

Meeting Council
Date and Time Wednesday, 15th January, 2020 at 7.00 pm.
Venue King Alfred Conference Chamber, Guildhall, Winchester

S U P P L E M E N T A R Y A G E N D A

Agenda Item.

8. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Pages 3 - 38)

City Offices
Colebrook Street
Winchester
SO23 9LJ

LAURA TAYLOR
Chief Executive

15 January 2020

Agenda Contact: David Blakemore, Democratic Services Team Manager
Tel: 01962 848217 Email: dblakemore@winchester.gov.uk



This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 1

From: Councillor Godfrey

To: The Leader (Cllr Thompson)

“What steps are being taken by the Council to replace the £5m grant from Enterprise M3 LEP to improve the public realm in Winchester which was lost as a direct result of the judicial review of the council's planning decision on Station Approach?”

Reply

“The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) have indicated that they would be receptive to a future funding application for grant for works at Station Approach. At this stage, there is no commitment from central government to the details of future funding to LEPs, but we are working closely with EM3 to progress a future bid at the appropriate time. Any other potentially available funding sources will continue to be explored, working closely with Hampshire County Council aligned with the Movement Strategy implementation.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 2

From: Councillor Rutter

To: The Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Wellbeing (Cllr Porter)

“Can the Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Wellbeing please report on any progress with DEFRA and the issue of Nitrate Neutrality? The indecision and lack of clarity on this from the government is a serious bar to important planning applications throughout the Solent area, including some areas of the Winchester District which are impacted by the current ban.”

Reply

“This is a serious an issue which has affected a number of councils across southern Hampshire and has meant that the council has been unable to grant permission for a number of residential schemes which are unable to demonstrate nitrate neutrality.

I wrote to the relevant Minister raising my concerns regarding the impact on housing delivery and the development industry more widely in November last year. I was seeking assurances this was being discussed at the highest level in order to find a way resolve the issue which stems from advice being provided by Natural England notwithstanding the fact that wastewater discharged into the Solent from residential development is regulated by the Environment Agency. To date however I have received no reply.

In order therefore to move the positon forward I am taking a paper to Cabinet on 22nd January recommending that we adopt a Position Statement with immediate effect which will enable us to consider permissions for housing schemes. This will involve the Council pursuing options which will enable developers to mitigate the impact of their developments where they are unable to do so themselves. A number of other neighboring councils have adopted a similar approach.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 3

From: Councillor Pearson

To: The Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation (Cllr Tod)
(in absence of Cllr Murphy, Cabinet Member for Environment)

“What issues does the new Waste Collection Contract address that were not covered by the present Contract with Biffa?

What is the status of the audit into the issues on the move to the new Waste Collection Contract?”

Reply

“The new waste collection contract provides a similar range of services to those currently delivered but there are also a number of service enhancements including:

- The use of only EURO6 compliant vehicles on the service thereby reducing the emissions from the refused collection fleet
- Greater use of narrow bodied refuse collection vehicles to improve access particularly in town centres
- A free household collection of small electrical equipment for recycling
- The introduction of new ICT technology both in-cab and as a reporting tool which will improve management information and collection performance

The review of the mobilisation in October 2019 has not yet been completed, and officers are currently working with the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee to ensure there is capacity and availability of the committee to look at the Audit as soon as it is finalised. As I explain in answer to another question, the performance issues caused by the late delivery of calendars was quickly addressed and the service is now operating well – although we continue to work to improve it still further. The award of the new contract to Biffa means

that there is no requirement for major changes in the organisation of collections in October 2020.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 4

From: Councillor Ferguson

To: The Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation (Cllr Tod)

“Can the Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation comment on what impact the new glass collection service has had on the volume of glass being collected across the district?”

Reply

“There has been a significant and positive impact on the volume of glass collected for recycling.

Whilst the data we have received is not final audited data, there is a significant increase in glass being collected since the service started on September 30th.

Number of tonnes of glass collected each month							
April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept	Oct.	Nov.
130	168	167	179	133	133	275	221

Based on the two months of data received so far since the new scheme began, there has been at around an extra 50 tonnes of glass collected for recycling per month, taking May to July as the comparative months, although exact changes are difficult to identify as only two months have passed and we are expecting the amount of glass collected to vary across the year.

