

# Hampshire Minerals Plan – Regulation 26 Consultation

## Romsey & Waterside Local Event

### Meeting Notes - Summary

#### Attendees:

Cllr Gordon Bailey MBE (Test Valley District Council – Blackwater)  
Cllr Mark Cooper (Romsey Town)  
Cllr Brian Dash (Hythe and Dibden)  
Cllr George Dart (Totton and Eling Town Council)  
Cllr Christopher Duxbury (Longparish Parish Council)  
Cllr Alan Glass (Fawley Parish Council)  
Cllr K Lord (Fawley Parish Council)  
Cllr Jenny Mills (Romsey Extra Parish Council)  
Cllr Kay Murrant (Awbridge Parish Council)  
Cllr Jim Neal (Longparish Parish Council)  
Cllr Caroline Nokes (Romsey Extra)  
Cllr John Parker (Romsey Extra Parish Council)  
Cllr Roy Perry (Romsey Extra)  
Cllr Paul Vickers (Beaulieu, Brockenhurst, Denny Lodge, East Boldre, Exbury and Lepe Parish Council)  
Steve Bowley (Planning Consultant – Michelmersh Brickworks)  
John Biggs (Power Triangle)  
Ian Bullivant (BKP Group)  
Jon Brazier (Shootash Against Gravel Extraction – SAGE)  
David Croll (SAGE)  
Steve Cole (Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd)  
Ray Dixon (Sherfield English Environmental Protection Society)  
Tony Finlason (Awbridge Quarry Action Group – AQAG)  
Paul Freeman (Michelmersh Brick Group)  
Michael Gratton (Romsey & District Society)  
Edward Gerry (New Forest District Council)  
Adrian Harbridge (Winchester Diocese)  
June Hoar (Sherfield English Environmental Protection Society)  
Mark Howard (Waltet Materials Ltd)  
James Iles (Test Valley District Council)  
Steve Lamb (Tarmac)  
Philip Liddell (Ace Liftaway)  
Graham Parkes (Hythe and Dibden Parish Council)  
Shirley Rogers (Romsey & District Society)  
Euan Russell (Broadlands Estate)  
John Salmon (Land and Mineral Management Ltd)  
Nicola Salvidge (R. F. Salvidge Farms Ltd)  
Phil Sands (Campaign to Protect Rural England – CPRE Test Valley District Group)  
Jean Sutton (Power Triangle)  
Malcolm Wade (Hythe and Dibden Parish Council)  
Paul Waring (CGM Solicitors)  
Patrick Warrener (AQAG)

## Question & Answer Session

Q1. It was stated that the Roke proposed preferred area would be returned in better condition than it is in currently. This was claimed to be the case at the Ridge site, which it is now proposed to become a permanent facility.

- A. There is a need for processing sites and it is believed that the Ridge site has potential for a second life. The situation has changed from 20 years ago. Raymond Brown have been working with the Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council to restore the Ridge site and this restoration process has not ceased.

Q2. The Inspector ruled that the Ridge site was not just premature but a totally unsuitable site. The people living near to the Ridge site have suffered long enough, when will the site be restored?

Q3. How long would the Squabb Wood and Roke sites operate for?

- A. Squabb is expected to operate until 2013. Roke would be 8 – 9 years for the combined sites.

Q4. Other proposals are located in rural or semi-rural areas, but Forest Lodge Farm is adjacent to an urban area. The Forest Lodge Farm proposed preferred area would have a major impact on the quality of life of residents of Butts Ash, what will be done to mitigate that?

- A. The details are yet to be worked out, but Raymond Brown are confident that they can mitigate and manage as other sites have been. The proposal involves straight forward extraction, not much processing. The main impact is likely to be traffic.

Response – More information on lorry movements, noise and dust impacts should be provided.

Q5. What are the widths of the hedgerows proposed at the Roke site and are both Ridge and Roke sites proposed for recycling?

- A. Ridge is proposed to be a strategic facility due to the amount of investment required. The problem is that they are transient. The County Council are committed to 1.7 million tonnes of recycled and secondary aggregate. This can be met either through greater imports or new sites. The industry is meeting the needs of society and the community. The Ridge site is in an ideal location due to its good access links to the M27 and markets. There is no intention of using Roke as a long-term recycling site. Details of mitigation can be found in the Planning Application which is available on the Hampshire County Council website.

Q6. There is an emergency access route for the petrochemical plant through the Forest Lodge Farm proposed preferred area. There are also four nationally important gas/oil pipelines running through the south of the site. How is it proposed that these will be taken into account and where is the proposed access point?

- A. The proposed access on the northwest edge of the site (where the 37 PO is shown on the location plan). The access would be screened and a slip road would be used. A conveyor could be run under the emergency access road and Raymond Brown is in discussion with Esso with regard to the pipelines. Raymond Brown is currently operating a site in [Dorset?] which contains pipelines and therefore have experience in operating in these conditions.

