

**Winchester and East Hants Local Event Meeting
4 September 2006**

Attendees

1. Cllr. Anthony Williams (East Hampshire District Council)
 2. Cllr. Judy Onslow (East Hampshire District Council)
 3. Robert Mulleady (Local Resident)
 4. Cllr. Andrew Luff (Headley Parish Council)
 5. Steve Lamb (Tarmac Limited)
 6. Cllr. Chris Wain (Whitehill Parish Council)
 7. Colin Neville (Clerk – Kingsley Parish Council)
 8. David Graham (Local Resident)
 9. Audrey Graham (Local Resident)
 10. Bill Griffiths (Envar Ltd – Area Manager South East)
 11. John Collins (Veolia Waste Management)
 12. Cllr. Stephen Godfrey (Winchester City Council)
 13. Cllr M. Wright (Winchester City Council)
 14. Cllr M. Kemp- Gee (Hampshire County Council – Chair)
 15. Nat. Belderson (South Downs Joint Committee)
 16. Alison Wood (East Hampshire District Council)
 17. David A. Ashcroft (Local Resident)
-

Questions and Answers

Q. What if a mineral site selected is on privately owned land?

A. Even if a site is identified as a preferred area it will still need planning permission to be developed. The landowner will need to agree to the proposal in order for it to be deliverable, if the landowner is not interested the site will not be considered.

Q. What if the land owner doesn't let you use the site?

A. The site won't go in as plan as the sites need to be deliverable.

Q. Once the document is out, it will be too late for the public to respond. The system needs to warn the public that we are in early consultation.

A. This will always be an unpopular process – the requirement is to find the 'least worst' sites. One of the concerns is not having enough sites - which is why we have included some omission sites from the last plan. If the landowner does not want to pursue the site we will not include it. It is better to consult on a long list of potential sites and thin it down than consult on a short list and find we have to re-consult because there are not enough sites.

Q. It would be better to consult District Councils and Parish Councils confidentiality first to give them a chance to warn the public.

A. That's partly why this evening is being held and you as community representatives have been invited.

Q. Many of the sites have poor transport links, with inadequate access, such as narrow lanes. It is hoped that these sites will be discounted from the process at some stage. The Herriard site – a composting site near Basingstoke - has been a successful site. Sites should be located on brownfield land or industrial estates.

A. Highway evaluation has been superficial up to now because of the Local Transport Plan but we are now working on getting a better highways input. We need more sites to look at and are happy to receive any suggestions. There will be opportunities to consider sites that may come much later down the line (even at the sessions with the planning inspector) but these would need to have been subject to sustainability appraisal.

Q. Southampton City Council, Portsmouth City Council and the New Forest National Park Authority are all listed as partners in the plan-making process - why has Winchester City Council not been included?

A. Winchester City Council is not a Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. Winchester were consulted on the 'core' Strategy as they are a Statutory Consultee and an informal discussion with planning officers about sites has taken place. This is only the first, informal stage of the consultation on sites as we are only at the very start of the process.

Q. 60% of human waste is getting disposed of in the Winchester City District.

A. This is a water company issue regulated by the Environment Agency. It is not controlled by Hampshire CC.

Q. Most sites are in the Kingsley ward, but the ward was not consulted on the Strategy: now they are being asked to say 'yes or no' to sites.

A. There were three rounds of full consultation- starting with the Material Resources Strategy (MRS) process. It was a very thorough process to develop the strategy and it is unfortunate that it didn't get to the councillor involved. Notice of the consultation appeared in sixteen newspapers across Hampshire and the relevant Parish and District Councils were informed.

Q. What is the timetable and how much do you plan to thin the list of sites by preferred options?

A. This depends on the type of sites and where it is. Requirements will vary from place to place. Landfill will need to be thinned down and prioritised as we don't want to provide too much capacity. All recycling and composting sites in acceptable locations should be included in the plan.

