

# HAMPSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

## MINERALS & WASTE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

### SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION

*Hearings commence:*

*23 January 2007*

Location:

Hearings:

Winchester Royal Hotel  
St Peter Street  
Hampshire County Council  
Winchester  
Hampshire SO23 8BS

Programme Officer:

Bill Lamb - Programme Officer  
c/o Hampshire County Council  
Sheridan House  
Jewry Street  
Winchester SO23 8RY  
Telephone no: 01962-857826  
e-mail: [bill.lamb@hants.gov.uk](mailto:bill.lamb@hants.gov.uk)

Inspector:

Stephen J Pratt BA(Hons) MRTPI

**HAMPSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE CORE STRATEGY**  
**SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION**

1. The Inspector has prepared this Schedule of Matters and Issues for Examination to guide and focus the discussion at the hearing sessions of the Examination into the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Core Strategy. It has been prepared using the Planning Inspectorate's *Guide to Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents*<sup>1</sup>, having regard to the representations made to the Core Strategy.
2. The Paper lists the main topics and issues which are likely to be discussed. For each topic, it sets out a series of questions on which the Inspector invites responses from the participants. A list of the relevant participants follows at the end of each topic, based on the current database. Participants are invited to respond to the questions raised in brief statements (no more than 3000 words per Matter), to be received by the Programme Officer **no later than Tuesday 19 December 2006**. Participants will have the opportunity to comment on the responses of others, including the MWPAs<sup>2</sup>, if necessary, in further statements to be received by the Programme Officer **no later than Tuesday 9 January 2007**. Responses can be made on the various topics and questions by all participants listed under that topic, limited to the topics and issues raised in the original representation, both by those attending the hearing and those wishing to make further written representations. Those who support the plan may also comment on issues related to the original representation, if necessary.
3. All further representations should address the Matters & Issues for Examination. Participants may refer to information in earlier representations and statements, but please note that the Inspector only has copies of the representations made at formal submission stage. The MWPAs should refer to information in the Self-Assessment of Soundness, Core Documents and Topic Papers, and may also wish to respond to relevant points raised in the representations. It is important that representations and responses include all the evidence and supporting material, and for the MWPAs, reference to the "core" evidence base, since the inspector is unlikely to accept further/new information once the hearing sessions commence. The submission of late information or evidence can seriously disrupt the hearing sessions and could disadvantage the participants, including the Inspector. All material which participants wish to put before the Inspector or refer to at the hearings or in writing should be submitted by the deadlines indicated. If participants wish to rely only on their original representation, no further statement is needed, but this approach should be confirmed with the Programme Officer.
4. As a result of the responses received to the Schedule of Matters and Issues for Examination, detailed agendas for the hearing sessions will be issued shortly before they commence. However, it is unlikely that the Inspector will introduce new issues or questions that do not arise from the topics and issues identified. Please note that not all matters and issues will be discussed at the hearing sessions; this will partly depend on those who wish to have an oral hearing, and some matters will be dealt with by written representations. Participants should let the Programme Officer know as soon as possible whether or not they wish to attend a particular session.
5. Participants are reminded that the Examination focuses on the tests of soundness set out in PPS12 (¶ 4.24), with the presumption that the Core Strategy is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise by evidence considered at the Examination. Participants are expected to explain why the plan is unsound in terms of a specific soundness test and specify how the plan should be altered, with precise wording and clear evidence to support this course of action.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Development Plans Examination – A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents* (Planning Inspectorate; December 2005)

<sup>2</sup> Reference to the MWPAs includes the Minerals & Waste Planning Authorities for Hampshire, New Forest National Park, and Portsmouth & Southampton City Councils

**HAMPSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE CORE STRATEGY**  
**SCHEDULE OF MATTERS AND ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION**

