

**Tuesday, 22 March 2022**

**EASTLEIGH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE**

will meet on

**Wednesday, 30 March 2022**

beginning at

**7:30 pm**

in the

**Oak Suite, Holiday Inn, Leigh Road, Eastleigh SO50 9PG**

TO: Councillor Alex Bourne (Chair)  
Councillor Paul Bicknell (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Tanya Park  
Councillor Tina Campbell  
Councillor Daniel Clarke  
Councillor Bhavin Dedhia  
Councillor Wayne Irish  
Councillor Darshan Mann  
Councillor Sara Tyson-Payne

Staff Contacts: Laura Johnston, Democratic Services Manager, 02380 688051  
Email:laura.johnston@eastleigh.gov.uk Please email  
Democratic.Services@eastleigh.gov.uk to register to speak  
before the meeting.

Guy Riddoch, Local Area Manager Tel: 023 8068 3369; Email:  
guy.riddoch@eastleigh.gov.uk

JOANNE CASSAR  
Executive Head of Governance

---

Copies of this and all other agendas can be accessed via the [Council's website](#)  
as well as in other formats.

Members of the public are invited to speak on general items at the start of the meeting,  
and on individual agenda items at the time the item is discussed. To register please  
contact the Democratic Services Officer above.

Please be aware that Eastleigh Borough Council permits filming, sound recording and photography at meetings open to the public, and Councillors will be using tablet devices to access committee papers.

## AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. Declarations of Interest

Members are invited to declare interests in relation to items of business on the agenda. Any interests declared will be recorded in the Minutes.

3. Minutes (Pages 5 - 10)

To consider the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2022.

4. Chair's Announcements

5. Public Participation

You can submit questions in advance of the meeting to the following email: [democratic.services@eastleigh.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@eastleigh.gov.uk). The deadline for submissions is **12pm on Tuesday 29 March 2022**.

**Please let us know if you wish to attend the meeting in person so that we can manage numbers. We are still encouraging all those in attendance to wear a face covering and take a lateral flow test before attendance. PLEASE DO NOT ATTEND IF YOU HAVE ANY COVID-19 SYMPTOMS.**

6. Presentation on Planning Guidelines

7. Planning Application - Land off Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh Consultation - CS/22/92463 (Pages 11 - 32)

**Please let us know if you wish to attend the meeting in person so that we can manage numbers. We are still encouraging all those in attendance to wear a face covering and take a lateral flow test before attendance. PLEASE DO NOT ATTEND IF YOU HAVE ANY COVID-19 SYMPTOMS.**

**This report relates to a consultation request on an application that has been submitted to, and will be determined by, Hampshire County Council. The purpose of this report is to set out Eastleigh Borough Council's response to the consultation.**

Reference Number: CS/22/92463

(NOTE: Hampshire County Council ref. HCC/2022/0071 – the development of a Material Recycling Facility and Associated Infrastructure at Land off Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh)

8. Planning Appeals

The Legal Services Manager to report:-

(a) that the following appeals have been lodged:-

143 Passfield Avenue, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9NH

Appeal against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of 1no. 2-bedroom, single-storey Wheelchair User Dwelling (Category M4(3) Building Regulations, 2010) to the rear of 143-145 Passfield Avenue, Eastleigh, SO50 9NH, together with associated access from Passfield Avenue.

This was a delegated decision.

Land at Toyndee Road, Eastleigh, SO50 9DH

Appeal against the Council's non-determination in time for the Construction of 105 dwellings together with access from Toyndee Road, associated parking public open space and landscaping following the demolition of existing buildings (amended plans)

This was a committee decision.

(b) that the following appeals have been dismissed:-

103 Bournemouth Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 3AE

Appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission for the demolition of existing commercial building and construction of a part three-storey and part two-storey block of flats comprising of 6no. 2 bed units and 2no. 1 bed units, with associated parking, landscaping and access from Bournemouth Road.

This was a committee decision.

<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> <b>Tuesday, 7 June 2022 at 7:00 pm</b> <b>In the Oak Suite, Holiday Inn, Leigh Rd,</b> <b>Eastleigh SO50 9PG</b></p>
---

Your Council's electronic news service - [e-news](#) -

Register your email address free with the Council and keep up to date with what's happening in the Borough. Simply select your topics and we will send you email updates with news as it happens including new Council Jobs, What's On, Recycling, Transport plus lots more.

## EASTLEIGH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 18 January 2022 (7:00 pm – 9:03 pm)

### PRESENT:

Councillor Bourne (Chairman); Councillors Bicknell, Campbell, Park, Clarke, Irish, Mann and Tyson-Payne

---

### RESOLVED ITEMS (SUBJECT TO QUESTIONS ONLY)

#### 19. INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed the Committee and reported that Councillor Doguie had stepped down and expressed thanks for his service to the town.

Councillors Irish and Clarke also extended their thanks.

#### 20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Irish declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 as he is a Trustee of Age Concern Eastleigh.

#### 21. MINUTES

##### **RESOLVED -**

**That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2021 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.**

#### 22. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation on this occasion.

#### 23. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair wished all Councillors, Officers and members of the public a Happy New Year.

The Christmas lights switch on was a very popular event with the footfall counters showing over 24,000 visitors to the town during the day. The Chair was also delighted to attend the Happy's Christmas Circus in aid of the Mayor's Charities.

Thanks were extended to Councillor Dougie who resigned earlier this month, this has led to a by-election in Eastleigh Central on 10 February 2022.