Workshop - Site Comments

Specific Sites

SITE	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
<i>EAST HAMPSHIRE</i>	
EHS 001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is already the subject of a composite planning application (F30633/012/CMA), which was first put to the Regulatory Committee on 19th July 2006. • The inclusion of the site in the Strategic Minerals Plan should be dependent on the outcome of the planning application. • Comments on the application have already been made. • There must be a careful handling of all the sites in this area including a consideration of the ‘whole’, for example, management/ aftercare and subsequent use must be taken into consideration. • There are likely to be long term issues. • The Environment Agency would not allow landfill. • There is likely to be local opposition.
EHS 002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site proposal is a slightly altered version of a planning application (F30633/006/CMA – HCC Ref: EH121), which was refused by the HCC Roads & Development Sub-Committee in January 2001. • Most of the reasons for the rejection of the 2001 proposal are still valid. • The operator continues to suggest that policy permits the extraction of clay, for which no need has been demonstrated, in order to create an artificial landfill cavity some 1,600,000 cubic metres on a highly visible hillside. • The 2001 proposal was for hazardous waste, the current proposal is for non-hazardous waste. • HCC has previously acknowledged that the deposit of non-hazardous waste in this location would be unacceptable to the Environment Agency. • The proposal is made despite the existence of sufficient inert landfill capacity for the next ten years. • The proposal is made despite the claim by the operator that insufficient inert waste is available to honour his existing planning obligation to infill and restore the adjacent sand quarry to pre-excavation levels. Either one claim or the other is clearly fallacious. • The clay excavated from the hillside would not be used for brick-making or landfill engineering. • The site is not an existing void, within an existing sand or gravel quarry, nor would clay extraction be incidental to the extraction of sand or gravel. • The proposed development would not be a small-scale extension to the existing clay extraction area permitted on the site. The existing clay extraction is limited to 308,000 cubic metres. • The site is not a preferred area in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. • The site is not within the area shown on the key diagram for non-hazardous landfill.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naturally occurring earth spoils to go into landfill - not inert or hazardous. • There is concern over the proximity to residential properties. • There may be effects on the water table/aquifer/river. • The haul Road already provides good access. • There must be a careful handling of all the sites and a consideration of the sites as a 'whole', for example, management/ aftercare and subsequent use must be taken into consideration. • The issues are likely to be long term. • There is likely to be public opposition. • Grundons as operator have been problematic.
EHS 003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is next to the sewage works and is a good location. • There are industrial sites next door. • The site is adjacent to the A31 and the access is good. • The site is well screened, but there maybe some visual impact. • Some office uses maybe affected. • The proximity to the river may be an issue.
EHS 004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is completely derelict. • A new A3 junction is proposed right on top of the site. • Road improvements may reduce the size of the site, making it too small to bother with. • The surrounding area has been restored back to common land. • There is good access onto the A3. • There is a need for good landscaping. • The site is not suitable. • The site is next to major environmental designations. • There is potential for a closed facility which is enhanced / contained.
EHS 009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is an existing permitted site. • The site needs restoring to the quality outlined in the planning permission. • There may be impact on the aquifer. • The site is unsuitable for landfill and is likely to be problematic.
EHS 010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has poor access and traffic on local roads and the A325 would be problematic. • There is a listed building adjacent to the site. • The proposal would result in the destruction of local amenity. • Restoration of the site could not be done properly. • The site is near a school and housing. • The site is unsuitable.
EHS 011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is small and expansion of the site should be investigated. • The site is in a good location for transport. • There are no residents to be disturbed. • Question the moving of the South Downs National Park boundary. However, the site should not be excluded due to the National Park.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exact location is unclear- is it in cadets area? Have MOD released it? • Longmoor Road is not an industrial estate. • The site is brownfield. • The Local County Councillor had objections.
EHS 015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is believed to be MOD land and unlikely to be released. • Procuring the site would be a difficult process.
EHS 016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is believed to be MOD land and unlikely to be released. • Procuring the site would be a difficult process.
EHS 017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be a careful handling of all the sites and a consideration of the sites as a 'whole', for example, management/ aftercare and subsequent use must be taken into consideration. • The issues are likely to be long term. • There is likely to be public opposition. • The site is on private land and they are not in support of extraction. • To extract from the site would destroy the Wey Valley. It is unlikely it will be possible to restore it to its original state. • Local residents have put up with mineral extraction for years but want to be NIMBYs. They have had to put up with it at both ends of the village. • There may be implications for the aquifer. • There is potential for traffic problems if the site is accessed on to the A335. • Trottsford farm is a listed building and there may impacts on its setting. • The site is adjacent to the original site. • The new site would be environmentally detrimental. • The site is adjacent to a bridleway and Right of Way.
EHS 018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be a careful handling of all the sites and a consideration of the sites as a 'whole', for example, management/ aftercare and subsequent use must be taken into consideration. • The issues are likely to be long term. • There is likely to be public opposition. • There may be implications for the aquifer. • The site is private land and they are not in support of extraction. • To extract from the site would destroy the Valley. It is unlikely it will be possible to restore it to its original state. • Local residents have put up with mineral extraction for years but want to be NIMBYs. They have had to put up with it at both ends of the village. • The site is adjacent to residential properties and a river.
EHS 019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Surrey side of the border is an Area of Great Landscape Value. The Hampshire side of the border will be a devastated landscape. • The same proposal was rejected in 2001 partly on the ground of

