundant farm or forestry buildings and their curtilages or hard standings.

Where appropriate and applicable, development in the countryside will be expected to meet highest standards of design, operation and restoration.

Minerals and waste development in the open countryside should be subject to a requirement that it is restored in the event it is no longer required for minerals and waste use.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy AND Restoration conditions in exceptional developments.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy = 0 AND For exceptional developments, number of planning permissions granted without restoration conditions = 0.

7-year trend

Only one planning permission has been granted in the countryside that was contrary to policy over the last seven years (2015) [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

One application has been granted contrary to policy.

Amber

Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt

Policy wording

Within the South West Hampshire Green Belt, minerals and waste developments will be approved provided that they are not inappropriate or that very special circumstances exist.

As far as possible, minerals and waste developments should enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt.

The highest standards of development, operation and restoration of minerals or waste development will be required.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted in the Green Belt contrary to policy AND Restoration conditions in exceptional developments.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted in the Green Belt contrary to policy = 0 AND For exceptional developments, number of planning permissions without restoration conditions = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted contrary to policy.

Green

Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should protect and, wherever possible, enhance Hampshire's historic environment and heritage assets, both designated and non-designated, including the settings of these sites.

The following assets will be protected in accordance with their relative importance:

- a. scheduled ancient monuments;
- b. listed buildings;
- c. conservation areas;
- d. registered parks and gardens;
- e. registered battlefields;
- f. sites of archaeological importance; and
- g. other locally recognised assets.

Minerals and waste development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of historical assets unless it is demonstrated that the need for and benefits of the development decisively outweigh these interests.

Monitoring Indicator

Planning permissions against English Heritage (EH) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions against English Heritage (EH) advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against Historic England (formerly English Heritage) advice.

Green

Policy 8: Protection of soils

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should protect and, wherever possible, enhance soils and should not result in the net loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Minerals and waste development should ensure the protection of soils during construction and, when appropriate, recover and enhance soil resources.

Monitoring indicator

Number of planning permissions that result in a net loss of Best & Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land in Hampshire AND Planning permissions against Natural England (NE) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions that result in a net loss of BMV land in Hampshire > 0 AND Number of planning permissions granted against NE advice = 0.

7 year tend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against NE advice or resulted in a loss of BMV land.

Green

Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments

Policy wording

Temporary minerals and waste development should be restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with the development plan.

Restoration of minerals and waste developments should be in keeping with the character and setting of the local area, and should contribute to the delivery of local objectives for habitats, biodiversity or community use where these are consistent with the development plan.

The restoration of mineral extraction and landfill sites should be phased throughout the life of the development.

Monitoring Indicator

Relevant planning permissions have restoration and aftercare conditions.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of relevant planning permissions without restoration and aftercare conditions = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No relevant applications have been granted without restoration or aftercare conditions.

Green

Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should not cause adverse public health and safety impacts, and unacceptable adverse amenity impacts.

Minerals and waste development should not:

- a. release emissions to the atmosphere, land or water (above appropriate standards);
- b. have an unacceptable impact on human health;
- c. cause unacceptable noise, dust, lighting, vibration or odour;
- d. have an unacceptable visual impact;
- e. potentially endanger aircraft from bird strike and structures;
- f. cause an unacceptable impact on public safety safeguarding zones;
- g. cause an unacceptable impact on:
 - i. tip and quarry slope stability; or
 - ii. differential settlement of quarry backfill and landfill; or
 - iii. subsidence and migration of contaminants;
- h. cause an unacceptable impact on coastal, surface or groundwaters;
- i. cause an unacceptable impact on public strategic infrastructure;
- j. cause an unacceptable cumulative impact arising from the interactions between minerals and waste developments, and between mineral, waste and other forms of development.

The potential cumulative impacts of minerals and waste development and the way they relate to existing developments must be addressed to an acceptable standard.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions against Environment Agency (EA) advice AND Planning permissions against Environment Health Officer (EHO) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted against EA advice = 0 AND Number of planning permissions granted against EHO advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against EA or EHO advice.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development in areas at risk of flooding should:

- a. not result in an increased flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall;
- b. incorporate flood protection, flood resilience and resistance measures where appropriate to the character and biodiversity of the area and the specific requirements of the site;
- c. have site drainage systems designed to take account of events which exceed the normal design standard;
- d. not increase net surface water run-off; and
- e. if appropriate, incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems to manage surface water drainage, with whole-life management and maintenance arrangements.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted against Environment Agency (EA) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions against EA advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against EA advice.

Green

Policy 12: Managing traffic

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should have a safe and suitable access to the highway network and where possible minimise the impact of its generated traffic through the use of alternative methods of transportation such as sea, rail, inland waterways, conveyors, pipelines and the use of reverse logistics. Furthermore, highway improvements will be required to mitigate any significant adverse effects on:

- a. highway safety;
- b. pedestrian safety;
- c. highway capacity; and
- d. environment and amenity.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted contrary to Highway Authority (HA) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions contrary to HA advice = 0.

7-year trend

0% over each of the last seven years [230 total permissions].

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted against HA advice.

Green

Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development

Policy wording

Minerals and waste development should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape and townscape.

The design of appropriate built facilities for minerals and waste development should be of a high-quality and contribute to achieving sustainable development.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions in the view of MWPA are of satisfactory design.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions without satisfactory design = 0.

7-year trend

0 over each of the last seven years.

RAG Monitoring status

No relevant applications have been granted without satisfactory design.

Green

Policy 14: Community benefits

Policy wording

Hampshire Authorities encourage negotiated agreements between relevant minerals and waste developers/operators and a community as a source of funding for local benefits.

Monitoring indicator

Percentage of major applications with community benefits.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Percentage of major applications with community benefits > 50%.

7-year trend

0 over each of the last seven years.

RAG Monitoring status

No applications have been granted with community benefits.

Red

Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources

Policy wording

Hampshire's sand and gravel (sharp sand and gravel and soft sand), silica sand and brick-making clay resources are safeguarded against needless sterilisation by non-minerals development, unless 'prior extraction' takes place.

Safeguarded mineral resources are defined by a Mineral Safeguarding Area illustrated on the Policies Map.

Development without the prior extraction of mineral resources in the Mineral Safeguarding Area may be permitted if:

- a. it can be demonstrated that the sterilisation of mineral resources will not occur; or
- b. it would be inappropriate to extract mineral resources at that location, with regards to the other policies in the Plan; or
- c. the development would not pose a serious hindrance to mineral development in the vicinity; or
- d. the merits of the development outweigh the safeguarding of the mineral.

The soft sand / potential silica sand resources at Whitehill & Bordon (Inset Map 5), further illustrated on the Policies Map are included within the MSA and are specifically identified for safeguarding under this policy.

Monitoring indicator

Area of Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) sterilised by non-mineral development granted permission by Local Planning Authority (LPA) against Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Area of MSA sterilised by non-mineral development granted permission by LPA against MPA advice = 0 hectares.

7-year trend

19.3 hectares of MSA was sterilised by development in the first five years of the Plan:

- 4.1 ha in 2015 (application 15/00392/REM, Edenbrook, Hitches Lane, Hart).
- 14.5 ha in 2016 (application 16/10764, Land at Buckland Manor Farm, Alexandra Road, Lymington, New Forest).
- 0.7 ha in 2016 (application 16/10497 Merryfield Park, Derritt Lane, Sopley).

A further 14.3 hectares of MSA have been sterilised in the last two years of the Plan:

- 8.3 ha in 2017 (application 17/01470/FUL - Land at former Ford Motor Co Wide Lane Southampton and application O/17/80319 – Land at Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice, Southampton. Site allowed by Planning Inspectorate during appeal).
- 6.0 ha in 2018 (application 18/02994/FULLS, Stoneham Golf Club, Bassett Green Road, Southampton and application APP/18/00287– Former Council Depot Site, Harts Farm Way, Havant).

RAG Monitoring status

33.6 ha of land has been sterilised against MPA advice in the 7-year period.

Amber

Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure

Policy wording

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.

Minerals sites with temporary permissions for minerals supply activities are safeguarded for the life of the permission.

The Hampshire Authorities will object to incompatible development unless it can be demonstrated that:

- a. the merits of the development clearly outweigh the need for safeguarding; or
- b. the infrastructure is no longer needed; or
- c. the capacity of the infrastructure can be relocated or provided elsewhere. In such instances, alternative capacity should:
 - i. meet the provisions of the Plan, that this alternative capacity is deliverable; and
 - ii. be appropriately and sustainably located; and
 - iii. conform to the relevant environmental and community protection policies in this Plan; or
- d. the proposed development is part of a wider programme of reinvestment in the delivery of enhanced capacity for minerals supply.

The infrastructure safeguarded by this policy is illustrated on the Policies Map and identified in 'Appendix B - List of safeguarded minerals and waste sites'.

Monitoring indicator

Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-mineral uses by Local Planning Authority (LPA) permission against Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-mineral uses by LPA permission against MPA advice = 0.

7-year trend

0 over each of the last seven years.

RAG Monitoring status

No safeguarded sites have been developed for non-mineral uses against MPA advice.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source

Policy wording

An adequate and steady supply of aggregates until 2030 will be provided for Hampshire and surrounding areas from local sand and gravel sites at a rate of 1.56mtpa, of which 0.28mtpa will be soft sand.

The supply will also be augmented by safeguarding and developing infrastructure capacity so that alternative sources of aggregate could be provided at the following rates:

- 1.0mtpa of recycled and secondary aggregates; and
- 2.0mtpa of marine-won aggregates; and
- 1.0mtpa of limestone delivered by rail.


Monitoring Indicator


Reduction in aggregate production capacity AND Land-won aggregate sales.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Aggregate production capacity is not reduced by more than 556,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 5.56mtpa) AND Land-won aggregate sales are not constrained by lack of capacity.

7-year trend





RAG Monitoring status

Sales of land-won aggregate have increased over the seven years. The loss in capacity is significantly greater than 556,000 between 2015/16. However, 2017 and 2018 suggest a recovery in production capacity.

Amber

Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development

Policy wording

Recycled and secondary aggregate production will be supported by encouraging investment and further infrastructure to maximise the availability of alternatives to marine-won and local land-won sand and gravel extraction.


Monitoring indicator

Production of high quality recycled and secondary aggregate.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Year on year decrease in the (capacity for) production of high quality recycled and secondary aggregates.

7-year trend*



RAG Monitoring status

Whilst there has been a year on year increase during the period 2012/15, there was a significant decrease in capacity in 2016 which has recovered in 2017/2018.

Amber

Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots

Policy wording

The capacity at existing aggregate wharves and rail depots will where possible and appropriate be maximised and investment in infrastructure and /or the extension of suitable wharf and rail depot sites will be supported to ensure that there is sufficient capacity for the importation of marine-won sand and gravel and other aggregates.

1. Existing wharf and rail depot aggregate capacity is located at the following sites:
 - i. Supermarine Wharf, Southampton (Aggregates wharf)
 - ii. Leamouth Wharf, Southampton (Aggregates wharf)
 - iii. Dibles Wharf, Southampton (Aggregates wharf)
 - iv. Kendalls Wharf, Portsmouth (Aggregates wharf)
 - v. Fareham Wharf, Fareham (Aggregates wharf)
 - vi. Marchwood Wharf, Marchwood (Aggregates wharf)
 - vii. Bedhampton Wharf, Havant (Aggregates wharf)
 - viii. Burnley Wharf, Southampton (Aggregates wharf)
 - ix. Eastleigh Rail Depots, Eastleigh (Aggregates rail depot)
 - x. Botley Rail Depot, Botley (Aggregates rail depot)
 - xi. Fareham Rail Depot, Fareham (Aggregates rail depot)
2. Further aggregate rail depots are proposed provided the proposals address the development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - Site allocations' at:
 - i. Basingstoke Sidings, Basingstoke (Rail depot) (Inset Map 2)
 - ii. Micheldever Sidings, Micheldever (Rail depot) (Inset Map 4)

The rail depot proposals are illustrated on the 'Policies Map'.

3. New wharf and rail depot proposals will be supported if the proposal represents sustainable development. New developments will be expected to:
 - a. have a connection to the road network; and
 - b. have a connection to the rail network or access to water of sufficient depth to accommodate the vessels likely to be used in the trades to be served; and
 - c. demonstrate, in line with the other policies in this Plan, that they do not pose unacceptable harm to the environment and local communities.



Monitoring indicator

Rail depot capacity AND Wharf capacity.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Rail depot capacity reduced by more than 130,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 1.3 mtpa) AND Wharf capacity reduced by more than 256,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 2.56 mtpa).

7-year trend



RAG Monitoring status

There has been a significant decrease in rail depot and wharf capacity from 2015. Rail depot capacity has had a slight increase in capacity in 2018 whilst wharf capacity has continued to decline.

Red

Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates

Policy wording

An adequate and steady supply of locally extracted sand and gravel will be provided by maintaining a landbank of permitted sand and gravel reserves sufficient for at least seven years from:

1. the extraction of remaining reserves at the following permitted sites:
 - i. Bramshill Quarry, Bramshill (sharp sand and gravel)
 - ii. Eversley Common Quarry, Eversley (sharp sand and gravel)
 - iii. Eversley Quarry (Chandlers Farm), Eversley (sharp sand and gravel)
 - iv. Mortimer Quarry, Mortimer West End (sharp sand and gravel)
 - v. Badminton Farm (Fawley) Quarry, Fawley (sharp sand and gravel)
 - vi. Bury Farm (Marchwood) Quarry, Marchwood (sharp sand and gravel)
 - vii. Bleak Hill Quarry (Hamer Warren), Harbridge (sharp sand and gravel)
 - viii. Avon Tyrell, Sopley (sharp sand and gravel)
 - ix. Downton Manor Farm Quarry, Milford on Sea (sharp sand and gravel)
 - x. Blashford Quarry (including Plumley Wood / Nea Farm), near Ringwood (sharp sand and gravel / soft sand)
 - xi. Roke Manor Quarry, Shootash (sharp sand and gravel)
 - xii. Frith End Sand Quarry, Sleaford (soft sand)
 - xiii. Kingsley Quarry, Kingsley (soft sand)
2. extensions to the following existing sites, provided the proposals address the development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - Site allocations':
 - i. Bleak Hill Quarry Extension, Harbridge (sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 13) – 0.5 million tonnes
 - ii. Bramshill Quarry Extension (Yateley Heath Wood), Blackbushe (sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 1) – 1.0 million tonnes
3. new sand and gravel extraction sites, provided the proposals address the development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - Site allocations':
 - i. Roeshot, Christchurch (sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 11) – 3.0 million tonnes
 - ii. Cutty Brow, Longparish (sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 3) – 1.0 million tonnes
 - iii. Hamble Airfield, Hamble-le-Rice (sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 9) – 1.50 million tonnes
 - iv. Forest Lodge Home Farm, Hythe (soft sand / sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 10) – 0.57 million tonnes
 - v. Purple Haze, Ringwood Forest (soft sand / sharp sand and gravel) (Inset Map 12) – 4.0 million tonnes

4. Proposals for new sites outside the areas identified in Policy 20 (including extension of sites identified in Policy 20 (1)) will be supported where:

- a. monitoring indicates that the sites identified in Policy 20 (1), (2) or (3) are unlikely to be delivered to meet Hampshire's landbank requirements and / or the proposal maximises the use of existing plant and infrastructure and available mineral resources at an existing associated quarry; or
- b. the development is for the extraction of minerals prior to a planned development; or
- c. the development is part of a proposal for another beneficial use, or
- d. the development is for a specific local requirement.

The extension and new sites identified above are shown on the 'Policies Map'.


Monitoring indicator

Landbank for Aggregate supply.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Landbank falls below 7 years worth of aggregate supply (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend



RAG Monitoring status

The landbank for aggregate supply dropped significantly below the required 7 years in 2016 based on the Local Requirement and has remained below the threshold.

Red

DRAFT

Policy 21: Silica sand development

Policy wording

1. An adequate and steady supply of silica sand will be provided by maintaining a landbank of permitted reserves sufficient for at least 10 years from:
 - i. Frith End Sand Quarry, Sleaford (silica sand)
 - ii. Kingsley Quarry, Kingsley (silica sand)
2. Proposals for silica sand extraction within the Folkestone bed formation and outside the permitted silica sand sites identified above 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.


Monitoring indicator

Landbank at individual silica sand sites.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Landbank falls below 10 years at individual silica sand sites (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend



RAG Monitoring status

While there has been a lack of availability of data to determine a baseline of silica sand provision, a 10-year landbank has not been achieved for each individual site.

Red

DRAFT

Policy 22: Brick-making clay

A supply of locally extracted brick-making clay for use in Hampshire's remaining brickworks that will enable the maintenance of a landbank of at least 25 years of brick-making clay, will be provided from:

1. the extraction of remaining reserves at the following permitted site:
 - i. Michelmersh Brickworks
2. and extension of existing or former brick-making clay extraction sites at the following sites, provided the proposals address the development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - Site allocations':
 - i. Michelmersh Brickworks (Inset Map 7); and
 - ii. Selborne Brickworks (Inset Map 6).

The sites identified above are shown on the 'Policies Map'. Extracted brick-making clay from Michelmersh and Selborne should only be used for the manufacture of bricks, tiles and related products in the respective brickworks.

3. Clay extraction outside the sites identified could take place where:
 - a. it can be demonstrated that the sites identified in Policy 22 (2) are not deliverable; and
 - b. there is a demonstrated need for the development; and/or
 - c. the extraction of brick-making clay is incidental to the extraction of local land-won aggregate at an existing sand and gravel quarry.


Monitoring indicator

Landbank for brick-making clay.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Landbank falls below 25 years worth of brick-making clay supply (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend



RAG Monitoring status

Despite a relative improvement in landbank in 2014/15, the 25-year landbank has not been achieved and continued to decline in 2018.

Red

Policy 23: Chalk development

Policy wording

The small-scale extraction of chalk will only be supported for agricultural and industrial uses in Hampshire. Extraction of chalk for other uses, such as aggregate, a fill material or for engineering will not be supported.

Monitoring indicator

Amount of chalk extracted in tonnes per annum (tpa).

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Amount of chalk extracted in tonnes per annum (tpa) < 25,000tpa.

7-year trend

The amount of chalk development only exceeded 25,000 tpa in 2015. Extraction at each site was relatively small-scale, only slightly going over 25,000.

Extraction returned to less than 25,000 tpa in 2016 and has continued to remain below the threshold.

RAG Monitoring status

Extraction exceeded the 25,000 tonnes during the 7-year period, although this returned to a level below the threshold in 2016 and remains below the threshold.

Amber

Policy 24: Oil and gas development

Policy wording

Oil and gas development will be supported subject to environmental and amenity considerations.

1. Exploration and appraisal of oil and gas will be supported, provided the site and equipment:
 - a. is not located within the New Forest National Park or South Downs National Park except in exceptional circumstances, where the reasons for the designation are not compromised and where the need for the development can be demonstrated; and
 - b. is sited at a location where it can be demonstrated that it will only have an acceptable environmental impact; and
 - c. the proposal provides for the restoration and subsequent aftercare of the site, whether or not oil or gas is found.
2. The commercial production of oil and gas will be supported, provided the site and equipment:
 - a. is not located within the New Forest National Park or South Downs National Park except in exceptional circumstances, where the reasons for the designation are not compromised and where the need for the development can be demonstrated; and
 - b. a full appraisal programme for the oil and gas field has been completed; and
 - c. the proposed location is the most suitable, taking into account environmental, geological and technical factors.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted in the countryside contrary to policy = 0.

7-year trend

0 over each of the last seven years.

RAG Monitoring status

No relevant applications have been granted in the countryside contrary to policy.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 25: Sustainable waste management

Policy wording

The long-term aim is to enable net self-sufficiency in waste movements and divert 100% of waste from landfill. All waste development should:

- a. encourage waste to be managed at the highest achievable level within the waste hierarchy; and
- b. reduce the amount of residual waste currently sent to landfill; and
- c. be located near to the sources of waste, or markets for its use; and / or
- d. maximise opportunities to share infrastructure at appropriate existing mineral or waste sites.

The co-location of activities with existing operations will be supported, where appropriate, if commensurate with the operational life of the site, and where it would not result in intensification of uses that would cause unacceptable harm to the environment or communities in a local area (including access routes), or prolong any unacceptable impacts associated with the existing development.

Provision will be made for the management of non-hazardous waste arisings with an expectation of achieving by 2020 at least:

60% recycling; and
95% diversion from landfill.

Monitoring indicator


Amount / percentage of non-hazardous waste recycled*.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Recycling not reaching 60% by 2020.

*It is noted that there is not an indicator which monitors the level of diversion from landfill.

7-year trend



The 2018 Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator shows that of all household, commercial and industrial 'waste removed' from sites in Hampshire – 39% (43%) was sent for 'recovery' while 5% (6%) was treated. Please note this figure will include some waste arisings which did not originate in Hampshire.

The 2016 and 2017 'waste removed' data has been corrected.

Based on data from Waste Data Flow, MSW waste arisings in 2018 were 799,007 (814,641) tonnes. The treatment of this waste was as follows:

- Recycled 25% (26%)
- Composted 13% (13%)
- Recovered 57% (56%)
- Landfill 5% (5%).

RAG Monitoring status

The percentage recycled trend shows a decline since 2014/15 and at present does not look to achieve the 60% by 2020.

Amber

Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure

Policy wording

Waste management infrastructure that provides strategic capacity is safeguarded against redevelopment and inappropriate encroachment unless:

- a. the merits of the development clearly outweigh the need for safeguarding; or
 - b. the waste management infrastructure is no longer needed; or
 - c. the waste management capacity can be relocated or provided elsewhere and delivered;
- or
- d. the proposed development is part of a wider programme of reinvestment in the delivery of enhanced waste management facilities.

The infrastructure safeguarded by this policy is illustrated on the Policies Map and identified in 'Appendix B - List of safeguarded minerals and waste sites'.

Monitoring indicator

Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-waste uses by Local Planning Authority (LPA) permission, against Waste Planning Authority (WPA) advice.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of safeguarded sites developed for non-waste uses by LPA permission, against WPA advice = 0*.

*Please note that "sites developed" is measured through planning permissions granted for development, rather than a physical development, as waiting until a site is developed would introduce significant delays to the monitoring process.

7-year trend

0 over each of the last seven years

RAG Monitoring status

No safeguarded sites have been developed for non-waste uses against WPA advice.

Green

Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development

Policy wording

In order to reach the objectives of the Plan and to deal with arisings by 2030 of:

2.62 mtpa of non-hazardous waste;

2.49 mtpa of inert waste;

0.16 mtpa of hazardous waste.

The following minimum amounts of additional waste infrastructure capacity are estimated to be required:

0.29 mtpa of non-hazardous recycling capacity; and

0.39 mtpa of non-hazardous recovery capacity; and

1.4 mt of non-hazardous landfill void.

Proposals will be supported where they maintain and provide additional capacity for non-hazardous recycling and recovery through:

- a. the use of existing waste management sites; or
- b. extensions to suitable sites:
 - i. that are ancillary to the operation of the existing site and improve current operating standards, where applicable, or provide for the co-location of compatible waste activities; and
 - ii. which do not result in inappropriate permanent development of a temporary facility and proposals for ancillary plant, buildings and additional developments that do not extend the timescale for completion of the development; or
- c. extension of time to current temporary planning permissions where it would not result in inappropriate development; or
- d. new sites to provide additional capacity (see Policy 29 - Locations and sites for waste management).

Monitoring indicator

Capacity and operational status of waste management facilities - provision of additional recycling and recovery capacity:

2011-2015 = 370,000 tonnes

2016-2020 = 205,000 tonnes

2021-2030 = 102,000 tonnes

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

No net loss of waste management capacity from closure of sites and/or no new recycling or recovery capacity proposals. (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend

Additional capacity delivery is shown in

Table 1 below.

