

MINUTES: of the meeting of the Planning and Regulatory Committee held at 10.00am on 22 July 2009 at County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Members

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| ** Roy Taylor (Chairman) | |
| ** Ian Beardsmore (Vice-Chairman) | |
| ** Elizabeth Compton | * Chris Pitt |
| ** Marisa Heath | - Denise Turner-Stewart |
| ** Stuart MacLeod | ** Fiona White |
| ** Ernest Mallett | ** David Wood |
| ** Mike Nevins | |

Ex-officio Members (Non-Voting)

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| - Geoff Marlow | Chairman of the Council |
| - Lavinia Sealy | Vice-Chairman of the Council |
| - Andrew Povey | Leader of the Council |
| - David Hodge | Deputy Leader of the Council |

Substitute Members

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Carol Coleman | |
| Stephen Cooksey | |
| ** Steve Cosser | For Denise Turner-Stewart |
| Pat Frost | |
| David Munro | |
| Chris Townsend | |

In Attendance

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Nigel Cooper | For Items 9, 10, 22 and 23 |
| Peter Martin | For Item 9, 10, 22, 23 and 8 |
| Pauline Searle | For Items 9, 10, 22, 23, 8, 11 and 16 |

- ** = Present
* = Present for part of the meeting
- = Apologies for absence given

PART ONE
(IN PUBLIC)

[All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting]

83/09 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** [Item 1]

An apology for absence was received from Mrs Denise Turner-Stewart who was substituted for by Mr Steve Cosser.

84/09 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING** [Item 2]

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman

85/09 **PETITIONS** [Item 3]

No petitions were received.

86/09 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME** [Item 4]

No questions were received.

87/09 **MEMBER QUESTION TIME** [Item 5]

No questions were received.

88/09 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 6]

The Chairman invited Members to declare any interests at the beginning of each item.

89/09 **APPLICATION FOR VILLAGE GREEN STATUS: LAND AT THE GREEN, WINDMILL DRIVE, LEATHERHEAD** [Item 7]

The Committee was asked to consider, on the basis of the evidence in this report, whether or not to register the land the subject of this application as a Village Green.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix A** to these minutes) were tabled.

The Principal Solicitor introduced the report stating that there had been no objection from the Treasury on this application. The Committee needed to consider whether the application fitted the criteria and approve if it agreed all the criteria had been fulfilled.

RESOLVED

That the application be ACCEPTED.

90/09 **MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION GU09/P/00903: NORMANDY
AUTO SALVAGE, NORMANDY** [Item 9]

This was a retrospective application for a weighbridge and weighbridge office and staff facility building, new 3.2m and 2.4m high boundary walls, a surface water drainage system and external lighting.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix B** to these minutes) were tabled.

Mr Forward made the following points on the application:

- He lived along Bailes Lane which was half a mile from the site and wanted his representation to be taken into consideration on both Item 9 and Item 10 on the agenda (Item 10 Minute Reference 85/09)
- He referred to Paragraph 7 of the update sheet and stated that information about the responses from the residents was incorrect. None of the residents on the two adjoining sides of the application site had ever been aware of ball crushers being used on the site in the past.
- These sites were at risk of fires, just recently there had been a large fire on such a site in North Yorkshire, and this had been the fourth fire on the site.
- The site was subject to a Certificate of Lawfulness which did not place limitations on the work that could be conducted on the site. Had this application been made in 1997, the Committee would certainly have included conditions to control the working on the site.
- A permanent weighbridge would increase the level of traffic and noise to the residents.
- The proposal would be unsightly, would be 3 metres from the residential properties when it should have been a minimum of 6 metres. Covering the activity would mean that the noise will be amplified rather than reduce the noise.
- A different proposal that was more environmentally friendly should be submitted instead of this application.
- The poles for the lighting were already erected on the site. This would presuppose that the applicant would get planning permission.
- At the height of the current proposal, the lights would intrude into the residential properties even though the report does not say that it will.
- This type of development is not suitable in a residential area.
- That the site has been used for this type of use previously, was not grounds for large industrial use at the site.

Mr Shapley made the following points on the application:

- He and thousand of other people used the facility at Normandy Auto Salvage as car breakers, however this proposal would lead to a change in the use of the site. It was bring industrial use into the village of Normandy.
- It would lead to an increase in the levels of noise and dust in the village
- The applicant had another site only a few miles from this one that would be more suited to this type of development.
- This proposal would be contrary to the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 Policy DC3 (General Considerations of Amenity and Environmental Issues) and the

Guildford Local Plan 2003. In addition, it would not be in accordance with the relevant Green Belt Policies.

- Three hundred homes would be directly affected by the industrial use created by this proposal.
- The village of Normandy had until recently been under scrutiny relating to the Foot and Mouth Disease, this type of development would lead to polluted fields. He expressed his alarm that the Committee could consider approving an application that would pollute the surrounding area and the watercourses. He stressed that pollution did not adhere to boundaries and would not stay within the site.
- He advised the Committee that Normandy was a village and not an industrial estate.

Mr Davis made the following points on the application:

- In the report the officer stressed that the site is subject to a Certificate of Lawfulness which permitted the current activity carried out on the site without any planning restrictions. He acknowledged that this was the case but stressed to the Committee that this was for the activities that were being carried out on the site at the time the Certificate was granted not for additional use linked to this.
- The Certificate of Lawfulness was for the storage and breaking up of motor vehicles on the site only. The use of a crane on the site has never taken place contrary to the update sheet provided to the Committee. This would be an additional use to that set out in the Certificate of Lawfulness.
- There was no need for the depollution structure on the site for the activities relating to the Certificate of Lawfulness. The facilities for carrying out this activity were already on the site.
- Previously, the applicant and the residents had lived in a peaceful co-existence.
- He urged the Committee to use common sense when determining the application.