Q7. Is there a policy that states that one site has to be worked out before another starts? In which case, Roke and Squabb Wood could not be worked together. If parts of the Roke site could not be worked, then they should not be shown on the plan. Have cumulative impacts been taken into consideration?

A. The plan shows an area of search and the exact boundaries are to be confirmed (as part of this consultation process). Cumulative impacts are being considered and Mott Gifford are providing advise on traffic impacts.

Q8. Transportation is a major concern. Hampshire County Council produced lorry routes documents 10 years ago but were never ratified. Lorries should be confined to the strategic road network. Roads near Forest Lodge Farm are already over capacity. Will proper traffic feasibility studies be done?

A. Traffic feasibility studies will be undertaken.

Q9. Why doesn't the landowner of the Cutty Brow proposed preferred area know about the proposal?

A. The landowner is aware and Tarmac have had a legal option on the mineral since 1992. The site would be restored with inert material.

Q10. Some reassurance that work has been undertaken on the Forest Lodge farm would be appreciated as so far the approach has been "trust us, we know what we're doing".

A. The identification of the proposed preferred area is the result of a long examination into possible sites to meet government requirements. There are limited opportunities for suitable sand and gravel. The purpose of this consultation is to help Hampshire County Council get complete understanding of the proposals. Comments area welcomed.

## **Proposal Specific Comments:**

### **Cutty Brow (pPA1)**

#### *Issues that relate to the area*

- The site has good access.
- The site is away from urban areas.
- The site is in the right spot environmentally and is not close to any housing.

#### *How the proposal should be worked*

#### *How the proposal should be restored*

#### *How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

### **Roke (pPA2)**

#### *Issues that relate to the area*

- Need guarantee on the timetable for extraction.
- There are concerns that there would be sufficient inert material to restore the site.
- There are concerns regarding the collective term 'Roke' for Roke Manor and Stanbridge Ranvilles. The new term was not discussed with Raymond Brown.
- Consideration should be given to waiting until Squabb Wood is finished before commencing on Roke and then the Squabb Wood access could be used.

- Need to consider the redirection route of the Test Way. Also need to consider impact of dust and noise on public using the footpath.
- Need to consider the noise levels of the two sites working together – cumulative impacts. There is also likely to be a noise issue at the Shootash end of the site.
- Need to consider cumulative impacts of sites (Squabb Wood, Timsbury and Kimbridge etc).
- Roke Manor would have a 10 year life – if this it goes on longer there should be penalties.
- Consideration should be given to the proximity of residents to the site and the processing plant.
- Need more detail on the location of the washing facility.
- Access to the A27 could only be gained through the new site (Stanbridge Ranvilles).
- Need to guarantee that lorries don't use Danes Road route.
- There are school playing fields near the site (Emily Park?).
- Examples of where two sites working in close proximity (as is proposed) in the UK would be useful.
- Need to consider traffic growth over next 15 years.
- The proposal is a non-starter due to access point and dangerous road.
- Need to consider historic landscape.
- Scale of the proposal will have an impact on the landscape.
- Need to consider traffic impact on school to the south.
- An extended period of time will mean that many sites are active at the same time – cumulative impact.
- The site has been preferred since 1995/7.
- Stanbridge Ranvilles is a recent addition.
- The site has never come up at Parish Council meetings.

#### *How the proposal should be worked*

- More traffic studies are required.
- More research should be undertaken on the possible access route through Squabb Wood.
- Site would need a turning circle as the road is unsuitable.
- If joint access with Squabb Wood can't be achieved – there should be no right turn. There should be a left turn access – back towards Romsey (not through White parish/Sherfield English).
- Need to ensure that an agreed timetable is enforced.
- The site should be worked when Squabb Wood is completed.
- Proposed access between two bungalows is not ideal.
- A turning lane would be required to prevent traffic building up.
- The material should be moved via a conveyor.
- There is no point having a second access (i.e. in addition to the Squabb access).
- Good bungalows shouldn't be demolished.
- Impacts need to be mitigated.
- Bunding and planting are needed in advance.
- The working should be phased.

#### *How the proposal should be restored*

- Concerns over the height of Squabb wood.
- The Test Way is of prime importance.
- Need to ensure that restoration retains the existing topography.
- The site should be restored as quickly as possible and the plans should be enforced.
- The site should be restored to its existing condition (agriculture, forest, countryside).
- Public access should be included in the restoration proposals.
- Wildlife habitats should be created.
- The site should not be built on.