**1. PROCEDURAL & CONFORMITY MATTERS** <sup>3</sup>  
***[Soundness Tests 1; 2A; 2B; 3; 4A; 4B; 4C; 5]***

**Key issues:**

- i. Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the current Minerals & Waste & Local Development Schemes and have the relevant details been met?
- ii. Has the Core Strategy been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the 2004 Regulations?
- iii. Has the Core Strategy been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, which has identified the process carried out, the baseline information used and the outcomes of the process; Has the Sustainability Appraisal provided a strategic input into the preparation of the Core Strategy and addressed the key sustainability issues and challenges in the district, and does the wording of the policies in the Core Strategy reflect the recommendations of the Final Sustainability Appraisal?
- iv. Is the Core Strategy a *spatial plan*, which properly reflects national guidance on spatial planning?
- v. Does the Core Strategy take account of the relationship between policies in the plan and the requirements and infrastructure investment programmes of other agencies and service providers?
- vi. Does the Core Strategy relate to other relevant plans and strategies which influence the delivery of its proposals, and will the policies in the Core Strategy be developed in more detail in subsequent Development Plan Documents?
- vii. Does the Core Strategy integrate effectively with plans prepared by other local planning authorities in the area (eg. unitary, district, National Park and adjoining county planning authorities), and are cross-boundary issues properly addressed?
- viii. Is the Core Strategy consistent with national planning policy and is there sufficient local justification for any policies which are not consistent with national planning policy<sup>4</sup>?
- ix. Is the Core Strategy in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy and is there sufficient local justification for any policies which are not consistent with regional planning policy<sup>5</sup>?
- x. Does the Core Strategy have regard to the local authorities' Community Strategies, by setting out policies which deliver key components of these strategies in so far as they are consistent with strategic planning policy and the use and development of land?
- xi. Has an Appropriate Assessment been satisfactorily undertaken under the Habitats Directive (Articles 6(3) & (4)) relating to European sites?
- xii. Is the plan period of the Core Strategy (to 2020) appropriate?
- xiii. What is the status of the Technical Document?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council<sup>6</sup>

SEERA

**Written representations**

Council for National Parks  
English Nature/Natural England  
Environment Agency  
Grundon Waste Management  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
New Forest DC  
Robert Brett & Sons  
Romsey & District Society  
Thames Water Property Services  
Power Triangle

East Hampshire DC  
GO-SE  
Frith End Residents Assn  
Cllr K Heron  
Lafarge Aggregates  
Quarry Products Assn  
SEEDA  
Berks UA JSPU  
National Trust

<sup>3</sup> These issues should be covered in the Council's Self-Assessment of Soundness

<sup>4</sup> Detailed aspects of consistency with national policy will be dealt with under individual policies

<sup>5</sup> Detailed aspects of conformity with regional policy will be dealt with under individual policies

<sup>6</sup> References to Hampshire County Council include the partner Minerals & Waste Planning Authorities (MWPAs) for Hampshire, New Forest National Park, and Portsmouth & Southampton City Councils.

2. **SPATIAL STRATEGY & OBJECTIVES**, including Alternative Options

*[Soundness Tests: 4A; 4B, 4C; 6: 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

**Is the Spatial Strategy soundly based and appropriate for Hampshire, consistent with national and regional policy, reflecting community views, and providing a sound basis for the strategic spatial policies in the Core Strategy?**

- (i) Does the spatial strategy properly reflect the objectives and policies of the adopted RSS and draft South-East Plan, and does it provide sufficient flexibility to deal with changing circumstances?
- (ii) Does the spatial strategy properly reflect local issues and circumstances identified as relevant to Hampshire?
- (iii) Have the MWPA's considered all reasonable options in terms of the overall minerals and waste spatial strategy?
- (iv) Is the Spatial Vision realistic, providing a sound basis for the Spatial Strategy?
- (v) Are the strategic objectives and general principles underpinning the spatial strategy soundly based and appropriate for Hampshire, and consistent with the spatial vision of the Core Strategy?
- (vi) Is it appropriate to combine minerals and waste planning issues in a single Core Strategy?
- (vii) Has sufficient consideration been given to transport issues and should there be a specific objective covering transport?
- (viii) Should the strategy include objectives to educate and encourage waste reduction and to encourage a change in building standards to reduce the amount of aggregates in house-building?
- (ix) Should the spatial strategy make more reference to adjoining counties and cross-boundary issues?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

**Written representations**

Frith End Residents Assn

Sherfield English Environmental Protection Society

Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Eversley Parish Council

Council for National Parks

New Forest DC

GO-SW

3. **SUSTAINABILITY & RESOURCE EFFICIENCY** [Policy S1]

*[Soundness Tests 3; 4A; 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

**Will Policy S1 facilitate the efficient use of resources, addressing the currently unsustainable rate of consumption of natural resources and promoting sustainable design, construction and demolition?**

- (i) Should Policy S1 be a "vision" rather than a policy?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Lafarge Aggregates

Power Triangle

**Written representations**

Gosport Borough Council

Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn

4. **WASTE GROWTH & DEMAND FOR NATURAL RESOURCES** [Policy S2]

*[Soundness Tests: 4A; 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

**Will Policy S2 ensure the rate of growth in waste is reduced, stabilising the annual amount of municipal, commercial and industrial waste requiring management and stabilising the consumption of primary aggregates?**

- (i) Can the planning system effectively control the production of waste and demand for aggregates; and should Policy S2 be an aim rather than a policy?
- (ii) How does the strategy address the current lack of waste management facilities and the need to increase waste handling capacity?
- (iii) Does the proposed approach sufficiently recognise the consequences of population and housing growth?

