

Hampshire Minerals Plan – Regulation 26 Consultation

Basingstoke & North East Hampshire Local Workshop – 23rd November 2007

Attendees:

Councillor Peter Bradley (Micheldever Parish Council)
Councillor Hugo Eastwood (Hart District Council)
Councillor Liz Hawkesworth (Micheldever Parish Council)
Councillor Mike Locksley (Silchester Parish Council)
Councillor David Simpson (Yateley North)
Councillor Pete Tidey (Eversley Parish Council)
Councillor Philip Todd (Eversley Parish Council)
Councillor David Wandless (Micheldever Parish Council)
Mr Stewart Apsey (Local Resident)
Mrs Teresa Aspey (Local Resident)
Mr Bruce Blaine (John Stacey & Sons Ltd)
Mr Alastair Cochran (Local Resident)
Mr Dick Crick (Local Resident)
Mr Derick Cullen (Local Resident)
Mr R Futchter (Kingsclere Lime Quarry)
Mr Julian Rowse (Local Resident)
Mr Colin Stone (John Stacey & Sons Ltd)
Mr Douglas Symes (D K Symes)
Mr Michael Tye (Lambert Smith Hampton)
Mr Peter Woodham (North Hampshire & West Berkshire Joint Action Group)

Question and Answer Session:

Q1. If an area has an existing quarry with associated problems, is this taken into consideration and why are sites being extended?

A. It is a factor that is considered. The problem is that sand and gravel can only be extracted where it exists. Allocations have to be made otherwise the inspector will do it themselves.

Q2. Using peak production rates only three plants can cover the allocations, why are four proposed and why are three in Eversley?

A. It is where sand and gravel is found in the area. If the maths in the document are incorrect, this should be highlighted in the consultation.

Q3. Environmental designations (SPAs / SSSIs) have meant that some sites have been rejected, why are some sites such as Buster (covered by designations) still being considered?

A. The reasons for the designations are important and sometimes, the restoration following extraction can be beneficial to the designation objectives.

Q4. Sites are already located in the area. Where will the access be and would there be a tunnel adjoining the sites? The existing gravel pit is good and there are no issues. There is concern that if a new site opens up there will be a separation. Screening is needed along Mortimers Road. There is also concern over the impact of extra HGVs.

A. Hanson has put forward the site and if the site was to go through into the Plan, these issues would be covered by the planning application process. The current proposal is to run a conveyor under the road to the existing site, once the existing site has finished. Therefore, there should be no increase in HGV movements.

Q5. Has there been consultation with Highways and road transport studies undertaken?

A. We have received comments, but more extensive transport studies are to be undertaken.

Q6. How would money be spent on improvements?

A. The operator would fund improvements as part of the site if possible.

Q7. Butser triangle was considered by regulatory committee and refused, why is it still being considered?

A. The site is going through an appeal process. If the appeal is refused, the site will be withdrawn.

Comment: By making the site a 'preferred option' this is helping the operators.

A. Point taken.

Q8. If Buster triangle is withdrawn, would the site to the north also be removed from the plan? Also, there is no information on timescales.

A. If the appeal is refused, we cannot clarify whether the north site will be used. Its feasibility would need to be assessed. Timescales are granted under planning permissions but are market dependent.

Q9. What the County do to ensure operators do what they are supposed to?

A. The County Council has a monitoring and enforcement team and they also work with the Environment Agency.

Q10. When will the preferred areas be finalised and can Human Rights be taken into consideration?

A. It is expected that the Plan will be adopted in 2009. I am unable to answer the question on Human Rights. It is a legal issues and people are recommended to contact Planning Aid to get more information on this issue.

Q11. Is there any recompense for Parishes?

A. Money may be available through the Aggregates Levy and, Sustainability Fund and community benefits from section 106 agreements. Section 106 agreements cannot be forced. The plan aims to negotiation nature conservation, recreation and public access restoration schemes.

Q12. The screening at the Lafarge site is not appropriate, what is happening to enforce that? Also Star Hill has been eliminated but is still appearing on local land surveys for housing sales, which is causing a blight on property in the areas affected.

A. The Star Hill site was considered as part of the Issues and Options consultation and that information is available on the website and cannot be removed as an audit trail is required. The Council is aware of the issues at the Lafarge site. Property owners are recommended to contact planning aid if they want to find out if they are liable for compensation.

Q13. There is an issue with rats at landfill sites. How are the holes going to be filled up at the Benyons Estate?

A. Household waste is not proposed at Benyons enclosure.

Proposals

Mortimer Quarry Extension (pPA8)

Issues that relate to the area

- Site is unsuitable.
- Highways agreement already on the site and there are issues with surfacing.
- Concern over recreational uses (rights of way and bridleways).
- Need to consider Natural England's response to the proposal.
- New quarry will create additional impacts.
- Concern over high traffic levels. Speed of existing traffic is excessive.
- Concern over impact on caravan site.
- Concern over impact on water table.
- Demand for sand and gravel and quality is petering out.