Table 1: Targets for additional capacity to be delivered and actuals 2011-20

| | Target (2011-15) | Actual (2011-15) | Target (2016-20) | Actual (2016-20) | Difference |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Recycling (tpa) | 108,693 | 16,888 | 114,693 | 58,640 | -147,858* |
| Recovery (tpa) | 260,904 | 354,950 | 89,904 | 290,640 | 294,782* |
| Landfill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 369,597 | 371,838 | 204,597 | 349,280 | 146,924* |

*Capacity granted permission up to August 2020

RAG Monitoring status

No net loss in waste management capacity over the five years. Combined recycling and recovery capacity provision meeting requirements, however recycling targets not being met.

Green

Policy 28: Energy recovery development

Policy wording

Energy recovery development should:

- be used to divert waste from landfill and where other waste treatment options further up the waste hierarchy have been discounted; and
- wherever practicable, provide combined heat and power. As a minimum requirement the scheme should recover energy through electricity production and the plant should be designed to have the capability to deliver heat in the future; and
- provide sustainable management arrangements for waste treatment residues arising from the facility.


Monitoring indicator

Number of facilities and amount of renewable energy produced.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Decrease in number of facilities and/or amount of renewable energy produced (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend



RAG Monitoring status

The number of sites and amount of renewable energy produced has varied over the seven years with a noticeable decline in 2014/15 but increasing again in 2016. 2018 sees a return to 2012/13 figures.

Amber

DRAFT

Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management

Policy wording

1. Development to provide recycling, recovery and/ or treatment of waste will be supported on suitable sites in the following locations:
 - i. Urban areas in north-east and south Hampshire;
 - ii. Areas along the strategic road corridors; and
 - iii. Areas of major new or planned development.
2. Any site in these locations will be considered suitable and supported where it:
 - a. is part of a suitable industrial estate; or
 - b. has permission or is allocated for general industry/ storage; or
 - c. is previously-developed land or redundant agricultural and forestry buildings, their curtilages and hardstandings or is part of an active quarry or landfill operation; or
 - d. is within or adjoins sewage treatment works and the development enables the co-treatment of sewage sludge with other wastes; and
 - e. is of a scale compatible with the setting.
3. Development in other locations will be supported where it is demonstrated that:
 - a. the site has good transport connections to sources of and/or markets for the type of waste being managed; and
 - b. a special need for that location and the suitability of the site can be justified.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions in accordance with Policy 29.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Planning permissions not in accordance with Policy 29.

7-year trend

Only two planning permissions in the first five years of the plan were not in accordance with Policy 29; one in 2014-15 and one in 2015.

There have been no issues of non-compliance between 2016 and 2018.

RAG Monitoring status

Two relevant planning permissions have been granted contrary to Policy 29 during the first 7-year plan period.

Amber

DRAFT

Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development

Policy wording

Where there is a beneficial outcome from the use of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste in developments, such as the restoration of mineral workings, landfill engineering, civil engineering and other infrastructure projects, the use will be supported provided that as far as reasonably practicable all materials capable of producing high quality recycled aggregates have been removed for recycling.

Development to maximise the recovery of construction, demolition and excavation waste to produce at least 1mtpa of high quality recycled/secondary aggregates will be supported.


Monitoring indicator

Amount of high quality recycled and secondary aggregate production.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Once 1mtpa production reached, production of high quality recycled and secondary aggregate production decreases below 1mtpa (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend



This indicator shows the four broad classifications for beneficial uses of inert waste. Overall, the amount of inert waste put to beneficial uses has reduced by 19.7% from 1.32 million tonnes (mt) in 2017 to 1.06mt in 2018:

- Recycled: 0.72mt
- Recovered: 338 thousand tonnes (kt)
- Reclamation: 0kt
- Construction: 0kt

RAG Monitoring status

Production of recycled and secondary aggregate has not decreased below 1mtpa however has decreased steadily for four successive years and the current trend suggests that production could fall below the 1mtpa in the next year.

Amber

Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management

Policy wording

Proposals for liquid waste management will be supported, in the case of waste water or sewage treatment plants where:

- a. there is a clearly demonstrated need to provide additional capacity via extensions or upgrades for waste water treatment, particularly in planned areas of major new development; and
- b. they do not breach either relevant 'no deterioration' objectives or environmental quality standards; and
- c. where possible (subject to relevant regulations), they make provision for the beneficial co-treatment of sewage with other wastes and biogas is recovered for use as an energy source in accordance with Policy 28 (Energy recovery development);

and in the case of other liquid waste treatment plants:

- d. they contribute to the treatment and disposal of oil and oil/water mixes and leachate as near as possible to its source, where applicable.

Monitoring indicator

Number of and capacity of Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) with co-disposal of liquid wastes and/or biogas recovery.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Decrease in number of WWTW and/or capacity for co-disposal of liquid wastes and/or biogas recovery (*Breach of benchmark over two successive years*).

7-year trend




Figure only records capacity of those WWTW with co-disposal capability. Please note that this capacity is also included in the capacity reported for the Policy 28 monitoring indicator.

RAG Monitoring status

The number of sites and capacity has not decreased during the 7-year period, but the biogas capacity has increased in 2017/2018.

Green

Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill

Policy wording

Development for landfill capacity necessary to deal with Hampshire's non-hazardous residual waste to 2030 will be supported.

Non-hazardous landfill capacity will be provided and supported in accordance with the following priority order:

1. the use of remaining permitted capacity at existing landfill sites:
 - i. Blue Haze landfill, near Ringwood
 - ii. Squabb Wood landfill, near Romsey
 - iii. Pound Bottom landfill, Redlynch
2. proposals for additional capacity at the following existing site provided the proposals address the relevant development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A – Site allocations':
 - i. Squabb Wood landfill, near Romsey (Inset Map 8)
3. in the event that further capacity is required, or if any other shortfall arises for additional capacity for the disposal of non-hazardous waste, the need may be met at the following reserve area, provided any proposal addresses the relevant development considerations outlined in 'Appendix A - Site allocations':
 - i. Purple Haze, near Ringwood (Inset Map 12)
4. proposals for additional capacity at any other suitable site where:
 - a. there is a demonstrated need for non-hazardous landfill and where no acceptable alternative form of waste management further up the waste hierarchy can be made available to meet the need; and
 - b. there is an existing landfill or un-restored mineral void, except where this would lead to unacceptable continuation, concentration or increase in environmental or amenity impacts in a local area or prolong any impacts associated with the existing development; and
 - c. the site is not located within or near an urban area, (e.g. using suitable guideline stand-offs from the Environment Agency); and
 - d. the site does not affect a Principal Aquifer and is outside Groundwater Protection and Flood Risk Zones; and
 - e. through restoration proposals, will lead to improvement in land quality, biodiversity or public enjoyment of the land; and
 - f. the site provides for landfill gas collection and energy recovery.


Monitoring indicator

Lifetime of Landfill capacity void.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Lifetime of Landfill capacity void drops below four years.

7-year trend



Landfill capacity as of 31.12.18 based upon averaged annual inputs as recorded by the Environment Agency and voids as reported by the operators.

In 2017, no more waste was accepted at Squabb Wood and in May 2018 Pound Bottom¹⁰ ceased landfilling operations, both sites are now in restoration.

Based on data from the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator, the amount of non-hazardous waste received at Hampshire's operating non-hazardous landfills (Blue Haze and Pound Bottom (Pre May 2018)) was 110,113 (169,066) tonnes, of which 65% (62%) came from Hampshire. Around 168,036 (177,687) tonnes of household, industrial and commercial waste received in non-Hampshire landfills came from Hampshire. At the same time, around 38,197 (63,801) tonnes of waste from other authorities was received at landfills in Hampshire.

The recent increase in lifetime of landfill capacity is due to the reduced quantities being accepted at Blue Haze.

¹⁰ The Pound Bottom landfill is within the Wiltshire administrative boundary, however as the HMWP applies to the whole New Forest National Park it is monitored here. Due to this, other figures from the EA on Hampshire's waste may not include Pound Bottom

RAG Monitoring status

The lifetime of landfill capacity has been below four years since 2015.

Red

DRAFT

Policy 33: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste development

Policy wording

Developments to provide sufficient capacity necessary to deal with hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste will be supported, subject to:

- no acceptable alternative form of waste management further up the waste hierarchy can be made available, or is being planned closer to the source of the residues; or
- in the case of landfill, it will be for material that is a proven unavoidable residue from a waste management activity further up the waste hierarchy and;
- it will contribute to the management of hazardous or radioactive waste that arises in Hampshire (accepting cross-boundary flows).


Monitoring indicator

Amount of hazardous waste management arisings and capacity.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Hazardous waste management capacity is higher than estimated arisings.

7-year trend



Arisings in 2018 (2017) were 146,302 (135,100) tonnes. Deposits were 110,386 (93,900) tonnes. Capacity remains at 232,000 tonnes per annum.

Data on arisings from Hampshire and deposits in Hampshire is from the Environment Agency's Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator.

RAG Monitoring status

The hazardous waste management capacity has been maintained above the level of arisings during the 7-year period.

Green

DRAFT

Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure

Policy wording

The following areas are safeguarded, so that their appropriateness for use as a minerals or waste wharf or rail depot can be considered, if they become available or are released from their current uses:

- i. land located to the north west of Hythe identified in the Port of Southampton Master Plan; and
- ii. land identified in the Southampton Core Strategy as operational port land; and
- iii. Marchwood Military Port (also known as Marchwood Sea Mounting Centre); and
- iv. land at HM Naval Base and commercial port as identified in the Portsmouth Core Strategy for port and employment uses; and
- v. existing and former railway siding and other land that could be rail linked.

The locations identified for safeguarding are shown on the Policies Map.

Monitoring indicator

Planning permissions granted contrary to advice of the Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) / Waste Planning Authority (WPA).

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review

Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of the MPA/WPA = 0.

7-year trend

There was only one occurrence in the first five years of the Plan where a planning permission was granted in a safeguarded area contrary to MPA advice (application 14/00865/OUT, Land at Chapel Hill, Kingsclere, Basingstoke was permitted affecting Basingstoke Sidings). However, this has been specifically safeguarded through Policy 16 and therefore, should not be considered under Policy 34. There have been issues of non-compliance between 2016 and 2018.

RAG Monitoring status

There has been one occurrence of planning permission being granted within a safeguarded area contrary to the MPA/WPA advice. However, this site is not considered under Policy 34.

Green

Summary of Monitoring status

| Policy Number & Title | RAG status | |
|---|------------|-------|
| | 2020 | 2018 |
| Policy 1: Sustainable minerals & waste development | Green | Green |
| Policy 2: Climate change –mitigation and adaptation | Green | Green |
| Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species | Green | Green |
| Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape | Green | Green |
| Policy 5: Protection of the countryside | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt | Green | Green |
| Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment and heritage assets | Green | Green |
| Policy 8: Protection of soils | Green | Green |
| Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste sites | Green | Green |
| Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity | Green | Green |
| Policy 11: Flood risk and prevention | Green | Green |
| Policy 12: Managing traffic | Green | Green |
| Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste | Green | Green |
| Policy 14: Community Benefits | Red | Red |
| Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure | Green | Green |
| Policy 17: Aggregate supply - capacity and source | Amber | Red |
| Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots | Red | Red |
| Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates | Red | Red |
| Policy 21: Silica sand development | Red | Red |
| Policy 22: Brick-making clay | Red | Red |
| Policy 23: Chalk Development | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 24: Oil and gas Development | Green | Green |
| Policy 25: Sustainable waste management | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure | Green | Green |
| Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development | Green | Green |
| Policy 28: Energy recovery development | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management | Amber | Amber |
| Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation | Amber | Green |

| | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management | Green | Green |
| Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill | Red | Red |
| Policy 33: Hazardous and low level waste development | Green | Green |
| Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure | Green | Green |

DRAFT

3. Issues requiring review

- 3.1 This section explores in more detail the issues identified through the Monitoring Reports (MRs) and those policies given an 'Amber' Monitoring status.
- 3.2 Consideration is given to the circumstances around the short-term breaches that may have occurred or the trends that have raised an issue with delivery.
- 3.3 Where comments have been raised by Plan practitioners (namely Development Management or Policy officers) on the implementation of the relevant policy these are also outlined.
- 3.4 A RAG (Red, Amber, Green) Review status and review update requirement is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Review shows that the policy does not need to be updated. | Green |
| Review shows that the policy does need to be updated with additional allocations, where possible. | Amber |
| Review shows that the policy requirements need to be updated. | Red |

Protection of countryside (Policy 5)

- 3.5 One planning permission has been granted in the countryside that was contrary to policy over the last seven years (2015).
- 3.6 This was planning application 14/01791/CMA at Stapeley Manor Farm. As the application was a Certificate for Lawful Use (CLU) it is not subject to the same process as a full planning application. Instead the planning authority has to decide whether there is sufficient evidence that the development has been present without issue for a certain amount of time. As the development already exists and the CLU simply acknowledges and regularises this fact, there is no opportunity to attach conditions. This process is set out in national legislation and there is no scope to alter it at a local level.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.7 There are no policy updates that have been identified relevant to protection of the countryside.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.8 Taking into account the single circumstances in which an application was granted contrary to policy, it is not considered that the issue needs to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

- 3.9 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated.

Green

Safeguarding: Mineral resources (Policy 15)

- 3.10 A total of seven applications have resulted in sterilisation of the Mineral Safeguarding Area (a total of 33.6 hectares of land). In each case, the relevant Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) was consulted and submitted its concerns.
- 3.11 Subsequent decisions undertaken by the Local Planning Authority were beyond the control of the MPA.
- 3.12 In February 2016, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Minerals & Waste Safeguarding¹¹ was adopted by Hampshire County Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils to assist the implementation of the safeguarding policies set out in the HMWP. Six of the seven applications that resulted in sterilisation of the Mineral Safeguarding Area were validated after the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document.
- 3.13 Engagement is on-going with Districts and Boroughs to raise awareness of safeguarding including raising awareness of the SPD. Two of the applications were in the New Forest District and three were in the borough of Eastleigh. The Council has worked closely with both authorities to ensure safeguarding considerations are outlined in their Local Plans, which once adopted, should enable early engagement on safeguarding issues on sites allocated for development.
- 3.14 Whilst there has been some sterilisation of resources, the MPAs have also experienced some success in facilitating prior extraction and enabling subsequent development. An example of this is the Whitehill & Bordon relief road¹² the proposed route of which was within the Mineral Safeguarding Area. Where levelling of ground levels and drainage works have taken place as part of the development, the extracted mineral resources have been taken to a local operator and incorporated into the mineral supply.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.15 Hampshire County Council worked alongside a selection of other Mineral Planning Authorities, the Minerals Product Association and the Planning Officers Society to update the guidance on mineral safeguarding¹³. Whilst it is recognised this is not government policy, it is the leading national guidance on mineral safeguarding.

Should this issue be addressed?

¹¹ Minerals & Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire – Supplementary Planning Document (2016) - <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/planning-strategic/HMWPMineralsandWasteSafeguardinginHampshireSPDFinalFeb2016.pdf>

¹² Relief Road (Hybrid) Application: https://planningpublicaccess.easthants.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=EHANT_DCAPR_234061

¹³ MPA/POS Minerals Safeguarding Guidance (2019) - https://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/MPA_POS_Minerals_Safeguarding_Guidance_Document.pdf

3.16 Whilst there have been incidents of sterilisation, the Mineral Planning Authorities are continuing to work proactively to implement the policies and it is not considered that changes are required to the existing policy. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed through an update of the Plan. However, the Plan would benefit from reference to the SPDs to increase awareness.

RAG Review status

3.17 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated.

Green

DRAFT

Aggregate supply – capacity and resource (Policy 17)

- 3.18 Although Policy 17 states that an adequate and steady supply of sand and gravel will be provided for Hampshire until 2030 at a rate of 1.56 million tonnes per annum (mtpa), the delivery of this landbank provision falls to Policy 20 (Local land-won aggregates) which enables the development to meet this requirement. Therefore, this issue is reviewed in ‘Local land-won aggregate (Policy 20)).
- 3.19 Whilst the maintenance of the landbank is monitored through Policy 20, the rate by which this is calculated – 1.56 mtpa of sand and gravel – is set out in Policy 17. When the HMWP was prepared, the ‘apportionment’ figure was based on an average figure of 10-years land-won aggregate sales. Sales during this period (2001-2010) peaked in 2001 at 2.29 mtpa of land-won aggregate but then showed a steady decline.
- 3.20 Table 2 shows the 10-year (yr) average (Av.) sales in 2018 for the period 2009-2018. This also shows general steady decline in sales from 2009, until 2012 where sales have gradually risen year on year. Both the 10-year and 3-year averages are significantly below the 1.56 mtpa of which 0.28 mtpa should be soft sand.

Table 2: 10-year average sales in million tonnes per annum 2009-2018

| Year | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | Last 3-yr Av. | Last 10-yr Av. |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------------|----------------|
| Soft sand sales | 0.1 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.2 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.22 |
| Sharp sand & gravel sales | 0.95 | 0.84 | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.73 | 0.78 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.73 | 0.96 | 0.77 | 0.81 |
| Total | 1.05 | 0.98 | 0.83 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.18 | 0.93 | 1.03 |

- 3.21 Mineral Planning Authorities are required through the NPPF to produce annual Local Aggregate Assessments¹⁴ (LAA). The LAA reports on the landbank. In the Hampshire LAA¹⁵, this has historically been calculated using the ‘Local Requirement’ (the 1.56 mtpa apportionment). However, guidance¹⁶ on preparing LAAs was agreed by the South East England Aggregate Working Party in 2019 which specifies that the LAA rate should be calculated taking into account a number of factors:

- Average of 10-years of aggregates sales data

¹⁴NPPF (Para. 207) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/733637/National_Planning_Policy_Framework_web_accessible_version.pdf

¹⁵ Hampshire Local Aggregate Assessment -

<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/2017LocalAggregateAssessment.pdf>

¹⁶ SEEAWP Supplementary Local Aggregate Assessment Guidance (July 2019) -

<https://documents.hants.gov.uk/see-awp/SEEAWP-SuppLAAGuidance-July2019.pdf>

- Average of 3-years of aggregates sales data;
- Economic forecasts;
- Population, housing and capital programme growth and;
- Major Infrastructure projects.

3.22 Taking these factors into account, the 2018 LAA Rate¹⁷ was established as 0.92mtpa for sand and gravel (compared to the 1.28Mt Local requirement) and 0.23Mt for soft sand (compared to 0.28mtpa Local requirement).

3.23 The NPPF requires a landbank of at least 7 years¹⁸ of permissions. A landbank calculated using the Local Requirement rate of 1.56 mtpa provides a lower landbank than those calculated based on the 2018 LAA rate and the 10- or 3-year averages as the figure is significantly higher (see Table 3).

Table 3: Sand and gravel landbank provision in 2018

| | Permitted Reserve | Landbank based upon Local Requirement | Landbank based upon 2018 LAA Rate | Landbank based upon 10-yr Av. sales between 2009-2018 | Landbank based upon 3-yr Av. sales between 2016-2018 | Landbank based upon 2018 sales |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | Million tonnes | Years | | | | |
| Soft sand | 0.634 | 2.26 | 2.76 | 4.14 | 2.88 | 2.76 |
| Sharp sand & gravel | 8.433 | 6.59 | 9.17 | 10.90 | 10.54 | 8.78 |
| Total | 9.067 | 5.81 | 7.88 | 9.75 | 8.80 | 7.68 |

3.24 Whilst Policy 17 states a provision of 1.56 mtpa of sand and gravel, this was a point in time and could be argued to no longer be relevant. As the requirement within the NPPF is for at least 7 years, using this Local Requirement rate has the impact of reducing the landbank which may not reflect the current market conditions.

3.25 Tables 2 and 3 highlights that the provision of soft sand does not meet the required 0.28 mtpa as specified by Policy 17. Soft sand supply is recognised as a regional issue and is a regular item of discussion at the South East England Aggregate Working Party meetings¹⁹.

3.26 A number of Mineral Planning Authorities in the South East have soft sand resources that are constrained by designations such as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

¹⁷ Hampshire 2019 Local Aggregate Assessment - <https://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/2019LocalAggregateAssessment.pdf>

¹⁸ NPPF (Para. 207)

¹⁹ SEEAWP Minutes - <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/seeawp/seeawpdocuments>

(AONB) or National Park. National Policy states that 'as far as practical' landbanks should be maintained by minerals from 'outside' National Parks and AONBs²⁰.

- 3.27 Mineral Planning Authorities in the South East have prepared a Position Statement on Soft Sand which sets out the existing supply situation, relevant national and local policy and the issues regarding supply. This Position Statement will then form the basis of Statements of Common Ground between Authorities.
- 3.28 As with sharp sand and gravel, the sales averages in Table 2 suggest that the 0.28 mtpa is higher than the actual demand level in Hampshire. The application of all the rates all result in a landbank lower than the required 7 years which also suggests there is insufficient permitted reserves (sites).
- 3.29 The remaining part of Policy 17 seeks to safeguard and develop infrastructure to ensure aggregates can be provided at specific rates: 1 mtpa of recycled and secondary aggregate; 2 mtpa of marine-won aggregate; and 1 mtpa of limestone by rail.
- 3.30 Monitoring seeks to ensure there is no significant reduction (more than 556,000 tonnes) in capacity for aggregate production as well as a reduction in land-won sales.
- 3.31 The Monitoring data shows that the sales of land-won aggregate have increased significantly from 2016. There was also a significant reduction in aggregate production capacity in 2016 but this appears to be making a steady recovery. However, this still indicates that there is not sufficient capacity to meet demand.
- 3.32 The review of Policies 18 (see 'Recycled and secondary aggregates development') and Policy 30 (see 'Construction, demolition and excavation waste development') show that capacity provision remains above 1 mtpa but that capacity remains unsteady.
- 3.33 The provision of marine-won aggregate is generally determined by wharf capacity which is where marine-won aggregate is landed. Policy 19 considers capacity of wharves and rail depots in more detail (see 'Aggregate wharves and rail depots' (Policy 19)). However, the monitoring data shows decreasing wharf capacity since 2016.
- 3.34 It should be noted that in 2016, capacity was surveyed for the first time through the Aggregate Monitoring (AM) survey. Prior to receipt of this data, capacity had been judged on the highest level of sales in previous years. It is recognised that circumstances may change at sites over time which can impact on capacity and it is believe this is what has resulted in the reduction of capacity. Although the recent drop in capacity in 2018 suggests this is not the only reason.

²⁰ NPPF (2018) (Para. 205) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/733637/National_Planning_Policy_Framework_web_accessible_version.pdf

- 3.35 In addition, Tipner Wharf in Portsmouth has now been redeveloped. This regeneration proposal was recognised in the HMWP and therefore, the site was not safeguarded.
- 3.36 It should also be noted that an application was submitted to extend Kendalls Wharf in Portsmouth²¹. However, this application has stalled as the proposed compensation measures have not been approved by Natural England.
- 3.37 In relation to rail depots, capacity was also surveyed through the AM survey in 2016. This concluded that a 1 mtpa capacity remained at the existing rail depots. No new rail depot proposals have come forward in the last 5 years, but capacity increased slightly in 2018.
- 3.38 The monitoring trigger for Policy 17 is a reduction of 556,000 tonnes in capacity. The 556,000 tonnes are a 10% reduction of the total aggregate capacity (including land-won). The most significant lack in capacity is at wharves and land-won sites (see Table 4). However, the ability to deliver the required land-won capacity is driven by Policy 20.