### Lawn Road Play Area

After several delays due to Covid, supply chain problems, a spate of severe vandalism and an attack on one of the contractors, the Chair was very pleased to announce that completion of the project was due by the early February, if not before.

Councillors have met a few times recently working on a project to improve the town centre. Studio B.a.d. Architects has been appointed to design and implement a £100,000 package of improvements to brighten up the town centre, to make it more attractive for visitors and residents. The package will include new planters for trees, shrubs and flowers, new seating, decorative lighting, large wall murals, pavement artworks and new shopping kiosks. The various elements will be delivered in stages over the next six-months and aim to complete the work ready for the summer in July this year.

### **Stoneham Lane Football Complex**

The Chair had received news from the MP and Hampshire County Council that they will not be putting in a controlled pedestrian crossing to allow safe passage to the overflow car park – instead they are moving the existing crossing a few meters and adding a streetlight. This was very disappointing news as this is a very dangerous crossing used every evening by children.

### **Market Street Community Garden**

The project is continuing – please look out for details of the February meeting which will be a workshop to develop a design for the wider garden.

### **Grants**

The Chair thanked Councillors Campbell, Bicknell and Park who formed the ELAC grants committee. Every year we invite bids for £10,000 community grant pot. The final awards are contained within the agenda papers. It was encouraged that this opportunity was shared far and wide to ensure support to as many community projects as possible in the coming year.

There was also a further £3,000 grant pot dedicated for supporting youth initiatives in the local area.

### **Mela 2022**

As restrictions ease the Chair was hopeful that residents could return to a more normal year of events over the year ahead. The full event programme was currently being developed and it was announced that the Mela will return to its early summer date of 24 July this year.

24. PRESENTATION ON PLANNING GUIDELINES

A Planning Officer gave a short presentation on guidelines that had to be taken into account when determining planning applications; in particular the issues that could, and could not, be taken into account. This was set against the broader policy framework.

25. PLANNING APPLICATION - LAND AT TOYNBEE ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9DN

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Head of Planning and Economy (Agenda item 7) concerning the construction of 105 dwellings together with access from Toynbee Road, associated parking, public open space and landscaping following the demolition of existing buildings. (Ref: F/20/88079).

The Committee was advised that there were no additional consultee responses received and no additional representations received.

**RESOLVED -**

**Delegate decision to Executive Head of Planning and Economy in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Ward Councillors to resolve the following:**

- i) Receipt of outstanding consultation responses and any necessary actions required as a result of comments received;**
- ii) Acceptable amended plans which respond to urban design, landscape and ecology comments;**
- iii) Satisfactory Completion of Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment including consideration of response from Natural England;**
- iv) Completion of S106 agreement for terms identified in report; and**
- v) The following conditions (with updates as necessary).**

**Then PERMIT subject to Conditions and Notes as set out in report.**

[Note: (A) One resident spoke in objection to the application citing concerns with regards to the impact on the local infrastructure, excessive number of dwellings, parking, traffic, pollution and structural issues for properties surrounding the site. (B) The agent spoke in support of the application stating that the site was allocated in the Local Plan for development, the site was highly accessible, and the houses were of a high quality. (C) The vote was tied at 4 FOR and 4 AGAINST therefore the Chair exercised his casting vote to permit the scheme.]

26. PLANNING APPLICATION - LAND AT VILLENEUVE ST GEORGES WAY, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9SJ

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Head of Planning and Economy (Agenda item 8) concerning the construction of a car dealership (Class Sui Generis), incorporating a workshop, ancillary offices, associated parking, access, servicing, landscaping, access and other associated works. (F/21/91786).

The following updates were advised:

- As per update table and the following conditions 13 & 15.
- Condition 13 updated: Development shall not commence until an updated Drainage Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Drainage Strategy shall include full details of the mechanisms for filtration including pollution mitigation indices. The Drainage Strategy shall thereafter be implemented fully in accordance with the approved plans.
- Condition 15 updated: Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Landscape, Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan (**to cover all soft landscaping including planting on the second floor terrace**), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- a response had been received from Southern Water, which set out further advice for the applicants.

**RESOLVED –**

**To PERMIT subject to proposed conditions and securing developers contributions towards public art and towards a biodiversity mitigation scheme (to be agreed).**

**[Notes: (A) One resident spoke in objection to the application citing concerns over trees being removed from the site unnecessarily and raised questions over previous planning applications for the site. (B) A written statement was submitted on behalf of the applicant in support of the application stating that the scheme had been carefully designed to ensure that it met the specific development criteria in the Local Plan, the car dealership will generate 50 net additional jobs and the development would bring a long-term vacant site back into use.]**

Councilor Clarke left the meeting at 20:56.

27. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT

The Committee considered a report by the Local Area Manager (Agenda Item 9) setting out recommendations for expenditure from the Committee's revenue budget and developer contributions.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) The formation of the New Parishing Working Group, nominated representatives and the Terms of Reference are noted;**
- (2) £500 was allocated for the Summer Bandstand Programme from the Revenue Budget;**
- (3) £6,000 was allocated for the Energy Centre Facilities Management costs from the Revenue Reserve;**
- (4) £3,000 was allocated for a Christmas Lights Switch-on Event Organiser from the Revenue Reserve;**
- (5) £10,000 was allocated to the Community Grant Fund from the Revenue Reserve;**
- (6) £1,500 was allocated to the Youth Grant from the Revenue Reserve;**
- (7) £5,200 was allocated to the Velmore Youth Café from the Revenue Reserve; and**
- (8) £27,000 was allocated for the 2022 Events programme from the Revenue Reserve as set out in paragraph 18.**

[NOTE: Councillor Bicknell asked if it was a new allocation of money or unallocated from previous years The Local Area Manager agreed to respond outside the meeting.]