The national measure of CO2 saved per tonne recycled is 233kg of CO2 saved per tonne recycled*, which suggest around 10-15 tonnes of CO2 saved per month by our increased recycling activity.

When we have received 3 months data we should be in a position to provide a more robust estimate of the increase in recycling rate.”

*English Carbon metric report produced by
wasteprogramme@defra.gsi.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 5

From: Councillor Mather

To: The Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation (Cllr Tod)
(in absence of Cllr Murphy, Cabinet Member for Environment)

“When will the Administration arrange for the removal of all the fiendishly adhesive “I’m voting tactically” stickers attached to lampposts, utility boxes, private house down pipes and street furniture in central Winchester and how much will it cost?”

Reply

“I share Cllr Mather’s frustration at the misuse of public street furniture for political or commercial purposes.

During the recent general election campaign, there were two main offenders:

- North East 4 EU – a limited company based in Newcastle – which sold the ‘I’m voting tactically’ and ‘Hearts Not Hate’ stickers from their website. On a walkabout last weekend, I saw around 30 of these in total – still wholly or partly in place – and they are in the process of being removed or have been removed.
- Campaign against Corbynism – a campaign set up by James Bickerton – a Daily Express journalist – which put up plastic anti-Corbyn posters around the Winchester constituency shortly before polling day.

Both of these have incurred cost to public authorities to have their materials removed – although we don’t exactly estimate the cost for each individual sticker or poster.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 6

From: Councillor Lumby

To: The Cabinet Member for Local Economy (Cllr Weir)

“Please can the Cabinet Member provide an update on next steps for Station Approach?”

Reply

“The council is reviewing the options for progressing the office and mixed use development at the Carfax site, Station Approach following the judicial review challenge. We remain committed to supporting the local economy through an exemplary, market leading low carbon office development in the city, and the Carfax site is ideal for that type of development. Leading the way with a net carbon neutral scheme that delivers new jobs and wider economic regeneration at Station Approach, in support of key elements of the Council Plan, is most important. We regret the unnecessary loss of the £5million grant from EM3LEP due to the legal action initiated by the City of Winchester Trust, but will continue to seek external funding to support the city centre economy.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 7

From: Councillor Gemmell

To: The Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation (Cllr Tod)
(in absence of Cllr Murphy, Cabinet Member for Environment)

"What income did we receive in the year 2018/19; and what received/forecast to receive, in the year 2019/20 from the textiles bins and the planned distribution of such funds?"

Reply

"The textile income balance at the end of 2018/19 was £95,368.

The forecast is for £25k of income for 2019/20.

The funds will be distributed to Salvation Army £22k and TRAID £7K as per the original agreement.

As per the original Portfolio Holder Decision in March 2014, the balance of funds are ring-fenced as additional money available for community grants.

These ring-fenced monies will be used to set up a competitive grant for carbon neutrality projects, initiatives and service. This will be administered through the council's crowd-funding platform."

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 8

From: Councillor Cook

To: The Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation (Cllr Tod)

“Can the Cabinet Member please inform us as how all the Lib Dem Election Literature (in many cases in excess of 20 leaflets being deposited through the door of each household) has been disposed of and do you consider this appropriate behaviour and action given the so called well publicised Emergency Declaration that your Party have widely declared?”

Reply

“I’m sure Councillor Cook will be pleased to know that Winchester Liberal Democrats, wherever possible, work with printers who offer climate neutral printing and climate neutral shipping as well as ensuring that we print on recyclable FSC®-certified paper. We would hope that the Conservative Party could take a similar approach.

Every month the council collects and recycles around 193 tonnes of paper and cardboard – and our estimate is that, on average, each household across the district received less than 200 g of Liberal Democrat literature during the General Election campaign – about the same weight as a single copy of the Hampshire Chronicle. This added around 2% by weight to the amount recycled across the district in November and December.

Given that the Liberal Democrats don’t have tons of newspapers such as the Daily Mail, Daily Express, Sun etc. produced every day in support of our party, we will continue to produce our own printed materials to challenge government and county council complacency on issues such as climate change and make no apology for doing so.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 9

From: Councillor Horrill

To: The Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management (Cllr Learney)

“Can the Cabinet Member for Housing explain why she saw fit not to attend the Nightshelter, Trinity or Emmaus AGMs to show her commitment to the partner organisations in the city which work with us to tackle the key issues of homelessness and rough sleeping? Is it that she had other political priorities?”