Table 4: Aggregate supply capacity in 2018

| | Target rate | Sales | Capacity | % Sales / Production |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------|----------|----------------------|
| | mtpa | | Mt | % |
| Land-won Aggregate | 1.56 | 1.18 | 1.875 | 63% |
| <i>Soft Sand</i> | 0.28 | 0.23 | 0.637 | 36% |
| <i>Sharp Sand and Gravel</i> | 1.28 | 0.96 | 1.237 | 78% |
| R/S sites | 1.0 | 0.72 | 2.368 | 30% |
| Wharves* | 2.0 | 1.45 | 1.547* | 94%* |
| Rail Depots | 1.0 | 0.68 | 1.2 | 57% |

Footnotes

Source: Aggregate Monitoring Survey, 2018. Please note that capacity data collection is still in the early stages, and as such, results should be treated with caution. Where capacity data has not been made available sales have been used. *Wharf Capacity Data is based upon sales

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.39 In 2017, the white paper 'Fixing our broken housing market'²² was published which set out a broad range of reforms that the government intends to introduce to help reform the housing market and increase the supply of new homes. The paper states that 225,000 to 275,000 or more homes per year are required to keep up with population growth and tackle under supply. The paper also recognises that development of communities is also required which does not just mean building homes but also roads, rail links, schools, shops, GP surgeries etc.

²¹ Kendalls Wharf Application - <http://publicaccess.portsmouth.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=OWVWPNM0HRB00&activeTab=summary>

²² Fixing our broken housing market (2017) - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/590463/Fixing_our_broken_housing_market_-_accessible_version.pdf

- 3.40 In August 2020, the Government published 'Planning for the future'²³ which sets out its proposals for planning reform. The consultation closes in October 2020, but the paper seeks to address the significant shortfall in new housing delivery.
- 3.41 The Minerals Product Association reports that the construction of a typical home requires 12 tonnes of mortar and 200 tonnes of aggregate, school requires 15,000 tonnes of concrete and a community hospital would require 53,000 tonnes of concrete²⁴. These figures highlight the need for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate to support the governments drive for delivering homes and infrastructure.
- 3.42 Whilst not policy, the recent national pandemic is recognised as having an impact on the aggregates industry. This is expressed clearly in the Minerals Products Association Press Release²⁵:

'Sales volumes of ready-mixed concrete and aggregates (crushed rock and sand & gravel), two materials that are used across most types of construction work, declined by 5.7% and 4.0% respectively over the quarter. For ready-mixed concrete, this follows three consecutive years of market declines since 2017, as Brexit-related uncertainties put a brake on commercial construction work, notably for offices, whilst housebuilding slowed in the capital. Housing and the commercial sectors have also been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 lockdown, with most major housebuilders having closed sites throughout the last week of March and April, and office construction impacted by the collapse in business and consumer confidence. Simultaneously, mortar sales, which are primarily used in housebuilding, fell by a further 1.6% in the first quarter of 2020, after a 7.9% fall at the end of last year. The trend in mortar sales volumes has been subdued over the past 18 months, a clear indication of the underlying weaknesses in housebuilding even before accounting for the impact of the COVID-19 lockdown.'

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.43 Policy 17 states that provision of 1.56 mtpa of sand and gravel will be provided of which 0.28 mtpa will be soft sand. Whilst it is recognised that this Local Requirement rate no longer reflects the current market, it is not the determining factor in sand and gravel provision. The landbank is used to determine whether a steady and adequate supply of sand and gravel can be maintained. The provision of the landbank is met through the implementation of Policy 20.

²³ Planning for future (2020) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf

²⁴ Mineral Products Association: Facts at a Glance (2018) - <http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/Facts-at-a-Glance-2018.pdf>

²⁵ Mineral Productions Association: Press Release (5 May 2020) - <https://mineralproducts.org/20-release15.htm>

3.44 The Government is seeking to increase the delivery of housing and infrastructure and whilst it could be argued the existing Local Requirement rate allows for an up lift in demand and maintenance of supply, the reality is that these rates have not been achieved to date and forecasts suggest that the impact of Brexit and the current national pandemic will have an impact on construction and therefore, aggregate demand. As such, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

3.45 In relation to capacity, it is recognised that there has been a reduction, and whilst this appears to be recovering, capacity at wharves continues to decline. The Policy seeks to maintain this level and is not a cap which would prevent further development. However, the Policy and its associated delivery policies²⁶ may be able to encourage capacity through support for further development through allocation. As such, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

3.46 The rates of provision in the policy need to be addressed and updated to enable the right provision of mineral supply and reflect the provision outlined in associated policies.

Red

²⁶ Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregate development, Policy 19: Aggregates wharves and depots, Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates

Recycled and secondary aggregate (Policy 18)

- 3.47 During 2012 to 15 there was a steady increase in recycled and secondary aggregate production. There was a significant decrease in capacity between 2015/ 2016. However, the recovery in 2017/18 appears unsteady with a slight decline in 2018.
- 3.48 These drops (in 2016 and 2018) do not indicate a year on year decrease. However, this threshold could be breached should a downwards trend continue from 2018.
- 3.49 It should be noted that this policy also relates to Policy 30 (Construction, demolition and excavation waste development) which supports development to maximise the recovery of construction, demolition and excavation waste and seeks to maintain at least 1 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) of capacity. Whilst there has been a decline in capacity, the capacity requirement has been met. However, the current trend suggests that capacity could fall below 1mtpa very soon.
- 3.50 As capacity has been maintained but sales have declined, this suggests that there could be a change in the market in relation to recycled and secondary aggregates.
- 3.51 Discussions with operators²⁷ have highlighted that there could be further reduction in capacity as demand for housing increases and there is completion for sites with good transport connections. Issues have also been raised regarding the availability of good quality inert material for recycling. It is considered that this is impacted further on demolition sites where the use of crushers on-site means that material never enters the market.
- 3.52 This will place greater emphasis on the safeguarding of minerals infrastructure to ensure that careful consideration is given to the potential loss of sites and the maintenance of capacity.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.53 The government's 25 Year Environment Plan (January 2018) includes the goal of zero avoidable waste by 2050 and to transition towards a circular economy. Specifically, this involves doubling resource efficiency and minimising environmental impacts at products' end of life by; looking at the whole life-cycle to promote their recycling/reuse wherever possible.
- 3.54 The Resources and waste strategy for England (2018) sets out how the ambitions of the 25 year Environment Plan can be realised in the sphere of waste and resource management. A variety of mechanisms are proposed including changes to waste collections, encouragements for implementing the waste hierarchy, introducing food waste targets and improving data collection. Some of these could have wide ranging implications on how waste is collected and managed.

²⁷ Source: Correspondence regarding safeguarding status of aggregate recycling site (2017).

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.55 Whilst it is recognised that there has been a decline in sales of recycled and secondary aggregate, Policy 18 seeks to encourage this form of development recognising its importance in aggregate supply. The recent decline in sales may be due to market changes and this is something that cannot be influenced by the MPAs. However, due to the unsteady nature of capacity and possible future decline in capacity below 1mpta, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed, through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

- 3.56 The issues behind the decline in capacity need to be explored and this will determine whether an update in the policy wording is required.

Red

Chalk (Policy 23)

- 3.57 Chalk is a plentiful mineral in Hampshire and although there is now only limited demand, there are a number of existing and active extraction sites.
- 3.58 The HMWP supports small-scale extraction of chalk which is defined as up to 25,000 tonnes per annum. During the 7-year period, the amount extracted exceeded this level to a limited extent²⁸ and has since returned to a level within the threshold.
- 3.59 There are currently two permitted chalk sites in Hampshire at Manor Farm, Monk Sherborne and Somborne Chalk Quarry, Winchester. Permission was granted for a new chalk quarry at Monk Sherborne²⁹ in 2018 to replace the existing Manor Farm quarry which is to be completed and restored by December 2021. The chalk will be extracted at the new quarry in Monk Sherborne at a rate not exceeding 25,000 tonnes per annum, a throughput similar to the operation at the existing site.
- 3.60 Somborne Chalk Quarry, which has been worked since 1860 has recently been sold and is currently mothballed for chalk production. Without the recently permitted quarry, existing contractors would have had to source chalk from alternative sites, mainly outside the County, which was not considered sustainable.
- 3.61 The chalk is extracted to provide agricultural lime. Information provided by the applicant for Manor Farm states that agricultural lime makes a significant difference to the productive potential of arable and grassland. It provides lime to the soil which improves soil aeration and helps to release soil nutrients. It contains calcium which is essential for plant development. It also restores the pH balance of acidic soils. It is a sustainable option for soil improvement. Specifically, it is natural product that optimises the plants ability to utilise major and trace nutrients more efficiently³⁰.
- 3.62 It is recognised that markets change over time and therefore, the demand for chalk may increase during the Plan period. Monitoring extraction allows this to be reviewed.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.63 There are no policy updates that have been identified relevant to chalk extraction.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.64 It is considered that should the level of extraction increase significantly and for a prolonged period, this could suggest that the policy approach needs to be reviewed.

²⁸ Actual figure cannot be released due to commercial confidentiality.

²⁹ Chalk Quarry Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=19053>

³⁰ Regulatory Committee Report (July 2020) -

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=19053>

3.65 Within 7 years, there is no clear evidence that the markets have shifted significantly to demonstrate a review of the current policy approach to chalk. It is considered that the existing policy sufficiently seeks to meet local demand. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

3.66 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated.

Green

DRAFT

Sustainable waste management (Policy 25) & Capacity for waste management (Policy 27)

- 3.67 Policy 25 seeks to make provision to be made for the management of non-hazardous waste arising, based on the expectation that certain targets will be achieved by 2020: 60% recycling; and 95% diversion from landfill.
- 3.68 These targets sought to take into account the targets established by the revised Waste Framework Directive: 50% recycling of household (and similar non-hazardous) wastes; and 70% recovery of inert.
- 3.69 At present, the trend for recycling non-hazardous waste has been declining since 2014/15 to below 45% in 2018 which suggests that the Waste Framework Directive target will also not be met.
- 3.70 The Plan does not include a monitoring indicator related to landfill diversion of non-hazardous waste. However, Policy 25 covers this aspect of waste management as well. The amount of household and industrial waste removed from sites in Hampshire and going to landfill has been 13% in 2011, 12% in 2012, 9% in 2013, 8% in 2014, 10% in 2015, 15% in 2016, 13% in 2017 and 13% in 2018. The recent increase of the percentage of waste going to landfill corresponds to the decrease in recycling rates and to a parallel increase in waste going to incinerators. It also corresponds with significant changes in household and industrial waste tonnages, with a high of 4 million tonnes in 2014 compared to 2.1 million tonnes in 2018. In fact, the amount of waste going to landfill has slowly been reducing from around 400,000 to less than 300,000 tonnes, and it is the changes in the total waste have led to the differing percentages of waste going to landfill.
- 3.71 The reduction of the amount of waste going to landfill also corresponds to a reduction the waste landfill capacity in Hampshire, indicative of a general trend that less waste is going to landfill and therefore less landfill capacity is needed. This is discussed further under Policy 32.
- 3.72 Overall, it is difficult to assess the direction of travel of landfilled waste, however at no point has it yet reached the level of 95% that the Plan aims for. As additional recycling and recovery capacity has been delivered, whereas no new landfills have been provided, there is no indication that the Plan policies are not encouraging landfill diversion, even if the targets have not been reached.
- 3.73 Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) outlines the minimum capacity requirements for making provision for dealing with waste arising within Hampshire up to 2030.
- 3.74 The trigger for Policy 27 has not been met as there has been no net loss in waste management capacity. There are also monitoring indicators in place to track progress on waste management provision. These show that additional waste management

capacity is being provided to meet projected demand, although there has been a greater level of recovery provision rather than recycling.

- 3.75 Whilst the type of waste management provision is recovery rather than recycling, this provision is market driven which is something that the Waste Planning Authorities cannot influence. The required capacity levels in Policy 27 are also minimum amounts of provision.
- 3.76 Campaigns to change behaviour of local residents to increase recycling rates have also been put in place by the plan-making Authorities and although these are hoped to influence the level of recycling, are not planning issues.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.77 The government's 25 Year Environment Plan (published January 2018) includes the goal of zero avoidable waste by 2050 and to transition towards a circular economy. Specifically, this involves doubling resource efficiency and minimising environmental impacts at products' end of life by; looking at the whole life-cycle to promote their recycling/reuse wherever possible.
- 3.78 The Resources and waste strategy for England (2018) sets out how the ambitions of the 25 Year Environment Plan can be realised in the sphere of waste and resource management. A variety of mechanisms are proposed including changes to waste collections, encouragements for implementing the waste hierarchy, introducing food waste targets and improving data collection. Some of these could have wide ranging implications on how waste is collected and managed, making planning for waste facilities more difficult.
- 3.79 The goal of improving recycling rates is likely to be encumbered by China's ban on imported plastics. The UK exports almost two-thirds of its waste to China and waste management companies lack the capacity in the UK to dispose of recyclable materials appropriately. Furthermore, there is uncertainty post-Brexit, regarding how the UK will design future targets in areas such as recycling and landfill. Specifically, whether the European Union's Circular Economy Package (CEP) goals will be maintained, filtered or enhanced. Industry leaders are also uncertain whether sources of funding for companies that build more sustainable waste management facilities will be replaced. Additionally, the potential inability to export waste (particularly Refuse Derived Fuel) to the EU may impact on the profile of waste that needs to be disposed of within the UK.
- 3.80 In March 2018, the Government approved plans for a bottle and can deposit scheme in attempt to reduce pollution and increase recycling rates.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.81 There is a lack of ability of Waste Planning Authorities to influence markets and due to the UK leaving the EU and recent Government announcements on waste, there is

currently a high level of uncertainty over waste management provision requirements nationally.

- 3.82 The monitoring of Policy 25 suggests that the recycling target of 60% by 2020 is unlikely to be met. However, while increased recycling rates are the aim, the policy itself relates to the provision of waste management capacity as this is what the WPA can influence. Policy 27 sets out the specific required provision of waste management and within the 5-year period, sufficient capacity has been delivered, albeit more focused on recovery than recycling.
- 3.83 Policy 27 enables provision of waste management and as the requirements are set at a minimum, the policy is considered sufficiently flexible to allow additional waste management to be delivered, should this be required. The ability of the Policy to provide waste management has been monitored and is shown to be delivering capacity, however there may be ways to improve the ways waste is driven up the waste management hierarchy. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

- 3.84 Whilst the policies are delivering the required level of capacity, the type of waste management could be better aligned with the waste hierarchy than is currently happening. It should be explored whether the policies (alone, in combination and/or in combination with other policies in the Plan) could do more to encourage driving waste up the waste hierarchy.

Amber

Energy recovery (Policy 28)

- 3.85 During the 7 years, there was variability in the number of sites and energy produced from energy recovery developments. 2016 saw a significant increase in the amount of energy produced, potentially due to improved reporting from sites. 2018 saw a drop in sites, but a slight increase in production (as the sites lost had not been operational). A variety of waste sites produce energy including landfill sites, energy from waste facilities, waste water treatment works, combined heat and power and anaerobic digestion sites.
- 3.86 Policy 27 (Capacity for waste management development) outlines the minimum capacity requirements for making provision for dealing with waste arising within Hampshire up to 2030. Monitoring of Policy 27 shows that whilst waste management provision is being made, more recovery development is being developed than recycling. It is worth noting that anaerobic digestion can be considered recycling under certain circumstances. Additionally, while non-hazardous landfill is not a preferred form of disposal, if it used, capturing the energy from leachate gases is the more sustainable option. Monitoring of Policy 28 suggests that, generally at a minimum, energy recovery development is producing electricity as the amount of energy produced is tracking the trend of the delivery of sites.
- 3.87 Energy recovery helps to divert waste from landfill. However, despite the increase in energy recovery development, the amount of waste being diverted from landfill is not yet reaching the target of 95% (see Policy 25).

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.88 As part of their strategy to improve the management of residual waste, the Government have set out in their 25 Year Environment Plan³¹, aims to explore methods of cutting carbon dioxide emissions from Energy from Waste (EfW) facilities. These include managing the amount of plastics in the residual waste stream and also increasing the use of heat produced through better connections to heat networks. They are also looking at managing residual waste beyond electricity, in the production of biofuels.
- 3.89 Improving energy efficiency to reduce emissions of air pollution and carbon is also a goal in the Government's recent draft Clean Air Strategy, which will sit alongside the Environment Plan.
- 3.90 The Resources and waste strategy (2018)³² has particular provisions for waste collection and food waste which may have further implications for recovery facilities and, in particular, anaerobic digestion.

³¹ 25 Year Environmental Plan (2017) - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/25-year-environment-plan>

³² Resource and waste strategy for England (2018) - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/resources-and-waste-strategy-for-england>

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.91 Although during the 7-year period, the provision of energy recovery development has been varied, monitoring data suggests that at a minimum, sites are producing electricity which can be considered renewable. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

- 3.92 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated.

Green

Locations and sites for waste management (Policy 29)

- 3.93 During the 7-year period, two planning permissions have been permitted that are contrary to Policy 29.
- 3.94 One of these permissions had the special circumstance of being very close to the waste produced³³ and the other was a certificate of lawful use where it is a matter of regularising an existing use³⁴. The exceptional nature of these permissions indicates that the problem was not the policy itself.
- 3.95 Plan practitioners have raised concerns regarding the wording and definitions contained within Policy 29. In particular, the highway element of the policy which includes terms 'good transport connections' and 'local' were highlighted as presenting issues as the terminology is open to interpretation. Additionally, phrases such as 'special need' and curtilage have previously encountered objections. This has led to difficulties where the policy is tested and placed under scrutiny.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.96 There are no policy updates that have been identified relevant to the locational criteria for waste sites.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.97 During the 7 years, only two permissions have been granted contrary to Policy 29, both considered exceptions either due to a specific waste or the Certificate of Lawful Use permission process. Greater scrutiny has also shown that in some circumstances, the lack of clarity of the terminology used within the Policy has led to difficulties in implementation.
- 3.98 It is recognised that the policy would benefit from clarification of these terms, but it is not considered necessary to update the Plan in order to make these improvements. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

- 3.99 The wording of the policy would benefit from clarification which should be kept under review.

Amber

³³ Breamore Marsh, Breamore Estate Lane, Nr Fordingbridge SP6 2DF: 14/11272

³⁴ Stapeley Manor Farm, Long Lane, Odiham, Hook Hampshire RG29 1JE: 14/01791/CMA

Construction, demolition and excavation waste development (Policy 30)

3.100 Policy 30 aims to encourage beneficial uses for construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste. A considerable amount of CDE reuse and recycling happens on site or at exemption sites, in ways that are not part of the waste management regime. There may be a case for measuring sales of CDE and amounts used beneficially, however consideration would need to be given about the remit of the waste planning regime. The existing indicator may align better with Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregate development).

Relevant national policy updates

3.101 Nationally there has been a slight adjustment to which beneficial uses of inert material are considered recovery and which are classed as inert landfill.

Should this issue be addressed?

3.102 This policy needs to be viewed in combination with Policy 18 (Recycled and secondary aggregate development) to avoid repetition and to focus on the stated aims of the policy, namely, to promote beneficial outcomes for the use of inert CDE waste.

3.103 Work has been ongoing at a regional level, through the South East Waste Planning Group, to improve understanding of beneficial uses of inert waste and this work should be incorporated in future updates of the policy.

3.104 The current indicator shows a declining trend from a high of 2 million tonnes recycled and recovered inert waste in 2015, to just over 1 million tonnes in 2018. In addition to the need to explore the appropriateness of the indicator and the interactions with Policy 18, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

3.105 The wording of the policy would benefit from clarification on its purpose and more suitable monitoring and indicators to determine the extent of beneficial outcomes should be explored.

Red

Long-term safeguarding (Policy 34)

- 3.106 During the 7-year period, there has only been one occurrence where a planning permission has been granted in a safeguarded area (application 14/00865/OUT, Land at Chapel Hill, Kingsclere, Basingstoke was permitted affecting Basingstoke Sidings).
- 3.107 However, although the site is an ‘existing’ siding (as per (v) of Policy 34), the site is included in the HMWP as an allocation and therefore, is monitored under Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure).
- 3.108 None of the listed areas in Policy 34 have been subject to safeguarding consultations.
- 3.109 The Mineral Planning Authority continues to engage the Local Planning Authorities with regards to Safeguarding. In addition, a Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Supplementary Planning Document (adopted in February 2016) was produced to further assist ongoing engagement.

Relevant national policy updates

- 3.110 Although not National Policy, in 2016, the Port of Southampton Port Master Plan – Consultation Draft was published by Associated British Ports (ABP)³⁵. The draft Master Plan covers 2016 to 2035 and outlines the proposals for the strategic land reserve at Dibden Bay.
- 3.111 This area is referred to as “land located to the north west of Hythe” in part (i) of Policy 34. As these expansion proposals are progressed by ABP, the draft Port Master Plan makes specific reference to Policy 34 of the HMWP (see para. 3.22).

Should this issue be addressed?

- 3.112 The permission granted contrary to safeguarding advice is not considered relevant to Policy 34 in this instance. The draft Port Master Plan produced by ABP does recognise the relevance of the HMWP and specifically Policy 34. Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed through an update of the Plan.

RAG Review status

- 3.113 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated.

Green

³⁵Port of Southampton Port Master Plan 2016-2035: Consultation Draft (Associated British Ports, 2016) - <http://www.southamptonvts.co.uk/admin/content/files/New%20capital%20projects/Master%20Plan%202016/Master%20Plan%202016%20-%20202035%20Consultation%20Document%20Oct%202016.pdf>

Summary of Review status

| Policy Number & Title | RAG status |
|--|------------|
| Policy 5: Protection of the countryside | Green |
| Policy 15: Safeguarding - mineral resources | Green |
| Policy 17: Aggregate supply - capacity and source | Red |
| Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development | Red |
| Policy 23: Chalk Development | Green |
| Policy 25: Sustainable waste management | Amber |
| Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development | Amber |
| Policy 28: Energy recovery development | Green |
| Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management | Amber |
| Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development | Red |
| Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure | Green |

4. Issues to be reviewed and may need to be addressed

- 4.1 This section explores in more detail the issues identified through the Monitoring Reports (MRs).
- 4.2 Consideration is given to the circumstances around the short-term breaches that may have occurred or the trends that have raised an issue with delivery.
- 4.3 Where comments have been raised by Plan practitioners (namely Development Management or Policy officers) on the implementation of the relevant policy these are also outlined.
- 4.4 A RAG (Red, Amber, Green) Review status and review update requirement is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Review shows that the policy does not need to be updated. | Green |
| Review shows that the policy does need to be updated with additional allocations, where possible. | Amber |
| Review shows that the policy requirements need to be updated. | Red |

Community benefits (Policy 14)

- 4.5 In the past seven years, no major applications have resulted in community benefits. Therefore, the percentage of applications is less than 50%.
- 4.6 However, implementation of this policy has highlighted that it does not relate directly to work done by the Minerals or Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) as it refers to bilateral agreements that do not include the MWPA. The policy provides more of a position in support of these separate agreements.
- 4.7 It is also difficult to monitor on an annual basis as such agreements can take time to be established and implemented and lie outside of the planning process. There is also no obligation for such agreements to be reported to the MWPA.

Relevant national policy updates

- 4.8 In 2016, the Government announced a community benefits funding scheme for host communities for shale gas - Shale Wealth Fund. In addition, the shale gas industry sets out its commitment to community engagement in its Charter. The Charter sets out what communities can expect from companies developing shale in their areas. This includes a commitment to a package for communities that host shale development which includes £100,000 in community benefits per well-site where fracking takes place (at exploration stage), 1% of revenues will be paid out to communities (at production). However, in November 2019, the Government placed a moratorium on fracking following the publication of scientific analysis which found that it is not currently possible to accurately predict the probability or magnitude of earthquakes linked to fracking operations.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 4.9 It is considered that this issue does need to be addressed through an update of the Plan. The Policy should be removed as the support for community engagement is already provided in the supporting text of Policy 1 (Para. 3.4).

RAG Review status

- 4.10 The Policy needs to be removed and further clarification provided in Para. 3.4.