- (iv) Does Policy S2 provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate changes in the production of waste and consumption of aggregates, particularly post 2016?
- (v) Does Policy S2 cover all relevant waste streams and types of minerals, and include adequate definitions of construction, demolition and excavation waste?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Raymond Brown (Consultancy) Ltd

Lafarge Aggregates

**Written representations**

Gosport Borough Council  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
Sherfield English Parish Council

GO-SE  
Thames Water Property Services  
Quarry Products Association

**5. SELF-SUFFICIENCY [Policy S3]  
*[Soundness tests: 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

**Will Policy S3 ensure that Hampshire will achieve self-sufficiency in waste management capacity and disposal?**

- (i) Is Policy S3 consistent with Policy W3 in the adopted (July 2006) Regional Waste Strategy (RPG9) and the draft South East Plan?
- (ii) To what extent should Policy S3 provide for landfilling of a proportion of London's waste?<sup>7</sup>
- (iii) Should the "net self-sufficiency" approach be more flexible to accommodate movements of waste between catchment areas, including sewage sludge?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Berkshire UA JSPU

SEERA

**Written representations**

Grundon Waste Management  
Gosport Borough Council  
GO-SE  
Robert Brett & Sons Ltd

Environment Agency  
East Hampshire DC  
New Forest DC  
Thames Water Property Services

**6. RECYCLING & COMPOSTING<sup>8</sup> [Policies S4 & S5]  
*[Soundness tests: 4B; 4C; 5; 6; 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

**How will Policies S4 & S5 ensure that there will be a progressive increase in the average recycling and composting rates for municipal, commercial and industrial waste over the plan period?**

- (i) Are the recycling/composting rates realistically achievable, and do the MWPA's have sufficient control over meeting the proposed recycling/composting rates?
- (ii) Do the Policies take sufficient account of commercial waste, or should there be a specific policy covering this type of waste?
- (iii) Are the figures for waste management and capacity, including recycling/composting and recovery/treatment, soundly based and appropriate for the county, and are they consistent with the latest RPG9 (Policy W7) and draft South East Plan?
- (iv) Should Policy S5 include more specific criteria and locational guidance to direct the search for new sites to meet the required capacity?
- (v) How will the plan deal with the provision of additional capacity to handle commercial and industrial wastes?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Berkshire UA JSPU

Power Triangle

**Written representations**

New Forest DC  
Godshill Parish Council  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
GO-SE  
C R Pearson

East Hampshire DC  
Romsey & District Society  
Godshill Parish Council  
Robert Brett & Son Ltd

<sup>7</sup> The issue of London's waste will principally be dealt with under Policy S3 and may be discussed in greater detail at the end of the hearing sessions

<sup>8</sup> See also Policy DC13

**7. LANDFILL<sup>9</sup> [Policy S6]**  
**[Soundness tests: 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

**Is the strategy for dealing with non-hazardous waste and landfill capacity soundly based, justified by robust and credible evidence, and in line with national and regional guidance?**

- (i) Does Policy S6 make sufficient provision for required non-hazardous landfill capacity and provide sufficient guidance for considering proposals for the use of non-recyclable inert waste?
- (ii) Are the figures of non-hazardous landfill capacity and non-recyclable inert waste soundly based?
- (iii) Do the landfill capacity figures reflect the draft South-East Plan figures and regional diversion targets, and should the figures in Policy S6 be adjusted to make provision for some of London's waste?<sup>10</sup>
- (iv) Is the Core Strategy's approach of linking landfill and mineral voids realistic, soundly based and appropriate for Hampshire?
- (v) Should the strategy give a clearer picture of the nature and distribution of existing waste treatment facilities?
- (vi) How does the proposal to cease the landfilling of untreated municipal waste by 2015 accord with the requirements of the Landfill Directive?
- (vii) Is the Non-Hazardous Landfill Potential Area necessary, reasonable and realistic, and are the selected areas properly defined, appropriate and soundly based, reflecting the Environment Agency's guidance on landfill sites and the need to protect groundwater<sup>11</sup>?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Berkshire UA JSPU

SEERA

**Written representations**

Chilbolton Parish Council  
GO-SE  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Grundon Waste Management  
New Forest DC  
Christchurch BC

**8. SPECIALIST FACILITIES [Policy S7]**  
**[Soundness tests: 4B; 4C; 6; 7 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