Reply

“My and Cabinet’s commitment is very clear - we have strengthened the commitment to work with partners to end homelessness in the Council Plan and through the homelessness strategy. During the autumn I have met individually or collectively with representatives of all our partners in this field. I have accompanied the street pastors into the early hours, taking the opportunity to talk to and provide refreshments to those still on our streets on a very wet and cold night. In the middle of November I took part in our annual homelessness count which again involved being out on the streets well into the night.

Like most Councillors I am frequently double or triple booked with evening meetings regardless of the level of political activity. While I would have attended if able, I was at a School Governing body meeting on the night of the Trinity AGM and undertaking training on the evening of the Winchester Nightshelter AGM neither of which could be rearranged. Neither I nor officers were invited to the Emmaus AGM.

It is a shame to see the time available for questions at this Council wasted with personal attacks such as this.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 10

From: Councillor Cunningham

To: The Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Wellbeing (Cllr Porter)

“Given the Council’s Climate Emergency declaration, and the fact that incineration is no form of recycling or renewable energy, it is a shame that the Council’s official submission regarding Wheelabrator’s Mega Incinerator at Harewood on the border of Wonston & Micheldever Ward has not been shared with Members.

The emissions from this Industrial waste fuelled Incinerator will directly impact concerned residents North & North East of Winchester between Micheldever Station and the city itself.

Can the Cabinet Member assure Members that the interests of residents in the affected areas is the Council’s primary concern, that this is reflected in the Council’s submission statement to Wheelabrator Technologies, and that the submission is issued, in full, to all Members without delay.”

Reply

“The Wheelabrator Harewood Energy from Waste proposal would see an incineration plant constructed 1.75km north of Barton Stacy and north of the A303 and is within Test Valley Borough Council area.

The proposal has been classified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and is therefore considered and decided by the Secretary of State following recommendations made by the Planning Inspectorate.

The proposal is currently at the pre application stage where the applicant is expected to work up the proposals having regard to local views.

Wheelabrator initiated a 6 week consultation on 31 October 2019. A briefing note was sent to local ward members and Parish Councils on 7th November 2019 setting out details of the proposal and how to respond to the consultation.

Given the timescale for submitting comments an Officer response was sent overseen by me. I am happy to share the full response, which is attached as an Appendix to this question.

At this stage we are not being asked whether we object to the proposal or not, but rather to comment on the extent of the information being presented. This we have done as demonstrated in our comprehensive response attached.

I would wish to reassure members that the interests of the district's residents are always very important consideration for us where any development is proposed and will be reflected in the Council's response when the applicant makes their formal submission for examination to the Planning Inspectorate. A full report will be considered by Cabinet which will set out the issues and our intended response to the scheme."



**Development
Management**

City Offices
Colebrook Street
Winchester
Hampshire
SO23 9LJ

tel 01962 840 222
fax 01962 841 365

telephone calls may be recorded

website www.winchester.gov.uk

To DWD
Acting for
WTI/EfW Holdings Limited

Case No:
Your Ref:
Enq to: Mr Stephen Cornwell
Direct Dial: 01962 848 485

Please quote on all correspondence

12 December 2019

Dear Sir

Subject: National Strategic Infrastructure Project to be considered under Planning Act 2008 (as amended) Wheelabrator Harewood: Proposed Application for a New Waste to Energy Facility and Associated Development on land to the West of Raymond Brown Waste Solutions, A303 Enviropark, Drayton Road, Barton Stacey, Andover, Hampshire. SO21 3QS

I refer to the above mentioned project which is currently in the pre-application stage for consideration as a National Strategic Infrastructure Project. This letter contains the formal response of Winchester City Council (WCC) to the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and the Consultation Document which has been put out as part of a consultation exercise running from Wednesday 31 October 2019 to 1700 hours on Thursday 12 December 2019.