Red

Aggregate wharves and rail depots (Policy 19)

- 4.11 Policy 19 seeks to ensure that there is sufficient wharf and rail capacity for the importation of marine-won sand and gravel and other aggregates. Capacity is to be provided by existing sites, allocated sites and criteria for determining new proposals.
- 4.12 The level of capacity of both wharves and depots during the 7-year period are declining with no significant change between 2015 and 2017. However, in 2018, rail depot capacity has increased slightly, and wharf capacity has declined further.
- 4.13 In relation to wharves, the monitoring trigger is a reduction of more than 256,000 tonnes per annum (10% of 2.56 mtpa). A significant reduction (350,000 tpa (top estimate)) occurred during 2014-2015 with the loss of Tipner Wharf which was considered unsuitable for wharf operations.
- 4.14 It should be noted that from 2016, capacity has been surveyed through the Aggregate Monitoring (AM) survey. Prior to receipt of this data, capacity had been judged on the highest level of sales in previous years. It is recognised that circumstances may change at sites over time which can impact on capacity and it is believe this is what has resulted in the reduction of capacity. In addition, a poor response rate from the wharves in 2018 (1/6 return) may be the cause for the further decline in capacity, as sales figures were used where data was absent.
- 4.15 Tipner Wharf in Portsmouth has now been redeveloped. This regeneration proposal was recognised in the HMWP and therefore, the site was not safeguarded.
- 4.16 It should also be noted that an application was submitted to extend Kendalls Wharf in Portsmouth³⁶. However, this application has stalled as the proposed compensation measures have not been approved by Natural England.
- 4.17 No new wharf sites have been proposed. However, the safeguarded area 'land located to the north west of Hythe' (also known as Dibden Bay) has been included as a strategic land reserve in the Port of Southampton Port Master Plan – Consultation Draft which was published by Associated British Ports (ABP)³⁷ in 2016. The draft Master Plan covers 2016 to 2035 and recognises that the strategic land reserve is safeguarded through Policy 34 (see 'Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure' (Policy 34)). Should this proposal come forward, consideration will need to be given to the provision of a minerals (and possibly waste) wharf as part of the development. This could have wider implications for existing wharves in the Southampton area. Should the capacity be viewed as a replacement to existing wharf capacity, these sites may be viewed as potential waterside regeneration sites.

³⁶ Kendalls Wharf Application - <http://publicaccess.portsmouth.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=OWVWPNMOHRB00&activeTab=summary>

³⁷Port of Southampton Port Master Plan 2016-2035: Consultation Draft (Associated British Ports, 2016) - <http://www.southamptonvts.co.uk/admin/content/files/New%20capital%20projects/Master%20Plan%202016/Master%20Plan%202016%20-%202035%20Consultation%20Document%20Oct%202016.pdf>

- 4.18 In relation to rail depots, the monitoring trigger is a reduction of more than 130,000 tonnes per annum in capacity (10% of 1.3 mtpa). A significant reduction occurred during 2014-2015. As there was no change in the number of sites, it is assumed that this was due to changes to the operations on the site leading to reports of reduced capacity. In addition, in 2018, Kendall's rail depots were taken over by Aggregate Industries. This may explain the change in capacity reported through the AM survey.
- 4.19 There are two allocated aggregate rail depot sites in the HMWP: Basingstoke Sidings; and Micheldever Sidings. Whilst there has been some limited interest raised regarding Basingstoke Sidings in the 7-year period, no formal discussions have been held or applications submitted for either of the allocations.
- 4.20 Micheldever Sidings has featured in previous plans but has not come forward for development.

Relevant national policy updates

- 4.21 In 2016, the Government announced a programme of development of railway stations and surrounding land to deliver homes and jobs to boost local growth³⁸. Network Rail and the Homes and Communities Agency will work with local councils to identify development opportunities with the ambition of delivering 10,000 new homes. Proposals have already been drawn up in York, Taunton and Swindon to deliver housing and regeneration. In order to release land for regeneration, Network Rail will need to provide evidence to the Office of Rail and Road that the land is no longer required for the railway.
- 4.22 The NPPF states that 'significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering genuine choice of transport modes'³⁹.
- 4.23 The drive for delivering homes and jobs at railway stations may create competition on land near railways. This may lead to an increase in pressure on safeguarding existing or allocated minerals and waste sites in these locations.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 4.24 Policy 19 supports aggregate wharf and rail depot development to ensure sufficient capacity to meet requirements and new wharf or rail depot development is supported through the criteria contained in Part 3 of Policy 19. However, further opportunities may be available.

³⁸ Government Press Release - <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regeneration-of-stations-set-to-deliver-thousands-of-new-properties-and-jobs>

³⁹ NPPF (Para. 103) - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

4.25 Therefore, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed by exploring further site options through an update of the Plan. However, the wording does not necessarily need to be updated as the existing policy makes provision for further development to address any shortfall in reserves.

RAG Review status

4.26 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated but site options should be explored through an update of the Plan.

Amber

DRAFT

Local land-won aggregate (Policy 20)

- 4.27 Policy 20 seeks to maintain of the landbank for 7 years of permitted reserves of sand and gravel through: the extraction of remaining reserves at permitted sites as listed; extensions to specific sites listed; new listed sand and gravel allocations; and new proposals which meet the criteria in 20 (4).
- 4.28 The landbank is monitored annually to ensure that sufficient supply is provided. The monitoring trigger is a breach of the 7 years over two years. The landbank dropped below the target in 2016 and has remained below the 7 years requirement (calculated against the Local Requirement rate). Therefore, the provision specified in the NPPF of at least seven years⁴⁰ has not been met.
- 4.29 Part 2 and 3 of Policy 20 outline specific sites which have been allocated as being suitable for development. Table 5 highlights the status of each of the allocations, as of September 2020.

Table 5: HMWP Allocation status in 2018

| Site | Proposal | Permitted? | Other information |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Bleak Hill Quarry extension | Sand & gravel extraction | Yes ⁴¹ Subject to legal agreement | Awaiting completion of legal agreement following determination at Regulatory Committee on 16 September 2020. |
| Bramshill Quarry extension | Sand & gravel extraction | No | No response provided. |
| Cutty Brow | Sand & gravel extraction | No | Application not currently anticipated. |
| Forest Lodge Home Farm | Sand & gravel extraction | Yes ⁴² | Extraction commenced with completion of restoration expected by 11 July 2027. |
| Hamble Airfield | Sand & gravel extraction | No | Application expected mid 2021 |
| Purple Haze | Sand & gravel extraction and reserve landfill | No | EIA scoping received 17 June 2020 and public engagement is being undertaken by the applicant. An application is expected in the near future ⁴³ , early 2021. |

⁴⁰ NPPF (Para. 207) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

⁴¹ Bleak Hill Quarry Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=20535>

⁴² Forest Lodge Farm Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=17774>

⁴³ Source: Correspondence with David Jarvis Associates on behalf of the Somerley Estate (18/06/2018)

| | | | |
|---------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Roeshot | Sand & gravel extraction | Yes ⁴⁴ Subject to legal agreement | Awaiting completion of legal agreement following determination at Regulatory Committee on 19 June 2019. |
|---------|--------------------------|---|---|

4.30 Policy 20 recognises that there is a shortfall in supply despite the allocated sites and this is expected to be met through unplanned opportunities. During the 7-year period, the opportunities in Table 6 have contributed to (or may) sand and gravel supply.

Table 6: Unplanned opportunities

| Site | Proposal | Permitted | Other information |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Kingsley Quarry Extension | Soft sand and silica sand extraction | Yes ⁴⁵ | Granted on 18 March 2020 with completion of restoration expected by 18 March 2031. Estimated 994,000 tonnes of silica sand. |
| Downton Manor Farm Extension | Sand & gravel extraction | Yes ⁴⁶ | Granted on 18 April 2018 with completion of restoration expected by 18 April 2034. Extraction area extended by 18.4 ha. Estimated tonnage of 760,000 tonnes of sand and gravel, at an extraction rate of between 70,000 – 150,000 tonnes per year. |
| Roke Manor Farm Extension | Sand & gravel extraction | Yes ⁴⁷ | Granted on 11 October 2018 Extraction area extended by 2.7 ha. Estimated tonnage of 50,000 tonnes of sand and gravel. |
| Frith End Quarry | Importation of aggregate. | Yes ⁴⁸ | Importation, handling and re-sale of soft sand from Whitehill Bordon Relief Road scheme. Estimated tonnage of 0.048Mt. |
| Five Oaks Farm | Soft sand and restoration | No. Application currently being determined, validated 07 July 2020 | Up to 230,000 tonnes of soft sand with 435,000 tonnes of infill. |

⁴⁴ Roeshot Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=17204>

⁴⁵ Kingsley Quarry Extension Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=19368>

⁴⁶ Downton Manor Farm Extension Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=18645>

⁴⁷ Roke Manor Farm Extension Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=18831>

⁴⁸ Frith End Application - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=19598>

- 4.31 Alongside the known opportunities outlined in Table 6, on-going discussions are taking place with the districts and boroughs regarding their proposed Local Plan housing allocations and opportunities for prior extraction including Eastleigh Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council. New Forest District Council recently adopted (July 2020) Part 1 (Planning Strategy) of its Local Plan. The Local Plan includes a number of sites within the Minerals Safeguarding Area and the Plan makes specific requirement for Mineral Resource Assessments. Opportunities to engage in further plan preparation with Hampshire's other districts and boroughs will be sought as plan preparation commences.
- 4.32 Whilst the landbank has been below the required 7 years since 2016, it should be noted that, permission was granted for Roeshot in 2019 (subject to legal agreement) therefore, this will increase the reserves for 2019 (3 million tonnes). Bleak Hill Quarry application (0.5 million tonnes) was submitted in 2019 and is yet to be determined. Applications are anticipated for Purple Haze (4.0 million tonnes) and Hamble Airfield (1.5 million tonnes) in 2021.
- 4.33 Each of these proposals, should they all be approved, will have a positive impact on the landbank by increasing the permitted reserves. Although it should be noted that there can be delays to commencement of extraction and therefore, reserves elsewhere will be depleted prior to these proposals contribute to supply. It is also currently unknown what impact the current recession and exit from the European Union will have on construction supply and demand.
- 4.34 Part 4 of Policy 20 seeks to support further development proposals to ensure the maintenance of the landbank provided they meet the criteria. Part 4 (a) requires a demonstration that the existing allocations cannot deliver the landbank and / or the proposal maximises an existing quarry. Part 4 (b) supports prior extraction, Part 4 (c) supports proposals for a beneficial use and Part 4 (d) supports proposals for a 'specific local requirement'.
- 4.35 The HMWP states that soft sand supply will be provided by remaining reserves and new allocated sites, including:
- a. Permitted sites:
 - i. Blashford Quarry (including Plumley Wood / Nea Farm), Ringwood
 - ii. Frith End Sand Quarry, Sleaford
 - iii. Kingsley Quarry, Kingsley
 - b. Allocated sites:
 - i. Forest Lodge Home Farm, Hythe
 - ii. Purple Haze, Ringwood Forest
- 4.36 It should be noted that the Kingsley extension is for the supply of silica sand not soft sand and therefore, does not increase the landbank for soft sand.
- 4.37 The Purple Haze is the last remaining soft sand allocation and would serve the south-west Hampshire/Dorset/Christchurch market rather than the north Hampshire market (subject to permission).

- 4.38 Within Hampshire, soft sand reserves are scarce and are concentrated in a small number of areas, in contrast to reserves of sharp sand and gravel which are more widely distributed.
- 4.39 Soft sand is currently extracted in western Hampshire from Nea Farm (Plumley Wood) in Ringwood Forest and east Hampshire at Frith End and Kingsley. As with sharp sand and gravel sites, the soft sand sites supply all of Hampshire as well as some adjacent market areas.

Relevant national policy updates

- 4.40 Although not national policy, the Minerals Products Association published the UK Minerals Strategy in 2018⁴⁹. The Strategy seeks to highlight the link between the need for more housing and infrastructure and the supply chain of minerals that enables them to be delivered. It states that a demand in supply is likely to increase and that permitted reserves are declining and not replenishing at an equivalent rate to enable a steady supply. The Strategy also identifies that some local shortages of minerals are already evident including certain sands and this issue is likely to increase further.
- 4.41 In relation to planning and regulation, the UK Strategy highlights that it can take up to 15 years from identifying a potentially viable resource to securing planning permission. Therefore, the Strategy states that up-to-date development plans are required to provide certainty for operators to invest in development.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 4.42 The 2018 Local Aggregate Assessment reported that the local requirement landbank has been below 7 years since 2016. Whilst it is recognised that the applications have not yet been determined, there are applications (both for allocations and for unplanned opportunities) in the pipeline which indicates that Policy 20 is encouraging development to maintain the landbank.
- 4.43 The promoters of most of the remaining allocations have suggested that these will come forward during the remaining life of the Plan. Policy 20 supports further proposals for new sites to meet the landbank should monitoring indicate that the sites listed within the Policy are unlikely to be delivered.
- 4.44 Therefore, whilst the landbank for both sharp sand and gravel and soft sand are below the required 7 year minimum, the pipeline applications suggest that the policy is not preventing applications being forthcoming but is likely to be with the forecasted capacity requirements outlined in Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source).
- 4.45 The existing policy does seek to enable development to maintain the landbank. However, in addition to consideration of the required capacity, further opportunities for extraction should be explored to provide more certainty of supply for both soft sand and sharp sand and gravel.

⁴⁹ UK Minerals Strategy (2018) - http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/UK_Minerals_Strategy.pdf

4.46 Therefore, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed by exploring further site options through an update of the Plan. However, the wording does not necessarily need to be updated as the existing policy makes provision for further development to address any shortfall in the landbank.

RAG Review status

4.47 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated but site options should be explored through an update of the Plan.

Amber

Silica sand (Policy 21)

- 4.48 Silica sand, also known as industrial sand, is used by the construction industry (as a non-aggregate) for a range of specialist uses but also high value industrial applications such as glass and chemical manufacture, water filtration and recreational uses.
- 4.49 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies silica as a mineral of local and national importance⁵⁰. Furthermore, the NPPF requires MPAs to plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals. This includes the provision of a stock of permitted reserves of at least 10 years for individual silica sand sites⁵¹.
- 4.50 There are two permitted sand and gravel quarries in Hampshire which provide silica sand: Frith End Quarry and Kingsley Quarry. It is acknowledged that resources at Kingsley and Frith End have properties with silica sand uses. However, historical data identified the quarries as soft sand only.
- 4.51 Data on silica sand has only been available since 2013. Due to confidentiality, sales data cannot be reported individually and therefore, a three-year average has been applied which shows a decrease in sales during this period. Based on the three-year average (2016-2018), collectively, the permitted reserves amounted to 3 years and based on 2018 sales was only 2.5 years. These figures fall significantly short of the 10 years of permitted reserves at each site required by the NPPF.
- 4.52 The resources at Frith End and Kingsley can be classed as soft sand or silica, any sales of the resources as non-aggregate (silica) depletes the soft sand reserves (see 'Aggregate supply – capacity and source' (Policy 17)). However, it should be noted that although the resources can be classed as silica, the current use of the sand is not currently for industrial purposes. The main use of the silica sand at Kingsley is for sports surfaces⁵².
- 4.53 The majority of resources which have silica sand properties in Hampshire are found either within or very close to the South Downs National Park. National Policy states that great weight should be given to National Parks and planning permission should be refused for major development except in exceptional circumstances⁵³.
- 4.54 In March 2020, permission was granted for an extension to Kingsley Quarry⁵⁴ which falls just outside of the National Park. This permission provides 994,000 tonnes of silica sand.

⁵⁰ NPPF (Annex 2: Glossary) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

⁵¹ NPPF (Para. 208 (c))

⁵² Planning Statement (supporting Kingsley Quarry Extension Application (May 2018))

⁵³ NPPF (Para. 172)

⁵⁴ Application No: 51188/003 - <https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=19368>

- 4.55 Applying the three-year average sales (which also includes Frith End and therefore, is assumed to be higher than the actual sales), the proposal increases the permitted reserves of the Kingsley site to over 10 years. However, the permitted reserves at Frith End would remain below 10 years.
- 4.56 In 2017, a national silica sand group was established to meet the requirements of the NPPF which required 'co-operating with neighbouring and more distant authorities to co-ordinate the planning of industrial minerals to ensure adequate provision is made to support their use in industrial and manufacturing processes'⁵⁵. Hampshire County Council is an active member of this group.

Relevant national policy updates

- 4.57 No relevant policy updates.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 4.58 The existing policy does seek to enable development to maintain permitted reserves provided that 'proposals do not have an unacceptable environmental or amenity impact either alone or in combination with other plans or projects'. However, further opportunities may be available.
- 4.59 Therefore, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed by exploring further site options through an update of the Plan. However, the wording does not necessarily need to be updated as the existing policy makes provision for further development to address any shortfall in reserves.

RAG Review status

- 4.60 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated but site options should be explored through an update of the Plan.

Amber

⁵⁵ NPPF (Para. 208) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/733637/National_Planning_Policy_Framework_web_accessible_version.pdf

Brick-making clay (Policy 22)

- 4.61 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies brick clay as a mineral of local and national importance⁵⁶. Furthermore, the NPPF requires MPAs to plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals. This includes the provision of a stock of permitted reserves of at least 25 years⁵⁷.
- 4.62 Hampshire has two local brickworks: Michelmersh, near Romsey and Selborne in the South Downs National Park. These brickworks produce bricks from local brick-making clay, although only Michelmersh is currently operational.
- 4.63 In 2014, permission was granted for the extension site allocated in the HMWP and extraction commenced in 2017. This led to a significant increase in permitted reserves. However, despite a relative improvement in permitted reserves in recent years, the 25 years has not and will not be achieved.
- 4.64 Selborne brickworks does not have a current operational clay reserve and there is no activity at this site.

Relevant national policy updates

- 4.65 The NPPF (2019) introduced a new criterion (208 (d)) in relation to the provision of brick clay for industrial purposes. The criteria states that Minerals Planning Authorities should 'take account of the need for brick clay from a number of different sources to enable appropriate blends to be made'⁵⁸.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 4.66 It is recognised that Michelmersh (and Selborne) do not currently collectively contain 25 years permitted reserves. However, the permission at Michelmersh has increased the permitted reserves at this site significantly. It is considered unlikely, based on the work undertaken during the preparation of the HMWP, that further suitable resources are available in the locality of the brickworks.
- 4.67 It is not anticipated that Selborne will operate as brickworks in the near future. Its potential to commence production within the Plan period is unknown and will depend on obtaining the relevant planning permissions.
- 4.68 The existing policy does seek to enable development to maintain permitted reserves provided that the site allocations are not deliverable (the Michelmersh allocation is currently being delivered and there is no evidence to suggest that the Selborne

⁵⁶ NPPF (Annex 2: Glossary) -

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

⁵⁷ NPPF (Para. 208 (c))

⁵⁸ NPPF (Para. 208 (d))

allocation will be delivered in the near future) and that there is a 'demonstrable need for the development' and / or the 'extraction of brick-making clay is incidental'.

4.69 Whilst it could be argued that further allocations should be identified to provide certainty of supply at Michelmersh, work undertaken to support the HMWP highlighted that alternative site options in the area are limited due to availability of suitable resources. Policy 22 currently makes provision for the need for clay extraction outside of the sites identified and therefore, can enable the supply of brick clay from different sources should this be required for blending.

4.70 Therefore, it is considered that this issue does need to be addressed by exploring further site options through an update of the Plan. However, the wording does not necessarily need to be updated as the existing policy makes provision for further development to address any shortfall in reserves.

RAG Review status

4.71 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated but site options should be explored through an update of the Plan.

Amber

Non-hazardous landfill (Policy 32)

- 4.72 Policy 32 supports landfill development to enable the capacity necessary to deal with Hampshire's waste to 2030. This is expected to be provided at: remaining permitted capacity at existing listed sites; additional capacity at listed sites; and additional capacity at other suitable sites that accord with the criteria.
- 4.73 Whilst the majority (95%) of household waste is diverted from landfill, the remaining amount still needs to be landfilled. Therefore, sufficient landfill capacity is required to meet these needs in the near future. In the longer term, technological solutions may deliver an alternative treatment option.
- 4.74 At the time the HMWP was prepared, it was estimated that there was 8 years of remaining capacity which would be exhausted by 2018/19⁵⁹. In line with the absence of new provision of landfill there has been a declining trend in the lifetime of landfill capacity, with a low point in 2017 (2.4 years). In 2018 this increased to 3.7 years as reduced amounts of waste were received at the remaining landfill in Blue Haze.
- 4.75 The lifetime of landfills is monitored annually to ensure that sufficient capacity is provided. The lifetime of landfill capacity dropped below 4 years in 2015 and has remained that way.
- 4.76 In 2016, Squabb Wood Landfill closed earlier than anticipated and is currently being restored. Squabb Wood is listed in Policy 32 in Part 1 (ii) as an existing site to provide remaining capacity and Part 2 (i) as the site that could provide additional capacity. The closure of the site means that the proposed extension of this site will not be implemented. This has been confirmed by the operator. With the early closure of the landfill both the remaining capacity at the site and any additional capacity that could have been provided have been lost.
- 4.77 Policy 32, Part 3 lists the allocated soft sand extraction Purple Haze as a reserve site for landfill. Purple Haze has not yet been permitted, though the site promoter has indicated that a planning application should be forthcoming in the near future. The current proposals for the site (at the scoping opinion stage) specifically make no provision for non-hazardous landfill. As the potential landfill capacity of this site could be up to 4 million tonnes this represents a significant loss of capacity and the loss of the only new landfill allocation.
- 4.78 The South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) which is formed of all of the Waste Planning Authorities in the South East, has recognised that the early closing and lack of replacement of non-hazardous landfill is a regional issue and is currently preparing a Landfill Joint Position Statement. The issue partly represents the successful diversion of waste from landfill. The Statement of Common Ground prepared by SEWPAG recognises that there is likely to be a move towards regionally strategically landfill sites in the near future.

⁵⁹ Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire: Landfill and Surcharging Report (2012).

Relevant national policy updates

- 4.79 The National Planning Policy for Waste⁶⁰ (NPPW) sets out detailed waste planning policies to which local planning authorities need to have regard. The NPPW recognises that when preparing Waste Local Plans there is a need to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy whilst recognising the need for a mix of facilities as well as adequate provision for waste disposal⁶¹.
- 4.80 The Resources and waste strategy (2018) seeks to enable the circular economy, improve recycling rates, drive greater efficiency of energy from waste plants, as well as directly reduce plastic and food waste not being recycled. All of these proposed policy and legislative drivers have the potential to further reduce waste going to landfill.

Should this issue be addressed?

- 4.81 Policy 32 seeks to provide sufficient landfill capacity. The estimated capacity forecasts appear to be accurate with a slight increase in lifetime capacity in 2018. However, non-hazardous landfill capacity is recognised as a regional issue and is being addressed by Waste Planning Authorities through the creation of a Position Statements and Statements of Common Ground. Therefore, whilst the capacity is not meeting the required level of 4 years, it is recognised that there is existing provision in the policy that the market has chosen not to take up. As such, it is considered that this issue does not need to be addressed through an update of the Plan, however in the case of a Plan update the issue would need to be reviewed to ensure all appropriate steps are being taken.

RAG Review status

- 4.82 The wording of the policy does not need to be updated, however in the case of a Plan update the policy and evidence would need to be reviewed to see if further allocations are necessary and possible.

Amber

⁶⁰ National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste>

⁶¹ NPPW (Para. 3).

Summary of Review status

| Policy Number & Title | RAG status |
|--|------------|
| Policy 14: Community Benefits | Red |
| Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots | Amber |
| Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates | Amber |
| Policy 21: Silica sand development | Amber |
| Policy 22: Brick-making clay | Amber |
| Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill | Amber |

5. Effectiveness of the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy & Key Diagram

- 5.1 It is recognised that Vision was considered briefly in the 2018 Review of the Plan but that the Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram were not addressed.