Mr Redfern made the following points on the application:

- The light pollution that would be created by this application would be greater than any in the neighbouring vicinity. It would provide daylight into the area for twenty-four hours a day.
- He asked whether there was really any justification for the thirty-five metre high poles within a dark village such as Normandy. The residents had been informed that the top two to three metres of the lighting structure would be removed if planning permission was not permitted, but the poles had been constructed in such a manner that this would not be possible. This shows a disrespect for the planning process.
- The work on the site that would pollute the watercourses. Workmen from the site currently tipped contaminated materials over the wall around the site into the residential properties.
- The water pipe for the residential properties ran under the site, contrary to the officer report that stated that there were no water pipes through the site. Before the land was concreted over, the pipe had broken and was not fixed for some time. This meant that the activities on the site would have polluted the water.

- He queried whether the crusher could be used without planning permission.
- The vehicle racks towered over the homes of the residents adjacent to the site. These cars were often not depolluted at the time and the alarms would go off at all hours of the day and night.
- At a similar yard in Doncaster, the racking had toppled over showing that they are not safe. In Portsmouth, an applicant was restricted to racks up to two car height due to the safety issues.
- The proposal was against the human rights of the residents of Chapel Farm Mobile Home Park. Most of the residents were retired and would be greatly affected.

Mr Charles made the following points on the application:

- The site was located within the Green Belt which should be preserved and also within a residential area not an industrial one.
- The applicant acknowledged that there was a Certificate of Lawfulness on the site for certain activities but stressed to the Committee that this did not preclude a relaxation of the relevant policies relating to the site. Guildford Borough Council had objected to the application.
- This proposal showed a disregard for the residents in Chapel Farm Mobile Home Park.
- There were no very special circumstances for the need for this proposal. It would increase the level of dust and depollution in the area. Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (Green Belt) and Policy LO4 stated that there was a strong presumption against development in the Green Belt. The Committee should recognise this.
- The scale of the proposal would be contrary to the open nature of the area within the Green Belt. It would have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. It was contrary to Policies LP6 and LP7 of the local development plan.
- PPG2 was explicit on the need to maintain the Green Belt. The proposal should only be considered if there were very special circumstances to outweigh the harm to the area. The applicant had previously stated that PPG2 was long in the tooth and outdated showing a lack of regard for the planning process.
- He implored the Committee to overturn the officer recommendation and refuse the application.
- He wanted his points and the points of the other objectors to this application also taken into consideration when determining Item 10 on the agenda (Minute Reference 85/09).

Mr Ellis, the agent, made the following points:

- There was a Certificate of Lawfulness for the current use of the site, and there was no requirement for any planning permission relating to the shear bailer and the car racking.
- The yard was fully concreted so no additional dust would come from the proposal.
- The view of the site from the Hogs Back was restricted and was only 10% of the development in the area.

- With regards to the Green Belt, this was not a new use of the land in the Green Belt, there was nothing set out in the local plans that stated that assumed use relating to the Certificate was unlawful.
- With regards to residential amenity, the Committee should concentrate on the planning application and not on the activity that was permitted under the Certificate of Lawfulness.
- Before the yard had been concreted over, the water pipe to the Mobile Home Park had burst. The applicant had requested that the warden of the Park come onto the site so that the issue could be addressed, but he did not accept.
- He acknowledged that it was unfortunate that this activity was being carried out next to residential properties but that the site did have an existing use.
- With regards to the external lighting from the site, there was a condition on the application that avoided the use of light into the evenings.
- The noise that was emitted from the site would be the same as previous use, there would be no new activity and therefore no new levels of noise.
- The site was concreted and therefore there would be no dust issues from the proposal.
- With regards to the access onto the site, the required access point had facilitated the same level of traffic as would be expected under these proposals and had been safe in the past.
- There was no requirement for planning permission to be provided relating to the use of the shear bailer and therefore this had not been included within the planning application.
- There had been a flooding system installed at the site to control the run-off from the activities, there would need to be flooding of biblical proportions for the activity on the site to affect the surrounding watercourses.
- Acoustics – The site was of an open nature and therefore there would be no additional impact of noise onto the residents.
- The objectors had mentioned that the activity on the site could be moved to the applicant's alternative site in the area, however the Certificate of Lawfulness meant that this activity could continue on the site without the planning permission.
- With regards to the points about the hours of working on the site, again this was covered by the Certificate of Lawfulness and was not subject to planning permission.
- The sale of cars on the site was not an abuse of the Certificate of Lawfulness, it was incidental to the Certificate and was not subject to planning permission. This had been agreed by the Guildford Borough Council Enforcement Officer.

The Planning Officer introduced the item stating that the proposal was for the site to be upgraded to provide better level of condition for the staff on the site and to restrict the use on the site by planning conditions.

Guildford Borough Council had approved the Certificate of Lawfulness for the existing use of the site in 1993 without planning conditions. This proposal would allow the County Planning Authority to control the use of the site.

The site was located within the Green Belt and therefore the Committee needed to be convinced that there were very special circumstances for the development in the area.

He stated that there were five elements to this proposal. The first was the weighbridge. The Environment Agency require information on the levels of materials entering and exiting the site. This weighbridge would solely be used for this purpose and would ensure that vehicles did not leave the site overloaded.