### *How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

- Boundary should be revised to reduce noise impacts at the Shootash end of the site.
- Entrance should be shown.
- Location plans should show the correct boundaries – as supplied by Raymond Brown.
- Plans currently show indicative boundaries and proposals need to be firmed up.
- The boundary is not wrong per se but need to consider the cumulative impact including Squabb Wood.
- The Test Way is a flagship route - the size of the site should be reduced on the eastern edge and conveyors should be used.
- The unsuitability of the roads should be shown on the location plan.
- The location of the process plant should be shown.

## **Forest Lodge Farm**

### *Issues that relate to the area*

- The cumulative impact of traffic is an issue. Transport is a serious concern.
- At the Dibden Inquiry there were plans to dual the A326 due to potential traffic impacts.
- The need for a dual carriageway still stands due to people using road for 'rat runs'.
- The impact on the local community is a major issue. The site is on the edge of a large community.
- Ownership of the site is an issue.
- Need to consider improvements in employment prospects.
- There is not enough slack in the traffic to add more pressure.
- There are implications of the location of pipelines and emergency routes.
- More information on the significance of soft sand would be helpful.
- Need to consider whether there is a choice between this site and Daedalus.
- Site was a strategic gap but designation was removed. Still provides amenity.
- Close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.
- Need to consider the hydrological impacts.
- Need to consider the Hazard Zone for the oil refinery.
- Need to consider noise, traffic (A326), safety of walkers and cyclists, visual impacts, air impacts, dust and health impacts.
- The proposed access is near where children play.
- It is proposed to make a cycle way along the A326.
- Need to consider the route of the Solent Way.
- Unused space is proposed for employment land.
- The northern part of the site is near historic landscape with archaeological potential.
- The proposals will have a negative impact on brand new housing.
- The description of the site should read 'north of Fawley' not 'north of Marchwood'.
- The proposed access is directly opposite a housing estate junction and is a primary route into Hythe and already has HGVs. Safety is an issue.
- The proposal would have major amenity impacts on residents.
- Need to consider airport safety.
- There is concern over the value of the mineral and the demand for landfill.
- The site is in the PUSH area but there is a long distance after A326.

### *How the proposal should be worked*

- Timings of the site need to be clarified – rumours that 2016 is proposed.
- The carriageway should be dual.
- A new entrance should be considered (from the south near the roundabout – see accompanying plan).

- The Fawley line should be re-opened for use by the site and then afterwards by passengers.
- The site should be restored to open space.
- A buffer is need to protect residential areas and environmental areas.
- The proposal should be short-term.
- Need to consider dust suppression and traffic management.
- The site should be phased.
- There should be landscaping on the western boundary.
- There needs to be mitigation for residents living nearby.

*How the proposal should be restored*

- Back-up grazing should be included.
- The site should be restored to its existing use.
- The restoration proposals should include amenity land for the local community (strategic land).
- The site should remain open.
- Restoration could preserve the strategic gap.
- Comments have already been made at the issues and options stage of the plan-making process.
- The site should be restored to provide for recreational purposes i.e. sport pitches and changing room facilities.

*How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

- Incompatible with surrounding areas.
- Significantly reduce the site – use predominately the southern site.
- Boundary need to take into account the bunds that would be required.
- The proposed access should shown to be at the south of the site.
- The plan should show the pipes.
- The northern part of the site should not be sued.

**Michelmersh Areas of Search (pAS3-5)**

*Issues that relate to the area*

- Proximity to housing (Area A particularly).
- Unique reserve / situation.
- Landscape of Area A is steep and therefore highly visible.
- The location is dependent on availability of the mineral.
- The local people are used to the situation.
- The company is a local employer.
- The site is close to a conservation area.
- The brickworks area valuable facility.
- Consideration should be given to safeguarding all of the site to ensure the future of the brickworks.
- A nearby resident who backs on to an existing site isn't aware of any problems.
- Michelmersh requires a long-term strategy.
- Need to consider issues and mitigation now and get plotting in place.
- The extraction includes short intense bursts of working on site, which can be noisy but the local residents are aware.
- The site is close to residents on the north-east side.

*How the proposal should be worked*

- The operator should look after the local residents.
- Need to include solid buffer zones close to existing housing – not just a bund.
- Advanced planting should be included.

- Mitigation need to be considered in the next 2/3 years

#### *How the proposal should be restored*

- Restoration plans need to consider the Test valley Biodiversity Action Plan, which also identified biodiversity opportunities.
- Need to consider Habitats Regulation Assessment and the proximity to Mottisfont Bats (importance of hedgerows).
- Potential for lake restoration.
- Sites closest to A3057 should be restored to agriculture.
- Sites close to the village could be restored to possibly nature conservation or amenity.
- Any potential for development should be a decent / lasting scheme.
- The village should be asked what they would want.