Vision

- 5.2 The Vision of the HMWP is ‘Protecting the environment, maintaining communities and supporting the environment’. The purpose of the Vision was to reflect the pillars of sustainability.
- 5.3 The 2018 Review concluded that the Plan was delivering the Vision but the issues raised through this Review suggest that whilst the development policies which control development are working effectively, the delivery policies are not necessarily supporting the economy, particularly in relation to aggregate supply.
- 5.4 Achieving sustainable development is still at the core of the NPPF⁶² and therefore, the Vision is still relevant. However, since adoption of the Plan, many of the partner Authorities have declared climate emergencies, which requires a re-focus on how the Authorities plan for the future.
- 5.5 In addition, Hampshire County Council launched the Hampshire 2050 Commission of Inquiry which ran from May 2018 to October 2019 and explored future prosperity, quality of life, and protection and enhancement of the character and environment of Hampshire. The HMWP currently looks to guide minerals and waste decision-making up to 2030. As such, there is an opportunity to align the HMWP with the Hampshire 2050 Vision principles.
- 5.6 The wording of the Vision would also benefit from a clearer relevance to minerals and waste planning and the inclusion of geographical specificity.

Plan Objectives

- 5.7 A suite of Plan objectives is set out in the HMWP that are intended to deliver the Vision and Spatial Strategy. A table showing the relationship between the Plan’s objectives and policies is set out in Appendix 1. The Table demonstrates that most of the objectives are addressed directly by the policies. Therefore, they are generally fit-for-purpose in delivery of the Vision through the policies as they currently stand. However, the review has highlighted that it is not clear how Policy 21 (Silica sand development) is addressed within the objectives as this is not an aggregate.

⁶² NPPF (Section 1) - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

- 5.8 As this 2020 Review indicates that not all the policies are meeting their delivery objectives, then the Plan is also failing to meet its objectives to deliver the Vision.
- 5.9 Any update to the policies and/or Vision will require a further review of the Plan objectives. This would also ensure that they deliver the Vision in line with policy driver changes set out in Section 6, for instance in relation to biodiversity net gain and climate change. In addition, a review would ensure they are SMART⁶³. Plan readability would be improved with a clearer distinction between Plan Objectives and the Vision and Spatial Strategy.

Spatial Strategy & Key Diagram

- 5.10 The Spatial Strategy sets the context for the Plan's policies. It is important, therefore, that the Spatial Strategy is reviewed to ensure that the context it provides is up to date, for instance ensuring that it accounts for changes in areas of growth, resource demand, infrastructure and planned development.
- 5.11 Components of the Spatial Strategy are illustrated in the Key Diagram (Para. 2.47 of the Plan). The Key Diagram is a diagrammatic interpretation. However, a lack of definition elsewhere in the Plan has led to an assumption that the diagram represents boundaries for what should be a technical consideration. Policy 29 (Locations for waste management development) supports development to provide recycling, recovery and/or treatment of waste on suitable sites in "Areas along the strategic road corridors". Whilst it is not outlined as a definition of a "strategic road corridor", Para. 6.198 provides further guidance in that waste sites should be prioritised with "good transport connections to the strategic road network".
- 5.12 During an Appeal for Knowle Lane, the lack of definition of the strategic road corridor in Policy 29 meant that the applicant was seeking to determine whether the site was within the boundary of the strategic road corridor as shown on the Key Diagram⁶⁴. However, the Key Diagram illustrates the presumption of where the corridor would be by applying a 1-kilometre buffer to the Strategic Road Network but does not take into consideration "good connections". As such, clarification of how a strategic road corridor is defined would be beneficial for Para. 6.198 of the Plan.

⁶³ SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely.

⁶⁴ See Planning Statement of Case (WYG) Para. 2.29 -

<https://planning.hants.gov.uk/ApplicationDetails.aspx?RecNo=17123>

6. Policy change drivers

- 6.1 As outlined in the previous sections, there have been a number of Government policy publications, announcements and consultations which have and will have an impact on the HMWP policies. Where these relate to the policies outlined in sections 3 and 4, these have already been discussed. However, there are implications on other policies which are outlined in this section.
- 6.2 Implementation of the HMWP policies by development management practitioners has also highlighted areas where further clarification of the terminology outlined in the policies would make them more effective. Therefore, where these clarifications have not been addressed in sections 3 and 4, they are also outlined in this section.

NPPF (2019)

- 6.3 Following consultation by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published in 2012 was subsequently revised in 2018 and 2019⁶⁵.
- 6.4 There is a discreet but strong encouragement given to local planning authorities to move towards strategic plan-making (para. 24). This is an improvement on the original NPPF, which focused on the preparation of single all-encompassing local plans containing both strategic and development management policies; which do not easily lend themselves to joint preparation with neighbouring authorities.
- 6.5 Linked to this is the strengthening of the duty to co-operate with the addition of a requirement for the preparation of statements of common ground. These are required to document the cross-boundary issues to be addressed and the progress in dealing with them.
- 6.6 Other NPPF revisions include (but are not limited to):
- additional guidance on securing net gains for biodiversity;
 - uses of land and developing green and brown field land;
 - greater emphasis on design of development;
 - additional guidance on the change of use of land in the Green Belt;
 - additional guidance on flood risk;
 - consideration of undeveloped coasts and public access to the coast;
 - additional guidance on designated landscapes;
 - consideration of ground conditions and impacts of air quality on natural environment; and
 - greater emphasis on energy security.
- 6.7 The NPPF (2019) has a direct impact on the implementation of all the policies within the Plan.

⁶⁵ NPPF (2019) - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)

- 6.8 The National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW)⁶⁶ sets out detailed waste planning policies to which local planning authorities need to have regard. A framework for Local Plan preparation is provided as well as on the need for waste management facilities and suitable sites on which they should be located. In relation to the determination of applications, provision is made for the consideration of impacts of non-waste development on existing or allocated waste sites.
- 6.9 The NPPW outlines much of the policy previously contained within Planning Policy Statement (PPS)10 which informed the preparation of the HMWP. As such, the HMWP is in conformity with the NPPW. Should further update occur, appropriate reference will be made in the updated HMWP.

Planning Practice Guidance (2014 onwards)

- 6.10 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was launched in 2014 by Government, following the adoption of the HMWP, to support the interpretation and implementation of the NPPF and NPPW. This is a live web-based resource, updated as necessary by MHCLG. The PPG includes references to Statements of Common Ground and specifically outlines the requirement for a Statement of Common Ground to be prepared for minerals and waste plans⁶⁷.

River Basin Management Plan (2016)

- 6.11 Originally published in 2009, the South East river basin district River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) was updated in December 2015, published in February 2016⁶⁸ and approved by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. An updated draft South East river basin district RBMP is being consulted on (October 2020 – April 2021) and will be published later in 2021.
- 6.12 The purpose of the RBMP is to provide a framework for protecting and enhancing the benefits provided by the water environment in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. To achieve this, and because water and land resources are closely linked, it also informs decisions on land-use planning.
- 6.13 The ambitions of the RBMP are delivered at the river catchment scale. Since 2012, formal Defra recognised Catchment Partnerships were established for each Water Framework Directive (WFD) catchment across England, as part of the Government's Catchment Based Approach (CaBA). Eight of these catchments are wholly or partly within Hampshire. Over the last few years, each catchment Partnership has prepared

⁶⁶ National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-for-waste>

⁶⁷ Planning Practice Guidance - <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

⁶⁸ South East River Basin Management Plan - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/718337/South_East_RBD_Part_1_river_basin_management_plan.pdf

and updated a Catchment Action Plan for its respective catchment, which encapsulate a range of objectives and actions that reflect the ambitions of partners, including Hampshire County Council. Policies 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 and 31 are most closely aligned with the delivery of the RMBP through action at the Catchment level.

Clean Growth Strategy: Leading the way to a low carbon future (2017)

- 6.14 The Clean Growth Strategy⁶⁹ sets out a comprehensive set of policies and proposals that aim to accelerate the pace of “clean growth”, i.e. deliver increased economic growth and decreased emissions.
- 6.15 Policies 1 and 2 are most closely aligned with the policies and proposals in the Strategy.

The 25 Year Environment Plan (2018)

- 6.16 The 25 Year Environment Plan⁷⁰ sets out Government action to help the natural world regain and retain good health. It aims to deliver cleaner air and water in our cities and rural landscapes, protect threatened species and provide richer wildlife habitats. It calls for an approach to agriculture, forestry, land use and fisheries management that puts the environment first. The Plan sits alongside the Government’s Clean Growth Strategy and Industrial Strategy.
- 6.17 The Plan strives to ensure that communities are “Using resources from nature more sustainably and efficiently” and “Minimising waste”. Great emphasis is placed on ‘natural capital’. The policies in the HMWP are aligned with the protection principles of this plan, particularly policies 2-6.
- 6.18 There is a noticeable change in focus to not only protect the natural capital that already exists but enhancing this where possible. This extra step is needed to increase resilience to climate change. Policy 9 of the HMWP is most closely aligned with this national policy change and may need strengthening to ensure mineral and waste development is aligned with national policy objectives. There is also a renewed emphasis on, not only conserving protected landscapes such as National Park and AONBs, but also enhancing them.
- 6.19 The detrimental effects of plastic on the environment have been widely covered in the press. The 25 Year Environment Plan sets out guidelines on how to transition to materials that can be recycled more easily leading to a reduction in overall waste. Policy 25, which relates to sustainable waste management, will need to encompass this change.

⁶⁹ Clean Growth Strategy - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clean-growth-strategy>

⁷⁰ 25 Year Environment Plan - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/25-year-environment-plan>

6.20 The Plan sets clear policy direction on “embedding an ‘environmental net gain’ for development, including housing and infrastructure”; this not only includes action to work with interested parties and streamline environmental processes but to widen environmental gains to include flood protection, recreation and improved water and air quality.

Industrial Strategy: Building a Britain fit for the future - White Paper (2018)

6.21 The Industrial Strategy⁷¹ sets out ‘how we are building a Britain fit for the future’ – how businesses will be helped to create better, higher-paying jobs with investment in the skills, industries and infrastructure of the future. The Government’s ambitions in the white paper in relation to regenerative circular economy, waste and energy infrastructure are particularly relevant to Policies 1, 2, 18, 25, 28 and 30.

Resources and Waste Strategy (2018)

6.22 The strategy⁷² sets out how we plan to double resource productivity and eliminate avoidable waste of all kinds (including plastic waste) by 2050, by:

- preserving stocks of material resources by minimising waste;
- promoting resource efficiency and moving towards a circular economy;
- minimise the damage caused to our natural environment by reducing and managing waste safely and carefully; and
- dealing with waste crime.

The strategy gives a clear longer-term policy direction in line with the 25 Year Environment Plan.

6.23 Policies 1, 18, 30 and 32 of the HMWP are most closely aligned with this national policy change and may need to be strengthened.

Review of Designated Landscapes (2019)

6.24 Following the publication of the 25 Year Environment Plan and implementing one of its key ambitions, the Government launched a review (‘Glover Review’) of designated landscapes (National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty - AONB) in England⁷³. The review concluded in September 2019 with the publication of a report containing 27 wide-ranging recommendations that span integrated environmental and landscape management, planning protection, nature recovery, governance, sharing of expertise, strengthening of statutory purposes and the resourcing and public awareness of AONBs. Policy 4 of the HMWP is specific to the protection of protected

⁷¹ Industrial Strategy - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/industrial-strategy-building-a-britain-fit-for-the-future>

⁷² Resources and Waste Strategy 2018 - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/resources-and-waste-strategy-for-england>

⁷³ Landscapes Review - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/designated-landscapes-national-parks-and-aonbs-2018-review>

landscapes. The Government is expected to announce its response to the report in late 2020. With almost 40% of Hampshire's land area covered by designated landscapes, any associated legislative and policy guidance changes will necessitate a review of Policy 4.

South Inshore and South Offshore Marine Plan (2018)

- 6.25 This Marine Plan⁷⁴ has been prepared for the purposes of Section 51 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and has been adopted with the agreement of the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.
- 6.26 The plan introduces a strategic approach to planning within the inshore and offshore waters between Folkestone in Kent and the river Dart in Devon, providing a clear, evidence-based approach to inform decision-making by marine users and regulators on where activities might take place within the marine plan area.
- 6.27 A number of policies within the Marine Plan are relevant to Policies 17 and 24 of the HMWP.

The Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019

- 6.28 The Order⁷⁵ updates the Climate Change Act 2008 by replacing its target with the 2050 Net Zero Emission target in relation to greenhouse gases. Policy 2 (climate change) of the HMWP is most closely aligned to this modification.
- 6.29 Following the declaration of a climate emergency by Hampshire County Council in June 2019, the council adopted a 2050 carbon neutral target.

Environment Bill (2020)

- 6.30 The Environment Bill⁷⁶ will put the environment at the centre of policy making. It will make sure that we have a cleaner, greener and more resilient country for the next generation. The Bill includes details on:
- creating a new governance framework for the environment;
 - a new direction for resources and waste management;
 - improving air quality;
 - securing our water services;
 - enhancing our green spaces; and
 - updating laws on chemicals (REACH).

⁷⁴ South Marine Plan - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-south-marine-plans-documents>

⁷⁵ Climate Change Order - <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2019/9780111187654>

⁷⁶ Environment Bill 2020 - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-bill-2020>

- 6.31 The Bill introduces a new requirement for the Secretary of State to prepare a statutory Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) and confirms that the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan (outlined above) will be the first EIP.
- 6.32 An important aspect of the Environment Bill is the power to set long-term, legally-binding environmental targets⁷⁷ to provide a strong mechanism to deliver long-term environmental outcomes, both to build upon progress towards achieving the long-term vision of the 25 Year Environment Plan and help tackle some of the serious challenges that remain. These targets will focus on matters which relate to the natural environment and people's enjoyment of it, including air quality, biodiversity, water, resource efficiency and waste reduction, and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). These targets will be relevant to a range of HMWP policies and it will be necessary to reflect these changes in Plan policies, where relevant.

Biodiversity Net Gain

- 6.33 The 2018 revision of the NPPF (maintained in the current 2019 version) introduced guidance that "...plans should... identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity" and that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should encourage "biodiversity improvements in and around developments..., especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity."
- 6.34 The Environment Bill, however, will introduce a mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for most new developments. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) through Natural England is currently testing its Biodiversity Metric 2.0⁷⁸ to quantify pre and post development biodiversity values to support the delivery of this requirement. Further consideration is being given to how the metric will be applied to minerals and waste development. Policy 3 of the HMWP is specific to the protection of habitats and species and will need to reflect this new requirement.

Fixing our broken housing market - Housing White Paper (2017)

- 6.35 This paper⁷⁹ re-evaluated the need and the way in which housing numbers are calculated in each local planning authority area.
- 6.36 This paper introduced the use of the statement of common ground as a way of evidencing joint working and the duty to cooperate which has been included in the revised NPPF.

⁷⁷ Environmental Bill: Environmental targets - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-bill-2020/august-2020-environment-bill-environmental-targets>

⁷⁸ Natural England Biodiversity Metric - <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5850908674228224>

⁷⁹ Housing White paper - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/fixing-our-broken-housing-market>

- 6.37 Whilst the introduction of statements of common ground does not directly impact the policies within the HMWP, statements would need to be drawn up between interested parties if an update to the Plan occurs.

Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations

- 6.38 The screening thresholds for industrial estate development and urban developments were raised in 2015⁸⁰. This will impact the implementation of Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management).

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015⁸¹

- 6.39 This change included temporary permitted development rights in respect of change of use of some industrial premises to residential, from a B8 storage and distribution use under 500m² to residential use. The regulations require prior approval to be sought in respect of specific issues including 'Impact on the sustainability of adjoining uses'. This requirement should therefore ensure that mineral and waste sites remain adequately safeguarded against encroaching non-mineral uses. Therefore, this order is relevant to Policy 16 (Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure) and Policy 26 (Safeguarding – waste infrastructure).

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 6.40 The Government published updated guidance on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014⁸².
- 6.41 The supporting text to Policy 1 (Sustainable minerals and waste development) refers to CIL. The charging of CIL is relevant to Southampton and Portsmouth City Councils. However, it is recognised that mineral extraction and some built facilities for waste management activities are exempt from paying charges.

Court Rulings

- 6.42 In April 2018, a court ruling by the European Court of Justice had a significant impact on Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The People over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta⁸³ had implications for developers and competent authorities in relation to plans and projects which are subject to HRA.

⁸⁰ SEA Guidance - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal>

⁸¹ Came into force 23 May 2017

⁸² CIL Guidance - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>

⁸³ People over Wind Vs Sweetman Ruling - <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=200970&pageIndex=0&doclang=en&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=424528>

- 6.43 The effect of the ruling is that where previously, mitigation measures which may modify site selections or the boundary of a site to avoid any effects on European sites such as scheme design, buffer zones or restriction on operating hours, can no longer be considered at the Screening stage and must be 'screened-in' for further consideration. This means that an analysis of the measures capable of avoiding or reducing any significant effects on the site concerned must be carried out specifically at Stage 2 of the HRA process (Appropriate Assessment). The Habitat Regulations have been amended to reflect this change in the law⁸⁴.
- 6.44 Furthermore, the 'Wealden Judgement'⁸⁵ has implications for the use of thresholds (in this case in relation to air quality and HRA) at the Screening stage. Recent guidance from Natural England, developed following the requirements of this Judgment, advise that screening thresholds should be applied with consideration to impacts from individual proposed developments and with consideration to in-combination effects.
- 6.45 The HMWP was subject to HRA⁸⁶. The Sweetman and Wealden rulings, therefore, are likely to be relevant should an update of the Plan be required.

Government Oil and Gas Consultations

- 6.46 The Government consulted on proposed changes to the planning system which relate to shale gas in 2018. On the basis of the disturbance caused to residents living near Cuadrilla's Preston New Road site in Lancashire and latest scientific analysis, the government announced in November 2019 a moratorium on fracking until compelling new evidence is provided.
- 6.47 The government also confirmed that it will not be taking forward proposed planning reforms set out in the 2018 consultation for shale gas developments at this time. The implications for Policy 24 (oil and gas development) in the HMWP will need to be considered as part of an update.

Planning for the future - White Paper (2020)

- 6.48 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) have consulted on proposals for reform of the planning system in England, contained in the white paper 'Planning for the future' (consultation ended October 2020)⁸⁷. The planning reform proposals are aimed at delivering a "significantly simpler, faster and more predictable system", although the detail is focussed on district local plans rather

⁸⁴ Habitats Regulations - <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2018/1307/contents/made>

⁸⁵ Wealden District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Lewes District Council and South Downs National Park Authority [2017] EWHC 351.

⁸⁶ Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan Assessment Under the Habitats Regulations: Habitats Regulations Assessment Record – Final (July 2013) - <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/planning-strategic/HMWPHRARRecordFINALSept2013.pdf>

⁸⁷ Planning for the future consultation - <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>

than minerals and waste local plans. Proposed changes or options relevant to the HMWP include:

- A move from discretionary to rules based planning, with all areas of land categorised in local plans as either growth areas – “suitable for sustainable development”; renewal areas “suitable for development”; or areas that are “Protected”.
- A new role for local plans and a new process for making them, with local plans being "significantly shorter in length" and completed within 30 months, with ‘sanctions’ for authorities who fail to achieve this, and the potential option for self-assessment rather than Examination.
- Local plans to be assessed against a single statutory “sustainable development” test, replacing the existing tests of soundness.
- The Sustainability Appraisal system abolished and a simplified process for assessing the environmental impact of plans developed, which would continue to satisfy the requirements of UK and international law and treaties.
- The Duty to Cooperate test removed (although further consideration will be given to the way in which strategic cross-boundary issues can be adequately planned for).
- Remove or limit the role of general development management policies in local plans and instead rely on such policies derived at national scale, with local planning authorities producing required design guides and codes for a whole local authority area, or for a smaller area or site.
- Greater use of digital technology with a move to digital local plans incorporating interactive web-based mapping.
- Replace the existing developer contribution regimes (including CIL and S106) by a consolidated ‘Infrastructure Levy’.
- Amend the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

6.49 Based on the outcome of the consultation, the Government will seek to bring forward legislation and policy changes to implement reforms. Although these changes may not significantly affect this review, subject to timescales, they may have significant implications for subsequent reviews and updates of the HMWP and, as such, the potential implications of these proposals need to be considered at this stage.

Changes to the Current Planning System consultation 2020

6.50 Published separately for consultation in parallel with the ‘Planning for the future’ white paper consultation is a further document - ‘Changes to the Current Planning System’⁸⁸, which sets out proposed short-term changes to improve the efficiency of the current planning system in certain areas and support economic recovery. The main proposals focus on the:

- standard method for assessing local housing need;
- delivering first homes;
- the small sites threshold; and
- extension of the current permission in principle regime.

⁸⁸ Changes to the current planning system - <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system>

6.51 By proposing changes to the methodology for assessing housing figures, with a focus on boosting housing supply, the outcome of this consultation may have implications for the demand for aggregates from the house building sector.

DRAFT

7. Review Workshop Outcomes

- 7.1 Following completion of the 2018 Review of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan, a Review Workshop was held on 25th September 2019 to explore the issues raised in the Review.
- 7.2 The Workshop was attended by approximately 60 participants including representatives from the minerals and waste industry, statutory consultees, neighbouring minerals and waste planning authorities and from the wider south east, districts and boroughs and Members.
- 7.3 The Workshop was structured around presentations and round table discussion sessions. The agenda was as follows:

| | |
|--|--|
| Introduction | |
| Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) Review outcomes | <i>Melissa Spriggs, Strategic Planning, Hampshire County Council</i> |
| The changed policy landscape: NPPF, 25 Year Plan, Waste and Resources Strategy, Brexit | <i>Chris Murray, Strategic Planning, Hampshire County Council</i> |
| Sustainability issues: Climate change, biodiversity net gain, horizon scanning | <i>Garry King, Strategic Planning, Hampshire County Council</i> |
| Biodiversity net gain | <i>Kirsten Williamson, South Downs National Park Authority</i> |
| Round table discussion on how the HMWP addresses sustainability issues (<i>All</i>) | |
| Waste issues – Circular economy, recycling, landfill, sites | |
| Waste Resource Strategy | <i>Vicky Beechey, Project Integra</i> |
| Round table discussion on how the HMWP addresses waste issues (<i>All</i>) | |
| Mineral issues – Soft sand, sharp sand and gravel, wharves | |
| Soft Sand | <i>Jane Poole, Idris Consulting</i> |
| Marine aggregates | <i>Dr Ian Selby, University of Plymouth</i> |
| Round table discussion on how the HMWP addresses minerals issues (<i>All</i>) | |

Key messages

- 7.4 The notes from the session are outlined in Appendix 2. However, a number of key messages were highlighted which can be used to inform this Review and the scope of the Plan update:

General messages

- 7.5 The issue of climate change was a key area of focus for many of the participants, especially in light of the climate emergency declaration.
- 7.6 It is was clear that due to the uncertainties over Brexit (and now arguably, the COVID-19 pandemic), the Plan needed to be future proofed and could be flexible in its approach. The potential for technological advances should also be taken into consideration.
- 7.7 There were a number of Government updates which had either happened or are known to be forthcoming. The Plan will need to take these into account, but it was also raised that guidance on how they are implemented was important, for example with biodiversity net gain.
- 7.8 It was felt that the Duty to Cooperate should be incorporated into the Review as well as more engagement with industry.
- 7.9 Lastly, whilst the Review looks at the effectiveness of the policies, it was also raised that the monitoring of the policies should be reviewed and the relevant triggers.

Minerals messages

- 7.10 Safeguarding was a key issue that was raised, particularly in relation to enabling prior extraction and also protecting capacity of the wharves.
- 7.11 When considering mineral supply, it was considered that this should be explored at a regional level and that greater emphasis should be placed on the annual Local Aggregate Assessment.
- 7.12 It was also considered that demand forecasts should take into account Local Plan delivery as well as infrastructure proposals.

Waste messages

- 7.13 In relation to waste, it was considered that there should be a wider focus on all waste streams, not just household waste.
- 7.14 It was also felt that a more detailed review was needed on data, the types of site (not just type of facility) but also how sites are delivered.
- 7.15 There was a call for more waste sites, such as resource parks, to be identified through the Plan but it was not clear where these would be located.