28. COMMUNITY GRANTS

The Committee considered a report by the Assistant Local Area Manager (Agenda Item 10).

**RESOLVED –**

**That grants be approved as contained in Appendix 1 to this report.**

[Note: In light of the interest declared, Councillor Irish did not take part in the vote in regards to the grant for Age Concern Eastleigh and left the meeting at 21:01.]

M6800

This page is intentionally left blank

**Application Number:** CS/22/92463  
**Case Officer:** Rebecca Altman  
**Received Date:** 14 February 2022  
**Site Address:** Land off Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh  
**Applicant:** Hampshire County Council Waste Management  
**Proposal:** Development of a material recycling facility and associated infrastructure.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that:

1. The Council responds to Hampshire County Council's consultation with an objection.
2. The content of this report is agreed as supporting evidence for the Council's objection.
3. The Council reserves the right to give further formal and material views on the matter in response to any further information from Hampshire County Council.
4. In the event of Hampshire County Council's Regulatory Committee granting permission, recommend the mitigations detailed in this report to be included as conditions to any permission.

---

## Summary and purpose of the report

1. The Council received notification on 14 February 2022 of an application by Hampshire County Council (HCC) for the development of a material recycling facility and associated infrastructure at Land off Chickenhall Lane.
2. The Council objects to this application for the reasons set out in this report.
3. Eastleigh Borough Council is not the planning authority for the application. Hampshire County Council, as the Minerals and Waste Authority, will be responsible for determining the application and all relevant publication and notifications have been dealt with by HCC. All public representations will be submitted directly to HCC.
4. The purpose of this report is to set out Eastleigh Borough Council's response to the consultation, to include supporting information to justify the Council's objection.

## **Site Characteristics and Character of the Locality**

1. The site lies within a predominantly industrial area at the southern end of Chickenhall Lane, with the railway line to the south and industrial uses to the north and west including a sewage treatment works. There are two residential properties within the industrial area directly to the north of the site, which are understood to be occupied by operatives of nearby facilities. The next nearest residential properties are located on Campbell Road, approximately 300m to the south west. The site lies on the edge of the urban area with countryside to the east and beyond the railway line to the south.
2. There is some surface water flood risk on the site, and to the east is the River Itchen and the Stamford Meadow Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The site also lies within the safeguarding zone for Southampton Airport.
3. Access to the site is from Chickenhall Lane, which links to Bishopstoke Road to the north.

## **Description of Application (as submitted to Hampshire County Council)**

4. The application is for the construction of a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF), with associated infrastructure including access roads, security fencing, weighbridges, lighting and landscaping. The facility would help meet the demand for a wider range of recycling as part of Project Integra, which is a partnership between Hampshire Authorities and Veolia.
5. There would be two vehicle access points at the north west side of the site, one for cars / staff and one for HGVs. There would be 24 car parking spaces including 2 accessible spaces. The facility is estimated to generate a maximum of 128 HGV movements daily (64 in and 64 out). There would also be up to 120 staff car trips per day (60 in and 60 out). Operating hours are indicated as 07:00 to 19:00.
6. The main building would measure 131m in length, 80m in width and up to 15.5m in height and would be clad in goosewing grey steel cladding. The facility would have the capacity to process approximately 135,000 tonnes per annum of dry recyclable waste, including paper and cardboard, glass, plastic, metals and cartons.
7. The submitted plans show new landscaping around the boundaries of the site, including new hedgerow and woodland/scrub planting.

## **Relevant Site History**

8. S/13/73507 – Eastleigh Borough Council raised objection to a consultation from Hampshire County Council for construction of an Energy Recovery Centre on 13 December 2013. Concerns related to a

lack of information to address noise and vibration from traffic movements, air quality and odour impacts and impacts on the River Itchen. Permission was granted by Hampshire County Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2014. The permission was subsequently implemented and is therefore extant.

9. F/17/81397 – Permission was granted by Eastleigh Borough Council for open storage use with ancillary office, storage buildings and vehicle wash facility on 15 March 2018. This application related to the adjacent land to the east of the current application site.

## **Policy Context and Designations Applicable to the Site**

### National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

10. Section 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
11. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives: economic; social; and environmental. These objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways, and should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in the Framework. One of the key environmental objectives noted in paragraph 8(c) of the NPPF is to minimise waste and pollution, and the requirement for local authorities to make provision for waste management infrastructure within strategy policies is set out in paragraph 20.

### Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)

12. Policy 29 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan supports proposals for waste management sites in appropriate locations, including within existing industrial estates. The policy requires development to be of a scale appropriate to its setting.

### Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) Saved Policies

13. Within the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review, the site is designated as an Employment site (Policy 112.E). Policy 117.E supports development for various employment uses including light industrial, general industrial and storage / distribution. Policy 118.E allows for alternative uses only if they would not impact on the wider employment base or would provide environmental or amenity benefits.

## Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

14. The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 was submitted by the Council to the Planning Inspectorate on 31 October 2018 with hearings in public having commenced in November 2019 and concluded in early 2020. The Council subsequently received the Inspector's feedback and recommended action points on the plan in April and May 2020. On 25 June 2020, the Council's Cabinet resolved to progress the examination on the basis of the main modifications outlined in the Inspector's letter and action points and/or any other main modifications which may be necessary.
15. The Council's Planning Policy Team subsequently prepared further evidence and drafted the main modifications in response to each of the Inspector's letters and points and the Inspector has also held an additional hearing in January 2021 in relation to Mercury Marina. Following on from this, the Inspector has now finalised the main modifications for public consultation and the Council has also prepared modifications to the policies map and proposed additional modifications. A report of the Planning Policy Senior Specialist was considered at Cabinet and Full Council on 27 May 2021 which recommended approval of the modifications proposed for public consultation. Consultation on the Main Modifications took place between 9 June and 21 July 2021, and adoption of the Plan is anticipated in mid 2022.
16. Proposed Policy E6 (Eastleigh Riverside) includes development criteria for the land south of the sewage works, stating that it would be suitable for waste management uses, subject to meeting relevant design and environmental requirements.
17. Other relevant policies include the following:
  - S1 (Sustainable Development)
  - S2 (Approach to New Development)
  - S4 (Employment Provision)
  - S12 and DM13 (Highways)
  - DM1 (General Development)
  - DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development)
  - DM11 (Nature Conservation)

### **Representations**

18. Public representations for the application are being submitted directly to Hampshire County Council as the planning authority. At the time of writing this report, 1 representation was available to view on HCC's webpage.

## **Eastleigh Borough Council Consultation Responses**

## Policy Officer

19. As per the criteria in Policy 29 of the Minerals and Waste Plan it is considered that the proposed material recycling facility would be appropriately located, and compatible with adjacent developments in the area.
20. The site is a safeguarded employment site under Saved Policy 112.E. Whilst the proposed use would not fall within the specified employment uses of the policy, it is a location that is considered suitable for a recycling facility. The principle of developing the site for waste management activities has previously been established.
21. The proposal would also accord with Proposed Policy E6 of the emerging Local Plan, provided all other material planning considerations are met, including highway and access issues, design and layout.
22. The scheme should meet BREEAM excellent standard and further information on this should be provided.

## Environmental Health

23. Holding objection due to inadequate information to assess potential noise, odour, air pollution and vibration impacts. Full comments can be viewed in appendix 1 and a summary is provided below.
24. The application would generate pollution from the following:
  - Housed reception and mechanical sorting of non-putrescible waste for recycling purposes and recovery;
  - Use of site vehicle reception and site circulation areas, and access to and from existing roads for import and export of materials.
25. Noise - The submitted information indicates that internally generated noise would be attenuated by the sound insulation of the fabric, which is a reasonable assumption and full details could be conditioned. Other mitigations such as closure of roller shutter doors other than for vehicle offload/collection, could also be conditioned.
26. However, there are concerns about how existing background noise levels have been measured as they appear to have been overestimated. This means that the design of the embedded mitigation measures such as sound insulation, has been carried out to an 'underestimated' target, and may therefore not be sufficient to prevent adverse noise impact during quieter periods of the day and night. The application therefore cannot be supported at this time. Request that further information is provided to determine the background noise levels and appropriate mitigation.

27. Recommend an operating environmental management plan to be requested by condition.
28. With regard to vehicle movements, there would be up to 124 heavy vehicle movements per day (64 in and 64 out) and 120 cars. Once joining the main public highway in Eastleigh, heavy and light traffic induced by the development would increase noise levels, but the change would be less significant than experienced by dwellings on Chickenhall Lane. However, there is concern that the actual noise impact on dwellings has not been fully considered as it does not take account of increases in noise during more sensitive times of the day, e.g. morning and weekends. Recommend further details are provided to assess potential adverse noise impacts on dwellings.
29. It is likely that more noise mitigation measures will be required to ensure no adverse impact on residential occupiers.
30. Vibration - The application does not inform on the condition of the road near Chickenhall Cottages and therefore the effect of heavy vehicles. If the road surface is suitable for heavy vehicles and strengthened appropriately, then vibration impact may not be adverse. Recommend further information is provided on this matter. Ongoing maintenance of the road should be included in the operating management plan.
31. Odour - Assuming incoming loads would be sheeted or sealed, then the proposed controls on odour within the facility and the closing of roller shutter doors after a lorry has passed through would be sufficient to prevent odour experienced at Chickenhall Cottages. However, there is concern about possible odour if roller shutter doors were left open. Request further information on how materials are transported and procedures for opening and closing of roller shutter doors.
32. Question whether the referenced meteorological conditions used by the EIA are sufficiently representative of the local wind conditions. Request further information to make accurate assessment.
33. Air Pollution - Air quality deteriorates in the presence of vehicular emissions of nitrogen dioxides, other oxides of nitrogen and fine or respirable particulate matter. When exceeding a proportion of the Air Quality Objectives, vehicular emissions harm. The A335 and M3 (both likely to be used by vehicles accessing the facility) are Air Quality Management Areas monitored by Eastleigh Borough Council. Request a contribution towards the recurring annual cost of monitoring the AQMAs.
34. The submitted Environmental Impact Assessment scopes in human health risk assessment from vehicular emissions and predicts impacts for scenarios that include other committed developments. The Highway Authority should be asked to comment on the appropriateness of the traffic model used.

35. Dust - The submitted information is not clear on whether dust would be generated by the development or not. Request more information to assess potential dust impacts.
36. Construction pollution - A Construction Environmental Management Plan should be secured by condition.

