

Summary of responses to “Have Your Say Consultation”, Feb 2011.

A “Have Your Say” document was published to inform initial public consultation in February / March 2011. A wide variety of groups were given the opportunity to comment. Public exhibitions and specialist workshops were also held.

The most relevant comments for Southampton relate to:

- a. The existing River Itchen wharves – Generally there was support for the approach to safeguarding these wharves. ABP support their long term redevelopment.
- b. Dibden Bay – ABP welcome the recognition of Dibden Bay’s potential but seek that the need for a wharf / port facility be more strongly acknowledged. Natural England register their opposition; and New Forest District Council (NFDC) seek added emphasis on the environment.
- c. Marchwood military port – if a part of the port becomes surplus, the MoD and NFDC support its use for marine activities provided this is not restricted solely to a minerals and waste wharf.
- d. Ashley Crescent – a potential applicant suggests there is the potential for a further small scale specialist waste facility.
- e. Woolston waste water treatment works (WWTW) – Southern Water seek that the plan recognises all options (upgrade on site or relocate) and support whichever becomes their preferred option.

In terms of more general comments, there were:

- a. 1,000 objections to sand and gravel extraction on the Hamble peninsula;
- b. 1,200 other comments – about 70% in favour of the questions asked. The main areas of debate relate to the balance between economic and environmental objectives; and the targets for land won mineral extraction.

More recently a meeting has been held with the ‘No Southampton Biomass’ group to discuss the emerging Plan and supporting documents. The main concerns they expressed in relation to the potential for a major biomass energy plant within the Port are:

- The site is close to residential areas
- Air quality issues – the site is close to an Air Quality Management Area
- The scale / design of an energy plant
- An energy plant is not genuinely port related
- The requirement should be for an energy plant to actually provide heat locally, not just ‘be capable of’ providing heat.
- The site is not previously developed (it is open hard standing)
- The site is not suitable for many of the waste management uses listed – it is within 250 metres of residential areas.