8. Compliance with National Policy

- 8.1 Guidance for Plan Review was issued by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) in the form of a Local plan Route Mapper & Toolkit (Oct 2019)⁸⁹. The Toolkit is in two parts with Part 2 setting out the requirements for Local Plan Content. Completing the associated checklist ensures Local Plans are in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 8.2 As the checklist is geared towards all Local Plans, some parts are not relevant to Minerals and Waste Local Plans. Where relevant, these parts of the checklist have been struck out and highlighted as 'not applicable'. In addition, the checklist does not include compliance with the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) (2014) which is relevant to Waste Local Plans and therefore, the requirements have been included.
- 8.3 The completed checklist is set out in Appendix 3. A RAG (Red, Amber, Green) Compliance status is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

| | |
|--|-------|
| HMWP Policy is in compliance with NPPF/NPPF | Green |
| HMWP Policy is in general conformity with NPPF/NPPF but required refresh to ensure compliance. | Amber |
| HMWP Policy is silent on NPPF/NPPF requirements | Red |

Key outcomes

- 8.4 The review of Local Plan Content compliance has demonstrated that on the whole the HMWP is in compliance and is not silent on any policy requirement. However, there are a number of policy areas where the general policy approach is in conformity, but the specific wording may need to be refreshed to ensure that the policy is fully compliant. This is unsurprising taking into account the updates to the NPPF in 2018 and 2019. It is also expected that the NPPW will be updated in the near future.
- 8.5 The key policy areas requiring a policy refresh include:
- Reference to government policy (post 2013);
 - The Vision and its relevance to minerals and waste;
 - The removal of some areas of ambiguity in policies;
 - Clearer identification of the Strategic Policies;
 - Reference to net gain, natural capital and the agent of change;
 - Clearer climate change measures;
 - Clearer delivery of the waste hierarchy; and
 - An update on terminology, such as 'sustaining' rather than 'protecting' historic assets.

⁸⁹ Local plan Route Mapper & Toolkit (Oct 2019) - <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/PAS%20Local%20Plan%20Route%20Mapper%20v1%2000.pdf>

9 Conclusion

- 9.1 This 2020 Review has considered the effectiveness of the HWMP since its adoption in 2013. Unlike the 2018 Review, consideration has been given not only to the monitoring data but specific compliance with national policy. In addition, the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram have been taken into account.

Development Management Policies

- 9.2 The monitoring data suggests that most of these policies are performing well, with Policy 14 (Community benefits) the exception. However, reviewing compliance against national policy requirements, highlights that whilst the general drive of the policy aligns with national policy, the policies would benefit from a refresh in their terminology and in some cases, their delivery. For example, the inclusion of natural capital, net gain and agents of change.
- 9.3 In addition, based on changes to national policy and local priorities, Policy 2 (Climate change – mitigation and adaptation) needs to be strengthened and Policy 9 (Restoration of minerals and waste developments) needs to ensure that climate change is suitably imbedded in its implementation.

Minerals Policies

- 9.4 The 2018 Review highlighted that the required 7-year landbank for sand and gravel (for both sharp sand and soft sand) was not being met; there was not 10 years of permitted reserves at the sites providing silica sand; and there was not 25 years of permitted reserves at brick-making clay sites. Two years on and the situation remains, as well as an increasing risk to recycled and secondary aggregate delivery and capacity issues at the wharves.
- 9.5 The aggregate delivery requirements (Policy 17 (Aggregate supply – capacity and source) would benefit from being updated, taking into consideration the fact that the 1.56mtpa has not been achieved since 2016 and the increasing supply issues regarding soft sand in the wider south east. The ability to maintain a 1mtpa capacity of recycled and secondary aggregate needs to be explored as well as the 2mtpa of marine aggregate. This would help ensure the requirements of the NNPF were being met.
- 9.6 Whilst the policies which enable the development to come forward are worded sufficiently for suitable development to be permitted, the policies would benefit from outlining any sustainable opportunities to ensure revised requirements are met but also to help provide certainty to industry and communities.

Waste Policies

- 9.7 The 2018 Review outlined that in general, the waste forecasts had been relatively accurate and additional capacity is coming on stream, albeit focused more on recovery

than recycling. This point is also raised in this 2020 Review. However, to ensure compliance with the NPPW, the policies relating to waste management delivery would benefit from an update to enable greater alignment with the waste hierarchy in enabling waste activities. The potential for a Waste Infrastructure Strategy should be explored to provide greater certainty on the types of activities required, when and where.

- 9.8 Landfill capacity continues not to meet the forecasted need. Policy 32 allows for landfill capacity to come forward where there is a clear need. However, it is recognised that the reserve capacity within the Purple Haze allocation may not be implemented. Therefore, the policy would benefit from considering possible sustainable options alongside other sites for waste management.

Monitoring Indicators

- 9.9 This Review has not assessed these in detail but it is recognised that not all indicators obtain the information required to monitor the effectiveness of the Policies. Where possible, some adjustments have been made to the monitoring plan, such as ensuring all data is covering the calendar year so that it is comparable. However, any update of the policies should include a further review of the monitoring indicators to ensure that they are SMART.

Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram

- 9.10 Due to the generic nature of the current HMWP Vision, it is possible to conclude that in general the policies are enabling the Vision. However, the issues with delivering minerals supply could suggest that the economy was not being supported adequately. The NPPF suggests that the Vision should state what it is seeking to deliver and therefore, the current Vision could be considered to be lacking in spatial identity and specificity in its aims in relation to minerals and waste. The Vision would also benefit from aligning itself with the visionary Hampshire 2050 work and the climate change agenda.
- 9.11 The Plan Objectives are present but not clearly identified in the HMWP and this is also an issue with the Strategic Policies which was highlighted through the compliance check. The Plan Objectives closely align with the policies (except Policy 21 (Silica sand development) and would help achieve the current Vision. As some of the Policies are currently not delivering their aim, this would suggest the Plan Objectives are not being met. An update of the Policies and/or Vision would need to include a review of the Plan Objectives to ensure they align.
- 9.12 The Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram outline how the Objectives and Vision will be implemented spatially and in diagrammatic form. Any update to the Policies would need to be reflected in both the Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram. To ensure compliance with national policy, the Policies need to be unambiguous and this also applies to the Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram.

Review limitations

- 9.13 It is recognised that there are limitations to this Review. However, the application of the PAS Guidance has enabled a more thorough assessment.
- 9.14 The monitoring indicators were set when preparing the Plan and were an attempt to quantify the impacts of the decisions made within the framework of the HMWP.
- 9.15 It is understood that the indicators and triggers set out in the HMWP may not, on reflection, be defined sufficiently narrowly to clearly identify an issue from the data alone. Any update to the policies should include a further investigation of the indicators and triggers. This will need to be reflected in an update to the Implementation, Monitoring Plan set out in Appendix C of the Plan.
- 9.16 The Plan also contains several Appendices which whilst not directly reviewed will need to be updated to align with any policy changes or circumstances. Appendix A (site allocations) will need to be updated with any additional sites and/or the boundary of the Mineral Safeguarding Area at Whitehill & Bordon may benefit in being updated to represent recent developments. This will also be relevant to the Policies Map.
- 9.17 Appendix B provides a list of safeguarded minerals and waste sites. However, this is now out of date and is superseded by the on-line updated version. An update of the Plan may benefit from reference to on-line list rather than an instantly out-dated Appendix.
- 9.18 In addition, Appendix D (Relationship between Plan policies and previously adopted policies) may be no longer of value. Appendix E will require updating to reflect any new studies required to update the Plan.
- 9.19 Lastly, the Plan's Glossary and acronyms will require updating to ensure they are consistent with national policy, regulations, and current circumstances.

Duty to Cooperate

- 9.20 Duty to cooperate correspondence has been issued to minerals and waste planning authorities who have a relationship with Hampshire in terms of minerals and waste movements to inform this Review. However, it is recognised that the minerals data is out-of-date (2014) as the new data was not available at the time. It was also intended that further liaison would be undertaken with industry and key stakeholders on some of the issues outlined in the 2018 Review. However, following the 2020 Review, and the need for a Plan update, it is felt that this focussed liaison can be addressed as part of the Plan update.

Future uncertainty

- 9.21 The 2018 Review highlighted that there were at the time a number of uncertainties which could have an impact on future supply and capacity requirements of minerals and waste. The most prominent was Britain's exit from the European Union due to the significant mineral and waste movements between Britain and Europe and any future alterations could impact local indigenous supply. However, uncertainty has only been increased due to the national pandemic, which is impacting on the economy, the longevity of these impacts is unknown.
- 9.22 The Government continues to drive forward changes to boost the housing market and enable the necessary infrastructure to support this, more recently with a proposal to fundamentally change the planning system. Whilst an increase in development will have a direct impact on demand for construction aggregates, the rate of this increase is unclear.

Next Steps

- 9.23 It is recommended that an update of the HMWP is undertaken to ensure compliance with the NPPF and NPPW but also to ensure that the Plan is delivering a steady and adequate supply of minerals and enabling sustainable waste management provision. An investigation of the monitoring indicators and triggers will ensure any changes to policy are reflected and that the monitoring plan is fit-for-purpose.
- 9.24 In addition, the Vision, Plan Objectives, Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram will need to be further reviewed to ensure that all requirements of the Plan are delivered but also that the Vision aligns with the 2050 principles for Hampshire.
- 9.25 To support the Plan update, an assessment of mineral and waste site options would ensure any suitable sites for enabling sustainable minerals and waste development are included in the Plan helping provision certainty to the industry and local communities.

Appendix 1: Plan Objectives / Policy Table

The following table plots the Policies against the Plan Objectives. Where a policy helps to deliver the Objective, this is marked as Green.

| Policies | Plan Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 1 | | | | | | Green | Green | | Green | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Green | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Green | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | Green | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Green | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | Green | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | Green | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | Green | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | Green | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | Green | Green | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | Green | Green | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | Green | | Green | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | Green | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | Green | | | | Green | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | Green | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | Green | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | Green | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | Green | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | Green | | | | | | Green | Green |
| 26 | | | | | | | | Green | | | | | Green | Green |
| 27 | | | | | | | Green | | | | | | Green | Green |
| 28 | | Green | | | | | | | | | | | Green | Green |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Green | Green |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Green | Green |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Green | Green |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Green |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Green |
| 34 | | | | | | | | Green | | | | | | |

The Objectives in the Plan have been allocated a number to enable this exercise (see below).

| Objective No. | Objective |
|---------------|---|
| 1 | Protecting and conserving the New Forest and South Downs National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other valued landscapes. Sensitive |

| | |
|----|---|
| | habitats like the Thames Basin Heaths and our archaeological and historic heritage will be treated similarly. |
| 2 | Helping to mitigate the causes of, and adapt to, climate change by developing more energy recovery facilities and the appropriate restoration of mineral workings. |
| 3 | Protecting community health, safety and amenity in particular by managing traffic impacts, ensuring sustainable, high quality and sensitive design and imposing adequate separation of minerals and waste development from residents by providing appropriate screening and / or landscaping. |
| 4 | Valuing the countryside for its own merits and protecting the South West Hampshire Green Belt from inappropriate development but recognising local geology, the rural economy and protection of amenity. |
| 5 | Managing traffic impacts including the encouragement of rail and water borne transport of minerals and waste. |
| 6 | Encouraging engagement between developers, site operators and communities so there is an understanding of respective needs. |
| 7 | Supporting Hampshire's continued economic growth, as well as the economies influenced by Hampshire and opportunities for urban regeneration where possible. |
| 8 | Safeguarding mineral resources, necessary existing minerals and waste infrastructure and land for potential wharf or rail depot infrastructure as a contribution to a steady and adequate supply of minerals and provision of waste management facilities. |
| 9 | 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. This will be achieved by ensuring sufficient aggregate is supplied to the construction industry from an appropriate combination of sources including: local sand and gravel from around Southampton, south west Hampshire, Ringwood Forest, east of Andover, the Bordon area and north-east Hampshire; marine dredged sand and gravel via wharves on the River Itchen, River Test and Portsmouth and Langstone Harbours; rail imported limestone via existing depots in south Hampshire and new rail depots located in north Hampshire; and giving particular support for recycled/secondary aggregates from various sites before supply from other sources. |
| 10 | Providing for brick-making clay for the brickworks at Michelmersh, near Romsey and Selborne, near Bordon. |
| 11 | Appropriately planning for chalk extraction for agricultural use. |
| 12 | Exploration and production of oil and gas. |
| 13 | Encouraging a zero waste economy whereby landfill is virtually eliminated by providing for more recycling and waste recovery facilities including energy recovery. |
| 14 | Aiming for Hampshire to be 'net self-sufficient' in waste management facilities whereby it can accommodate all the waste that arises, whilst accepting there will be movements into and out of the area to facilities such as the nationally important incinerator at Fawley. |

Appendix 2: Review Workshop – Notes from Event

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan Review Workshop

25 September 2019, Ashburton Hall, Winchester

Notes from the round table discussions

Review & Sustainability Issues

How could the methodology be improved for the 2020 review?

Key Messages:

- Climate change needs to be a key area of focus.
- The monitoring indicators / triggers themselves should be reviewed as part of the process.
- More communication is required with industry.
- More detailed review of mineral supply is required (not just from land-won sources).

| Table | Comments |
|-------|---|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Change – should be higher on the agenda and at the forefront of work • Waste sites – have a uniqueness; firstly, you have to work around any constraints. No real problem for finding sites for waste uses. Good vehicle access is important |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAG (Red, Amber, Green) system – exceptional circumstances should not trigger a red score • Triggers – could be wider (more included) but generally the methodology works • Policy one – why should sustainability be judged on the length of time to determine applications? • Climate Change (policy two) – why is this judged against EA (Environment Agency)? Also states three criteria and only uses one • Climate Change – needs more guidance • Monitoring indicators – one indicator against all those policies isn't the most effective. However, understand that monitoring indicators need to be something you have data on, which is why it has probably been selected • Windfall sites – policies have a general presumption against sites outside of the allocated sites therefore policies preclude windfall sites being utilised |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better communication of issues directly with local operators – unaware of some of Hampshire County Council concerns • Joined up developments • Multi nationals well served – independents less informed of updated. Quarterly policy update / wish list? |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light touch in engagement with industry, felt that it was strongly officer led |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brexit – no impact • Acceptance that there will always be a need for landfill capacity. Preference from strategic siting of landfill • Issues with recording of mineral data • Coordination with other parties plans and strategies |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsure on what happened in the review • Land bank (S&G), which is low there could be a mineral shortage in the Council which the review needs to recognise this. • What questions are asked in the review. What is evidence showing? If we change plan, what do we achieve? How can we change things so we can change the outcome? • Industry would like firmer policies to allow investment to occur with sites. More site allocation to allow for greater land bank. • Review windfall, what is it set out to achieve? • Are current allocations based on seven years in recession, which shows more sales? Minerals and waste was not fully affected by recession. • Industry feel like they are playing catchup in regard to the Council's apportionment. • With the plan being from 2013, how big of an influence of housing had on the review of the Plan. Does it make the Plan vulnerable the longer a comprehensive review is not done? • Is windfall recognition there's not enough minerals and it's a hope factor that it makes up the difference. • Availability is one thing and landbank is another. Landbank is an indicator-not the end of the world. • Seems to be a gap between national and local government emphasis on minerals planning. • Lack of gov guidelines. Government might look to review minerals. • Do the County Council understand the types of CDE (construction demolition and excavation) waste? Lack of understanding of what is recycled aggregate. Can only make aggregate from hard material, not from all CDE. |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical starting point – have to start looking early based on evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the evidence based getting out of date? ○ Evidence base underpins everything so up to date information is necessary ○ Have to avoid complacency – every plan reviewed every 5 years ○ Quarries capacity has been discussed – new quarry in the south of the district providing much of New Forest minerals and waste • Is there any independent assessment? Any external critical assessment on both the plan and review? • Critical review maybe required if approach stays the same with each review, to ensure support if challenged • Plan up to 2030, reviews at present are over lifetime of plan, as opposed to new proposals • Policies pulled in as part of related issues, e.g. waste capacity satisfactory but further review needed to assess whether something is a trend and plan needs to be updated, review into whether update necessary or not – future review with greater evidence base. |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More communication with industry |

| | |
|-------|---|
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further community impact monitoring – issue with how all local plans are monitored. Could take into account the complaints. More influence from individual site monitoring • Feed into the community |
|-------|---|

Are there any other factors that need to be taken into consideration in the next review?

Key Messages:

- The need to future proof the Plan taking into account:
 - current and on-going policy updates from Government (e.g. on waste or environment)
 - Technological advancements
- Climate change and any emerging guidance/action plans.
- The Duty to Cooperate
- Consideration of wider sources of mineral supply (e.g. marine and prior extraction/windfall opportunities)

| Table | Comments |
|-------|---|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes e.g. deposits on glass bottles – will be a big change coming regarding recycling (standardised approach or all paid for by producers) and will need to facilities to be in place – not covered in policy in the Plan. How will it be handled? Future proofing / flexibility – needed to cope with whatever system comes in |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think Brexit is unlikely to change policy drastically • Waste should be reviewed more frequently than minerals considering the rate of progression • Lack of national and regional guidance so no benchmark for everyone • Protected landscapes review – talks about strengthening settings of protected areas (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs)) and could it advance allocations? |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wharves need to be safeguarded – flexibility of uses where current uses unviable • Duty to Cooperate |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technological advances – extraction of resources (specialist resources) such as lithium and ELV (End of Life Vehicles) facilities for electric vehicles • Consideration of industrial uses for waste uses (B8 and B2) • Potential to review industrial estate study to demonstrate suitability |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependent on new government policies and goals • May be overachieving already but new policies may create higher requirements • How will climate change emergency declaration affect review and future plans? |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Only so much policy and officers can do, also down to industry ○ Interesting to see how risk is assessed based on when/how policy changes may be made (also whether legal challenges will be necessary) ● Decisions made based on climate emergency “priority” may be contrary to plan policies due to shifting priorities outside of scope of initial plan – e.g. Hampshire declares intention to be climate neutral but proposed site in plan cannot be made to be carbon neutral by 2030 – clash between policy and government intentions |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the review need to focus more on the way need is actually assessed (i.e. greater focus on local aggregates assessments, rather than figures in place at the time of adoption) ● Duty to Cooperate / cross boundary matters ● Interaction with housebuilding targets and local plans (including to facilitate local sourcing of aggregates) ● Minimal provision / allocation (which may be politically more acceptable) vs flexibility through over provision ● Marine resource is very large and could supply much but major issue is wharf capacity including onward transport via rail (as opposed to road) |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More consideration of the viability of the processing and extraction of mineral in assessing sites for continued inclusion in the Plan ● More weight on prior extraction for housing permissions / allocations ● Further consideration of previously rejected sites |

How effective is the Plan at ensuring development is sustainable?

Key Messages:

- There is a need to consider Net Environment Gain / off-setting and guidance is required on how to implement
- Need to review how sustainability is defined and measures in the Plan

| Table | Comments |
|--------------|---|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 10% seems reasonable, but it will need offsetting ● Applying the metric – how to decide where the benefits are; what they will be in the future; what is valuable now may not be in the future |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need to take a step back and detail what exactly you want to achieve ● Currently no substance – where is the guidance? ● Can minerals sites assist waste sites i.e. offsetting? ● For existing brownfield industrial sites, what is the natural benefit? How can we ensure improvement when sites are low benefit and already impacting upon air quality etc |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Effective as much as possible at the time of adoption ● Ideals are good but balance between aims and practical possibilities not currently available |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Subjective in what ‘implement’ comprises |

| | |
|------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caveat policy 'or' and 'and' – policy 32 • Lack of quality (in addition the subjectivity) • Welcome current position on requirement for implementation |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much is 10% net gain on a site that has zero value • Can environmental be subjective? Who makes decisions on the net gain. • Could there be regional environmental plans that sites could aim towards • Could there be a policy that every application has a certain percentage on net gain, could this be more than the national 10% • Need to make sure that biodiversity net gain doesn't over shadow very important issues that affect rural Hampshire • The restoration must be accepted by the land owner and be commercially attractive. • Could land owners be compensated when a development exceeds the 10% • Will certain sectors come to parks and other groups to carry out offsetting for them as they own the land? • How will Brexit affect this? • Aggregates don't have flexibility of housing and can't only choose low environmental areas. • Climate change can change the areas in which you're looking at then how can you measure its environmental net gain. • The plan should give more weight to other forms to restoration than biodiversity. • Sites should return to what it originally looked like. • Could there be a structure of what are Hampshire's biodiversity targets, this can then help the industry • What changes would you propose to the Plan to improve the sustainability of development? • Can industry make a contribution to a wider scheme as an offset strategy • We can't always make the species stay in the created habitat, which should be recognised in the plan. • Is the County Council going out of its responsibilities in term? See where sustainability goes in terms of how quarries operate. • A site will operate within its grounds of sustainability • Could industry have free reign to operate within the standards already set out on climate change, and have less intervention from local government? • Some minerals & waste industry are going to third party companies to provide clean electricity, rather than them trying to implement this clean energy on site. • Could reviews be done more often, as technology is moving at such a fast rate in the period that the plan spans? • Can sites offset each other with their biodiversity net gain so you can have varying restorations? |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what way is it sustainable? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planning permission granted? ○ Environmental? ○ Biodiversity? ○ Minerals and waste? ○ National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) definition of sustainability? Economic, Social, Environmental |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability an overriding factor in decision making “If it’s not sustainable it won’t get through” • If an application complies with policies, then by definition it should be sustainable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shifting baselines of sustainability (e.g. biodiversity net gain) ○ Can policies be enforced or upheld without the calculations? ○ List of what can be included within “30%” • Hampshire minerals and waste plan specifies (policy 1?) that if an application is sustainable planning permission should be granted without further delay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Differing pressures on all; “advantages outweigh disadvantages” ○ Need vs sustainability • “As long as you’re in line with the NPPF then you have met your requirements” • Doing its best within existing policy • Lag in environmental returns • Retrospective assessment under modern day principals? • 5 year after-care period • Can aspire to improvement but practical enforcement unlikely • Review restoration plans in existing sites (e.g. extension of time etc) to meet current standards • Government looking at 106’s to include (for example) future maintenance of roads as well as initial cost |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability is now a recognised and accepted concept which is positive • Industry is well placed to deliver net gain after extraction (maybe more so than other developments) • Difficulty of taking objective / dream / vision of sustainability as 2050 vision and knowing what this means in practice and on the ground |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality issues – include shipping emissions • How far should plans go – site specific emissions • Better scoping of what the sustainability issues are / and explanation of them • 10% net gain – depends on how it is quantified – needs to be kept simple to keep costs down for developers. Net gain currently a bit woolly! |

What changes would you propose to the Plan to improve the sustainability of development?