**Is the strategy for increasing hazardous waste management capacity soundly based and fully justified?**

- (i) Are the figures for hazardous waste management capacity based on robust and credible evidence and are they appropriate for Hampshire?
- (ii) Should the figures in Policy S7 be adjusted to accommodate some of London's waste<sup>8</sup>?
- (iii) Should Policy S7 deal with "common" hazardous wastes, such as batteries and refrigeration gases, and other forms of specialist waste, such as end-of-life vehicles and tyres, and how does it address the WEEE Directive?
- (iv) Should the provision of hazardous waste facilities be subject to environmental and other constraints?
- (v) Should the provisions of Policy 51 of the current M&WLP be carried forward into the M&WDF, particularly with regard to infrastructure and sewerage provision?
- (vi) Paragraphs 19-.2-19.3: Should the text refer to the potential hazards of nutrient run-off from biowaste?

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
New Forest DC  
Southern Water Services  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

East Hampshire DC  
Thames Water Property Services  
GO-SE

<sup>9</sup> See also Policy DC15

<sup>10</sup> The issue of London's waste will principally be dealt with under Policy S3 and may be discussed in greater detail at the end of the hearing sessions

<sup>11</sup> Specific Non-Hazardous LPAs at Bordon & Walkford Farm/Roeshot will be discussed at later sessions of the hearings (Matters 19 & 20) or by written representations

9. **MINERALS – SAND & GRAVEL PROVISION** <sup>12</sup> [Policy S8]  
**[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

**Is the strategy for providing sand and gravel in accordance with national and regional guidance, with proposed provision levels based on sound, robust and credible evidence, reflecting the particular circumstances of Hampshire?**

- (i) Does Policy S8 and the accompanying text reflect national guidance in MPG6 and regional guidance in RPG9 and the emerging South-East Plan, including national and regional guidelines for aggregates and the sub-regional apportionment figure?
- (ii) Does Policy S8 and the accompanying text reflect the requirement to provide a 7-year landbank and address the current state of the County's landbank?
- (iii) Is the proposal for a Strategic Reserve of sand and gravel (2016-2020) fully justified, and should this provision be included in Policy S8, or should the Core Strategy identify sand and gravel sites for the period beyond 2016?
- (iv) Is the plan's emphasis on production rather than supply fully justified, or should sufficient quarries be identified to ensure that the annual apportionment is actually produced, and provide sufficient flexibility to ensure adequate supplies of sand and gravel?
- (v) Is it appropriate to apportion the requirement for land-won sand and gravel between geographical areas at sub-County level, and is the apportionment reasonable and soundly based on evidence?
- (vi) Should the Policy differentiate between soft sand and sand and gravel, and between primary and secondary aggregates supply?
- (vii) How does the strategy address the potential for expansion of marine-dredged sand and gravel?
- (viii) Should Policy S8 include more specific criteria and locational guidance to direct the search for sand and gravel sites?
- (ix) Should land-won sand and gravel extraction be permitted in National Parks & AONBs in exceptional circumstances, and is sand and gravel extraction necessarily incompatible with SSSIs & SPAs?
- (x) Is the principle of Mineral Resource Areas soundly based and fully justified, including consequential inert landfill as part of restoration?
- (xi) Are the specific Mineral Resource Areas shown on the Key Diagram necessary, soundly based and cover an appropriate well-defined geographical area, and should the sub-County areas also be shown?<sup>13</sup>
- (xii) Should Policy S8 specifically exclude "aviation/airfield use" areas?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Trustees of Barker-Mill Estate  
Lafarge Aggregates  
Robert Brett & Son  
Quarry Products Association

Power Triangle  
Land & Mineral Management  
Raymond Brown (Consultancy) Ltd  
Cllr K Heron  
SEERA

**Written representations**

Adams Hendry  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
English Nature/Natural England  
GO-SE  
Council for National Parks  
Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn

New Forest DC  
Chilbolton Parish Council  
Grundon Waste Management  
SLR Consulting Ltd  
Gosport BC  
Sherfield English Parish Council

---

<sup>12</sup> See also Policy DC15

<sup>13</sup> Specific Mineral Resource Areas (eg Walkford Farm/Roeshot) will be discussed later in the hearings (Matter 20) or by written representations

10. **MINERALS – RECYCLED & SECONDARY AGGREGATES [Policy S9]**  
***[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

**Is the strategy for providing recycled and secondary aggregates in accordance with national and regional guidance, with proposed provision levels based on sound, robust and credible evidence, reflecting the particular circumstances of Hampshire?**

