

AT A MEETING of the Regulatory Committee of HAMPSHIRE COUNTY  
COUNCIL held at the castle, Winchester on Wednesday, 24th January, 2024

Chairman:

\* Councillor Peter Latham

- |                                 |                               |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Lance Quantrill    | * Councillor Stephen Parker   |
| * Councillor Lulu Bowerman      | * Councillor Roger Price      |
| * Councillor Steven Broomfield  | * Councillor Kim Taylor       |
| * Councillor Mark Cooper        | * Councillor Stephen Philpott |
| Councillor Rod Cooper           |                               |
| Councillor Christopher Donnelly |                               |
| * Councillor Michael Ford       |                               |
| * Councillor Pal Hayre          |                               |
| * Councillor Keith House        |                               |
| * Councillor Adam Jackman       |                               |
| * Councillor Lesley Meenaghan   |                               |
| * Councillor Sarah Pankhurst    |                               |

\*Present

**153. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Rod Cooper and Councillor Chris Donnelly. Councillor Stephen Philpott attended as a deputy for the meeting.

**154. 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 5 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.

**155. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and agreed.

**156. DEPUTATIONS**

It was confirmed that two deputations had been received for the meeting.

157. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman confirmed changes within the Planning team and officers were congratulated in their new roles.

158. **LOCKHAMS RECYCLING LTD, SHEDFIELD EQUESTRIAN CENTRE, BOTLEY ROAD, SHEDFIELD**

***Retrospective planning application for the change of use to open storage of recycled aggregate materials and the retention of ancillary office and workshop and associated works at Lockhams Recycling Ltd, Shedfield Equestrian Centre, Botley Road, Shedfield SO32 2HN (No. 22/02015/HCS) (Site ref: WR228)***

The Committee considered a report from the Assistant Director of Waste & Environmental Services (item 6 in the minute book) regarding an application for a retrospective permission in Shedfield.

The report was summarised and it was confirmed that a site visit had taken place in 2023. An update report had been made available, which included minor amendments to the report and a representation from the local County Councillor, Hugh Lumby.

The Committee was shown aerial photographs of the location as well as elevation photos from the site. Due to being contrary to policies 5, 10 and 29 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, the application was recommended for refusal.

There were two deputations for the meeting from Shedfield Parish Council and Winchester City Council, both of which were in support of the refusal.

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

- The committee's consideration of the application had been delayed due to additional information being required from the applicant.
- Whilst Highways had concerns over the status and suitability for HGV traffic using the shared wider Equestrian site access junction with the A334 exists, it was understood that all traffic associated with this proposal would remain unchanged (in terms of type and number from the approved appeal decision site adjacent) and therefore were unable to object to the application.
- If the recommendations were supported, the applicant would have six months to appeal the decision but the serving of any enforcement action would bring this forward.

In debate, Members agreed that the report was clear and well set out in presenting the proposals and explaining why the recommendation was to refuse, and acknowledged that strict planning conditions would be required should it go to appeal and succeed.

## RESOLVED

Planning permission was REFUSED for the reasons set out below:

- a) On the basis of the information submitted, the location of the proposal has not been adequately justified in terms of its need for being located in the countryside, and is contrary to the requirements of Policies 5 (Protection of the countryside) and 29 (Location of waste management development) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013), Policy MTRA4 (Development in the Countryside) of the Winchester City Council Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (2013)) and Policy DM10 (Essential Facilities and Services in the Countryside) of Winchester City Council Local Plan Part 2 (2017);
- b) On the basis of the information submitted, and notwithstanding the proposed mitigation, it is considered that the proposal is likely to result in an unacceptable visual impact on the locality contrary to the requirements of Policies 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) and 13 (High quality design of minerals and waste development) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013), Policy CP13 (High Quality Design) of the Winchester City Council Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (2013) and Policy DM23 (Rural Character) of the Winchester City Council Local Plan Part 2 (2017); and
- c) On the basis of the information submitted, it is considered that the proposal has not demonstrated that it can be situated and drained safely and that it would not create flood risk to the site and its immediate surroundings contrary to the requirements of Policy 11 (Flood risk and prevention) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) and Policy CP17 (Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment) of the Winchester City Council Local Plan Part 1 (2013).

### Voting

Favour: 15 (unanimous)

---

Chairman,