

AT A MEETING of the Regulatory Committee of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL held virtually on Microsoft Teams on Wednesday 20th January, 2021

Chairman:

* Councillor Peter Latham

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Lance Quantrill | * Councillor Gary Hughes |
| * Councillor Christopher Carter | * Councillor Wayne Irish |
| * Councillor Charles Choudhary | * Councillor Alexis McEvoy |
| * Councillor Mark Cooper | Councillor Neville Penman |
| * Councillor Rod Cooper | * Councillor Stephen Philpott |
| * Councillor Jane Frankum | * Councillor Roger Price |
| * Councillor Andrew Gibson | |
| * Councillor Pal Hayre | * Councillor Ray Bolton |
| * Councillor Keith House | |

*Present

237. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Neville Penman. Councillor Ray Bolton was in attendance as a deputy.

238. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3, Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Non-Pecuniary interest in a matter being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 2 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

239. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

It was noted that the meeting took place virtually on Microsoft Teams and not in Ashburton Hall in Winchester. The minutes of the last meeting were then agreed.

240. DEPUTATIONS

The Chairman welcomed five deputations to the meeting and confirmed that each had a maximum of ten minutes to address Committee.

241. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman's announcements.

242. **LAND AT THREE MAIDS HILL OFF A272 WINCHESTER**

Development of an Inert Waste Recycling Facility at Land at Three Maids Hill, off A272, Winchester SO21 2QU (No. 20/01765/HCS) (Site Ref: WR243

The Committee considered a report from the Head of Strategic Planning (item 6 in the minute book) regarding a proposed development at Three Maids Hill in Winchester.

The officer summarised the report, which had been presented to Committee and deferred in December 2020 pending a site visit. Following a national lockdown in the New Year, the site visit was done virtually using footage and images from the proposed site location and surrounding area.

Since the previous Committee meeting the reservations from Winchester City Council around highways and landscaping had been resolved, and the applicant had proposed a three metre bund to the south of the site as opposed two metres to assist in further shielding site activity.

The Committee received five deputations. David Bowe spoke on behalf of Littleton Stud against the application, sharing his concerns about the welfare of the horses and impact on the business. The measures in place were felt to be weather dependent and the landscaping would take 7 years to flourish and have full effect. Councillor Stephen Burgess spoke on behalf of Littleton & Harestock Parish Council and also shared concerns over noise and HGV traffic in the local area.

Councillor Mel Iredale from Headbourne Worthy Parish Council spoke against the application on the basis that it was not appropriate for a greenfield site and the potential impacts of traffic in the local area.

Luke Bridges and Steve Austin addressed Committee on behalf of the applicant, and reassured deputations and Committee that it would be a highly regulated site with hard infrastructure and procedures in place to minimise noise and dust. The site would not open until 7am and the largest plant machinery would not be used until 8am each day. It was also proposed that a liaison group be set up to enable open communication between the applicant and local residents.

Finally, local Hampshire County Councillor Jan Warwick spoke against the application and the use of the proposed land due to it not being extraordinary circumstances and there being no justification for the site being in that location.

During questions of the deputations, the following points were clarified:

- The horses are played music in the barns, but the road noise from the A34 was constant and very different to sporadic noise coming from a site;

- The number of horses on the Stud varied between 65 and 120;
- The Section 106 agreement, 3 metre bund and liaison had all been developments proposed since the application was deferred at the December 2020 Regulatory Committee meeting;
- 'Push' noises had replaced the usual 'beeping' on site vehicles;
- Access to the main highway network had been an important factor in determining the location and therefore the top of the field had not been proposed due to being further away;
- The default position of the application was that dust did not leave the site;
- Ecological bunds had been designed by consultants to encourage butterflies;
- There were provisions for water in times of extreme drought, but the tank on site would be maintained at all times so there was no risk of not having the amount required.
- The bund would restrict noise at 2 metres and increasing it to 3 metres would only assist with the visual impact;

During questions of the Officers, the following points were clarified:

- The Environment Agency would monitor dust impacts as well as the County Council;
- The 2019 aggregate assessment for the County Council reported aggregate levels at 850,000tpa, compared to the 1,000,000tpa required;
- Hampshire Minerals & Waste plan took precedent over the Winchester City Council plan, and Policy 29 did allow for development in a greenfield area providing there were good transport connections and the site was suitability justified

During debate, many Members acknowledged that dust and noise suppression issues had attempted to be addressed by the applicant yet some remained doubtful that these did enough to negate impacts on the local area. It was also debated that the location was felt to not be suitable and should be protected from development.

RESOLVED:

That permission be REFUSED due to breaches of Policies 5b, 10 and 29 of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan

Voting

Favour: 6

Against: 8

Abstentions: 2

Chairman,