The second element was the office building. This would be the operational base for the weighbridge and would replace an existing building on the site.

The third element related to the boundary walls. These were proposed to replace the current fences on the site which were two metres high. It was previously considered that these walls needed to be 2.4 metres high, but following discussions, it was considered that the higher the walls, the less noise from the site would impact on the residential properties.

The fourth element related to water drainage. The Environment Agency required that the applicant purify the water from the site and store it safely in case of flash flooding. The proposal addresses this concern and mitigates against water from the site entering into the local watercourses.

The fifth element was the lighting to be erected at the site. The use of the lighting columns was restricted by a condition in the agenda report which states that this lighting can only be used up to 5.30pm at night.

There had been forty-four letters of representation against this proposal. Some of them were opposing the use of the sheer bailer and the car racking which was not subject to planning permission.

Guildford Borough Council and Normandy Parish Council had objected to the application based on Green Belt issues. The update sheet states that Natural England, Three Valleys Water and the Surrey Wildlife Trust had yet submitted views, however the Planning Officer stressed that they had not submitted objections against previous applications on the site.

He stated that there had never been a 300 square metre building on the site, he directed the Committee's attention to Aerial 2 of the agenda report and indicated that there had been three smaller buildings on the site.

The update sheet stated that if the application was approved, the site would not be active on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

During discussion on the application, the Committee made the following points:

- Some Members stressed that this site was located within the dark village of Normandy, that the lighting was equivalent to that use at a sports facility. [The Planning Officer advised that the height of the lighting had been determined as to cover the floor of the site. The lights were directed at the ground on the site and would be flashscreens with cowels fitted. If they

were situated closer to the ground, more lights would be required to ensure safe working on the site. The lights would be switched off at 5.30pm and would only be used for certain months of the year.] Following this advice, Member still held concerns regarding the impact the lighting would have on the neighbouring residents.

- Clarification was requested on where the nearest street lighting with poles at this height were. [The local Member advised that there was no street lighting in Normandy and that it was some considerable distance before street lighting of this type was located in relation to Normandy.]
- Concerns were raised regarding the disturbance the introduction of the weighbridge would have on the village lanes. [The Planning Officer advised that the weighbridge would not increase the level of traffic along the village lanes but would ensure that vehicles would not leave the site overloaded which would be beneficial to the residents in the area.]
- It was noted that the applicant had a scrap yard close to this site. [The Planning Officer advised that the Aldershot site owned by the applicant was restricted in its use, and the Committee needed to consider the application that was within the agenda report rather than looking at alternative sites.]
- One Member requested that if the application was to be permitted the hours of working on Saturdays should be restricted to 11am to 3.30pm
- One Member questioned whether there were very special circumstances for the development in this area.
- Some Members stated that this proposal would permit the County Planning Authority to regulate the activity being carried out on the site rather than permit working on the site relating to the Certificate of Lawfulness to continued unregulated.
- One Member stated that this proposal would make the activity on the site less intrusive than previously.
- It was acknowledged that when the Committee visited the site and drove around the mobile home park, it was only possible to see the car racking from the residential properties, and this was not subject to planning permission.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the intrusiveness of the concrete walls on the neighbouring residents and whether they would actually mitigate against the noise from the site. [The Planning Officer advised that the walls had already been constructed and the applicant had stated that the residents could decorate them in any manner they wanted to on the side facing their properties.]

The Committee voted on the application and overturned the officer recommendation on a vote of five for the recommendation and six against the officer recommendation.

The Committee considered three reasons for refusal. The Committee considered and voted on two reasons for refusal based on the intensity of the activity within the Green Belt and that there were no very special circumstances for this development that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

RESOLVED

That, against the officer recommendation, the Committee REFUSED the application based on the following reasons:

1. The proposed elements of this application will intensify the use of the site and constitute inappropriate development that will cause harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its nature and scale and would encroach on the countryside, and is therefore contrary to Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2) (Green Belts) January 1995, The South East Plan May 2009 Policy SP5 (Green Belts) and Surrey Waste Plan May 2008 Policy CW6 (Development in the Green Belt).
2. The need for the additional elements, weighbridge and weighbridge office and staff facility building, new 3.2 and 2.4m high boundary walls, a surface water drainage system and 10m high external lighting is not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and the presumption against inappropriate development and is therefore contrary to the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2) (Green Belts) January 1995, The South East Plan May 2009 Policy SP5 (Green Belts) and Surrey Waste Plan May 2008 Policy CW6 (Development in the Green Belt).

91/09 **MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION GU09/P/00904: NORMANDY AUTO SALVAGE, NORMANDY** [Item 10]

This was a retrospective application for the erection of a depollution structure and the provision of a portacabin to be used as a weighbridge office and staff facilities and the retention of a night watchman's caravan all for a temporary period of one year.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix C** to these minutes) were tabled.

Mr Charles made the following points on the application:

- He requested that the Committee consider the points raised by the members of the public speaking against Item 9 on the agenda (Minute reference 84/09) when considering this item.
- In addition, he stated that as the Committee had determined not to have the permanent facility on the premises, there was no need to have the facilities for a temporary period.

Mr Ellis, the agent, made the following points:

- Although the permanent facility had been refused by the Committee, the activity on the site needed to continue and therefore it would be necessary for the Committee to approve this application.
- If the Committee refused this application, the activity would still continue under the Certificate of Lawfulness.

