

<b>Site Name &amp; Reference</b>	<b>AS13 - Roeshot</b>
----------------------------------	-----------------------

<b>Brief Summary of Proposal</b>
----------------------------------

Extraction of approximately 3.5 million tonnes over 15 years.

Total number of Representations received **16**                      Number of Representors: **16**

<b>Were comments received from the following consultees?</b>
--

Natural England <b>Yes</b>	Local Nature Partnership <b>No</b>	Parish Council (Burton) <b>No</b>
English Heritage <b>Yes</b>	Local Enterprise Partnership: <b>No</b>	District Council (Christchurch & East Dorset Councils) - <b>Yes</b>
Environment Agency <b>Yes</b>		

<b>Other bodies making comments included:</b>	New Forest District Council - Yes
---	-----------------------------------

New Milton Sand & Ballast	New Forest National Park Authority - Yes
DK Symes & Associates	
RSPB	
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	
CPRE	
Hampshire County Council	

<b>Petitions</b> – No petition was received for this site.
--

<b>Site Issues – the following is a summary of the main issues that have been raised by stakeholders</b>		
--	--	--

<b>Summary of Issue</b>	<b>Officer Initial Response</b>	<b>Actions &amp; Further Information Requirements</b>
-------------------------	---------------------------------	---

<b>General Issues</b>		
-----------------------	--	--

<b>Consultation detail:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New Forest National Park boundary not shown on the accompanying map.</li> <li>▪ Burton Common SSSI located to the east of the site, within the National Park, is not illustrated on the plan.</li> <li>▪ Essential to consult Natural England for internationally designated sites.</li> </ul>	Future consultation will encompass all relevant organisations and boundaries.	These matters will be considered in further detail.
---	---	---

<b>Backfill:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It is stated that the development will require 30 lorry movements in and 30 out for recycling (in addition to</li> </ul>	Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies and further detail regarding the proposal.	These matters will be considered in further detail.
--	--	---

<p>the 50 in and 50 out for mineral extraction). It is unclear however, what the purpose of this recycling is. For example, is it envisaged that inert material would be imported into the site for recycling/restoration purposes in order to restore original ground levels? This needs to be made clear.</p>		
<p><b>Quarry working:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Much of Roeshot's reserves will go northwards and eastwards on the A35 into Hampshire and the South East region rather than for use in Dorset.</li> <li>▪ Need to consider phasing of the extraction process and ensure appropriate access arrangements are in place with HCC.</li> <li>▪ Other more sustainable sites exist which should be identified to meet the need for sand and gravel in Dorset.</li> <li>▪ An underground oil pipe line crosses the nominated site AS13 at Roeshot. The oil line would sterilise part of the site, unless a developer paid to relocate it.</li> </ul>	<p>The Mineral Planning Authority has a duty to make provision for an adequate supply of aggregates to support the economy and meet the need for aggregates. The overall aggregates requirement is set out in the newly adopted Minerals Strategy and the allocation of sites will need to ensure that this need can be met. The MPA will carry out further work to assess how many sites will be needed over the plan period (having regard to likely workable reserves) and will take this into account when assessing the suitability of the nominated sites.</p> <p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies and further detail regarding the proposal.</p>	<p>The MPA will carry out further technical work on the overall need and potential supply of aggregates needed over the plan period.</p>
<b>Environmental Issues</b>		
<p><b>Environmental Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unclear whether an assessment has been made of the impact on the New Forest National Park as a designated landscape outside of the Plan area.</li> <li>▪ All applications should be accompanied by an assessment of the impacts on important ecological resources within the zone of influence of the proposals.</li> <li>▪ Essential to have natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats.</li> <li>▪ Southern Damselfly has been identified on the River Mude.</li> <li>▪ Noise from extraction would drive away the existing wildlife such as buzzards, lapwings, hares.</li> </ul>	<p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies.</p> <p>In order to be acceptable, the development proposal would need to pass the tests in the Conservation Regulations (previously: Habitats Regulations).</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Detrimental impact to potential impact on sensitive receptors such as SNCIs and locally important wildlife features.</li> <li>▪ It is unclear from the document whether an assessment of the New Forest Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar Sites has been carried out, and whether impacts on adjacent Burton Common SSSI have been assessed: it is essential that the relationship with surrounding protected nature conservation interests outside of the Plan area is assessed as well as assessing those within the Plan area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Restoration:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposals should maximise the overall wetland gains</li> <li>▪ The choice of restoration may be influenced by the proximity of Bournemouth Airport.</li> <li>▪ Due to the high water table on the site, restoration of Roeshot after extraction (other than to the original ground level) is likely to result in the creation of lakes which would create a bird strike hazard; and would be inconsistent with the landscape character of the area.</li> <li>▪ There is a real concern that during the restoration of Roeshot the competing demands on inert CDE waste either for restoration/landfilling of Roeshot or for the production of high quality recycled aggregate will reduce the availability of materials to be landfilled which will mean that the final restoration will take significantly longer than it would at other sites in Dorset.</li> <li>▪ There is the potential to landscape the site post-extraction to benefit species associated with local habitats.</li> <li>▪ Restoration to lakes, wetland or poor quality land, will lead to the permanent loss of BMV agricultural land.</li> </ul>	<p>The adopted Minerals Strategy sets out policies relating to restoration as well as general development management policies which cover the identified issues. It will be a matter for the planning application stage to consider suitable conditions relating to detailed restoration programmes. At this stage site proposers have been contacted requesting further information about their sites which will inform our understanding of restoration issues and the MPA will also liaise with relevant experts such as Natural England and the Environment Agency. This information will form part of the overall assessment of the suitability of the site to go forward in the site selection process.</p> <p>An indicative programme at this stage suggests that restoration will be principally to agriculture at a reduced ground level, creating a River Mude corridor to ensure there is no impact on the river or its immediate setting. Further, restoration will be progressive and will provide additional public access to the countryside through the creation of a network of SANGs, and the concept proposed is to not divert the footpath along the eastern boundary as it will be in the undisturbed corridor</p>	<p>Restoration issues will be considered having regard to relevant policies in the adopted Minerals Strategy.</p>