Introduction

The proposed location of the incinerator lies within the Test Valley Borough Council area. For the purposes of the 2008 Planning Act, Winchester City Council (WCC) is a neighbouring authority with regard to this proposal. Accordingly, the following comments will focus on this perspective but touch on other matters where the Council considered that they have a bearing on its function as a local planning authority (LPA).

The local planning authority notes the status of the proposal and the following comments have been framed to reflect the current stage in the pre application process. In that context, the majority of the comments below are encouraging the applicant to present greater clarity on specific issues and undertake further engagement with the interested local planning authorities and the wider community. As part of that process, WCC remains committed to working with Wheelabrator.

The comments below relate to the PEIR and are structured under the relevant chapter headings. The comments have drawn on views from other colleagues within the authority. This response has also been discussed with the Portfolio Holder for the Built Environment and Wellbeing.

Background

The proposal would see the construction of a waste to energy facility taking in up to 500,000 tonnes of municipal solid waste, commercial and industrial waste. It could generate up to 65MW gross electrical output. There would be 2 combustion lines, allowing for operations to be ongoing whilst one line is undergoing repair or maintenance. A 24hr 7 days a week operational programme is envisaged over 285 days per year, with the remaining down time used for maintenance. The facility would have a design life of 50 years. Access to the site is off the A303. The feedstock is envisaged coming from a broad area including Hampshire, Dorset and Wiltshire. The complex of elements would be designed to nestle around the tallest building which would be the boiler house. Two chimneys are also proposed. The combustion process would be undertaken using an inclined reciprocating grate technology enabling a burn of at least 2 seconds at a temperature exceeding 850C. The flue gas treatment system will be designed to achieve emissions within the limits as specified in the Industrial Emissions Directive and in the Best Available Technology reference document for Incineration. These would be enforced through the Environmental Permit that the plant will be required to hold. Sections of solar panels would be attached to the roof and walls of the building generating 2MW of electricity. The electricity connection to the grid is not put forward as part of the proposed DCO proposal.

Chapter 5 Alternatives

It is considered that the section on how this site was chosen needs further information. The reference in the document to the facility being CHP ready for when the heat demand arises is considered a highly optimistic statement when the potential for development within the surrounding area is considered. Without an identified outlet for the waste heat, the efficiency of the facility is considered to be severely compromised. The view of WCC is that this factor should have featured as one of the principle considerations in the site selection process.

Within an environmental statement the applicant is obliged to include information on the main alternatives they have studied and the reasons for their choice. The reason this site was chosen are listed in the documents as the following:

- Location to Hampshire and region
- Proximity to Enviopark next door
- Proximity to strategic road network
- Low environmental sensitivity of site
- Availability of land

None of the above are viewed as critical in the selection process and it is considered that they are as likely to apply to a number of other sites. A far more rigorous

explanation and justification of why this site was chosen is required. It is noted that the proximity to an electricity connection point on the grid is not identified as one of the considerations.

The grid connection should form part of the submission as an essential component of the overall project.

The potential for this type of facility to be located at a former energy generating site such as Didcot should have been considered particularly given that locations additional access to the rail network.

One of the alternatives is the do nothing scenario. This appears to have been discounted without any clear assessment of the future direction of recycling generally. The projected 50 year design life of the facility is noted. In view of the dynamic nature of the recycling industry some recognition of the potential availability of feedstocks throughout this period should be considered including the future trends in waste management. Indicators suggest less waste being generated in the future or with better options for reuse or recycling and it would be perverse if feedstock was being trucked over long distances to supply the facility. This would defeat the principle of reducing emissions. The presence of other energy from waste incinerators is noted and so the concept of completion for waste is a realistic possibility which could result in premature redundancy of the plant. Whilst paragraph 4.89 says it is unrealistic and potentially misleading to attempt at this stage to provide information on the origin of the fuel this is not accepted.

The applicant states that the proposal would generate employment opportunities in the local area. Whilst focusing on the Andover Travel To Work Area, this benefit could presumably apply to parts of the Winchester area. Conversely, the proximity of the site to the strategic road network is considered to give people the ability of travelling to the site from a wider area which may dilute any more localised benefits.

Chapter 6 Traffic

The lack of any links to public transport opportunities means that all employees will drive to the site by car. A strategy to reduce individual car use and to prevent both construction traffic and employee traffic from using the A272/A30 and local road network should be put forward.