The Planning Officer introduced the item stating that the proposal for the development of the depollution structure was a temporary issue. It was proposed to be erected until the end of the year or when a permanent building had been given planning permission. The office would provide cover for staff when working on the site, and the night watchman building was needed to provide safety and shelter to the night watchman.

Government Guidance was that in the Green Belt, this type of facility should ideally be located within existing sites and this was preferred to placing the facility within new sites.

There were no environmental or amenity issues relating to this application. The depollution structure would be coloured grey and would merge into the background against the shed on the otherside of the boundary.

He mentioned that Guildford Borough Council had raised objections against the night watchman caravan, the depollution structure and the boundary walls.

During discussion on this item, the Committee made the following points:

- One Member expressed sympathy with the position of Guildford Borough Council and Normandy Parish Council and argued that this would have an impact on residential amenities.
- One Member stated that the South East Plan RM10 stated that locating this type of development in this type of location would require the building to have soundproofing. The current structure did not have soundproofing. [The Development Control Team Manager advised that the County Noise Consultant had stated that the building would either not change the level of noise from the work being carried out or would slightly reduce the noise.]
- One Member argued that this type of development would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
- It was stated that although you can't see it from the residential properties this did not mean that it would not impact on the residents or the Green Belt. The colour of the building would not reduce the level of impact on the residents
- Members acknowledged that the applicant already had the permission to depollute cars through the Certificate of Lawfulness, what needed to be considered was whether this structure would improve the working on the site.

- It as acknowledged that the applicant currently carried out electrical work when depolluting the cars. It would be better for this to be carried out within a covered environment.
- Members considered that as this was a temporary structure this would have less residential impact.
- Members discussed the location of the depollution building and stated that it was at the far corner of the site to the residential properties and the car racks would be located between the building and the residential properties covering its view.
- It was acknowledged that Guildford Borough Council and Normandy Parish Council had objected to the night watchman building. However, Members noted that the night watchman caravan would be the same height as the fencing and therefore would not be seen from the residential properties.
- One Member requested that if the application was to be approved, then the hours of working on the Saturday to be amended to be between 8.30am – 1.30pm.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report, amended by the update sheet and be amended to show that the hours of working on the Saturday be between 8.30pm – 1.30pm, subject to the resolution of the Environment Agency concerns (delegated to the Development Control Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman)

92/09 **MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION WA09/0737: WITLEY COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE, WITLEY [Item 8]**

This was an application for approval of the details of a scheme of lighting pursuant to Condition 29 of planning permission ref: WA08/2128 dated 25 April 2009.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix D** to these minutes) were tabled.

Mrs Perkins made the following comments on the application:

- The proposed development would be located 50 meters from the closest residential property.
- The new Community Recycling Centre was now fifty metres from the residential properties. The lighting from the development would cause a disturbance for the neighbouring residents.
- There had been no consideration by the officers or the applicant to the needs of the residents in the area, it was not a good idea to locate such a scheme in a residential area.
- The Department for Communities and Local Government has stated that the character of the countryside and the needs of the residents need to be taken into consideration when determining this type of scheme.

- This development would increase the level of noise and would permit this increase of noise for a longer period.
- She urged the Committee to request that SITA re-examine its lighting proposal.

Mrs Klementowicz made the following points on the application:

- The proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the area. It was located in a Thames - Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and in the Green Belt.
- This would have an impact on the residents of the area. She stated that she kept livestock on her land adjacent to the application and the lighting from the Community Recycling Centre would have an impact on their daily routines which would reduce their produce and would affect her livelihood.
- The light from the site would confuse her birds regarding the patterns of the day and would stop them from nesting.
- The strong lighting bulbs (150watts) would look out over the residential gardens. This was contrary to Planning Policy Statement 23.
- The vegetation that should shield the residents from the site was to be made up of native deciduous trees. These took twenty five years to grow into maturity, what were the residents to do for those twenty-five years?

Mrs Eley made the following points on the application:

- Bishop Barkley, an ancient philosopher, asked the following question "If a tree crashes down in a forest, but there is no-one there to hear it, does it actually crash down?". This is pertinent because the applicant has not taken into consideration that residents live close to the site and will be affected by the proposal.
- This was a rural and tranquil area and the lighting scheme would have an effect on the wider rural land.
- The Community Recycling Centre attracted thieves. If the lighting scheme was approved, if the thieves came onto the land, the lighting would come on. This could be at all hours of the day and night. Could the Committee assure the residents that this would not occur?
- The Nuisance Act was brought into force to protect residents, the Human Rights Act to protect peoples' privacy. In addition, the European Union and CPRE were conducting studies into the effect of lighting as a priority.
- SITA have stated that the residents have been heavily consulted but this is not the case. They were only consulted on a different scheme with a reduced number of lights.
- She stated that the plans put before the Committee were incorrect as they didn't show the residential properties around the site. The planning officer had acted as if there were no residential properties in the area which was untrue.
- She urged the Committee to send the application back to SITA for reconsideration.

Mr Phillips, the agent, made the following points:

- The applicant has considered the concerns of the neighbouring residents. It was following this consultation that the applicant had agreed to place the 150 watt bulbs in the centre of the site and the 70 watt bulbs around the perimeter. The County Lighting Consultant had requested that the applicant use flat glass luminaires and this had been incorporated within the scheme.
- With regards to the security lighting, Surrey Waste Management would be installing infrared controls outside of working hours so that the lights did not get triggered.
- If the applicant wanted to reduce the height of the columns, more light columns would be required for safe working. This would not alleviate the concerns of the residents.
- The proposal exceeded the guidelines set by the Institute of Lighting Engineers for sky globes.
- County Lighting Consultant had stated that as the proposed lighting was not to be used for twenty four hours it would not have much impact and this recommendation should be given much weight by the Committee.
- As a company SITA try to operate a good neighbour policy.
- He requested that the Committee approve this application and stressed that the statutory consultees had not objected to this application.