### Ecologist

37. The level and standard of the ecology survey work is acceptable. The site itself comprises mainly semi-improved grassland which is not botanically diverse. Other habitats include semi-natural broad-leaved woodland, a pond, a defunct hedgerow, tree lines, scattered shrub, tall ruderal and short perennial vegetation and a dry ditch. The site supports at least seven species of bat, badgers, slow worms, common amphibians (e.g. toad), breeding birds and widespread invertebrates.
38. There are two statutory nature conservation designations, the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Stanford Meadow Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), within 2km of the site. The broadleaved woodland on the site is also recognised as an ecological network opportunity for retention and enhancement.
39. Satisfied that there is unlikely to be impacts on the SAC in terms of light, noise airborne pollutants and dust. However, as highlighted by the Flood Authority, there could be issues with the interaction between groundwater levels and winter rainfall which has the potential to impact the SAC. Further information is therefore required to conclude no significant effect on the SAC.
40. The majority of habitats on site would be lost, with some marginal habitats retained and enhanced around the edge. There would be a 28.3% net loss of biodiversity on the site, which is contrary to national and local policy. All opportunities for enhancement and ecological provisions on site should be explored before defaulting to an off site solution. Recommend that the inclusion of a green / brown roof is explored to contribute towards mitigating the loss of biodiversity.
41. The applicants propose to mitigate the loss of biodiversity through an off site project at Abbey Fruit Farm, Netley. No details are provided about the scheme beyond it providing woodland, a pond and grassland habitats. Further certainty would be needed to ensure a biodiversity net gain.
42. Recommend on site enhancements, species specific mitigation, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, and a Construction Environmental Management Plan are secured by condition.

### Landscape Officer

43. Holding objection due to insufficient information within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).
44. There is potential for erosion of views from the Itchen Way long distance recreational route. The LVIA viewpoint photography is all taken in the summer. A winter assessment is required to fully assess the visual impact.
45. There may be a need for additional mitigation proposals such as changes to orientation, material finish, tree planting or green walls / roofs.
46. Recommend that the LVIA is updated to include winter viewpoints and winter assessment, and a wireframe of the proposals superimposed on winter and summer viewpoint photographs.

### Tree Officer

47. The proposal would involve the loss of 8 individual trees and parts of 2 groups of trees. The submitted documents do not justify the removals. If the removals can be justified, replacement tree planting would be required.
48. The information also does not demonstrate how retained trees would be protected during construction. An Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan would be required.

## **SUMMARY OF MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN**

### **Policy principle**

49. Eastleigh Borough Council acknowledges that the general policy principle of the proposed development is acceptable, provided that all relevant environmental and amenity issues can be satisfactorily addressed. EBC also acknowledges the wider environmental benefits of improving material recycling within the Hampshire area.

### **Pollution – noise, odour, dust and air quality**

50. EBC cannot support the proposal as submitted as the information does not satisfactorily assess noise, odour and vibration impacts on the local area and nearby residential occupiers.
51. In relation to noise, the Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submitted Environmental Impact Assessment and considers that the existing background noise level has been

overestimated. This means that the embedded noise mitigation measures within the design have likely been underestimated, and may not provide adequate mitigation. There are also concerns that the noise impacts of additional traffic on surrounding residential occupiers has not been satisfactorily assessed as it needs to take account of impacts during more sensitive times of the day.

52. Further concerns noted by the Environmental Health Officer relate to potential impacts from odour, vibration and dust. There is currently insufficient information within the application documents to determine that these potential impacts have been fully considered.
53. With regard to air quality, the conclusions of the Air Quality Assessment are dependent on the suitability of the traffic assessments, which is a matter that would be considered by the Hampshire Highway Authority. Should the development be permitted, Eastleigh Borough Council would request a financial contribution towards the on-going monitoring of Air Quality Management Areas.

### **Highway implications**

54. Eastleigh Borough Council is concerned about the increased level of HGV movements in the local area, most notably in relation to the impacts on congestion and air quality along Bishopstoke Road and the roundabout junction with Station Hill / Romsey Road / Twyford Road. Whilst the applicants have commented that the level of HGV movements would be no greater than that proposed for the previously permitted Energy Recovery Centre, it must be recognised that this development was never completed and the traffic levels / conditions within the area will have changed since 2014.
55. An associated impact of increased traffic is that of noise to local residents. As noted by the Environmental Health Officer, the impacts of increased noise from additional HGVs has not been properly assessed and therefore it cannot be concluded that residential amenity will be protected. There is particular concern about noise impacts at night and EBC would wish to see clear conditions on the timings of HGV movements to avoid the most noise sensitive times of day.

### **Amenity impact and public health**

56. Due to the inadequacies in the information relating to impacts of noise, odour, dust and vibration, and concerns about the impacts of additional HGV's on air quality, Eastleigh Borough Council is concerned that the development could have an adverse impact on the amenity and health of nearby residential occupiers. EBC will be making strong recommendations to HBC as to the further information required to properly assess the impacts on local residents, as identified by the Environmental Health Officer.

## **Landscape impact and trees**

57. The Council's Landscape Officer has identified a fundamental flaw in the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as it does not include an assessment of winter views. As views through vegetation and trees would be greater during winter months, a winter assessment is vital to fully understanding the visual impacts of the development. There is particular concern about the impacts on views from the Itchen Way long distance recreational route. Subject to further assessment, there may be a need for further consideration of the design and orientation of the building to ensure no adverse visual impacts.
58. The Council's Tree Officer has noted that there is insufficient information to justify the proposed loss of trees or to demonstrate that retained trees would be protected. Should tree loss be accepted, EBC would emphasise the need for suitable replacement tree planting.