The inadequate standard of the east and west bound de-acceleration and acceleration lanes at the junction of the A303 and Drayton Road, are noted. This situation is considered to be an incentive for people to avoid using the A303 and seek instead to find an alternative route to and from the site which would involve the use of the rural road network referred to above. For traffic approaching from the south this means using local roads that pass through the WCC area. This concern needs to be recognised, assessed and appropriate mitigation measures put forward.

At the operational stage a similar set of measures should be adopted.

It is projected that 40% of the traffic delivering feedstock to the site will come up the A34. The PEIR at paragraph 6.165 acknowledges the Junction 9 M3 road improvement, but simply says this has to be factored in. A more detailed and thoughtful analysis of this is required. If the junction improvements do take place they may result in

traffic delays which can lead to traffic seeking to bypass the road works by using the roads through Winchester itself. The City has poor air quality which any additional HGV traffic will not improve. More than that, if HGVs do pass through the city, they are less likely to re-join the A34 but continue up the A272 seeking a rural route to the site.

Chapter 7 Air Quality

The WCC Chartered Environmental Health Practitioner has commented on the proposal. His comments are included in the response below but the full version is attached at the back of this letter.

In general terms of noise and air quality, the proposed modelled receptors are acceptable. The approaches to the analysis of the impact from emissions on human health are noted.

It is considered that the scientific implications to health relative to the size of particulates is becoming an ever more apparent and important factor. The ability to meet standards will be influenced by the nature and degree of waste in the burn. It should be clarified what risk may result if one particular type of waste is burnt (for example plastic) and whether that burn could overwhelm the emissions treatment system resulting in an escape of an over concentration of particulate matter or other elements in the flue gases. A more detailed outline of the handling and any pre treatment/processing of the waste stream before it enters the incinerator is required.

The nature and extent of the proposed waste feedstock needs qualifying in greater detail.

A critical factor is considered to be the ability of the facility to adapt to future tightening of requirements to reduce emission levels. It needs to be clarified if the facility has a sufficient level of inbuilt resilience to allow for improvements in the future. For example, if the particulate level is reduced to include the capture of smaller PM2.5 particulate matter.

The details contain a reference to the presence of an ongoing monitoring system of the emissions. However, it is not clear what procedure would be followed if this system identified a concern with the emission levels. This needs clarifying and setting out using a number of scenarios if this assists in the clarification.

Chapter 13 Archaeology and Heritage

The comments of the Historic Environment Team Leader are included below. There is no objections to the methodology used to assess the impact on the built heritage. There are however some queries in relation to the assessment in terms of conservation areas which it is considered require clarification. The table on page 10 of Chapter 13 (Archaeology and Heritage) states that conservation areas have a medium heritage value but that conservation areas of a demonstrable high value would have a high heritage value. I have not been able to find a definition of what constitutes 'demonstrable high value' or a methodology for how this would be assessed in the submitted documentation. However it is noted that Barton Stacey, Longparish and Hurstbourne Priors Conservation areas are considered to have high value (p. 17). The study appears to omit an assessment of the impact on the Sutton Scotney conservation area, Tufton Conservation area in Page 26 Hedge and Deane, and Wherwell Conservation

Area in Test Valley, all of which fall within the 5km distance band and should be considered.

It is considered that an additional view from the elevated site at Norbury ring is required.

No panoramic views or wire frames showing the potential impact of development appear to have been submitted and this is a significant omission which should be rectified.

Chapter 14 Landscape & Visual Impact

The views of the Landscape Officer have been sought and their conclusions are contained in the comments below. A full copy of their response is set out at the back of this letter.

Landscape and visual impact is a direct product of the size and scale of the proposed facility. The details refer to a reduction in the height of the main buildings and chimneys following closer analysis. However, the PEIR does reference to different heights and this needs to be edited out to one consistent set of figures. In paragraph 2.2.2 reference is made to the boiler house of up to 55m and chimneys 90-100m in height. Paragraph 2.3.4 again makes reference to the 90-100m chimney heights. Table 4.2 then refers to a main facility with a maximum height of 46m and the chimneys having a maximum height of 80m.