Peter Martin, the local Member for Godalming South, Milford and Witley made the following points:

- He directed the Committee towards paragraph forty eight of the report and stated that the Committee had already approved planning permission for the redevelopment of the site and that the Committee was solely looking at the lighting scheme at this meeting.
- At first he had had major concerns regarding the number of lighting columns and the wattage of the lights. He wrote to the County Planning Authority and had received a comprehensive response detailing the need for the columns for the safety of the site and this had alleviated his concerns.
- The columns were proposed to be two metres shorter than the normal height of columns for this type of facility.
- With regards to the hours of working, he only wanted the lighting to be used during the normal operational hours of the site and was satisfied as long as this was the case.
- He stated that he would oppose the hours of working on the site if the Committee were considering this at this meeting.
- He was satisfied that the objections of the residents could be mitigated by the conditions set.

The Development Control Team Manager reminded the Committee that it was only considering the lighting scheme for the development at this meeting.

He had looked at the number of the lighting columns on the site, where they were located and how they were shielded. He was satisfied that this was an optimum scheme. The scheme had been assessed against the Institute of Lighting Engineer's guidelines. This facility had been assessed as being

located within an area categorised as E2 (rural or small village location) and the proposal met the guidelines for lighting in this category.

With regards to visual impact, the lighting would only be operational within the current operational hours of the site and had been painted mid-grey so that it would merge into the background.

During the discussion on this item, the Committee made the following points:

- The Community Recycling Centre was used extensively by local residents and the site needed to be safe for those who used the site.
- Clarification was requested on whether the Committee should request that the lighting have blanks fitted on the back so that there could not be any spillage into the residential properties. [The Development Control Team Manager advised that the conditions set out in the agenda report adequately addressed this issue.]

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

[The Committee adjourned for lunch at 12.50pm and reconvened at 13.35pm]

93/09 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL SU09/0244: LAND AT FRIMLEY CofE SCHOOL, FRIMLEY GREEN [Item 22]

This was an application for the construction of hard surface multi-use games area (MUGA) and associated timber structure for use as out-door classroom/amphitheatre.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix E** to these minutes) was tabled.

Mr Chris Pitt declared a personal interest in this application for the following reasons:

- He was a County Councillor for the Frimley Green and Mytchett area.
- He had been a Governor of the School for the last 10 years.
- His property (Moor Farm) backed onto the school property.

Dr Tanner made the following points on the application:

- Fifty-seven residents had been informed of the application, from which, the County Planning Authority had received twenty-eight objections. No letters of support had been submitted.
- The application had been amended following the closure of the consultation. This was not fair on the residents who had been consulted on the previous information. This change would lead to a clash of times for the two after school clubs.
- Had any of the statutory consultees been consulted on the changed times? – otherwise they would have been miss-led regarding their responses.

- The County Noise Consultant had advised that the after school clubs would increase the noise for the residents. He had stated that this was reasonable once a week but this had not been incorporated in the agenda report.
- If the pupils were able to use the Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) until 4.30pm, this would be at the same time that the swimming pool on the site would be in use. The levels of traffic would be high. If the pupils only used the MUGA until 4.00pm then this would provide a traffic buffer, which would be adequate. Why would the school not want to avoid traffic clashes in the area?
- He requested that if the Committee approved the application, that the County Noise Consultant recommendations be incorporated within the conditions.

Mr Harris made the following points on the application:

- He questioned why the school needed to build another area of concrete hardstanding when the tennis court was already built. Using the tennis court would mean that the proposal could be built without destroying additional Green Belt.
- The location of the proposed MUGA was ill thought-out, it should not be located in the remotest part of the site. There would be poor visibility from the school but good access onto the site and the location from the main road. The 3 metre high fence would not be a deterrent for teenagers wanting to access the site. There was poor disabled access to the proposed MUGA.
- The path that would link the school to the MUGA would bisect the school's playing field.
- If the MUGA were to be built on the site, then it should be built behind the swimming pool. This would mean that it was located 34metres away from residential properties (three times the current proposed distance) and 42metres from the nearest classroom, but shielded from the school by the swimming pool. In this location there would be existing ambient lighting so wouldn't need additional lighting and would have easy access to the school.
- The MUGA would be beneficial to the school but the scheme was ill thought-out.
- He requested that the Committee defer its consideration on this item for other locations to be considered.

Mr Davis made the following points on the application:

- There were two sections of Henley Drive, the first was the straight 30metres beyond the proposed MUGA, the second was a tight blind bend. Currently people using the school and the swimming pool parked along the first stretch of the road, and then when this was full parked around the bend. This created a blind corner of single-file traffic. This renders the road as dangerous especially when children walk out from behind parked cars.
- He requested that a survey be carried out to consider whether the development of the MUGA would make this situation worse.
- He urged the Committee to request that the MUGA be built closer to the school and that the use of the MUGA finish at 4.00pm rather than the current proposal of 4.30pm.

- He also requested that the consideration of this item be deferred until the September meeting when the other application relating to sports facilities at this site would be considered.
- He also requested that his objection to this application be minuted.