## **Ecological impact**

59. The development would result in a 28.3% net loss in biodiversity, which is contrary to local and national policy. Whilst the applicants have put forward proposals to mitigate the biodiversity loss with an off-site project, the details of this are limited and insufficient. It is noted that the proposed project would be in Netley and EBC would question the appropriateness of off-site mitigation so far from the application site. Eastleigh Borough Council is not satisfied that the applicants have fully explored opportunities for enhancing biodiversity on site, such as with green / brown roofs, and would require a lot more details regarding the off-site scheme if this is to be considered appropriate to achieve a biodiversity net gain.
60. The Council's Ecologist has also noted the comments made by the Lead Flood Authority about the potential interactions of winter groundwater levels and infiltration. Further information is required to determine no adverse impacts on the River Itchen SAC.

## **Climate change**

61. In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

62. The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and emerging plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and emerging plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Emerging Local Plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.
63. The NPPF, Saved Policies 34.ES and 37.ES of the local plan, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Emerging local plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. Policy 2 within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan also emphasises the requirement for minerals and waste development to minimise their impact on the causes of climate change. It is therefore important that the matters identified by EBC for further consideration are fully assessed to ensure that the policy requirements relating to climate change are met.

### **Equalities Implications:**

64. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:-
- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
    - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
    - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
    - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
65. When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this consultation request does not raise any equality implications.

### **Conclusion**

66. Eastleigh Borough Council raises an objection to the proposed development of a material recycling facility due to the absence of sufficient information to assess the impacts on the local area in respect of pollution, visual impacts and ecological impacts. The grounds of objection are summarised as follows:

- Pollution and public health – Insufficient information to determine that the development would not harm residential amenity through increased noise, odour, dust, vibration and air quality impacts.
- Highway implications – Concern regarding increased traffic congestion and pollution on Bishopstoke Road and roundabout junction with Station Hill / Romsey Road / Twyford Road.
- Landscaping and trees – Insufficient information to assess landscape impact due to lack of winter assessment, and lack of information to justify tree removals.
- Ecology – Insufficient information to demonstrate that on-site biodiversity enhancement has been fully explored and lack of information about proposed off-site mitigation scheme; further information required to assess impact on River Itchen SAC.

67. It is requested that should new information be received by HBC in relation to any of the matters outlined within this response, EBC should be formally reconsulted to allow for further review and comment.

### **Further Recommendations**

68. Should the application progress, EBC would recommend that the following additional information is requested from the applicants to allow for a more detailed assessment of the proposals:

- Reassessment of the background noise levels and resulting noise impacts of the development. Assessments should include hourly operation noise results compared with an hourly background level at that time and at night time in 15 minute intervals.
- Further assessment of the noise impacts of increased traffic in the local area, to include more sensitive times of day / week including early mornings, night time and weekends.
- Reconsideration of embedded noise mitigation measures in light of further assessments recommended above.
- Further information on the condition of the road near Chickenhall Cottages and any works required to upgrade the road surface.
- Assessment of local wind and atmospheric conditions to fully assess potential odour impacts.
- Clarification on whether odour would be emitted from lorries and any required mitigation.
- Further information to assess potential dust impacts, including clarification of the activities taking place and relevant mitigations.
- Further information on how roller shutter doors will be managed to prevent odour / dust escape.
- Further information regarding the interaction of winter groundwater levels and infiltration to determine no adverse impact on the River Itchen SAC.
- Confirmation that all opportunities for on-site biodiversity enhancement have been fully explored, e.g. green / brown roofs.
- Further detail regarding the proposed off-site biodiversity provision to ensure it would achieve a biodiversity net gain.

- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to be updated to include winter viewpoints and winter assessment, and a wireframe of the proposals superimposed on winter and summer viewpoint photographs.
- Further information to justify the proposed loss of trees, and details of tree replacements.
- Submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.
- Further information to demonstrate how the development would meet BREEAM 'excellent' standard.

69. Notwithstanding the objections raised by EBC, in the event that HCC were to recommend permission for the proposed works, the following matters are requested to be addressed through suitably worded conditions or obligations:

- Provision and monitoring of all measures required to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development.
- Financial contribution towards on-going monitoring of Air Quality Management Areas.
- Restrictions on the timings of HGV movements to reduce impacts during more sensitive times (e.g. night time, early morning).
- Provision, implementation and monitoring of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- Provision, implementation and monitoring of an Operating Environmental Management Plan, to include on-going maintenance of the access road and odour control mechanisms.
- Implementation of protected species mitigation.
- Provision of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.
- Implementation and maintenance of on-site biodiversity enhancements.
- Provision and management of off-site biodiversity mitigation scheme (if agreed).





This page is intentionally left blank

## **Pollution Control - HCC 2022 0071 - The Development of a Material Recycling Facility and Associated Infrastructure at Land Off Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh**

We refer to:

- Planning Statement, dated January 2022
- Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 7 Noise, dated January 2022
- Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 8 Air Quality, dated January 2022

### **1) Noise Pollution (in use)**

The site locates amongst municipal works and industry. Access is via the industrial estates to the north and east. The largest cluster of dwellings are some 300m to the southwest on Campbell Road, and the closest, a few dwellings on Chickenhall Lane locate closer at 170m to the site and 35m from its access. The setting is on the edge of greenfield and railway and industry and brownfield.

The polluting character of the application is in summary:

- Housed reception and mechanical sorting of non-putrescible waste material for recycling purpose and recovery.
- Use of site vehicle reception and site circulation areas, access to and from and existing roads for the import of mixed waste and export of sorted materials.

Outline information on the building envelope indicates internally generated noise will be attenuated by the sound insulation of the fabric. This is a reasonable assumption and subject to detailing for this to be a purpose-built building, designed to comply with the local planning authority's noise limits. This can be conditioned for demonstration prior to commencement of the development and coming into use, as can be for equipment such as for ventilation and intakes and exhausts, pumps and so forth.

