

AT A MEETING of the Regulatory Committee of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY
COUNCIL held at the castle, Winchester on Wednesday 22nd June, 2022

Chairman:

* Councillor Peter Latham

* Councillor Lance Quantrill
* Councillor Lulu Bowerman
* Councillor Steven Broomfield
* Councillor Mark Cooper
* Councillor Rod Cooper
* Councillor Michael Ford
* Councillor Keith House
* Councillor Gary Hughes

* Councillor Adam Jackman
* Councillor Alexis McEvoy
* Councillor Stephen Parker
* Councillor Louise Parker-Jones
* Councillor Stephen Philpott
* Councillor Roger Price
Councillor Kim Taylor

*Present

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Kim Taylor.

2. 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.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed.

4. DEPUTATIONS

The Chairman confirmed that three deputations had been received for the meeting, along with County Councillor Andrew Joy.

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman confirmed that Member training would take place on Monday 25 July in the afternoon. It was also confirmed that the Three Maids Hill appeal had been successful following an inquiry and therefore permission had been granted.

6. **UNIT 5 WATERBROOK ESTATE, WATERBROOK ROAD, ALTON**

Variation of condition 5 of 51471/007 to extend the life of trial period until 31 March 2023 at Unit 5 Waterbrook Estate, Waterbrook Road, Alton GU34 2UD (No. 51471/008) EH156

The Committee considered a report from the Assistant Director of Waste, Planning and Environment regarding an application to extend a trial period regarding Condition 5.

The officer summarised the report, confirming that there had been a change of site operator and the previous consent had never been fully implemented. It was reinforced that the Committee could only focus on the application area as outlined within the report.

A liaison panel had been established, which was Chaired by County Councillor Andrew Joy. An update report had been circulated confirmed the following change to paragraph 36 (change highlighted in **bold**):

*“The proposed development has been assessed under Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The development is classified as a Schedule 2 development as it falls within Category 13 (Changes and extensions), section (a) as it is a change to a installation falling which **was originally categorised as being within Category 11(b) (ii) and (iii) (Installations for the disposal of waste (unless included in Schedule 1)).** However, whilst being identified under the Regulations, it is not deemed an EIA development requiring an Environmental Statement.”*

Aerial photos were shown of the site and it was confirmed that the access was shared by two separate land uses. The proposals included 12 HGV movements at night, but this did not involve any processing or unloading. A video was shown to Committee depicting an HGV reversing. All HGVs entering and egressing the site out of hours would be set to silent reversing alarms and use white noise systems (be in ‘night mode’). Officers had received 13 letters of objection, predominantly regarding the noise impacts and HGV routing.

The Committee received three deputations and a local Member to speak on this item.

Duncan McGregor addressed the Committee as a local resident speaking against the application. He shared how he felt that relationships had broken down with the current operator and that some activities had continued after the current permission had ceased. Councillor Suzi Burns spoke on behalf of East Hants District Council, sharing concerns over the local residents to the site who suffered previously due to operations on the site. John Palmer spoke on behalf of the applicant and confirmed that processing of materials was only done during the day and its location made it accessible to the strategic road network. Trips would not take place every night, only when required for roadworks. Noise monitoring is being prepared for the whole of the site. The applicant was keen for the liaison panel to continue and thanked Councillor Joy for chairing.

County Councillor Andrew Joy shared his concerns regarding the application, including that roads were kept in the most elevated area of the site in line of sight to local dwellings, but accepted that there would be less issues if the site was properly managed and the conditions worked effectively and was also pleased that the new operator was taking positive steps to engage with residents and had significantly reduced the stockpiles and site levels on site.

During questions of the deputations the following points were clarified:

- The topography of the site and the fact that residents were situated higher made it more difficult to control noise;
- More complaints had been received over the recent months, but it could not be guaranteed that the cause of complaints was the applicant due to the operations in the area;
- The current applicant took over in 2021;
- There was a busy road separating the site and housing;
- The liaison panel covered all operations within the unit;

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

- It could not be anticipated what would happen following the temporary permissions ceasing in 2023;
- Noise monitoring would be done across the site as a whole;
- It was anticipated that the noise generated would be less than the background noise and the Environmental Health Officer didn't feel there was additional need for mitigation measures, particularly for a temporary application;
- The weighbridge and HGV reverse alarms will not be used at night;
- Landscaping had been proposed to shield the wider site as a whole rather than focused on the application area as part of previous permissions.

Officers proposed to add an additional condition on tailgates and further informative's on noise monitoring and records of road planings imported to the site following questions from members.

In debate, Members agreed that the noise should be monitored, even though it was not anticipate that it would pose a problem, particularly with the precautions being taken at night with hydraulic tailgates and reversing of HGV's.

RESOLVED

Planning permission was GRANTED subject to:

- a) The recommended conditions set out in Appendix A;
- b) The completion of a Section 106 agreement providing obligations on out of hours Heavy Good Vehicle movements to and from the site;
- c) A condition being added on the use of hydraulic tailgates to minimise the noise of HGV's at night
- d) Information being added relating to noise monitoring
- e) Information being added requesting that records of road planings imported to the site should be kept and made available on request

Voting:
Favour: 15 (unanimous)

Chairman,