Mr Hills made the following points:

- He had lived along Henley Drive for 30 years. For the first 27 years he had had no conflict with the school. In the last 3 years however, there had been significant traffic concerns relating to the use of the swimming pool.
- He stated that this application and the swimming pool were inextricably linked so they should be heard together. Surrey Heath Borough Council wants them heard at the same time.
- This proposal would lead to an increase in the level of traffic around the school and parking along Henley Drive. There were currently about 1,000 swimmers per day that parked in the cul-de-sac.
- The MUGA was currently proposed to be situated 10 metres from residential properties and 40 metres from the school, this was inconsiderate to the residents.
- The proposal included the development of a 100metre asphalt path across the school playing field, it would be more sensible to build it closer to the swimming pool. Not building a path would have a cost saving as well.
- He requested that the Committee postpone the consideration of this application until September and consider it in conjunction with the swimming pool application.
- Secondly, he requested that the Committee recommend that the MUGA be moved closer to the swimming pool.

Mrs Cartwright made the following points on the application:

- She stated that she was not against the idea of a MUGA on the school site but stated that its location should be reconsidered.
- The Committee should consider three aspects
 - Child Safety relating to the proposal
 - Policies relating to development in the Green Belt
 - Residential amenities
- As an outdoor classroom it should be located close to the school. Surrey Police state that all classrooms should be overlooked.
- If the development was moved closer to the school it would remove the need for the 900square feet path and would preserve the residential amenities.
- The proposal would lead to noise and disruption throughout the day.
- Policy CS2 states that no development should detract from residential amenities.
- She requested that the application be permitted but with conditions to improve child safety, help preserve the open space and residential amenity.
- She requested that the Committee ask the applicant to act as a good neighbour and move the MUGA closer to the school. The residents of Henley Drive would be very grateful.

Mr Peace, the head teacher and applicant, made the following points:

- The facility was required to provide facilities for the pupils of the school. It would not be for external use.
- The MUGA would continue to fit in with existing practice for after school clubs. The school currently used the open space four days a week between 3-4pm and 3-4.15pm (with outside providers). The time between 4.15 and 4.30 was requested to allow people time to leave the site after the activity had concluded. It was not the intention to use the time up to 4.30pm for activities.
- One of the requests was that the old tennis court be used as a site for the new MUGA. Trees currently screened this area, and the proposal would ensure that these were not harmed.
- The proposed location would be in clear line of sight from the school, closer than the current hard tennis court and not enclosed by trees so would be easier to monitor.
- The school had a rising in-take (although it was close to its capacity) which meant that the school was required to increase the amount of hard play area it provided. This proposal would provide for this need.
- The school had a good record of road safety and educated the children on the topic and share this information with the residents in the area. The school had a Directive that was provided to the pupils and their parents and external users regarding road safety.
- The recent issues regarding the swimming pool were relating to another application.
- He wanted to work harmoniously with the residents along Henley Drive and other residents.
- The school had won the grant to build the MUGA through a public vote of 10,000 people on national TV. Sports England had stated that the benefit of the MUGA would outweigh the loss to the playing field.
- The school had been re-awarded the Active Mark which it had held for several years through its work to promote active and healthy lifestyles.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the report stating that the Committee was being asked to consider an application for a Multi-Use Games Area not the swimming pool. The proposal was for this to be located on a netted hard court area in the current playing field.

Thirty-four objections had been received from residents on the application on a range of concerns.

He directed Members towards paragraphs twenty-nine to thirty of the agenda report and the information on the design of the MUGA. It would be located on a fully enclosed site, however residents would be located close to the site.

With regards to noise, he directed Members towards paragraph thirty-six of the agenda report. He advised that the site was already being used as a school for the hours of operation within the proposal and therefore it was reasonable to expect school-type activities during the week. The change of the proposal from 4.00pm to 4.30pm was not a material difference and is in keeping with what you would expect of an after school activity. Finishing the activity on the site at 4.30pm was a worst case scenario, the applicant had stated that the activity

would cease at 4.15pm as a matter of course. There were no proposals for additional lighting on the site.

The facility was for use by existing users so there should not be an increased impact on the residents. He reminded Members that this was not an application for the swimming pool and the impact this could have was not under consideration now.

The MUGA permitted the school to have a greater scope on the activities being used on the site. The intensity usually seen at the close of the actual school at 3.15pm would be spread overtime until 4.30pm.

With regards to the use of the site on the Saturday, this would only be on two occasions within a three month period for inter-school activity but this was not significant enough to warrant an objection from Transport Development Control.

A representative of the Highway Authority was present at the meeting and explained that he was satisfied that the proposal did not give rise to changes in traffic patterns to and from the school which warranted an objection being raised. The availability of after school activities had a potentially beneficial effect in spreading car trips for the afternoon pick up over a longer period.

During discussion on the application, the Committee made the following points:

- Clarification was requested on the official closing time of the school. [The applicant advised that the school closed for lessons at 3pm.]
- Clarification was requested on whether the resident of number 18 Henley Drive had objected to the application. [The Development Control Team Manager advised that they County Planning Authority had received a letter of representation from the resident of number 18 Henley Drive.]
- Some Members stated that individuals were not guaranteed a right of view.
- The Committee acknowledged that they could not consider what they preferred but what was within the agenda report put forward by the applicant.
- Clarification was requested on why the MUGA was not proposed to be situated closer to the swimming pool. [The Planning Officer suggested that the proposed location was situated at the edge of two rectangles of playing field. This might be considered to have least effect on the existing layout of pitches.]
- The Committee recognised the concerns of the residents regarding traffic flow around the school, but acknowledged that this was unlikely to be exacerbated by the application.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

94/09 **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EL09/1021: ESHER CofE HIGH SCHOOL, ESHER** [Item 23]

This was an application for the installation of a single storey demountable classroom unit comprising two classrooms for a temporary period of five years.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix F** to these minutes) was tabled.