Openings for import and export by lorries are relevant consideration for noise impact assessment currently because their effect is a function of the site design. But these are attenuated by roller shutter doors which will be closed except for access to lorries when offload or collecting. Other embedded mitigation is the use of non-tonal plant and machinery, including movement alarms which other easily attract attention even over distance. These can also be conditioned.

Vehicles movements outside and induced traffic on the local highway network are 64 heavy vehicles in and out (124 total per day) and 120 cars total per day over a 24-hour operating cycle. Likewise, these can also be conditioned if the impact is found not to be adverse, exceeding noise limits at this time.

Noise limits will be on the cumulative impact of all activities on the site operating premises and an operating environmental management plan would be required, which should be embedded in the operators certified ISO14001 Environmental Management System. By doing so, the live system would be self-monitoring and self-correcting according to the best practice of 'plan - do - check - act'. We advise conditions also include monitoring on coming into use, periodically and record of results kept along with information on any remedial actions taken and complaints about nuisance received and resolved.

Looking at the impact of the facility, for the purpose of the EIA report the applicant measured background sound levels at two locations closest to the facility. These are at a few dwellings off Chickenhall Lane and on Campbell Road to the southwest. Daytime and night-time levels are

approximately similar and significantly, dwellings off Chickenhall Lane are much closer to the facility and potentially therefore more likely to be adversely impacted.

We are currently informed the Chickenhall Lane dwellings are homes to operatives on nearby sites and facilities, possibly the sewage treatment works. We recommend planning colleagues follow up on this and consider whether the occupants are less or the same sensitivity as dwellings on Campbell Road. This is important as it concerns whether an adverse residual impact resulting from the planned development is acceptable.

The background sound level survey was carried in May 2021 over one weekend (Friday to Monday continuously) and are said to be "*indicative*". We agree they provide an indication and possibly err on the cautious side as in 2021 Covid restrictions affected activity in the community and of industry and commerce. Also, generally noise levels are lower over weekends as industry and commerce can be less active. Nevertheless, the applicant can also carry out more measurements over time and wind directions to help inform the noise limits we will condition.

How the information is used is more important for decision making on the planning application as simple averages or means for example can underrepresent the background sound levels experienced by dwelling holders. We have concern on this as explained in the following two paragraphs and ask for the applicant to change its report.

The concluded "*representative*" background sound levels for the purpose of the EIA are daytime L90 44 dB(A) at both locations and night-time L90 40 dB(A) and 38 dB(A) at Chickenhall Lane and Campbell Road dwellings respectively. Looking at the results, we find the daytime L90 at Chickenhall Lane dwellings is lower than has been summarised by the EIA. For example, daytime afternoon and evening levels are nine decibels lower at Chickenhall Lane. We are concerned about this because it is fair and reasonable to assess the impact to occupants during time of the day when this occurs. For example, over an hour of daytime operation, according to the clock, background sound level at that time is compared to the operating noise of the facility in that hour. Same at night but over 15-minute time clock periods.

Likewise, at Campbell Road dwellings, the average L90 noise levels mentioned above over report background sound levels by up to 11 decibels. This is of greater significance and a concern. The consequence of overestimating the background sound level is that the design of embedded mitigation measures such as sound insulation of the facility's building envelope, attenuation of plant and equipment noise etc has been carried out to an 'underestimated' target. That is, not enough to prevent adverse noise impact during the quieter periods of the day, such as in the afternoon for example. The same during the night.

Therefore, because the noise control or mitigation is underestimated, we cannot support the applicant as it currently stands. We advise amendment is sought to reduce the risk of adverse noise impact and to enable reasonable conditions for approval to be drafted.

Moving on to the assessment of noise emissions from the facility, we note no correction for tonal or intermittent character is necessary because there will be none. This is acceptable if all vehicles are fitted with an alternative broadband movement alarm, or vehicles will not reverse or manoeuvre with a tonal type of alarm outside of the building and the building envelope attenuates such sounds and other equipment with characterful emission inside. A captive fleet of lorries for example, can operate broadband movement alarms.

The EIA predicts impacts of five and seven decibels over the daytime and night respectively at Chickenhall Cottages. But these levels will exceed the Local Planning Authority's limits by nine to 13 decibels. The exceedance will be higher than this because as explained above, the background sound level has been overstated. Looking at Campbell Road dwellings, daytime and night-time impacts exceed the limits, and they need to be reduced considerably to make this application acceptable.

Offsite, once joining the main public highway in Eastleigh, heavy and light traffic induced by the development will naturally increase noise levels, but the change will be less significant than experienced by dwellings on Chickenhall Lane. The EIA predicts an average or mean change over a 12 hour of ambient noise of two decibels. But this belies the effect as experienced by a dweller in the hour say. We ask what the impact is to dwelling holders say at breakfast time and lunchtime for example and on a weekend? Being adversely impacted during more sensitive times and possible also by new peak or instantaneous noise affects the quality of living and therefore is material together with premises noise on whether the planned development is acceptable. We recommend the applicant looks more closely into the details of adverse impacts the development will bring.

According to the above, we disagree with the EIA prediction of "*negligible impact magnitude to all receptors*" and therefore object subject to additional mitigation being proposed. This is likely to be more than has been set out in Section 7.5.3 "*Additional Noise Mitigation*" and should be detailed and explained before planning consent is granted.