- (i) Should there be more distinction between sites for manufacturing recycled and secondary aggregates and other recycling/waste management operations?
- (ii) Are the particular requirements of Aggregate Recycling Facilities adequately recognised in the strategy, or is a separate policy needed?
- (iii) Is the approach of identifying a figure for the supply of recycled/secondary aggregate reasonable and soundly based?
- (iv) Is the process by which sites have been defined for producing aggregates soundly based?
- (v) Paragraph 20.17: Are the figures for recycled construction, demolition and excavation waste accurate?
- (vi) Paragraph 20.19: Are the sites of aggregate recycling facilities correctly identified?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Raymond Brown (Consultancy) Ltd

**Written representations**

Sherfield English Parish Council

11. **MINERALS – CHALK, CLAY, OIL & GAS [Policies S10, S11 & S12]**  
***[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

**Are the policies for extraction of chalk, providing a reserve of brick-making clay and the exploration, appraisal and development of oil and gas appropriate and soundly-based, and in line with national and regional guidance?**

- (i) Policy S11: Is the approach taken to prevent the export of brick-making clay for other uses appropriate for Hampshire, soundly based and fully justified?
- (ii) Policy S11: Is there robust and credible evidence to justify that a sufficient quantity and quality of clay is available to meet the demand for landfill engineering?
- (ii) Policy S12: Is the approach taken to oil and gas exploration and drilling in the National Parks and AONBs consistent with other policies in the Core Strategy, and should oil and gas operations be excluded from the proposed South Downs National Park & AONBs?

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council

Selborne Parish Council [S11]

Environment Agency [S11/S12]

Council for National Parks [S12]

East Hampshire DC [S12]

GO-SE [S11]

Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust [S12]

12. **MINERALS - WHARVES & RAIL DEPOTS [Policy S13 & DC18]**  
***[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

**Is the policy for the provision of wharves and rail depots for the reception and movement of aggregates, recyclables and waste soundly based and appropriate for Hampshire?**

- (i) Is Policy S13 in line with national guidance in MPG6 in terms of safeguarding existing and future wharf facilities needed for the import of materials?
- (ii) Is the provision envisaged in Policy S13 of wharves for future crushed rock and dredged sand and gravel imports adequate and realistic?
- (iii) Should Policy S13 make provision for longer distance transportation of crushed rock, particularly by sea, including deep water wharves?

- (iv) Should Policy S13 address the issue of the threat to crushed rock imports through Southampton Docks and consider the need for alternative deep-sea aggregate wharves?
- (v) To what extent should South Hampshire's aggregate demand be met from marine-dredged sources and imported crushed rock and marine materials?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Quarry Products Association

Adams Hendry (ABP)

**Written representations**

Robert Brett & Son  
GO-SE  
Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

Terence O'Rourke  
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd

**13. MINERALS – SAFEGUARDING AND STERILISATION OF MINERAL RESERVES [Policies S14 & S15]**

*[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

**Is the policy to safeguard existing minerals and waste sites and prevent the sterilisation of mineral deposits soundly based and in line with national and regional guidance?**

- (i) Are Policies S14 & S15 strong enough or will they unduly inhibit development opportunities?
- (ii) How will Policies S14 & S15 safeguard "new" sites identified at a later stage?
- (iii) Does Policy S14 adequately address the needs of the crushed rock trade, particularly in terms of deep water wharves?
- (iv) Paragraph 22.4: how does the review fit with future work on the HM&WDF and should it be broadened in scope?
- (v) Does Policy S15 conform with national guidance in MPG6 and with regional guidance in RPG9 and the draft South-East Plan?
- (vi) Should Policy S15 refer to mineral *deposits* or *resources*, rather than *reserves*?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Robert Brett & Son

Adams Hendry (ABP)  
Quarry Products Association

**Written representations**

Terence O'Rourke  
SEEDA  
GO-SE

East Hampshire DC  
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd

**14. LOCATION, CO-LOCATION, SYSTEMS & INFRASTRUCTURE [Policies S16 & S17]**

*[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]*

**Key issues:**

**Is the strategy of locating waste activities alongside or within areas of new development, providing waste management capacity within major developments, and co-locating compatible minerals and waste activities soundly based and appropriate in Hampshire?**

- (i) Do Policies S16 & S17 adequately recognise the particular requirements of Aggregate Recycling Facilities and other waste recovery sites, or is a separate policy needed?
- (ii) Is it likely that any sites will come forward suitable for large-scale waste management facilities of the type envisaged in Policy S16?
- (iii) Policy S16: is the principle of locating strategic waste management facilities in defined Areas of Search in North-East and South Hampshire soundly based and supported by robust and credible evidence?
- (iv) Paragraph 23.8: Should the text be expanded to recognise the possibility of locating organic waste recycling/composting facilities at existing sewage treatment works?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Raymond Brown Ltd