Mrs Ellis made the following points on the application:

- She lived in Vincent Close which was adjacent to the proposed site.
- The school was situated on a fifteen-acre site and had grown both in structure and in pupil intake in recent years.
- The single storey yellow building that was being proposed was inappropriate development based on issues relating to design, material, size and location. The boundary of her property would be within 1 metre of the classroom unit.
- The officer report stated that there would be no impact on the surrounding residential properties, however the residents of Vincent Close would have a view of the property from the ground floor of their properties for the majority of the year. In addition, the aerial photographs did not show the recent development in the area.
- The closeness of the proposal to the residential properties would mean that they would be subject to vandalism. Currently the residents of Vincent Close were subject to littering from pupils at the school, but if the building was situated where it was proposed it would facilitate easy access into their gardens. This would increase the risk of trespassing, vandalism and reduce the safety of the residents.
- The proposal would affect the safety of the trees both on the site and in the residential properties.
- She asked the Members of the Committee how they would feel looking out of their residential properties at a yellow building for most of the year?

Mrs Ellis made the following points on the application on behalf of Mrs Baitz:

- The proposal is for development located within the Green Belt. Ponds that act as a home for a variety of birds and animals would be located within 5-10metres of the building. The area was surrounded with flora and fauna that could be lost.
- The area currently between the residential properties and the school was a bio-habitat for many species of birds including owls and kestrels.
- An Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out on the area to identify the impact of the development. The proposal should not be considered until this has been completed. The reason for this is that development should not be agreed if it is identified that there are significant number of species in the area.
- She stressed her concern regarding the safety of the residential properties in Vincent Road. The proposal would shield pupils from view when entering her property and from there entering her neighbour's properties.
- Currently the residents were subjected to litter being discarded in her garden but this development would increase the likelihood of trespassing.

- Neither she or her husband accepted liability for the safety of the trespassers on their property, nor relating to the trees in their or the school's property and the danger it could cause to people using the area.
- The development would be an eyesore as it would be adjacent to her property and the noise levels would be unacceptable. It was not in keeping with the buildings or the environment in the surrounding area.
- She stated that she would like to be involved in discussions relating to the re-sitting of the proposal or the trees.

John Hearsom made the following points on the application on behalf of Mr Paterson:

- Mr Paterson wanted the Committee to apply the same rigorous practices to the consideration of this application as would be applied to a private applicant.
- The proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt. If very special circumstances for the proposal could be argued, then the proposed location of the development must be within the current footprint of buildings on the site.
- Alternative locations on the school site were appropriate but they had not been considered.
- Aerial 2 of the agenda report had an arrow pointing towards the "Application Site". He asked Members to note that there was a paved area half-way along this arrow which was one of the possible alternative sites for the building. He stated that the Headmaster of the School had stated that he thought that this was a better location for this development. This was bounded on three sides by other buildings and was away from the residential properties.
- He stated that if he was the applicant he would not expect to get planning permission for this development in this location.
- Hinchley Wood School which was close to this site, and could be considered an alternative site.
- He stated that the applicant had not provided sufficient information to the Department of Communities and Local Government, and would expect a timetabled analysis of the development.
- The applicant had not demonstrated very special circumstances.

Liz Hanrahan, on behalf of the applicant made the following points:

- She was attending the meeting on behalf of the Schools and Learning Service within the Children, Schools and Families Directorate.
- The school could not manage the necessary intake of pupils in September if it did not have this additional development.
- The proposal had followed the Department for Communities and Local Government guidelines for developing provision at schools. Schools had been nationally judged against these guidelines.
- The location of the building was designed to enable departments to be more cohesive and encourage learning within departments. This was best for the education of the pupils at the school.
- The building had been placed opposite the main route into the school.

- With regards to alternative locations, some had been considered but had been assessed as not providing easy access between the building and the rest of the school and did not permit the same rationalisation of departments.
- The colour of the building could be changed. She would be happy to enter into discussions with the residents regarding the colour of the building facing the residential properties.
- It was necessary that this proposal be in place before the September intake otherwise it would place too much of a strain on the school.
- Some of the objectors to the application were concerned that this increase in pupil numbers would in time increase the size of Esher High School, this had not been formally considered.

Mr Nigel Cooper, the local member for East Molesey and Esher made the following points:

- He was amazed at the location of the proposal and that there were no other preferred alternative sites. This was not the best location for this development, it was the easiest for the applicant.
- This would be a large building close to the main road through the area.
- He was supportive of improving the education facilities for the pupils of the school, but the building was badly sited.
- He supported the people who had spoken at the meeting objecting to this application – why should it be placed in this location?
- Moving the fence would have an impact on the trees in that area.
- He requested that the Committee consider deferring the application, visiting the site and looking at alternative locations but quickly so that the development could be in place for the September intake.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the report stating that it was for a proposal within the Green Belt, so that there needed to be very special circumstances for the development if the Committee were to approve the application. He directed Members to paragraphs 13 – 15 of the agenda report where the need for the development and the search of the alternative sites was set out.