Key Messages:

- Enhance the Climate Policy, what measures could be put in place and how it is monitored.
- Greater flexibility in the Plan to deal with changes in the minerals and waste industry in the future.
- There is a need to strengthen the connection between the need for minerals and waste and maintaining communities.

| Table | Comments |
|-------|--|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Change policy – could be more strongly worded, don’t give developers the option of avoiding the policy |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to record what has been actioned and was it successful? Record in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Could it be more widely reported, easily accessible? Record progress or lack of progress, perhaps annually? • Should we have climate change net gain? If so, should it be recorded and how would it be recorded? • There should be a requirement to use recycled materials over primary resources |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need clarity in the overarching policy but also detailed guidance in a separate document • Review of aggregates levy – tax could be better utilised – should be spent locally for environment and community – could be increased? • Set out why minerals and waste are critical to communities in plans – get the message out there and explain why it's sustainable |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change policy needs strengthening – metric needs to be clarified • Air quality particulates – electric vehicles not yet available • Policies need to be accepting of current technological constraints rather than state structure • Transport of mineral around the site by conveyor rather than lorry • A need for flexibility during the Plan period |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity of screening of biodiversity enhancement for DM (Development Management) purposes • Work with developers in helping them identify potential for improvements • Net benefits to be provided elsewhere within the Plan area • Requirement for minerals and waste developers to provide additional area for green space • Ensure developers are clear on what is expected of this • Emerging waste plans make policy reference to the circular economy (West London Waste Plan) • Influence emerging local plans to accord with this policy in terms of planning for industrial ecosystems |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting in line with government targets and guidance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Decide whether we want to go above and beyond government • Local targets, what would they be? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Primary focus would be environmental net gain? • Is 10% sufficient? With waste 10% may be too high, minerals sites usually viable agricultural land – weight of biodiversity vs economical. Viability of future options, e.g. workable land for farmers. • Whose responsibility will it be to define baseline biodiversity and future biodiversity? • What is the 10%? Biodiversity of species? Metric? • Copycat planning – Net gain goes into one policy • Connectivity - Habitat fragmentation – connectivity, red line boundaries? |
| Seven | <p>Is there too much emphasis on extraction than reuse? (although suggested that UK is quite good at these already):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of objectives, how things will be assessed and monitored – consistency of approach |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more careful consideration of how sustainability and net gain will be measured (e.g local vs global: competing objectives) – even with metric this is quite subjective; resources for amenity • Industry is already doing things for sustainability – maybe need to feed in more to minerals and waste Plan review in terms of what is realistic and achievable |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include all issues discussed in presentation – including net gain and air quality • Net gain policy to reflect alternative option where improvements cannot be done on site • Include sustainability of development in Plan principles – location of facilities, use of resources, heat and power considerations – wider benefits for communities / climate change • Inclusion of renewable energy facilities • How to address the loss of exporting materials to China – is this not additional landfill? • Retrofit energy recovery to existing sites e.g. methane capture • Needs joined up thinking and proper coordination |

How will the evolving sustainability policy impact minerals and waste planning?

Key Messages:

- It is recognised that the policy changes will make positive improvements.
- More guidance will be required on how they are implemented.
- There are concern over the cost and burden on developers.

| Table | Comments |
|-------|---|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are housing targets over estimated? Use different methods for house building. Complete change away from what we do now, and it will require a huge change • Electric vehicles, to include electric trucks transporting minerals and waste. |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becoming more difficult to get applications through • Policies need to be worded positively and set out criteria / guidance clearly • Demonstration of the link between housing and minerals and waste is essential – helps people to understand the importance and that they go hand in hand • Engagement – needs to be correct for the type of consultee but would help get everyone on the same page and policy to be effective for everyone involved |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally positive • Impact / possibility of improvement of previously poorly restored sites – when does net gain come into consideration for historic sites • Movement of waste by rail • Will net gain impact upon capacity and future provision? Need vs viability. Should costs be a planning consideration |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent adopted plans which integrate biodiversity net gain and strengthen landscape policy yet to be tested in the delivery (appeals / case law) • Creates burden on developers – potential impact on viability and therefore delivery in accordance with the Plan’s requirements |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In principal it can improve biodiversity and benefit • What impact can one minerals and waste plan have on its own? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regional strategies required – beyond borders |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More incineration of waste may bring opportunities for more re use • Minerals industry could be after net gain trading for other sites that can’t provide it |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lorry movements are not sustainable • Electric vehicles, although the technology isn’t there yet • Land ownership issues will attract net gain potential (how the site is restored) – they will want to maximise returns • Costs of environmental improvements and viability issues. Needs to be clear on what environmental requirements are to determine viability of schemes before making an application • Who monitors Government initiatives? The gap between local and national monitoring, if any |

Minerals Issues

How effective is the Plan at enabling sand and gravel (including soft sand) supply?

Key Messages:

- More work required on working developers on ensuring prior development where relevant.
- Landbank is not met but supply is coming forward and is affected by markets.
- Designated areas impact the availability of supply.
- Stronger emphasis on safeguarding of wharves is required.

| Table | Comments |
|-------|---|
| One | None |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently a lag in data figures – needs to catch up • Policy 20 – only refers to landbank figures and doesn't report marine sources • Sand and gravel have not run out so must be somewhat effective • Need to safeguard wharves for future marine supplies |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding policies fine – problem is co-ordination with housing developers – Whitehill Bordon not successful • Can't rely on windfall developments • Soft sand and gravel should be separated • Always coming up against requirements of housing developers |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not effective – cannot demonstrate land bank in accordance with NPPF • Not all allocated sites have come forward • Safeguarding wharves and mineral infrastructure |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of supply could be due to how we are not allowed to get aggregates from within certain designations – the Plan should be more supportive |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies are effective, got allocations and criteria |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger emphasis on prior extraction needed • Not been effective at safeguarding protected wharf sites from housing development – better interpretation needed between minerals and waste plans and local plans |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues of market and viability are outside the control of the Plan • Soft sand a geological / location issue – consider protected areas? |

What changes would you propose to the Plan to improve sand and gravel supply in Hampshire?

Key Messages:

- Reference should be made to the Local Aggregate Assessment as this is updated annually.

- There is a need to consider mineral supply more strategically (at regional level).
- The Plan needs to maintain flexibility in supply sources and locations.

| Table | Comments |
|-------|--|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate marine figures into policy – need to report land and marine sources – increases transparency and will improve public perception • Flexibility – consider any site that comes forward, don't limit to only allocated sites – don't make provision per site so exact, allow for change • Be thinking more long term and more strategically – plan for a bit further ahead so the Plan does not become so outdated by the review. Tie together inshore and offshore to have more joined up thinking |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separating soft sand and sharp sand and gravel • Better understanding of allocation • Plans should be regional • Certainty of supply |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trend led with infrastructure • Maintain flexibility to extract in sensitive landscape areas (national parks and AONBs) • Conditions within policy to allocate extraction in these areas for example, demonstrating clear need and satisfactory mitigation • Make reference to updated LAA (local aggregate assessment) to inform mineral requirement |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could there be a potential of a minerals site within a national park – this could create political issues • Do the allocations of minerals and waste sites need to be dealt with on a national infrastructure level, as it seems politics are playing a large role at the moment |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan did not have supply ready for end period of plan when written • In a more comprehensive review, a call for sites would likely be required • Holistic approach required • Minerals without borders |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be helpful to have three separate landbanks, for the different types of aggregate • Better communication between decision making authorities |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources are being sterilised by housing allocations – needs stronger policy support • Encourage wharf use – how to target industry to invest? • Look at provision at a regional level – wider hubs? • Plan on a geology basis rather than administrative one, or another determining factor |

What are the key factors that need to be considered in forecasting aggregate demand?

Key Messages:

- Need to be more flexible on end uses of material (e.g. beach replenishment and use of silica/soft sand).
- There is a need to consider local demand through emerging local plans but also national infrastructure.
- The future of the construction industry and use of materials needs to be considered.

| Table | Comments |
|--------------|--|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locally – impossible as it doesn't all correlate (e.g. regional housebuilders vs local aggregate supply / usage) • Marine aggregates used for beach refill isn't reported by the LAA • Silica sand treated differently – why is end use so heavily dictated? Flexibility is the key! • Need to be less inward looking and consider other regions and trends occurring |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry are not that flexible • Future housing delivery • How effective is safeguarding? - not very as it is too easy to override |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in building material / construction – aware of economic position • Changes in construction habitats / use of materials |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions over marine soft sand and how useful it is • Caution to be taken regarding marine won sand and its viability in replacing land won sand |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine not likely to replace land won soft sand in the plan period (though may contribute) • Access in Hampshire to viable wharves for marine won resource • What is the lead indicator e.g. housing, and key infrastructure projects? • Emerging local plans need to be considered; not just adopted • Declining use of aggregates in construction over time |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operators are buying in sand rather than extract their own resources because the price will increase in the future • Look beyond the demand of Hampshire – wharves are national assets – transport constraints • Marine extraction – where would the silt go? Only gives two types of sand – not versatile enough. Not enough wharf and shipping capacity at present • Decreasing land won extraction would impact inert waste infill capacity • Wider view to meet national infrastructure and housing projects e.g. HS2 • A more joined up approach is needed |

Waste Issues

How effective is the Plan at enabling waste management provision?

Key Messages:

- There are issues with the availability of sites, the location of sites and the acceptability of sites by local residents.
- The Plan is currently quite flexible but will need to be more so in the future with potential change in national policy.
- The Plan focusses too much on household waste.
- Better linkages between county and districts/boroughs in waste management provision.

| Table | Comments |
|-------|--|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to deal with food waste – specific facilities. Handle in Hampshire only – localised vs strategic facilities • Need more capacity to deal with food waste in Hampshire • Want a commitment from Government that funding will be made available • Have integration of the waste management systems and interpreting within the local plan • What will be done with the output of the process, whatever that is • Climate Change should be embedded throughout the Plan • Strategic Planning – does waste need more strategic approval? • Does the Plan need to allocate other points? • Education and behaviour change • Specify recycled aggregate over primary – specify (mandate?) a proportion to be used |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste management provision adapts with societal needs, the Plan will not always enable it, it depends on need • Waste management facilities should be treated as any other industrial use • Currently an overlap in regulatory controls which hinders development • More flexibility on sites – positive approach for all sites that come forward |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too small focus – don't hub activities in the continental fashion |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mismatch of recovery and recycling targets • Lack of sites available • Need to update waste capacity data • Need to consider call for sites • Need to be more flexible – provide appropriate capacity and therefore market resilience • Ensure the public are well informed • Introduce zonal areas for waste management on a strategic scale • Encourage waste facilities to be located near to manufacturing plants (circular economy) • Political issues / stigma / unwanted land use • Demonstrating public incentives / trade off / developer contributions |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste sites are being put forward for housing. |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the public perception on waste sites justified? • Waste is a complete industry of itself, why do we have a Waste and Minerals plan together. • Should they be separate • CDE (Construction, demolition and excavation) is still associated with minerals, whereas municipal waste isn't • Some policies are beginning to become redundant in the HMWP as they are no longer linked to waste. • Minerals are temporary and waste used to be but now seen as relatively permanent investments. • Are incinerators industrial or sui generis? • CDE isn't always fully understood by authorities. • Could the review of the waste part of the plan take longer than other areas? • Regions will have to deal with all the waste they produce, not necessarily counties or boroughs. • Are Hampshire integral in looking for waste sites, and what happens when these sites don't come forward. • Could we follow the European model where each town/borough has its own facilities on a smaller scale? • Why Incineration doesn't count as recycling? Because it wastes the material, recycling keeps material in circulation. • Could more be done at the source of the waste? To segregate the brick from the metal from the concrete? • 'NIMBY'ISM (not in my back yard) is the main barrier of planning - traffic/noise – they can be seen as destroying communities |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK working at 45% • Technology investment required e.g. air compression technology • Is the Hampshire waste plan in line with the circular waste economy • Policy has good flexibility to allow for changing technologies – establishing site for use as waste remains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is policy being used effectively? ○ Attractive to private companies? ○ Enabling experimentation and investment in new technologies • Safeguarding of waste sites • Not feasible for privately run ERFs (Energy Recovery Facilities), have to be part of PPIs (Public Private Investment), no private incentives • 50 MW generation part of NSIPs (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects)? • Principal is broad which allows for flexibility • EA permit tiered and often allows for higher capacity than the planning application or LPA (Local Planning Authority)/Waste Authority would permit • Capacity, especially in light of European countries adding tax to waste fuel exports |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire has been successful in the past e.g. permissions for investors • Need more focus on prevention e.g. education to reduce food waste • Review of industrial estates to facilitate sites for uses of waste (NB focus on permitted development rights for housing is not making protection of industrial sites easy) • Need better waste issue enforcement (from small to fly tipping) |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency of collection is key and ease of collection / usability for people • Challenge – land take of facilities after composting • Challenge – resident objections to waste uses • Better relationship needed between county minerals and waste planning and district local plans (e.g. planning for facilities in local plan allocations) • |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single minded on household waste. More consideration of commercial waste production and where the waste needs to be taken • Better waste separation of some for C&I (Commercial & Industrial). And waste minimisation at source |

What changes would you propose to the Plan or its implementation to improve waste management provision in Hampshire?

Key Messages:

- Better communication with the waste industry.
- There is a need to more fully review the data.
- More consideration needs to be given to how sites come forward and what type of site is required.
- The Plan needs to be flexible to deal with emerging Government policy and targets.

| Table | Comments |
|-------|--|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking favourably upon adaptation of existing facilities (flexibility) especially for repurposing materials • Do waste management sites need to be allocated? Why not consider any site that comes forward? • Policy 27 – wording to be more open and flexible minus caveats about ancillary • Policy 29 – maybe combine into one policy or make clearer that one is just capacity and one is location |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EfW (energy from waste) site for industrial / commercial sector, built by Hampshire County Council • Waste parks • More collaboration with commercial partners instead of only concentrating on domestic • Realistic / practical conditions • More communication with private operators • Set up working group with waste operators |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deposit protection schemes may be good – how and where will the facilities be implemented? • Food waste required to achieve circular economy |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any consideration for sites for private companies • Principal/policy is effective at present – is a review necessary introduce specific policies or sites for new facilities handling different aspects of the waste stream? • Locational requirements as opposed to operator or tech requirements |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A one size fits all solution to collection won't work (e.g. terraced housing) • Inclusion of producer pays changes • Needs to be achievable, not just aspirational – some technology isn't available or viable yet • Data based review and decision making • Educating the public and putting it simply, raising awareness (starting in schools), options available (e.g. extension building waste – knowledge of where it goes, does it need to be separated) • Working more with partners • The current plan is unable to address 2025 targets, therefore a review is needed |

What are the barriers to suitable sites being put forward for waste uses?

Key Messages:

- Public / Political concerns
- Cost and availability of sites
- Restrictions on site operations.

| Table | Comments |
|--------------|---|
| One | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of sites • Timescales • Use more localised sites |
| Two | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner aspirations • Public perception • Policy needs to be more positive and enabling • EA (Environment Agency) – needs more flexibility |
| Three | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political • Culture • Better figures of non-municipal waste quantities to show the need for facilities |
| Four | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Five | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Six | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locations may be specified but barriers (public comment/objections etc) are raised after a planning application is formed • Conditions such as hours of work can be restrictive • Minimal response to call for sites from waste operators |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste doesn't have the monetary value for landowners (compared to housing or employment sites) • Are our conditions a barrier to new sites coming forward, or increasing capacity on site? • EA permit tiered and often allows for higher capacity than the planning application or LPA (Local Planning Authority)/Waste Authority would permit • Capacity, especially in light of European countries adding tax to waste fuel exports |
| Seven | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>See response to Question above.</i> |
| Eight | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affecting change! • More information on what the requirements are for bringing a site forward (e.g. what do landfills need – size, accessibility etc?) • Technological limitations at present – recycling limits, product separation. Investment needed – the Government needs to lead on this but need sites available to do this • Enabling sustainable change – co location of facilities e.g. lorry park closer to sites instead of protecting a low-quality green belt site for example...) |

Appendix 3: National Policy Checklist

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | <i>General Requirements</i> | | |
| 1. | Include any relevant material that is set out in a government policy statement(s) for the area for example a national policy statement(s) for major infrastructure and written ministerial statements. | NPPF Para 5, 6 | <p>Relevant Government Policy is outlined in the HMWP – Other Plans and Programmes (Para 2.19 – 2.24)</p> <p>However, there have been a number of Policy updates (Post 2013) which are relevant and should be applied [check others]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) - Energy Policy: Written statement - HCWS690 (May 2018) - 25 Year Environment Plan (2019) - Waste & Resources Strategy (2019) |
| 2. | Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. | NPPF Para 8, 9, 16 | The need to contribute to achieve of sustainable development is set out in HMWP Policy 1: Sustainable minerals and waste development |
| 3. | Apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. | NPPF Para 11 | Applying the presumption is set out in HWMP Policy 1: Sustainable minerals and waste development |
| 4. | Provide a positive vision for the future; a framework for addressing <u>housing mineral demand and waste management</u> needs and | NPPF Para 15 | The HMWP Vision is set out in Para 2.25 |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | other economic, social and environmental priorities. | | <p><i>'Vision: 'Protecting the environment, maintaining communities and supporting the economy'</i></p> <p>Whilst the Vision outlines the needs to address economic, social and environmental priorities, it does not specially address the mineral and waste needs.</p> |
| 5. | <p>Plans should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Aspirational and deliverable b) Contain clear and unambiguous policies c) Accessible through the use of digital tools d) Serve a clear purpose avoiding duplication | NPPF Para 16 | <p>The aspirations of the HMWP are set out in the Introduction (Para 1.1 – 11.5). The Policies Map is available on-line and is interactive.</p> <p>However, since adoption, it has become clear that some of the policies contain areas of ambiguity and some clarification would be of benefit for their implementation.</p> |
| 6. | <i>Plan Content</i> | | |
| 7. | Include strategic policies to address priorities for the development and use of land. They should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development. | NPPF Para 17, 20 | <p>The content of the HMWP is set out in Para 1.5</p> <p><i>'The Plan comprises three elements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Strategic approach and policies;</i> - <i>Strategic sites allocations considered necessary to deliver the Plan objectives; and</i> - <i>General and site-specific development management policies.'</i> |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | The Spatial Strategy is set out in Paras. 2.26 to 2.46 and this is supported by the Key Diagram (Figure 6). |
| 8. | Outline which policies are 'strategic' policies | NPPF Para 21 | Whilst the HMWP outlines that it contains Strategic Policies in Para 1.5, these are not specifically identified. |
| 9. | Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period <u>from adoption</u> . | NPPF Para 22 | <p>The overall strategic priority is set out in HMWP Para. 28:</p> <p><i>'The overall 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, without jeopardising Hampshire's environment and the quality of life of its communities.'</i></p> <p>This priority is then transposed in HMWP <i>Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source</i> and <i>Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development</i>. Both policies include the Plan period of 2030.</p> |
| 10. | Indicate broad locations for development on a key diagram, and land use designations and allocations on a policies map. | NPPF Para 23 | The HMWP Key Diagram is outlined in Figure 6 (Key Diagram) and the allocations are set out in inset maps (Appendix A) and the Policies Map (adopted 2013). |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----------------|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 11. | Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed <u>mineral demand and waste management needs</u> over the plan period. | NPPF Para 23 | The HMWP Spatial Strategy is set out in Paras. 2.26 to 2.46. |
| 12. | Include non-strategic policies to set out more detailed policies for specific areas. | NPPF Para 18, 28 | Whilst the HMWP outlines that it contains Strategic Policies in Para 1.5, these are not specifically identified. However, the HMWP contains detailed policies for the provision of different minerals and waste streams as well as outlining specific development management policies. |
| 13. | Set out contributions expected from development (<u>where relevant</u>) and demonstrate that expected contributions will not undermine the deliverability of the Plan. | NPPF Para 34, 57 | The requirement for planning obligations are set out in HMWP Para 3.9 – 3.13. *Typo in para 3.13, line 5 |
| <i>Housing</i> | | | |
| 14. | Be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance as a starting point. | NPPF Para 60 | Not applicable |
| 15. | Identify the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups. | NPPF Para 61 | Not applicable |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 16. | Where a need for affordable housing is identified, specify the type of affordable housing required. | NPPF Para 62 | Not applicable |
| 17. | Expect at least 10% of homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups | NPPF Para 64 | Not applicable |
| 18. | Set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. | NPPF Para 65 | Not applicable |
| 19. | Identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period, and specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan. | NPPF Para 67 | Not applicable |
| 20. | Identify land to accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, unless it can be demonstrated that there are strong reasons why the 10% target cannot be achieved. | NPPF Para 68 | Not applicable |
| 21. | Support the development of entry level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers, | NPPF Para 71 | Not applicable |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | unless the need for such homes is already being met within the authority's area. | | |
| 22. | Include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, and requiring a buffer of 10% where the local planning authority wishes to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites through an annual position statement or recently adopted plan. | NPPF Para 73 | Not applicable |
| 23. | Be responsive to local circumstances and support rural housing developments that reflect local needs. | NPPF Para 77 | Not applicable |
| 24. | Identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. | NPPF Para 78 | Not applicable |
| 25. | Avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless specific circumstances are consistent with those set out in the NPPF. | NPPF Para 79 | Not applicable |
| | <i>Economy</i> | | |
| 26. | Create conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. | NPPF Para 80 | Not applicable |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 27. | Set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration. | NPPF Para 81 | Not applicable |
| 28. | Set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period. | NPPF Para 81 | Not applicable |
| 29. | Seek to address potential barriers to investment, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing, or a poor environment. | NPPF Para 81 | Not applicable |
| 30. | Be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. | NPPF Para 81 | Not applicable |
| 31. | Recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. | NPPF Para 82 | Not applicable |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 32. | Enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. | NPPF Para 83 | Not applicable |
| 33. | Enable the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. | NPPF Para 83 | Not applicable |
| 34. | Enable sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside. | NPPF Para 83 | Not applicable |
| 35. | Enable the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. | NPPF Para 83 | Not applicable |
| 36. | Recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. | NPPF Para 84 | Not applicable |
| 37. | <i>Town centres</i> | | |
| 38. | Define a network and hierarchy of town centres and promote their long-term vitality and viability. | NPPF Para 85 | Not applicable |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 39. | Define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, and make clear the range of uses permitted in such locations. | NPPF Para 85 | Not applicable |
| 40. | Retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones. | NPPF Para 85 | Not applicable |
| 41. | Allocate a range of suitable sites in town centres to meet the scale and type of development likely to be needed, looking at least ten years ahead. | NPPF Para 85 | Not applicable |
| 42. | Where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available for main town centre uses, allocate appropriate edge of centre sites that are well connected to the town centre. | NPPF Para 85 | Not applicable |
| 43. | Recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites. | NPPF Para 85 | Not applicable |
| 44. | <i>Healthy and safe communities</i> | | |
| 45. | Achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, are safe and accessible, and enable and support healthy lifestyles. | NPPF Para 91 | The HWMP has limited scope for contribution to the provision of health and safe communities due to the nature of the development delivered. However, HMWP Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 46. | Plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments. | NPPF Para 92 | developments specifies that restoration of minerals and waste developments should 'contribute to the delivery of local objectives for habitats, biodiversity or community use where these are consistent with the development plan. Para. 4.74 states that restoration should include at least one of the aims including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved public access to the natural environment through the creation of enhanced access as well as leisure and amenity opportunities. - Contribution to local objectives (provision of green infrastructure). |
| 47. | Take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community. | NPPF Para 92 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved public access to the natural environment through the creation of enhanced access as well as leisure and amenity opportunities. - Contribution to local objectives (provision of green infrastructure). |
| 48. | Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs. | NPPF Para 92 | Not applicable |
| 49. | Ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community. | NPPF Para 92 | Not applicable |
| 50. | Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services. | NPPF Para 92 | Not applicable |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|--|
| 51. | Consider the social, economic and environmental benefits of estate regeneration. | NPPF Para 93 | Not applicable |
| 52. | Promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements. | NPPF Para 95 | The promotion of Public Safety is outlined in HWMP Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity. However, the HWMP has limited scope for taking into account wider security and defence requirements. |
| 53. | Provide open space, sports and recreational facilities which meets the needs of the local area. | NPPF Para 95 | The HWMP has limited scope for provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities due to the nature of the development delivered. However, HMWP Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments specifies that restoration of minerals and waste developments should 'contribute to the delivery of local objectives for habitats, biodiversity or community use where these are consistent with the development plan. |
| 54. | Protect and enhance public rights of way and access. | NPPF Para 98 | Para. 4.74 states that restoration should include at least one of the aims including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved public access to the natural environment through the creation of enhanced access as well as leisure and amenity opportunities. Contribution to local objectives (provision of green infrastructure). |
| 55. | <i>Transport</i> | | |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|------------------------------------|---|
| 56. | Should actively manage patterns of growth in support of objectives in Para 102. Significant development should be focused on locations which are/can be made sustainable. Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas - this should be taken into account in plan-making. | NPPF Para 103 | Transport issues relating to minerals and waste development are addressed by HWMP Policy 12: Managing traffic. However, the Policy makes reference to ‘mitigating’ significant adverse effects rather than considering the <i>“environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains”</i> (NPPF, Para. 102 (d)). |
| 57. | Support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. | NPPF Para 104 | Minerals extraction development can only take place where the geology is present. Therefore, there is limited scope to consider an appropriate mix of uses. However, different waste management activities can occur in varying scales and HMWP Para. 5.36 outlines the suggested scale of development in a waste management network to reduce the transport impacts. |
| 58. | Identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development. | NPPF Para 104 | The HWMP only considered minerals and waste transport infrastructure. These are identified and safeguarded though Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure, Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots and Policy 34: safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure. |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----------------|--|------------------------------------|---|
| 59. | Provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans). | NPPF Para 104 | Not applicable. |
| 60. | Provide for any large-scale transport facilities that need to be located in the area and the infrastructure and wider development required to support their operation, expansion and contribution to the wider economy. | NPPF Para 104 | The HWMP only considered minerals and waste transport infrastructure. These are identified through Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots and Policy 34: safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure. |
| 61. | Recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields. | NPPF Para 104 | Not applicable. |
| 62. | Provide adequate overnight lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages. | NPPF Para 107 | Not applicable. |
| 63. | In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, it should be ensured that: appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. | NPPF Para 108 | The assessment of sites for mineral and waste development is set out in HMWP Policy 12: Managing traffic. |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
| 64. | Development should only be prevented on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. | NPPF Para 109 | In addition to HWMP Policy 12: Managing traffic, Para. 5.36 makes specific reference to the importance of cross-boundary impacts and cumulative impacts. |
| 65. | <i>Communications</i> | | |
| 66. | Support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections, setting out how high-quality digital infrastructure is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time. | NPPF Para 112 | Not applicable. |
| 67. | <i>Making effective use of land</i> | | |
| 68. | Promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. | NPPF Para 117 | Minerals extraction development can only take place where the geology is present. However, Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates outlines the locations of where provision will be met and specific criteria for proposals for new sites. |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|---|
| | | | <p>The provision of waste management development is outlined in Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management. Part 2 makes specific reference to support development where it “is previously development land or redundant agricultural and forestry buildings, their curtilages and hardstandings or is part of an active quarry or landfill operation”.</p> <p>The HWMP seeks to protect the environment and living conditions through Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity.</p> |
| 69. | <p>Set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or ‘brownfield’ land.</p> | NPPF Para 117 | Not applicable – <i>See NPPW Requirements</i> |
| 70. | <p>Encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains.</p> | NPPF Para 118 | <p>The HWMP has limited scope for encouraging multiple benefits from both urban and rural land. However, HMWP Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments specifies that restoration of minerals and waste developments should ‘be restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with the development plan’.</p> <p>Para. 4.74 states that restoration should include at least one of the aims listed.</p> <p>The policies and supporting text do not make specific reference to achieving net environmental gains.</p> |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 71. | Recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production. | NPPF Para 118 | The important functions or contributions land can make are highlighted in various parts of the HMWP including Para. 4.1. However, there is no specific mention of some of the functions listed in NPPF Para. 118. Neither is there a clear statement giving cause for land to be undeveloped due to the importance of these functions. |
| 72. | Give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land. | NPPF Para 118 | Minerals extraction development can only take place where the geology is present. Therefore, the opportunities for use of brownfield land is limited. The provision of waste management development is outlined in Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management. Part 2 makes specific reference to support development where it “is previously development land or redundant agricultural and forestry buildings, their curtilages and hardstandings or is part of an active quarry or landfill operation; or is within or adjoins sewage treatment works and the development enables the co-treatment of sewage sludge with other wastes”. |
| 73. | Promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings. | NPPF Para 118 | |
| 74. | Support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. | NPPF Para 118 | Not applicable. |
| 75. | Reflect changes in the demand for land. | NPPF Para 120 | Allocations and capacity are monitored annually for both minerals and waste development and reported in the Monitoring Report and/or Local Aggregate Assessment. An assessment of the allocations was |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | undertaken as part of the 2018 Review of the HMWP and is being repeated to inform the 2020 Review of the HWMP. |
| 76. | Support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account the need for different types of housing and other forms of development, local market conditions, the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services, the character and setting of the area, and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. | NPPF Para 122 | <p>The HMWP only considers minerals and waste development. The efficient use of land is encouraged through a number of policies including: Policy 15: Safeguarding minerals resources which seeks to encourage prior extraction; Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste development which seeks to achieve beneficial after-uses; and Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management development which recognises the various the locational requirements of different types of waste development.</p> <p>The availability and capacity of infrastructure is considered through: Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure; Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source; Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots; Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates; Policy 21: Silica sand development; Policy 22: Brick-making clay; Policy 23: Chalk development; Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure; Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development.</p> <p>Securing well-designed development is sought through Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development.</p> |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|---|
| 77. | Avoid homes being built at low densities where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of identified housing needs, and where appropriate include the use of minimum density standards. | NPPF Para 123 | Not applicable. |
| 78. | <i>Design</i> | | |
| 79. | Set out a clear design vision and provide maximum clarity about design expectations. | NPPF Para 125 & 126 | <p>The requirement for design of minerals and waste developments is set out in HMWP Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development. This is supported by Para. 5.44 which states design and access statements are required, where appropriate. This is supported further by Para. 5.45. which provides the key designs and operational principles that should be met.</p> <p>The scope for design of minerals development is limited. However, the policy does not seek to encourage the inclusion of local communities in considering the design of waste management facilities only consideration of the impact of the development on communities through the reference to Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity.</p> |
| 80. | Ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to local character and history, | NPPF Para 127 | The requirement for design of life cycle of minerals and waste developments is set out in HMWP Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and |