Regarding vibration from road traffic during construction and operation, the EIA does not inform on the condition of the road near Chickenhall Cottages and therefore the effect of heavy vehicles. If the road surface is suitable for heavy vehicles or strengthened appropriately, vibration impact may not be adverse. Maintenance of the road thereafter would sensibly be included in the operating environmental management plan and the operators certified ISO14001 Environmental Management System.

In summary, we object to the operating noise impact for the reasons given above and ask planning colleagues to seek amendment of the EIA and improvement in the performance of additional mitigation measures to protect all sensitive receivers. These in our opinion are within Best Available Techniques for an Environmental Permit as well. We also require more information on reducing vibration on access roads close to the premises, such as near Chickenhall Cottages.

## **2) Odour Pollution (in use)**

The EIA predicts in a south southeast and south downwind effect to Chickenhall Cottages a risk of odour impact occurring from residual leachate or other organic material in the mixed pre recycled waste. We assume incoming loads will be sheeted or sealed and therefore the controls on odour within the facility building and the closing roller doors after a lorry has passed through will be sufficient to prevent odour experienced at Chickenhall Cottages, the closet dwellings. We ask planning colleagues to seek further information on this because if for practical sake the roller shutter doors are open sufficient for a puff of odour to escape, an impact will likely occur downwind.

Our experience is that this leachate and organic material have potent odours depending on moisture content of the waste materials and temperature. A single exposure would be adverse because of this and therefore, the EIA's assessment that a six per cent chance reduces the significance of the impact is disagreed.

We also ask if the reference meteorological conditions used by the EIA are sufficiently representative of the local wind rose, air flow over ground at near ground level to Chickenhall Cottages and Campbell Road dwelling and other relevant atmospheric conditions such as temperature and inversions? It seems likely the odour potential from leachate and organic matter is greater in summer and hot days and may also depend on other factors such time and the way the incoming recycled materials have been handled at source, at source. It will be relevant to know more about the control or acceptance criteria the facility will operate to prevent odour emissions.

We ask for clarification on whether an odour will be emitted from lorries and from the facility and if there will be despite the above controls and after allowing for local conditions, what additional mitigation will be provided to prevent a residual impact occurring in generally and on 'high emission / more impacting days' what will be done to prevent odour?

We also recommend odour control is included in the operating environmental management plan and the operators certified ISO14001 Environmental Management System.

### **3) Air Pollution (in use)**

Air quality deteriorates in the presence of vehicular emissions of nitrogen dioxides, other oxides of nitrogen and fine or respirable particulate matter. When exceeding a proportion of the Air Quality Objectives, vehicular emissions harm. The upper limit is not an absolute litmus on health impact unfortunately. In recognition of this, Eastleigh Borough Council designates Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) according to national policy. For example, the A335 and M3 which will inevitably be used by vehicles destined for the facility are AQMAS monitored by us. The significance of these is the cumulative impact current and future planned development have upon dwellings and other sensitive locations.

Regrettably, there are no controls available to reduce impacts of concern to dwellings now and into the near future other than reducing development and in time seeing a reduction due to more use of electric vehicles and cleaner combustion / exhaust control.

Currently we see redevelopment of existing residential site for new dwellings alongside the A335 for example at ordinary or established set back building lines being required to consider alternative locations on the building at further distance for intake of fresh air. For existing dwellings, there is no choice and therefore they are more impacted than we would prefer. The level of pollutants in the AQMAS increases the risk of harm to dwelling holders.

The EIA scopes in human health risk assessment from vehicular emissions and predicts impacts for scenarios that include other committed developments. We are not traffic engineers and so ask planning colleagues to ask for comment on the traffic model proposed by the applicant for this application.

Vehicles induced traffic on the local highway network are as mentioned 64 heavy vehicles in and out (124 total per day) and 120 cars total per day over a 24-hour operating cycle. The EIA predicts the impact of these across the local highway network and within the AQMAS is small and would not exceed the Air Quality Objectives when taking account of background and other development related emissions. Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) will be up one per cent against the Objectives (+0.15 ug/m<sup>3</sup>) and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> size of 10 micrometres or less) less than one percent (+0.18 ug/m<sup>3</sup>). In these terms, the EIA predicts negligible impact from vehicular emissions and not significant health effect.

As the traffic induced by the facility can be conditioned for the operating character applied for, the risk of more traffic appears none. And we note electric vehicle charging facilities will be provided at the facility to assist staff having and adapting to use these.

Operating the AQMAs is a recurring annual cost to Eastleigh Borough Council, and we ask for contribution to this from the applicant.

Regarding dust from the facility, the EIA is not clear on whether operations of will generate dust or not. We therefore anticipate tipping, handling, sorting and batching inside the building only will contain all dust emission from loose particulates and abrasion during processing. Presumably, there will some filtration in the ventilation and exhaust systems and outdoor areas will not be used for yard purpose. And again, if roller shutter doors are practically open, dust will escape. Please ask for more information on this to address concerns to dwellings on Chickenhall Lane and Campbell Road.

#### **4) Construction Pollution**

The EIA predicts no significant effects from construction noise, vibration and dust after implementation of good practice and mitigation measures. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan will be implemented, and this should be a condition for the planning approval. The outline of these described by the EIA is appropriate and details should be worked out when constructions works are programmed, and the methods and plant and machinery are known. We agree monitoring and audit is necessary and while making best plans and carefully scheduling work stages and control and mitigation measures, the CEMP should be responsive to complaints and seek to resolve and abate the problem within 24 hours.

15 March 2022

\*\*\*

This page is intentionally left blank