The size of the building is directly related to the space needed to accommodate the equipment . The choice of the inclined reciprocating grate technology chosen for the combustion process needs to be justified in the context that another technology might result in a development that has a lower height for the buildings and consequential a reduced visual impact.

Paragraph 14.40 sets out that the plume is not considered in the impact assessments as it is 'only expected to be visible intermittently'. The affects of the plume should be considered as a worst case scenario.

The impacts of night time lighting should be included within any assessment bot both the construction and operational phases of the development. The assessment should address impacts to aviation receptors and should also address impacts from the potential illumination of the plumes during night-time. The assessment should cross-refer to other relevant aspect assessments (such as ecology and cultural heritage). Due to the height of the chimney stacks, aviation lighting will no doubt be required. The LVIA should assess the additional night time impact this lighting would have. Also whilst the impacts of the plumes cannot be quantified, this impact should not be ignored and discounted from the assessment altogether.

The potential glinting affect at a distance of the proposed solar panels on the roof and/or sides does not appear to have been sufficiently assessed or mitigated at this stage.

The dramatic cut off applied to the 5km distance is considered to be too abrupt to separate the wider visible area from the variable visible area. (para 14.64)

Sutton Scotney which does lie within the 5km zone is not recognised as such in the assessment.

An additional viewpoint is required in the area of Sutton Scotney or a clear and convincing reason why no such viewpoint is proposed. The 5km cut off excludes Norsebury Ring at 100m AOD which lies east of Sutton Scotney and Worston.

The visualisations only show the existing landscape. No attempt has been made to show what the project would look like other than a general reference to a section of the building and chimneys being in view.

It is considered that nothing can be done to reduce the impact within the WCC area of the presence of the building. However the applicant offers no mitigation of any kind in recognition of that situation. This needs to be considered with appropriate mitigation put forward.

Conclusion

Winchester City Council has sought to restrict its comments to those aspects relevant to its standing as a neighbouring authority. The applicant is requested to provide further explanation on a range of issues. A proposal of this nature which involves emission discharges into the atmosphere will inevitably raise concerns in the local community relating to air quality. At the present time the level of detail is considered to have a number of omissions. Whilst recognising that the applicant goes into the PEIR consultation with a scheme still in its formative stage, it should also be recognised that the applicant must put out into the public domain a sufficient degree of information on which the public can make reasonable and rational comments. The DCLG publication Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre application process (March 2015) acknowledges that a consultation can take place in phases as detail becomes available. The benefit of this approach is obvious as it allows the progressive development of a scheme and does not hold back detail until the formal submission stage when the consultation exercise is more limited in its nature and extent. The publication and consultation of more detail as a second stage consultation exercise is something the applicant is encouraged to adopt in this instance.

If you have any queries or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the Case Officer, Mr Stephen Cornwell on 01962 848 485.

Yours faithfully

Julie Pinnock BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI
Head of Development Management

Full comments attached below from:

Landscape Officer
Chartered Environmental Health Practitioner
Historic Environment Team Leader

Landscape Officers Comment in Full

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We have concerns relating to how the proposal would affect the landscape within the WCC boundary.

Landscape Policy

- **NPPF**

With regards to the National Planning Policy Framework, the following paragraphs should be considered in relation to landscape proposals.

127. *Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*

- a) *will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) *are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) *are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*

130. *Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area*

170. *Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*

- b) *recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*

- **WCC Local Plan**

Policy CP13 – High Quality Design

Policy CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character

Policy DM23 – Rural Character

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Chapter 14 of the PIERS admits that the proposed development would result in moderate to major adverse effects; the development would provide no beneficial landscape or visual effects to the immediate or wider landscape. Therefore it is considered that the proposals do not meet the requirements of Paragraphs 127, 130 and 170 of the NPPF and Policies CP13, CP20 and DM23 of WCC's Local Plan.

Winchester City Council boundary is within the 5km zone of theoretical visibility. This brings Sutton Scotney and Egypt within the assessed zone. Higher ground outside of the 5km radius would also be affected visually by the proposed building mass.

Assessment Methodology

14.39 - *The landscape and visual baseline assessments have been based on desk study and field work. Field work has been stated as being undertaken between June 2018 and June 2019 and has included both summer and winter inspections to take account of the changing seasons and the differences between vegetation being in leaf or not.*

The 2019 winter photography has yet to be carried out although there is a statement of the changes that occur in the winter.

