

BHH Local Area Committee – Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022

ITEM 10 – HAMBLE AIRFIELD, ref. CS/22/92277 UPDATE TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

Item no.	Updates	Recommendation amendments
10	<p><u>Further information received:</u></p> <p>Report received from Transport Consultants Systra, providing further information to support Eastleigh Borough Council’s transport concerns. Please refer to separate Addendum Paper.</p> <p><u>Correction – paragraph 89</u></p> <p>There is an error in the reference to trip rate comparisons in paragraph 89. The paragraph should read as follows (corrections shown in bold):</p> <p><i>In relation to traffic, in finding the Minerals and Waste Plan sound (including this site allocation), the Inspector was provided evidence that there could be up to 60 <del>two-way</del> HGV movements per day (30 in, 30 out), judging this to be an insignificant increase in the number and frequency of HGV movements on Hamble Lane. It is noted that the applicants Transport Assessment indicates that during peak years of operation there would be 144 HGV movements per day (72 in, 72 out), which is 140% greater than the upper limit on which the Inspector based his decision in 2013.</i></p>	<p><u>Conclusion/ Summary of objection</u></p> <p>The summary of matters for objection set out in paragraph 118 has been updated as follows (additional matters in bold):</p> <p>Eastleigh Borough Council objects to the proposal for mineral extraction at Hamble Airfield for the reasons details in this report, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient justification for mineral extraction at Hamble Airfield given the significant environmental impacts;</li> <li>• Inadequate assessment of highway impacts, notably in terms of predicted traffic generation / <b>trip rates, inappropriate assumptions regarding future highway improvements, lack of junction capacity assessments</b>, and resulting implications for highway and pedestrian safety and the local economy;</li> <li>• Insufficient information to assess pollution, noise and air quality impacts and effects on the health and wellbeing of local residents and businesses, <b>including school children</b>;</li> <li>• Lack of assessment of the impact of displaced recreational activity on protected coastal areas, and concern that the ecological value of the site has been underestimated;</li> <li>• Objection to loss of trees at access;</li> <li>• Poor design of landscape buffer bunds and associated visual impacts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Further recommendations</u></p> <p>Within the recommendations for further information set out in paragraph 121, it is recommended that the following points are added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Further information to justify the assumptions on which the traffic impacts are based, including information regarding the timing and deliverability of future highway improvement works;</b></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Carry out junction capacity assessments to cover junctions of Hamble Lane with Satchell Lane, Portsmouth Road, Jurd Way and Tesco access, as well as the Windhover Roundabout and M27 junction 8.</b></li><li>• <b>Reassessment of access design to reduce risks to cyclists.</b></li></ul> <p>The following points are also added to the recommended conditions and obligations set out in paragraph 122:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Provision of any necessary off-site highway improvements.</b></li></ul>
--	--	--