| | A. NPPF Requirement | B. NPPF Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|
| | including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development, and create places that are safe, accessible and inclusive. | | <p>waste developments and Policy 13: High-quality design of minerals and waste development.</p> <p>This is further supported by the following policies which give specific criteria on the locational requirements of development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 19: Aggregate wharves and rail depots - Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates - Policy 21: Silica sand development - Policy 24: Oil and gas development - Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development - Policy 28: Energy recovery development - Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management - Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management - Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|--|
| 81. | <i>Green Belt</i> | | |
| 82. | Set out proposals for new Green Belts within strategic policies. This should demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate, any major changes in circumstances, consequences for sustainable development, the need for Green Belt to support adjoining areas, and how new Green Belt would meet other objectives of the Framework. | NPPF Para 135 | Not applicable. |
| 83. | Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period. Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies, including neighbourhood plans. Even when exceptional circumstances are demonstrated strategically to take land out of the Green Belt, it is still necessary to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist at the site level. | NPPF Para 136 | The potential impact of minerals and waste development on the Green Belt is set out in HMWP Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt. Whilst the policy outlines that development within the Green Belt with need to demonstrate that it is not inappropriate or that very special circumstances exist, the terminology of the policy and support text does not reflect the NPPF's use of 'exceptional' circumstances or the regard that should be given to the permanence of the development impact on the Green Belt. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| 84. | Strategic policies should make as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land and optimise the density of development including promoting an uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and locations well served by public transport. Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously developed and/or is well served by public transport. They should also set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land. | NPPF Para 137 & 138 | Not applicable. |
| 85. | When defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should ensure consistency with the development plan's strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development, not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open, identify areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt where necessary, make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time, be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period, and define boundaries clearly. | NPPF Para 139 | Not applicable. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---------------|---|
| 86. | <i>Climate change, flooding and coastal change</i> | | |
| 87. | Take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperature. | NPPF Para 149 | The HMWP seeks to address the mitigation and adaptation of climate change through Policy 2: Climate change mitigation and adaptation. Whilst the policy states that minerals and waste development should minimise their impacts, this is not necessarily a 'proactive' approach. |
| 88. | Support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts. | NPPF Para 149 | The Climate Change Act requires Local Plans to monitor carbon emissions. The Plan does not outline the baseline for carbon emissions or measures to monitor the performance of the Plan on its carbon impact. In June 2019, Hampshire County Council declared a Climate Change Emergency ⁹⁰ . The HMWP is listed in the Climate Change Strategy as being a support for managing Hampshire's emissions and resilience. |
| 89. | Increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat by providing a positive strategy for energy from these sources, identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and identifying opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. | NPPF Para 151 | HMWP Policy 2: Climate change mitigation and adaptation and Policy 28: Energy recovery development seek to facilitate low carbon technologies. Policy 28 also requires the design of plants to have the capability to deliver heat in the future, this is not necessarily being delivered on the ground. |
| 90. | Strategic policies should manage flood risk from all sources. | NPPF Para 156 | The impact of minerals and waste development on flood risk it set out in HMWP Policy 11: Flood Risk & Prevention. The supporting text |

⁹⁰ Portsmouth declared a climate change emergency in March 2019, Southampton in September 2019.

| | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|--|
| | | | <p>considers all sources of flooding and the role of the lead local flood authority (LLFA). However, at the time of adoption, the role of the was being defined and this text would benefit from being updated.</p> <p>Reference to the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is set out in Para. 5.27.</p> |
| 91. | Avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas and not exacerbating the impacts of physical changes to the coast. | NPPF Para 167 | <p>Consideration of the impact of development on the coast is outlined in Para. 5.24 and 5.25. However, there is no mention of Coastal Change Management Areas and the need for their consideration where proposals are made on the coast.</p> |
| 92. | <i>Natural environment</i> | | |
| 93. | Contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services. | NPPF Para 170 | <p>The HWMP recognises the benefits of ‘ecosystem services’ in Para. 4.1 but does not make reference to natural capital.</p> <p>The contribution to and the enhancement of the natural and local environment it set out in the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species - Policy 4: Protection of the designated landscape - Policy 5: Protection of the countryside - Policy 8: Protection of soils - Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments <p>Protection of soils, water and air is considered through Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|--|
| | | | However, there is no specific reference to protection of the undeveloped coast or the provision of net gains. |
| 94. | Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure, and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries. | NPPF Para 171 | The hierarchy and enhancement of sites, habitats and species is set out in HMWP Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species. Consideration of the enhancement of habitat network and green infrastructure is provided in Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments. However, there is no reference to natural capacity or the framework for how this can be considered at a catchment or landscape scale. |
| 95. | Conserve the special character and importance of Heritage Coast areas. | NPPF Para 173 | Not applicable. |
| 96. | Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species, and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. | NPPF Para 174 | The consideration of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological network is provided in HMWP Policy 3: Protection of habitats and species and Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments. The sites are identified and mapped on the Policies Map. However, there is no reference to securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|--|
| 97. | Ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions, any risks arising from land instability and contamination, and the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. | NPPF Para 178 & 180 | The suitability of site conditions for minerals and waste development is set out in HMWP Policy 10: Protecting health, safety and amenity. |
| 98. | Sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. | NPPF Para 181 | <p>HMWP Policy 10: Protecting health, safety and amenity considers the potential for release of emissions to the atmosphere but does not make specific reference to air quality. It does consider cumulative impacts.</p> <p>HMWP Policy 12: Managing traffic considers the carbon dioxide emissions of traffic and methods for reducing this but does not make specific reference to Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones.</p> |
| 99. | Ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities. | NPPF Para 182 | HMWP Policy 13: High quality design of minerals and waste developments seeks to ensure that minerals and waste development maintains and enhances the distinctive character of a landscape and townscape. This is elaborated further in Para. 5.45 in that development should 'be appropriate in scale and character in relation to its location, the surrounding area and any stated objectives for the future of the area. This should include any planned new development or regeneration'. |

| | | | |
|------|---|---------------|--|
| | | | <p>Policy 16: safeguarding – minerals infrastructure and Policy 26: Safeguarding – waste infrastructure both seek to protect planned and existing development from encroachment.</p> <p>However, reference is not made to the ‘agent of change’.</p> |
| 100. | <i>Historic Environment</i> | | |
| 101. | Set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. | NPPF Para 185 | <p>The conservation of the historic environment is outlined in HMWP Policy 7: Conserving the historic environment. However, the emphasis is on ‘protection’ rather than ‘sustaining’. Whilst the contribution to a ‘sense of place’ and ‘local identity’ is outlined in Para. 4.53, the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits are not considered in the supporting text.</p> |
| 102. | <i>Minerals</i> | | |
| 103. | Provide for the extraction of mineral resources of local and national importance. | NPPF Para 204 | <p>The extraction of minerals resources of local and national importance is set out in the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources - Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure - Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source - Policy 20: Local land-won aggregates - Policy 21: Silica sand development - Policy 22: Brick-making clay - Policy 23: Chalk development - Policy 24: Oil and gas development |

| | | | |
|------|---|---------------|--|
| | | | Whilst the policies seek to make provision, the rates outlined in HMWP Policy 17 are not currently being met. |
| 104. | Take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials, before considering extraction of primary materials. | NPPF Para 204 | <p>The contribution of substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make is outlined in Policy 17: Aggregate supply – capacity and source and Policy 18: Recycled and secondary aggregates development. This is further supported through Policy 30: Construction, demolition and excavation waste development.</p> <p>Whilst the policies seek to make provision, the rate of 1mpta outlined in HMWP Policy 17 is not currently being met.</p> |
| 105. | Safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas. | NPPF Para 204 | <p>The safeguarding of minerals resources and the need for prior extraction is outlined in Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources. This is further supported by the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Safeguarding Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)*.</p> <p><i>*As this was adopted after the HMWP, the Plan would benefit from making reference to the SPD.</i></p> |
| 106. | Encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practical and environmentally feasible, if it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place. | NPPF Para 204 | |
| 107. | Safeguard existing, planned and potential sites for: the bulk transport, handling and processing of minerals, the manufacture of concrete and concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material. | NPPF Para 204 | <p>The safeguarding of minerals infrastructure is set out in Policy 16: Safeguarding – minerals infrastructure. The requirement for the safeguarding is set out in Para. 6.22. In addition, Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depots seeks to safeguard sites that may become available in the future. These policies are further supported by the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Safeguarding Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD).</p> |

| | | | |
|------|--|---------------|---|
| | | | *As this was adopted after the HMWP, the Plan would benefit from making reference to the SPD. |
| 108. | Set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health | NPPF Para 204 | The criteria and requirements to ensure permitted and proposed operations do not have an unacceptable adverse impact are set out in the Development Management policies (1 - 12) including Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity which considered the potential for cumulative impacts. |
| 109. | Recognise that some noisy short-term activities, which may otherwise be regarded as unacceptable, are unavoidable to facilitate minerals extraction | NPPF Para 204 | The recognition of the impacts of minerals and waste development including noise is outlined in Paras. 5.4 and 5.8. Policy 10: Protecting health, safety and amenity seeks to address any significant adverse impacts such as noise. |
| 110. | Ensure that worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high-quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place. | NPPF Para 204 | The need for restoration of worked land is set out in Policy 9: Restoration of minerals and waste developments. The requirement for provision at the earliest opportunity is outlined in Para. 4.70*. |

National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | <i>General Requirements</i> | | |
| 1. | Positive planning through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency; - ensuring that waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns; | NPPW Para 1 | The delivery of sustainable development is outlined in HMWP Policy 25: Sustainable waste management. Para. 6.128 outlines how the waste policies contained within the Plan seeks to address wider planning concerns. |
| 2. | Providing a framework in which communities and businesses are engaged with and take more responsibility for their own waste; – helping to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment; and - ensuring the design and layout of new residential and commercial development and other infrastructure (such as safe and reliable transport links) complements sustainable waste management. | NPPW Para 1 | Not applicable |
| 3. | Ensure that the planned provision of new capacity and its spatial distribution is based on robust analysis of best available data and information, and an appraisal of options. | NPPW Para 2 | Provision is outlined in Policy 25: Sustainable waste management and the detail on how this is to be delivered in capacity terms is set out in Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development. |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|----|--|-----------------------------|---|
| | | | The background to this information is set out in Paras. 6.166 to 6.179 and provided in more detail in the <i>Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire: Waste Data Summary Report</i> . |
| 4. | <p>Work jointly and collaboratively with other planning authorities to collect and share data and information on waste arisings, and take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) waste arisings across neighbouring waste planning authority areas; (ii) any waste management requirement identified nationally, including the Government's latest advice on forecasts of waste arisings and the proportion of waste that can be recycled. | NPPW 2 Para 2 | <p>The HMWP was prepared in Partnership which is outlined in Para. 2.23.</p> <p>The information on waste arisings is set out in Table 6.5 which takes into account the guidance on forecasts at the time. This is provided in more detail in the <i>Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire: Waste Data Summary Report</i>.</p> |
| 5. | Ensure that the need for waste management facilities is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns, recognising the positive contribution that waste management can bring to the development of sustainable communities. | NPPW Para 2 | <p>The delivery of sustainable development is outlined in HMWP Policy 25: Sustainable waste management. Paras. 6.126 to 6.128 outlines how the waste policies seek to meet national planning objectives.</p> <p>However, the Plan could be more explicit in relation to the positive contribution that waste management can bring to communities.</p> |
| 6. | Undertake early and meaningful engagement with local communities so that plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and set of agreed priorities when planning for sustainable waste management, recognising that | NPPW Para 3 | Paras 1.6 and 1.7 of the HMWP outlines how and when the local community was engaged in the development of the Plan including the Vision and Plan objectives. The concerns regarding waste management |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|---|
| | proposals for waste management facilities such as incinerators can be controversial. | | development are recognised and outlined in Para. 2.17 as a key issue for the Plan. |
| 7. | Drive waste management up the waste hierarchy, recognising the need for a mix of types and scale of facilities, and that adequate provision must be made for waste disposal. | NPPW Para 3 | Application of the waste hierarchy is outlined in Policy 25: Sustainable waste management and the types and scales of the facilities required to delivery is set out in the supporting text to Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management. |
| 8. | Identify the tonnages and percentages of municipal, and commercial and industrial, waste requiring different types of management in their area over the period of the plan. | NPPW Para 3 | <p>The requirement is outlined in Policy 25: Sustainable waste management and the detail on how this is to be delivered in terms of types of infrastructure is set out in Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development.</p> <p>The background to this information is set out in Paras. 6.166 to 6.179 and provided in more detail in the <i>Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire: Waste Data Summary Report</i>. This includes minimum capacity targets through the Plan period.</p> |
| 9. | Consider the need for additional waste management capacity of more than local significance and reflect any requirement for waste management facilities identified nationally. | NPPW Para 3 | <p>The consideration of capacity for waste management of more than local significance and national requirements which may result in the need for limited facilities are set out in the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 28: Energy recovery development - Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management - Policy 32: Non-hazardous waste landfill |
| 10. | Take account of waste management needs, including for disposal of the residues from treated wastes, arising in more | NPPW Para 3 | |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|---|
| | than one waste planning authority area but where only a limited number of facilities would be required. | | - Policy 33: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste Development |
| 11. | Work collaboratively in groups with other waste planning authorities, and in two-tier areas with district authorities, through the statutory duty to cooperate, to provide a suitable network of facilities to deliver sustainable waste management. | NPPW Para 3 | <p>The HMWP was prepared in Partnership which is outlined in Para. 2.23 and waste management is currently provided under a partnership of a number of Hampshire local authorities known as Project Integra (Para. 6.160). The Duty to Cooperate during plan-preparation was met (Para. 2.23).</p> <p>The delivery of provision is set out Policy 25: Sustainable waste management and the detail on how this is to be delivered is set out in Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development.</p> |
| 12. | Consider the extent to which the capacity of existing operational facilities would satisfy any identified need. | NPPW Para 3 | <p>Existing capacity at the time of the Plan preparation is outlined in Paras. 6.160 to 6.162. This was taken into account to establish the capacity gaps which outlines the additional capacity required during the Plan period as set out in Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development.</p> <p>More detail is provided in the <i>Assessment of Need for Waste Management Facilities in Hampshire: Waste Data Summary Report</i>. This includes minimum capacity targets through the Plan period.</p> |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 13. | Identify the broad type or types of waste management facility that would be appropriately located on the allocated site or in the allocated area in line with the waste hierarchy. | NPPW Para 4 | <p>The types of facilities and locational requirements are set out in HWMP Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management. At the time of the plan adoption, there was a suitable network of facilities in place. The only allocations for waste management were for non-hazardous landfill and outlined in Policy 32: Non-hazardous landfill.</p> <p>It was expected that some future provision could be made on industrial estates (Para. 6.203). However, these are not identified within the Plan.</p> <p>Policy 29 also suggests that certain types of waste development would be supported in 'areas of major new or planned development' and these are identified on the Key Diagram.</p> <p>The Plan expects market-led delivery. However, monitoring suggests that there is a disconnect between what is being brought forward by the market and Policy 25 which seeks to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy.</p> |
| 14. | Plan for the disposal of waste and the recovery of mixed municipal waste in line with the proximity principle. | NPPW Para 4 | The proximity principle is outlined in part (b) of Policy 25: Sustainable waste management. |
| 15. | Consider opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises | NPPW Para 4 | There is limited scope for on-site management of wastes for minerals and waste developments. However, Policy 30: Construction, demolition |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|---|
| | | | and excavation waste development seeks to encourage recycling or recovery of the material which can take place on-site. |
| 16. | Consider a broad range of locations including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate waste management facilities together and with complementary activities. | NPPW Para 4 | Co-location of facilities is addressed in the following HMWP policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 25: Sustainable waste management - Policy 27: Capacity for waste management development - Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management - Policy 31: Liquid waste and waste water management |
| 17. | Where a low carbon energy recovery facility is considered as an appropriate type of development, waste planning authorities should consider the suitable siting of such facilities to enable the utilisation of the heat produced as an energy source in close proximity to suitable potential heat customers. | NPPW Para 4 | HMWP Policy 28: Energy recovery development states that 'As a minimum requirement the scheme should recover energy through electricity production and the plant should be designed to have the capability to deliver heat in the future' (Part (b)). |
| 18. | Give priority to the re-use of previously-developed land, sites identified for employment uses, and redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages. | NPPW Para 4 | HMWP Policy 29: Locations and sites for waste management includes support for 'previously-development land or redundant agricultural and forestry buildings; their curtilages and hardstandings' (Part 2 (c)) but is provides a more focused direction on employment sites by referencing 'suitable industrial' estates and land 'allocated for general industry/storage'. This is due to fact that not all employment sites are suitable (e.g. business parks) as outlined in Para. 6.203. |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|---|
| 19. | Physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses. | NPPW Para 5 | HMWP Para. 6.196 states that the market-led approach 'recognises the 'spatial' needs of different types of waste facilities, including the demand for certain sites, and the constraints that limit the location of some facility types'. |
| 20. | The capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport. | NPPW Para 5 | The capacity of transport infrastructure to support waste management is outlined in HMWP Policy 12: Managing traffic. Potential wharves and rail depots are referenced in Policy 34: Safeguarding potential minerals and waste wharf and rail depot infrastructure. |
| 21. | The cumulative impact of existing and proposed waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential. | NPPW Para 5 | The cumulative impact of waste development is considered in Policy 10: Protecting public health, safety and amenity. |
| 22. | Planning authorities should first look for suitable sites and areas outside the Green Belt for waste management facilities that, if located in the Green Belt, would be inappropriate development. Local planning authorities should recognise the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities when preparing their Local Plan. | NPPW Para 6 | Waste development in the Green Belt is considered in HMWP Policy 6: South West Hampshire Green Belt. |

| | A. NPPW Requirement | B. NPPW Paragraph Reference | C. Record your assessment results |
|-----|---|------------------------------------|---|
| 23. | Local planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, monitor and report. | NPPW Para 9 | Section 7 of the HMWP outlines the responsibility of the Authorities to monitor and report on the Policies. An Implementation and Monitoring Plan is set out in Appendix C. |

DRAFT