AT A MEETING of the Regulatory Committee of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL held at the castle, Winchester on Wednesday, 23rd February, 2022

Chairman:
* Councillor Peter Latham

* Councillor Lance Quantrill	* Councillor Alexis McEvoy
Councillor Lulu Bowerman	* Councillor Stephen Parker
Councillor Steven Broomfield	* Councillor Louise Parker-Jones
* Councillor Mark Cooper	* Councillor Stephen Philpott
* Councillor Rod Cooper	* Councillor Roger Price
Councillor Michael Ford	* Councillor Kim Taylor
* Councillor Keith House	* Councillor Sarah Pankhurst
Councillor Gary Hughes	* Councillor Hugh Lumby
* Councillor Adam Jackman	
* Councillor Alexis McEvoy	
* Councillor Stephen Parker	* Present

37. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Mike Ford, Gary Hughes and Lulu Bowerman. Councillor Sarah Pankhurst and Hugh Lumby were in attendance as deputies.

38. 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.

39. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed.

40. DEPUTATIONS

The Chairman confirmed that due to the number of deputations received, Section 9 of the Planning Code of Conduct had been waivered to extend the hour for deputations and allow 7 minutes per deputation.

41. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman confirmed that due to the amount of interest in the item, the meeting would be web streamed into the Mitchell room as well as on YouTube via the Hampshire County Council website.

42. **DEVELOPMENT OF AN ENERGY RECOVERY FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AT ALTON MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY, A31, ALTON GU34 4JD (NO. 33619/007) (SITE REF: EH141)**

Development of an Energy Recovery Facility and Associated Infrastructure at Alton Materials Recovery Facility, A31, Alton GU34 4JD (No. 33619/007) (Site Ref: EH141)

The Committee considered a report from the Assistant Director of Waste, Planning and Environment (item 6 in the minute book) regarding an application for an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) at the Alton Materials Recovery Facility (MRF).

The Chairman introduced the item, highlighting the significance of the application and the two update reports that had been circulated with some minor amendments.

The officer gave a detailed presentation on the application, and the Committee was shown aerial plans and photographs of the site and surrounding area, as well as the importance of the proposed site and how it would operate. 5,598 representations had been received from 4,049 individuals and the key issues were summarised.

The Committee received deputations from Emma Barnett - No Wey Incinerator Action Group, Christopher Napier – CPRE Hampshire, Alison Melvin - Binsted Eco Network, William Butler – West End Flower Farm, Dr Alexandra Roberts – Froyle Parish Council, Councillor Mark Merryweather, Farnham Town Council, Councillor Adam Carew - East Hants District Council, Councillor Rob Mocatta – South Downs National Park and Councillor Martin Tod – Hampshire County Council, who all spoke against the proposals.

The main reasons for objecting were:

- The location was not suitable for such a big development;
- There was no need for an ERF;
- The visual impact of the site on the landscape, walkers and local residents as well as visitors to the South Downs National Park;
- A devastating impact on local businesses and potential tourism;
- The impacts on the local road network;
- Emissions and plumes from the chimney stacks; and
- Finding an alternative to incinerating and shifting focus to increasing and improving recycling.

The applicant spoke to support the application, stating how the County was running out of landfill, exports commercial and industrial (C&I) wastes the importance of finding an alternative for businesses to manage C&I waste. It was confirmed that 365,000 tonnes was currently being exported or going to landfill each year. The ERF is a well-established technology. Carbon Capture Storage (CCS) technology would be implemented once the technology was available and regulated. The ERF was focussed on C&I waste rather than municipal solid wastes . The emissions would also be safe and closely monitoring by an Environmental Permit regulated by the Environment Agency.

County Councillors Jackie Porter, Andrew Joy and Mark Kemp-Gee also spoke as local Members. Councillor Jackie Porter and Mark Kemp-Gee shared their objections of the proposal and Councillor Andrew Joy read a statement of objection on behalf of Rt Hon Damian Hinds MP who felt that the benefits did not outweigh the negative aspects of the application.

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

- Assessment work included in the Environment Statement on the emissions and potential health effects and it concluded that there would be no risk to human health. Public Health England, the Public Health team at Hampshire County Council and the Environmental Health Officer were consulted on this assessment;
- Heat transfer would offer benefit in the longer term once potential customers had been sought;
- Alternative sites had been investigated and contained within Appendix I to the report;
- Existing Traffic Regulation Orders were in place to protect more rural routes from HGV's, but a lorry routing set out in the proposed section 106 would be monitored by the Monitoring and Enforcement Team.

During debate, some Members agreed that there was a need to focus more on recycling and were against a market-led approach to incineration, whilst others highlighted the need to have an alternative to landfill and exports.

Whilst the importance of recycling was acknowledged, some Members felt that the focus on residential recycling mentioned by some of the deputations caused confusion as the proposal was for a merchant facility with a focus on C&I waste and not related MSW.

It was highlighted that the ERF would only be used for 'residual' waste that had no other option but to go to landfill and export and an Environmental Permit would be in place to monitor odour, light and noise from the site.

RESOLVED

The application was REFUSED.

Notwithstanding the proposed mitigation, it was considered that the proposal:

a) Would result in significant adverse impact on the character of the area, the wider landscape, and the visual amenity contrary to Policies 10 (Protecting

public, health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High -quality design of minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013), paragraphs 130 and 174, 176 and 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021);

b) Did not demonstrate a special need for its location and the suitability of the site could not be adequately justified and therefore is contrary to Policies 27 (Capacity for waste management development) and 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Vote
Favour: 3
Against: 12

Chairman,