14.40 – *this paragraph sets out that the plume is not considered in the impact assessments as it is 'only expected to be visible intermittently'.*

This affects of the plume should be considered as a worst case scenario

Inspectors Comments

4.9.5 *The impact of night time lighting should be assessed for both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. The assessment should address impacts to aviation receptors and should also address impacts from the potential illumination of the plumes during night-time. The*

assessment should cross-refer to other relevant aspect assessments (such as ecology and cultural heritage).

The assessment of impacts to aviation receptors is not a matter for the LVIA, but has been considered in Chapter 17 – Other Issues of this PEIR. The assessment of impacts relating to the potential illumination of the plume at night-time cannot be readily quantified, however the impact of night time lighting will be assessed qualitatively in the LVIA for the ES.

Due to the height of the chimney stacks, aviation lighting will no doubt be required. The LVIA should assess the additional night time impact this lighting would have. Also whilst the impacts of the plumes cannot be quantified, this impact should not be ignored and discounted from the assessment altogether.

The potential glinting affect at a distance of the proposed solar panels on the roof and/or sides does not appear to have been sufficiently assessed or mitigated at this stage.

Conclusion

Whilst mitigation measures are proposed, these are actually small and cosmetic which would have no benefit to the wider landscape. Due to the combination of site location, shape and surrounding landscape characteristics, moderate and major adverse landscape and visual effects remain with no beneficial landscape and visual effects having been identified. Characteristics, guidelines and strategies set out in the tiers of landscape character assessments have not been taken into consideration.

Chartered Environmental Health Practitioner Comment in Full

On behalf of the David Ingram (Service Lead – Public Protection) I have now reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). I have restricted my consideration to potential impacts relating to Winchester City Council's District. There is a higher potentiality for more localised impacts but I will be leaving such comments to Test Valley BC in whose area such impacts could occur.

I have therefore reviewed the PEIR with particular reference to the following chapters within the main report and figures (Volume 1):

Chapter 4 – The Proposed Development

Chapter 6 – Traffic & Transport

Chapter 7 – Air Quality (plus Appendix 7.1 of volume 2)

Chapter 8 – Health

Chapter 9 – Noise and Vibration

Chapter 17 – Other Issues (plus Appendix 17.3 Statement of Statutory Nuisance)

There is little consideration of impacts with Winchester City Council's district but this is considered acceptable as the location of the development results in more sensitive/closer receptors being within the Test Valley BC area. I am therefore satisfied that in terms of noise and air quality the proposed modelled receptors are acceptable.

With regards to impacts within Winchester City Council's area, it is likely the main concern to our residents will be potential health impacts from the stack emission discharge. Overall I am satisfied this will be fully assessed by the proposals within this PEIR and in particular note:

1. Although the exact design is not finalised the type of plant and proposed abatement techniques are tried and tested technology.
2. From an ambient air quality perspective the proposed assessment is robust and I welcome the extension of the monitoring exercises to ensure a greater accuracy in the modelling ratification process.

3. The site will also need permitting by the EA that will set wider emission criteria. The proposed assessment will be worst case as it is based on maximum acceptable emission criteria set within the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).
4. The proposal to include a full Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) is welcomed and will need further detailed assessment once complete.

From a wider Climate Change perspective it is worth noting that the plant will not be Combined Heat and Power (CHP) being only "CHP ready". You may therefore wish to make further comment on seeking more positive steps that could be taken at the planning stage to ensure this functionality is utilised in the future.

Historic Environment Team Leader

I can advise that there are no objections to the methodology used to assess the impact on the built heritage. There are however some queries in relation to the assessment in terms of conservation areas which it is considered require clarification. The table on page 10 of Chapter 13 (Archaeology and Heritage) states that conservation areas have a medium heritage value but that conservation areas of a demonstrable high value would have a high heritage value. I have not been able to find a definition of what constitutes 'demonstrable high value' or a methodology for how this would be assessed in the submitted documentation. However it is noted that Barton Stacey, Longparish and Hurstbourne Priors Conservation areas are considered to have high value (p. 17). The study appears to omit an assessment of the impact on the Sutton Scotney conservation area, Tufton Conservation area in Basingstoke and Deane, and Wherwell Conservation Area in Test Valley, all of which fall within the 5km distance band and should be considered.