**Written representations**

Gosport BC  
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd

Thames Water Property Services

15. **SITE SELECTION – Methodology & Factors [Policy S18 & Appendix 2]**  
**[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

**Is the site-selection process set out in Policy S18 and Appendix 2 sufficiently clear, robust and soundly based?**

- (i) Does the site-selection process reflect national guidance in PPS10?
- (ii) Does Policy S18 accurately reflect the process for selecting minerals and waste sites, including the methodology and process in Appendix 2, and is further clarification needed?
- (iii) Does the site-selection process and criteria adequately recognise the particular requirements of aggregate waste recycling facilities?
- (iv) Should minerals and waste sites in the National Parks only be allowed when it is in the public interest, in line with MPG6 and draft MPS1?
- (v) Does the designation of Mineral Resource Areas, Safeguarded Sand & Gravel Deposits & Non-Hazardous Landfill Potential Areas conflict with Policy S18 and the site-selection process?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Quarry Products Association

Raymond Brown (Consultancy) Ltd

**Written representations**

Sherfield English Parish Council  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Gosport BC  
Council for National Parks

16. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL – Environmental Policies [Policies DC1-DC12]**  
**[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]**

**Key issues:**

**Do the policies represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, are they founded on a sound, robust and credible evidence base, and are they consistent with national and regional guidance and other policies in the Core Strategy?**

**Policy DC1 – Sustainable Minerals & Waste Development**

- (i) Are the criteria in paragraph 25.6 appropriate and soundly based?

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

**Policy DC2 – Sites with International & National Designations**

- (i) Does the wording of Policy DC2 reflect national guidance in PPS9 & MPG1, particularly in terms of the European Habitats Regulations and dealing with mineral extraction in National Parks?
- (ii) Paragraph 25.10: Should the text refer to “*unacceptable adverse impact*”, should the policy for major proposals be elevated to the Policy itself, and should the criteria for minor proposals be strengthened?
- (iii) Should the requirement to undertake *Appropriate Assessment* be included in the Policy itself and does the text accurately reflect the procedure?
- (iv) Should *Nationally Designated Sites* include conservation areas and does the test within such areas reflect national guidance in MPG1?
- (v) Does Policy DC2 and accompanying text provide an appropriate level of protection to other heritage features?
- (vi) Should the text point out that mineral extraction is not necessarily incompatible with internationally designated sites provided that restoration is sympathetic to the needs of particular habitats?
- (vii) Is there a need for a policy covering the protection of Protected Species?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Trustees of Barker-Mill Estate

Lafarge Aggregates Ltd

**Written representations**

Council for National Parks  
GO-SE  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust  
English Nature/Natural England

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Berkshire UA JSPU  
National Trust  
English Heritage

### **Policy DC3 – Impact on Landscape & Townscape Development**

- (i) Is the supporting text (paras 25.16-25.17) consistent with Policy DC3 in terms of considering landscape & townscape considerations?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
English Heritage

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

### **Policy DC4 – Historic Heritage**

- (i) Does the wording of the Policy need clarification?  
(ii) Does Policy DC4 provide an appropriate level of protection to the historic heritage, with sufficient consideration of the effect on the historic environment?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Power Triangle

#### **Written representations**

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

English Heritage

### **Policy DC5 – Green Belt**

- (i) Does Policy DC5 accurately reflect national guidance in PPG2;  
(ii) Should Policy DC5 enable time-limited waste operations to be permitted in the Green Belt?  
(iii) Should Policy DC5 indicate that gravel extraction will not be permitted in urban areas where imminent business development is proposed?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Trustees of Barker-Mill Estate

Lafarge Aggregates

#### **Written representations**

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
GOSE

Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn

### **Policy DC6 – Highways**

- (i) Does Policy DC6 adequately address the impact of additional traffic on the road network and adequately address road congestion?  
(ii) Should Policy DC6 indicate that sites which have congested lorry routes should not be chosen for sand and gravel working?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Finchampstead Parish Council

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn

### **Policy DC7 – Biodiversity**

- (i) Is Policy DC7 consistent with national planning guidance in PPS9, particularly with regard to reflecting the need for appropriate compensation?  
(ii) Should Policy DC7 allow development to be permitted where its merits outweigh the likely impact on regional/locally designated sites or protected species, and cross-refer to Policy DC12?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
English Nature/Natural England  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Environment Agency