#### *How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

### **Ridge**

#### *Issues that relate to the area*

- The site should not be considered due to the appeal decision.
- The appeal decision was to restore the site.
- It is the wrong location for a permanent site.
- Lack of trust over timescales.
- There is a demand for recycling of inert materials.
- There has been a lack of proactive searches for suitable sites.
- The site should be considered a 'countryside' (as per inspectors report). Therefore the proposal is development in the countryside.
- The site should be called Ridge 'Farm' not 'Quarry'.
- The proposal is an extension of a temporary use into permanent industrial use.
- Need to consider the nearest houses (not in ownership of the operators).
- A lot of land around the site has been restored.
- Weather has hindered the restoration of the site recently.
- The site only had temporary permission in the first place.
- Bad access in the south-east corner of the site.

#### *How the proposal should be worked*

- The Inspector said that site should not be considered.
- It is felt that the site has been worked enough already.
- The impact on the local environment is likely to be very high.
- There is potential for screening during working.
- The site shouldn't be worked.
- The policing of the existing conditions seems very limited. There should be more rigorous enforcement of existing conditions (Hampshire County Council and Environment Agency).
- Local residents find it difficult when applicants play the system.

#### *How the proposal should be restored*

- The site should already be restored to agriculture.
- The inspector stated it was "premature".
- Not sure there is sufficient justification for the site.
- The site is a good example of why people don't like mineral sites.
- The site should be restored to countryside or meeting agricultural needs.

*How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

## **Squabb Wood (EXE4)**

*Issues that relate to the area*

- More information on proposed height increase (of surcharge) and timetable is required (i.e. how many years the site would be extended).
- Need to consider the impact on the school to the south.
- Need more reassurance of impact proposals on Habitats Directive (SSSIs etc)
- Need to check the designation of site (western edge)
- Concern over traffic problems – need to have designated routes for lorries.
- Need to consider environmental issues.
- Need to consider pollution.
- Landfill legislation would reduce the lorry movements by 60%.
- The site has been running for too long already. The site should stop for the amenity and quality of life of the local residents.
- Access is the main issue.
- There is ‘grim acceptance’ that the site will have to continue.
- Need to consider the cumulative impact.
- Planning permissions need to be tighter to ensure the end date is achieved.
- Permissions should not be extended or drive by commercial demands of the operators.
- County stopped surcharging years ago and there is surprise that this is being reconsidered.

*How the proposal should be worked*

- There is a need to force operators to stick to their timescales.
- There should be one access and the local planning authority should compulsory purchase the access route to ensure this route is used.
- Cannot equate surcharging with quarrying, they will be sequential.
- Need to manage impacts.

*How the proposal should be restored*

- The existing landscaping quality is not up to standard.
- The site should be restored to woodland.
- The restoration should be in consultation with original landowner.
- The site adjoins woodland and the site should be restored back to this.
- Access should be improved for the local community including an informal recreational area.
- Need to improve any future attempts.

*How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

## **Bunny Lane (EXE2)**

*Issues that relate to the area*

- Traffic issues – access and routes (there are height restrictions through Romsey and therefore, only one route can be taken). The route passes a number of domestic dwellings and affects their structure. A3057 preferred route.
- The area is heavily worked and access roads are damaged (litter etc).
- Off-site issues need to be address to prevent public discomfort.
- Proximity to housing and proposed new development to the north.
- Need to consider the location of markets.

- More information on why landfill is still required would be helpful.
- This is the best location to have the site as it is existing.
- Need to consider potential impacts on groundwater.
- Need to consider insitu recycling.
- The site is not suitable for household waste.
- Need to consider water quality issues (to stream from old site). The site is very close to watercourses.
- Casbrook Common is not a bad site.
- Need a precautionary approach to pollution.
- Need to ensure cumulative impacts are being considered.
- The site is not suitable for MBT and should be discussed as part of the Waste Management Plan.
- The site is good.
- The site needs heavy engineering.
- The change in waste would lead to methane.
- There are no existing problems with leachate.
- Hunts Farm quarry has been in a dreadful state for 20 years.
- The site has also been in a bad state and landfill could help improve it.

*How the proposal should be worked*

- Lorry routes need to be used.
- Need a traffic plan for the whole area taking into account cumulative effects.
- Phasing would help reduce impact of increased traffic.
- Need to maintain access roads.
- The proposal will put a lot of pressure on recycling facility – ideally need a new one to the south side which may mitigate traffic.

*How the proposal should be restored*

- There is existing planning permission that the site should be restored to agriculture.
- The original topography shouldn't be changed too much.
- To put any reasonable volume in, land would have to rise considerably.
- The site should not be a community centre as it is too far out.

*How the boundary should be revised (see maps)*

- Need to consider how the proposed boundary meets with the existing quarry site (now disused).