How the proposal should be worked

- S106 on highways and changes in speed limit.

How the proposal should be restored

- Restoration to proper habitat.
- Nature conservation benefits.

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)

- Boundary should be revised at northern and southern edge.

Eversley Common Quarry Extension (pPA9)

Issues that relate to the area

- Site has been thrown out twice already.
- Site should be kept as two separate sites (north and south).
- Small site but has been extended to make it more viable.
- Extension is a significant issue to the local residents.
- Other sites removed due to European designations (SPAs etc) and 50% of the site is covered – why not removed?
- Concern that the site is being promoted to keep adjacent processing plant going.
- The amount of screening required on the site makes it unviable.
- Concern over HGV movements.
- Concern over dust issues.
- Water supplies to the local area are across farmland.
- Concern over nature conservation (SPA) and ecology.
- Need clarification on timescales.
- Site is unsuitable.

How the proposal should be worked

- The plan states it would take 8 years to extract – maximum should be 4 years.
- Minimum 50m boundary east and west makes the site unworkable.

- Screening required. Boundary planting should be done 10 years before work starts.
- Phasing needs to be carefully considered due to housing in the north.
- S106 and using existing access.
- Conveyor under road.

How the proposal should be restored

- Open heathland with further rights of way.
- No commercial forestry.
- No agriculture.
- Agriculture.

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)

- Site should be split into two separate sites.

Eversley Quarry Extension (pPA10)

Issues that relate to the area

- By using a conveyor and implementing infrastructure will make the whole area feasible and Berkshire likely to be given an extension.
- Access by road or conveyor. If access off main road, it would open the site for development.
- Concern over traffic and proximity to village.
- Unprocessed gravel taken through the village would cause disturbance and via Cross Lane is not suitable for HGVs as too narrow.
- A lot of the area is priority habitat.
- If no processing facility, material will have to be removed by lorry.
- Volume of aggregate site has, it has a disproportionate impact on residents.
- Concern over impact on conservation area,
- Concern over impact on residents and school.
- Flooding in area to the north.
- B3272 traffic is very busy. B3016 also very busy with cut through to A30. Roads are at capacity.
- Cumulative impact on the area.
- Unsuitable site.
- Wet working.

How the proposal should be worked

- Conveyor belt to nearby site.
- Extracted as fast as possible.
- No further extensions given.
- Drainage scheme (mitigate against flooding).
- Use of existing tunnel under the road.
- Screening.

How the proposal should be restored

- Increase biodiversity and recreation.
- Some open water, reed beds and access for the public.
- Village green / common.
- To best needs of the community.
- Pasture.

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)

- Boundary is incorrect.

- Area prone to flooding in the north should be excluded.

Kingsclere Lime Quarry (pAPA6)

Issues that relate to the area

- In AONB.
- A339 – very busy at peak hours. High traffic movements and volume. Don't want HGVs through Kingsley.
- Four miles to the north – Greenham Business Park, proposal for warehousing which will increase HGVs. Concern over cumulative impact.
- Road is wide and good. 'A' road and access to other roads.
- Concern over lorries crossing busy traffic.
- Well screened.
- Remote.
- Not much noise.
- No faith in operators paying for road improvements.
- No visibility for the public.

How the proposal should be worked

- No peak movements (avoiding 7-9am and 5-6pm).
- Traffic/highways survey / impact assessment.
- Effective monitoring.
- Safe access / turning space.
- Traffic routing.
- Screening.
- Roundabout at entrance (costly). Slow people down the hill.
- Link junction and link roads.
- Maintain visibility of the road.

How the proposal should be restored

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)

Micheldever Rail Depot (pAPA7)

Issues that relate to the area

- Better site than Basingstoke.
- Access – bridge from Andover roads.
- Transporting materials off site – potential problems with a need to create access onto Overton Road and introducing street lighting and road improvements to the A303.
- Concerns over Micheldever New Town proposals creating a short-term demand for this site.
- Site likely to be an option until Basingstoke brought forward.
- Weight limit on bridge to the south of the site.

How the proposal should be worked

How the proposal should be restored

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)

- Access point highlighted (northwest corner) but problems with loading over main line and topography.

Basingstoke Rail Depot (pAPA8)

Issues that relate to the area

- Doesn't look big enough to be worthwhile.
- Would have to be road based.
- Access?
- Market interest in this site.
- Basingstoke appears favourable to operate and would have less impacts than Micheldever.
- Need to consider quality of views from local businesses.
- Impacts need assessment.

How the proposal should be worked

How the proposal should be restored

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)

Mortimer Quarry Extension (pPA8)

Issues that relate to the area

How the proposal should be worked

How the proposal should be restored

How the boundary should be revised (see maps)