### **Policy DC8 – Pollution, health, quality of life and amenity**

- (i) Should Policy DC8 consider the impact of minerals and waste development on business and employment opportunities?  
(ii) Should the text refer to PPS10, in particular, the cumulative effect of continued mineral extraction and waste/landfill development on communities?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Sherfield English Parish Council

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn

### **Policy DC9 – Public Safety**

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

### **Policy DC10 – Water Resources**

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Southern Water Services

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Thames Water Property Services

### **Policy DC11 – Flooding**

- (i) Is Policy DC11 in line with national guidance in PPS25, particularly with regard to sewer flooding, the possibility of flooding away from a flood plain as a result of development, and sustainable drainage systems?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Thames Water Property Services

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

### **Policy DC12 – Restoration & after-care**

- (i) Is Policy DC12 in line with national guidance in MPG7 and the Environment Agency's requirements, particularly with regard to the period of aftercare following site restoration?
- (ii) Why is the use of back-up grazing restricted to the New Forest?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Environment Agency  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
GO-SE  
Terence O'Rourke

## **17. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL – Locational Policies [Policies DC13-DC23]**

***[Soundness tests: 4B, 4C, 6, 7 & 9]***

**Key issues:**

**Do the policies represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, are they founded on a sound, robust and credible evidence base, are they consistent with national and regional guidance and other policies in the Core Strategy, and should they include caveats relating to environmental considerations?**

### **Policy DC13 – Waste Management & Recycling**<sup>14</sup>

- (i) Does Policy DC13 reflect national guidance in PPS10?
- (ii) Does Policy DC13 adequately recognise the particular requirements for aggregate waste recycling facilities?
- (iii) Should Policy DC13 include a presumption against locating waste management and recycling facilities within National Parks?
- (iv) Paragraph 25.55: should the text confirm that mineral/landfill sites that are not restored or due to be restored can be regarded as previously developed land?
- (v) Should Policy DC13 identify sites and areas suitable for new/enhanced waste management facilities?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Raymond Brown (Consultancy) Ltd

#### **Written representations**

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Environment Agency  
Sherfield English Parish Council

Council for National Parks  
GO-SE

### **Policy DC14 – Landfill**<sup>15</sup>

- (i) Does the accompanying text (para 25.63) diminish the intention of the Policy?
- (ii) Should Policy DC14 include a presumption against landfill facilities in National Parks, AONBs and the proposed South Downs National Park?
- (iii) Should Policy DC14 include details of monitoring and enforcement?
- (iv) Should landfill sites only be permitted where there is no adverse impact on the environment or surface/ground water, or on the local economy, and require methane to be collected as a power source?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Power Triangle

#### **Written representations**

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
East Hampshire DC

Council for National Parks  
Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn

### **Policy DC15 – Sand & Gravel**<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See also Policies S4 & S5

<sup>15</sup> See also Policy S6

- (i) Should the wording of Policy DC15 be clarified, particularly in terms of application of the criteria?
- (ii) Should Policy DC15 allow sand and gravel extraction in National Parks and AONBs in exceptional circumstances, and is criterion (d) consistent with Policy DC2?
- (iii) Is the presumption against sand and gravel extraction outside the Mineral Resource Area soundly based and fully justified?
- (iv) Should future sand and gravel working be restricted to permitted sites, saved Local Plan sites, and future preferred sites?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Power Triangle  
Quarry Products Association

Trustees of Barker-Mill Estate  
Christchurch Borough Council

**Written representations**

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Council for National Parks  
Terence O'Rourke

Berks UA JSPU  
GO-SE

**Policy DC16 – Chalk**

- (i) Is it appropriate for chalk extraction to be permitted where the need outweighs environmental and other impacts?

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

**Policy DC17 – Clay**

- (i) Is Policy DC17 unduly restrictive in terms of preventing the export of clay from brick-making sites<sup>17</sup>?

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Environment Agency  
Grundon Waste Management  
Terence O'Rourke

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
English Nature/Natural England  
GO-SE

**Policy DC19– Oil & Gas**

- (i) Should Policy DC19 include special consideration for the proposed South Downs National Park?
- (ii) Is Policy DC19 consistent with Policy DC15 in terms of its application to National Parks and AONBs?

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Environment Agency  
English Nature/Natural England  
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
East Hampshire DC  
Winchester City Council  
Council for National Parks

**Policy DC20 – Borrow Pits**

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

**Policy DC21 – Prior Extraction of Minerals**

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Terence O'Rourke

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

**Policy DC22 – Additional plant, buildings and minor development**

**Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
English Nature/Natural England

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC

<sup>16</sup> See also Policy S8

<sup>17</sup> See also Policy S11 (Matter 11)

### **Policy DC23 – Local Development Orders**

- (i) Does the Policy reflect the latest national guidance in Circular 1/2006?
- (ii) Would the Policy unduly affect business and employment sites?

