

Dear Residents

Below we report on 'The Hamble Quarry' case, where their campaign has many similarities to our own, in the hope we can learn from their experiences. More importantly it shows that when the local community works together such applications can be refused.

The following is a precis of the Hamble Regulatory Committee meeting by Chris Morrow:

"Maxine (Mayer) and I have been following the quarry application at Hamble in some detail, The Regulatory Committee meeting was May 15th 2024 and the application was refused. The meeting was live-streamed and a recording is available to view to YouTube <https://youtu.be/QqdDyxOs3ho>

The general point was made several times that the inclusion of a site on the Minerals Plan does not automatically mean the development will be allowed, Approval must depend on the proposal development meeting all relevant planning considerations

A number of important issues/observations arise from the meeting and the officers' report.

- The content of the report consistently underestimates the negative effects of the proposed quarry. This is driven by the need for the officers to present findings which are defensible if there was to be an appeal.*
- The report accepts the findings of the applicant's Air Quality Assessment but purely because the applicant has followed the correct process and procedure. The council obtained their own report which I strongly suspect followed the same flawed and outdated desk modelling process and therefore came to the same conclusion as the applicant's report. Interestingly the councillors were swayed by the credentials of the expert witnesses on behalf of the residents. A recent appeal has been upheld by a planning inspector on exactly these grounds and all of the emerging evidence on health risks is currently ignored by the planning process.*
- There was however a very late submission (5:30pm on the afternoon before the meeting) from Natural England objecting to the potential damage caused by dust to nearby protected species and habitats. This was accepted as a ground for refusal.*
- The report identified unacceptable flooding risks and this was accepted as a ground for refusal.*
- The highways section of the report identified clear impact on the wider highway network however these did not meet the 'severe' threshold required for planning refusal. The county highway dept 'negotiated' a £500,000*

contribution to improve cycling and walking routes and access to the local rail station. This was not considered an adequate mitigation for the local disruption and was therefore a reason for refusal.

• Hampshire has just over 7 years of sand and gravel supply – just over the minimum required, however some sites are currently mothballed.

In summary the 3 grounds for refusal were:

- 1. Flood risk*
- 2. Local highways impact*
- 3. Dust damage to nearby species and habitats (NOT effects on humans)*

I think this should help us to focus on where we can have maximum impact in purely planning terms. In my view these are:

- Flood risk*
- Ecology*
- Local highway impact*
- Need – current oversupply*

We need to revise how to proceed with our ongoing AQ/Dust research work.”

In the meantime we have established a working relationship with the new Senior Minerals Planning Officer at WCC. His current assessment is that Smiths Concrete are unlikely to submit their response to WCC’s Regulation 25 demand for more information until late July/early August. We expect this Smiths response will contain mitigations **intended to address** the first consultation comments/objections.

This will trigger a Second Consultation a few days later where you all have the opportunity to object again. Unless you do, the Planning Officers may well accept those mitigations and recommend accepting Smiths application to the Planning Committee. We have three weeks to comment/object at that point and all those of you who commented/objected in the first consultation last year should be contacted by the WCC planning officers with details of Smiths response and how to submit your response,

Your response needs to challenge one or more of the Smiths mitigations where you have reasonable reasons, ideally quoting evidence. Emotion or NIMBYism is ignored by the planning officers and could waste your challenge. **We are developing a dedicated web site at stopthebarfordquarry.org which includes a direct link to comment on the quarry application.**

As you will see we have started to raise the profile of our campaign again by resurrecting banners initially, followed later by leaflets and press releases. By

kind permission of the headmistress, Mrs. Mary Baker, we are arranging a 'Town Hall' meeting to update you and take questions on July 8th at 7.30pm.

Chris Morrow and Malcolm Eykyn