It is considered that an additional view from the elevated site at Norbury ring is required.

No panoramic views or wire frames showing the potential impact of development appear to have been submitted and this is a significant omission which should be rectified.

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 11

From: Councillor Scott

To: The Cabinet Member for Service Quality and Transformation (Cllr Tod)
(in absence of Cllr Murphy, Cabinet Member for Environment)

“Can the Cabinet Member for Environment confirm the statue of the waste collections and what level of complaints are coming from residents dissatisfied with the service?”

Reply

“The waste collection service began a 1-year contract extension with Biffa on the 30th September. This service is now operating within the main performance levels set out in the contact, as the crews have developed experience of delivering the new routes over those first three months, and is significantly better than this time last year, although we continue to work to improve performance still further. On average fewer than 0.1% of collections are currently being reported as missed. It is important to remember on average 215,000 collections are made per month.

Missed bins per month	Refuse	Recycling
December 18	178	118
December 19	98	55

Any phone calls and complaint received are now within the number that we would expect for a system that is performing to contract standard. In the week before Christmas, (17th-23rd December) for example we only received between 50 -75 phone calls each day for the whole waste service, whereas for the same period at the end of November the number of phone calls was roughly double that.

The Christmas period when there is significant change to the waste collection service through bank holidays, and increases in the volume of material produced has also passed without any significant issues arising, which

reflects well on the effort put in by our contractor and our contact management team.

This is demonstrated in the numbers shown overleaf, in table 1, which relates to our contractual performance targets for missed bins in December. We continue to try and improve performance across the board.”

Table 1

Current missed bin performance against contract levels.

	Number of collections per month	Bins missed in December	Bins missed per 100,000 collections	Contract performance threshold
Refuse and recycling collections	215,000	150	69	144
Green waste collections	107,000	73	68	165
Glass Collection	53,800	60	111	165



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 12

From: Councillor Brook

To: The Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Wellbeing (Cllr Porter)

“At the Cabinet meeting, there were numerous concerns highlighted by Architects Builders and Developers, regarding the Nitrates issue and its impact on delivering the much needed housing within our district. Other Councils have already implemented a plan. Could the Cabinet Member please advise on when we can expect some progress on this? We need to prevent intervention being required when our targets for meeting the current Local Plan are missed and to ensure delivery of the much needed affordable housing for our residents, including the WCC schemes that will inevitably be delayed.”

Reply

“I have already addressed the nitrate issue earlier this evening in my response to Cllr Rutter’s question.

I can add that adopting this Position Statement with immediate effect will enable us to begin considering planning permissions for residential schemes to help us maintain an adequate supply of land for housing development in the district, with the benefits this brings for our communities and people looking to live in the district, as well as the businesses that deliver new homes.”

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING – 15 January 2020

Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)

QUESTION 13

From: Councillor Pearson

To: The Cabinet Member for Built Environment and Wellbeing (Cllr Porter)

“A noticeable absence to the Climate Emergency Action Plan is specific reference to the Policy CP11 in the Local Plan Part 1.

- (a) What does this Policy now state?
- (b) What is now the status of this Policy now that Housing is an important element of the Climate Emergency Action Plan?
- (c) Have Planning Officers, and the Planning Committee been given guidance that this Policy should now be given DUE CONSIDERATION AND IMPORTANCE, with all new developments dated from 1st December 2019?”

Reply

“Nothing has changed in relation to Local Plan Policy CP11 as a result of the declaration of a climate emergency – it is the adopted policy and will be modified or replaced as necessary when the Local Plan is reviewed.

The application of the policy to individual planning applications has been restricted somewhat by the government’s national planning guidance but the general requirement to seek to minimise carbon emissions in new development has been and remains the Council’s policy. The government is currently consulting on updates to national Building Regulations which will set out new standards for energy efficiency and in time these will set the minimum requirements for all development.

In preparing the new Local Plan, the importance of minimising carbon emissions arising from development will be fundamental to the evaluation and testing of options and the recognition of a climate emergency will thus play a key role in shaping the whole development strategy, not just individual elements.”

This page is intentionally left blank