	<p>‘unacceptable adverse impact of the landscape character of the area’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extraction of clay to provide a landfill void is in breach of policies 27 and 28. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The site is not identified in the minerals plan for clay extraction. ➤ No evidence that the clay will be used for brick working. ➤ No suggestion that clay will be used for landfill engineering, nor is the extraction incidental to the extraction of sand and gravel. ➤ Not a small-scale extension to an existing excavation therefore breaches all policies under DC17. • Geology unsuitable. See Gaffney Cline & Associates report (F3063/6). • Inert waste: Applicant’s restoration proposals for the sandpit are based on the statement that there is not enough inert waste to fill the existing pit. But now, apparently there is enough to fill a hole of 1.6m cubic metres. One or other is not true. Obviously the long-term aim is to import other profitable waste (see F3063/6 application). • The site is on an aquifer that supplies drinking water to 30,000 people. • 8,850 people have signed a petition over concerns effecting water supplies. • Although implying that this site is linked to Grooms Farm, the site lies approximately half-a-mile away from Grooms Farm and is associated with Mellow Farm. • There is no direct road connection between Mellow Farm and Grooms Farm. • The adjacent lanes are too narrow and not constructed to take heavy lorry traffic. • Any suggestion of a haul road or conveyor running for a mile along the River Wey valley between Grooms Farm and Mellow Farm would exacerbate the visual impact considerations, which would be impossible to screen adequately. • Approximately one third of the population of Dockenfield live within 250m on the elevated ground above the proposed site and the River Valley. • There is no physical indication on the land to indicate the site lies adjacent to the County boundary. • The exploitation of this sand deposit should be considered exclusively in conjunction with Surrey and integrated with the Surrey minerals and waste plan. • If Surrey has not included the adjacent sand deposit within their plan, the reasons for this decision must be pertinent to any decision reached by Hampshire. • There must be a careful handling of all the sites and a consideration of the sites as a ‘whole’, for example, management/ aftercare and subsequent use must be taken into
--	--

	<p>consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issues are likely to be long term. • There is likely to be public commission. • There may be implications for the aquifer. • There is woodland adjacent to the site. • There is a Right of Way across the site (Royal Warmer Way) • There are no adjacent properties. • There is too much money involved – the money should be used to pay for government inspectors that can check through the throughput and what goes in through the gates. This would help to restore trust. • The chairman of Grundons was prosecuted for polluting the water. • Proper engineering can be in place to stop land slippage. • Sand pits can be restored safely. • The main traffic problems will be in Whitehill / Bordon.
EHS 020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is good access on to the A325. However, there are concerns regarding the cumulative impact of traffic. • There are no particular bad feelings locally. • The phasing elements need to be considered – a conveyor would have less impact. • There are nature conservation designations near the site. • The site is adjacent to a farm complex and residential buildings. • The site has a right of way. • There is an opportunity for recycling or recovery longer term. • The visual impact would be significant at nearly 360 degrees. • The site was subject to planning application but it was rejected on landscape grounds. • The proposal would destroy a multi-million pound business called Country Market providing a range of food (mini garden centre) to locals as well as local employment. Would destroy the business. They are planning to go organic next year. Development would impact on Pick Your Own area. • The existing mineral workings are already causing problems with fumes and sand. • ARC may own the mineral rights (although may have sold up). Landowner does not own mineral rights. • To landfill the site would take it below the water table, which is a concern to the Parish. • There are listed buildings adjacent to the site to the south. • There would be a destruction of a local amenity. • Restoration of the site could not be done properly.
EHS 021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be a simple operation and would not require much equipment. • Industry are very keen on the proposal. • Lorry movements in the area would rise. • There is restrictive access to east. The A325 would need to be upgraded