<p><b>Hydrology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hydrological assessment needs to be submitted.</li> <li>▪ A 'no go buffer zone must be provided alongside any watercourses or wetland features of interest'.</li> <li>▪ Concern that sediments transported away from the Roeshot site via watercourses and natural drainage will impact negatively on river ecology and habitats and on the natural circulation processes of Christchurch Harbour.</li> <li>▪ the lanes around the site spend half the winter flooded so surely this will have an effect on extraction?</li> <li>▪ dewatering the land will have detrimental impact to BMV land and adjacent Ramsar/SSSI sites.</li> <li>▪ a buffer of at least 20m should be maintained along the Mude Stream</li> </ul>	<p>The MPA will not proceed with assessment of sites submitted for consideration until all the specified hydrological assessments have been completed and an assessment report submitted for the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) consideration.</p> <p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies.</p> <p>The Environment Agency is consulted as a matter of course on such matters.</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>
<p><b>Historic Environment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A further archaeological impact assessment is required before further decisions are made.</li> </ul>	<p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies, which includes a full archaeological assessment of the impact from any development on the archaeological sites</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>
<p><b>Safeguarding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The NPPF requires the safeguarding of Best and Most Versatile ("BMV") agricultural land: the majority of the land at Roeshot is Grade 2 to Grade 3a and is therefore BMV agricultural land.</li> </ul>	<p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies. These are required by the Planning Authority before any further decisions can be made.</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>
<p><b>Green Belt:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development would cause detrimental impact to the essential quality of the Green Belt, namely its openness.</li> </ul>	<p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies.</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>
<p><b>Impact to National Park:</b></p> <p>The haul road serving Roeshot will go through the New Forest National Park causing adverse impact. The preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of a</p>	<p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies.</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>

National Park is a statutory duty and must be considered.		
<b>Social Issues</b>		
<p><b>Highways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Detailed transport assessment, in liaison with Hampshire County Council, is required to show cumulative impact of proposed minerals working and new housing / commercial development.</li> <li>▪ No link with LTP work evident.</li> <li>▪ Heavy goods traffic is likely to have serious impacts on the surrounding road network.</li> <li>▪ The level of developer contributions needs to be agreed between Dorset and Hampshire County Councils to counter HGV use of roads.</li> <li>▪ Concern if concurrent working of the Dorset and Hampshire sides of this mineral site takes place, as this will further increase levels of congestion and impact on residential amenity.</li> <li>▪ Impact on AQMAs*: Traffic will access the A35 and potentially travel in both an eastward (ie, through the National Park) and westward direction – has assessment been undertaken?</li> <li>▪ Additional traffic from Quarry and from additional planned housing in Christchurch would cause unacceptable impact on the New Forest National Park.</li> </ul> <p>*AQMAs = Air Quality Management Areas</p>	<p>Site proposers have been contacted requesting a broad range of further assessment studies The Highway Authority, which considers matters of highway safety, is consulted at every stage in the plan's preparation.</p> <p>Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) study</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>
<p><b>Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concern that the railway line does not provide adequate screening for visual, noise and dust, light and odour impacts from residents south of the railway line and for Burton and Highcliffe residents.</li> <li>▪ The development would cause an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape.</li> <li>▪ Site too close to residential area.</li> <li>▪ Concern that greater areas of farmland is being taken</li> </ul>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions attached to any planning consent can be used to minimise adverse impacts upon amenity, including dust and noise.</p> <p>Mitigation may include restrictions on hours of working, screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment to reduce noise.</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>

<p>away from the British countryside, resulting in the possibility of greater levels of food imports.</p>	<p>The Mineral Planning Authority has a duty to make provision for an adequate supply of aggregates to support the economy and meet the need for aggregates. The overall aggregates requirement is set out in the newly adopted Minerals Strategy and the allocation of sites will need to ensure that this need can be met. The MPA will carry out further work to assess how many sites will be needed over the plan period (having regard to likely workable reserves) and will take this into account when assessing the suitability of the nominated sites.</p> <p>Consideration is also given to the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. This may have a bearing upon site options.</p>	
<p><b>Recreation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Detrimental impact to Public Rights of Way (PROW) which cross the site.</li> <li>▪ It is recognised that this requirement for alternative natural green space is likely to increase as further residential development comes forward in subsequent development plans.</li> <li>▪ A much used footpath is being lost and other footpaths will be affected by noise and activity as they run next to and near proposed site.</li> <li>▪ Potential conflict with the provision of the 'eastern SANG*' to serve the Christchurch Urban Extension.</li> </ul> <p>*SANG = Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace</p>	<p>Should the site be considered for inclusion in the plan the MPA would need to take account of recreation opportunities which might be secured both during extraction and post-restoration.</p>	<p>These matters will be considered in further detail.</p>
<b>Economic Issues</b>		
None identified		