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn  
Council for National Parks

Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Committee for Rural Hampshire  
GO-SE

### **17. KEY DIAGRAM**

#### **Key issues:**

- (i) Should the relationship between the Key Diagram and the Proposals Map be clarified; and should the Key Diagram be at a larger scale and more precise?
- (ii) Should references to the Key Diagram in Policies S8, DC6, DC13, DC14, DC15 & S15 be replaced with “Proposals Map” in order to provide the detail required;
- (iii) Are the minerals and waste lorry routes shown on the Key Diagram appropriate and soundly based?
- (iv) Should the Key Diagram include the latest information on flooding and the extent of flood risk?
- (v) Does the Area of Search for Strategic Facilities in North-East Hampshire conflict with the Thames Basin Heath SPA?
- (vi) Should the Key Diagram distinguish between International and national designated sites and environmental constraints?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Quarry Products Association

#### **Written representations**

Hampshire County Council  
Fair Oak & Horton Heath PC  
Terence O'Rourke  
GO-SE  
Chilbolton Parish Council  
Fareham BC

Finchampstead Parish Council  
Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Assn  
Environment Agency  
Land & Mineral Management Ltd  
SLR Consulting Ltd

### **18. OTHER ISSUES**

#### ***[Soundness tests 2B, 6, 7 & 8]***

#### **a. Document style**

- (i) Is the content and style of the document appropriate?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

West End Parish Council

#### **b. Consultation process**

- (i) Have the consultation arrangements been undertaken in line with the provisions of the Statement of Community Involvement, including local residents and “hard to reach” groups?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

Cllr K Heron

#### **c. Implementation and monitoring**

- (i) Does the Core Strategy contain sufficient targets and milestones relating to the delivery of the policies, with clearly identified delivery mechanisms and timescale for the implementation of policies, along with a clear indication of who is intended to implement each policy?
- (ii) Does the Core Strategy include sufficient targets and indicators to monitor the performance of the strategy and the policies, and are the selected indicators and targets realistic and achievable?

#### **Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council

**19. BORDON NON-HAZARDOUS LANDFILL PROTECTION AREA  
[Policies S6, S8, DC10 & DC14 & Key Diagram]**

**Key issues:**

- (i) Is the proposed Non-Hazardous Landfill Protection Area at Bordon soundly based and fully justified, particularly in terms of the effect on major aquifers?

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
(Environment Agency)

Whitehill Town Council

**Written representations**

Frith End Residents Association

Grundon Waste Management

**20. WALKFORD FARM/ROESHOT MINERAL RESOURCE AREA & NON-HAZARDOUS LANDFILL PROTECTION AREA [Policies S6 & S8 & Key Diagram]**

**Key issues:**

- (i) Is the proposed Mineral Resource Area & Non-Hazardous Landfill Protection Area at Walkford Farm/Roeshot soundly based and fully justified, particularly in terms of :
- a. impact on local highway network and adequacy of access;
  - b. impact on local amenity, including noise, dust, pollution and disruption, and proximity to existing and proposed residential development;
  - c. impact on nature conservation sites, natural beauty and wildlife;
  - d. impact on hydrology and local water table;
  - e. impact on local burial ground and public health;
  - f. impact on the Green Belt, environment, landscape, listed buildings, agricultural land, countryside and tourism

**Attendance at hearing**

Hampshire County Council  
Alan Griffiths  
Chewton Glen Hotel  
Highcliffe Residents Association  
Highcliffe & Walkford Conservative Branch  
(Environment Agency)

John Purves & Rosie Devonshire  
Dr Christopher Day  
Jeremy & Sally Wilkes  
Cllr M Mawbey  
Christchurch BC

**Written representations**

see Council's lists

**21. ISSUES ARISING FROM WILTSHIRE AREA OF NEW FOREST NATIONAL PARK**

***Matters and Issues and participants to be identified following formal submission and representation period***

**HAMPSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE  
CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION**

**KEY DATES**

Inspector's Schedule of Matters  
& Issues for Examination  
and Programme for hearing sessions  
of the Examination published

7 November 2006

Period for making representations  
on the incorporation of Wiltshire  
element of the New Forest National  
Park expires

6 December 2006

Submission of written statements  
responding to Matters & Issues for  
Examination

**19 December 2006**

Comments on statements (if necessary)

**9 January 2007**

**Hearing sessions commence**

**23 January 2007**