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are existing sites to north east and east. • There are aquifer/ water issues and potential impacts on Kingsley Stream. • This proposal would turn Kingsley into a water pool. • It is a large site that can't be screened and therefore there would be visual impacts. • There are properties against the site boundary. • The southern site would need to be tunnelled under the road to the site in the north. • There are a number of accidents at Bakers Corner – highway restrictions would not be enough. • There needs to be use of planning gain funds for repair on the roads that are being destroyed by the mineral lorries. • Landfill funds can be put back into the community within a 10 mile radius. • There are also other community needs as well as road repairs.
EHS 023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is reserved for recycle and composting. • The site is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. • The road infrastructure needs upgrading/changing. • The site could benefit from landscaping, but is it needed? • What can be done with the site – should it be left alone? • Access onto A3 is not much of a problem. • The site can be seen from road. • The quarry could provide natural screening. • There may be impacts on the aquifer. • Access agreement would be required including a dedicated access. • There maybe impact on the country park. • Total restoration is required and this would need to include public access to National Park. • The site is excellent. • There is industrial archaeological interest on the site.
EHS 024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are fewer concerns about the impact on the National Downs. • No information is provided showing figures. • There may be an issue of visual intrusion.
EHS 025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concerned regarding the National Downs. • There may be issues with visual intrusion. • There may be access issues. • Appropriate landscaping should be done in a suitable way. • The land should not be left sterile. • Residents are concerned about traffic at Durrants. • There are more people in immediate vicinity of this site than at the more northern sites.
WINCHESTER	
WCC 001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vehicle access is very poor and the roads are narrow. • The proposal would result in the destruction of a major public amenity including walking, wildlife, riding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a surplus of chalk. Why bother? We don't need any new chalk sites.
WCC 004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a strange location for new development as it is a bit out of the way. • Consideration must be taken for existing permissions, etc.
WCC 006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site seems reasonable. • The proposal is an appropriate neighbour use.
WCC 008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be opportunity for possible rail connection.
WCC 009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is quite good access from 'A' road. • The sites looks to be located in fairly open landscape and would need screening. • There a need to demonstrate how much gravel there would be available and the disturbance is worth it. • Vehicle access difficult- poor visibility at junction on to road already used heavily by traffic to Groom Farm and Micheldever Tyres and cars going to improved to rail station. • Destruction of major public amenity.
WCC 010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear how much gravel is available. • What do you do with all the chalk? • Vehicle access is very poor along a narrow, single track road. • The proposal would result in the destruction of a local amenity. • Neighbouring land (<100m) is used for stables and other rural activities.
WCC 011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are phasing issues in relation to this site. • WCC 009, 010, 011: need to be dealt with at WCC 009. • Vehicle access very poor along a narrow single track road. • The site is very close to growing residential site.
WCC 014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is potential for rail connection. • Access to the site is not good: • Industry turned the site down as it is not viable. • Access is difficult via the new road next to the new major residential development. • The site is within 250m of 100 dwellings. • There are major parking problem next to station with improved services. • There are growing traffic problems with new dwellings and proposed industrial site at Hydro Chafer.
WCC 015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no neighbour complications • There has been an application submitted for use as transport depot for 50 large vehicles. • The site is near to (<500m) to 30 dwellings. • There are possible landscape benefits in replacing the existing structures. • There are new houses in the vicinity. • Difficult access on to busy road by heavy vehicles from Grooms Farms and Tyre depot and car traffic using rail station with improved service.

WCC 017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is quite small and would question the profit. • The site is quite remote and the access roads would need to be considered. • There are residents near to the site boundary.
WCC 019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Minerals industry have not looked at the site as it is so small. • The river is very close and there are wildlife implications, etc.

Industrial Estates

SITE	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
<i>EAST HAMPSHIRE</i>	
IEH 002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road access is very bad. • There is an OSU (?) site behind J. Sainsbury.
IEH 003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is suitable, but there is a need for a new HWRC. • The site is very visible from the bypass and landscaping is required.
IEH 005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A map is required, but access issues mean it is not suitable.
IEH 008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a good site but there is uncertainty over availability.
IEH 009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is unsuitable and too small • There are prestigious offices on the site. • The site is unsuitable due to access issues.
IEH 010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is too small.
IEH 012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is good.
IEH 015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has the same issues as IEH 003- clarification of site is required.
IEH 016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good site for rail access only.
IEH 017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is possible the site is suitable.
IEH 018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the site is in Horndean – it is not suitable. • The site has poor access.
IEH 019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be impacts on local services. • The site is part of Bordon opportunities project. • There are alternative uses proposed (SEEDA project). • The site would be suitable but only if linked to highway improvements and redevelopment of the land.
<i>WINCHESTER</i>	
IWR 003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a large new residential development on the site.
IWR 011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is identified as a potential location for affordable housing.

New Sites

SITE	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
Land adjacent to Alton MRF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is worth considering

General Comments:

- Way landfill is restored is the key to the future and consideration when choosing.
- Small scale recycling should be further encouraged. Local and more available.
- Difficult to comment on the sites when lorry numbers are not provided.