He explained that the reason the applicant had applied for extra capacity at Esher CofE School rather than at Hinchley Wood Infant School was due to the proximity to Kingston of Hinchley Wood Infant School. It would not have been guaranteed that the intake at this school would come from Surrey. The proposal needed to address the identified shortage of places identified among Surrey residents

Within the site, the applicant had considered alternative locations, but this proposal had been submitted due to the links it provided to other departments that would reduce the current deficiencies of the school.

The officer view was that there were very special circumstances for the development that outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

He advised that officers did not anticipate that the development would aid trespassing onto the neighbouring residential properties. The applicant would

be introducing a sturdy fence behind the property to enhance the current boundary fence.

With regards to the colour of the building, he stated that although the sides facing the school would be mushroom, the side of the building facing the residential properties would be dark green to fit into the current view from that direction. He acknowledged that trees would be removed to permit the development, but that a replacement scheme was proposed by the applicant.

Transport Development Control had stated that they did not consider the possible 3.3% increase in traffic to be significant within the surrounding infrastructure network.

During discussion on the item, the Committee made the following points:

- There could be other sites that would be preferred if the Committee had the option of putting forward alternative options, however the only powers the Committee had were to consider the proposal in the agenda against the relevant planning policies.
- Clarification was requested on whether the school was aware of the proposal before the Committee. [The applicant stated that the school was aware of the application.]
- Members stated that they had sympathy with the objections to the application from the residents along Vincent Close.
- Members also stated that they could see the requirement for the additional classroom spaces at the school. That the school needed a proposal that would be beneficial both from a safety and an educational viewpoint.
- Clarification was requested on whether, if the Committee decided to approve the application, whether it would need to be referred to the Secretary of State. [The Development Control Team Manager advised that due to the size of the development and its limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt, it would not need to be referred to the Secretary of State for consideration. This followed recent changes made by the government to the rules governing referral of Green Belt development]
- Clarification was requested on whether the County Planning Authority needed to undertake an assessment into the residence of bats in the area between the residential properties and the school. [The Development Control Team Manager directed the attention of the Committee to Aerial 2 within the agenda report and advised that there was not evidence of bats residing in this area.]
- Clarification was requested on what parts of the site had been considered as alternative locations. [The Development Control Team Manager elaborated on alternative sites that had been considered.]

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

95/09 **MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION GU08/1472: LAND AT WISLEY AIRFIELD, NEAR OCKHAM** [Item 11]

This is an application for the construction of a fully enclosed in-vessel composting facility for the reception and processing of green, kitchen and animal wastes on a site of approximately 16.75ha. This would comprise; a composting building, control office, car parking facilities, landscaping, internal access roads, rainwater storage tank, leachate storage tank, package sewage treatment, diesel storage tank, attenuation pond, perimeter fencing, and a new access off the A3 Ockham roundabout.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix G** to these minutes) were tabled.

The Development Control Team Manager reminded the Committee that on 16 July 2008, Wharf Land Investments (Jersey) Ltd submitted a planning application (ref. GU08/1472) for an in-vessel composting (IVC) facility at the former Wisley Airfield. On 20 February 2009, the applicant lodged an appeal for the non-determination of the planning application (Appeal ref. APP/B3600/A/09/2098568/NWF) by the County Planning Authority. The reason that County Planning Authority (CPA) had not determined the planning application was because Natural England had objected to the proposed development as they considered that the proposal could have a significant effect on the interest features of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The CPA was advised that an Appropriate Assessment was required under Article 6 of the Habitats Directive. The Directive is implemented under Regulation 48 of the Habitat Regulations 1994, which restricts the granting of planning permission for development which is likely to significantly affect a European site. On 22 April 2009, Members adopted the CPA Appropriate Assessment Screening Report recommending that an Appropriate Assessment be carried out.

A public inquiry is scheduled for a period of eight days, commencing 15 September 2009. The Appeal was to be determined by an Inspector, however the Secretary of State has directed that he should determine the Appeal as it '*involves proposals for development of major importance having more than local significance*'. To assist the appeal process, the Committee was being asked to consider whether it would have granted planning permission for the application on the information it currently had and without a full Environmental Impact Statement.

During discussion on the item, the Committee made the following comments:

- Clarification was requested the difference between the EU Habitats Directive and the validity of the Surrey Waste Plan based on the Inspectors decision in January. [The Development Control Team Manager advised that the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 was valid as the decision only affected part of the Plan. The EU Habitats Directive stated that where it was identified that a proposal would have a significant effect on the surrounding habitat, the proposal could not be approved within the completion of a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). An EIA had not been submitted relating to this application.]

- Members stated that the Committee had not received sufficient information to consider approving this application.

RESOLVED

That the Committee would have REFUSED the application if it was still able to determine the application.

96/09 **MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION GU09/0835: SLYFIELD WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, GUILDFORD** [Item 16]

This is an application for the use of the existing Community Recycling Centre without compliance with Condition 2 of planning permission ref: GU03/0913 dated 6 October 2003 by extending the hours of operation to 20.00 hours Monday to Sunday including Public Holidays for a temporary period of seven months.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix H** to these minutes) were tabled.

Mrs Pauline Searle, the local member for Guildford North made the following points:

- This may only be a temporary application but temporary permissions often become permanent through future proposals.
- She had been raising these issues at the Local Committee and at Council but that this cause had not been considered or prioritised.
- The only access into the Community Recycling Centre was through Morefield Road, which has deteriorated significantly over the last couple of years.
- The volume of traffic using the access was horrendous with over 1,000 vehicle movements per day. The roads were at capacity and couldn't take any more.
- Often vehicles were queuing up along the A320 Woking Road back to the Salt Box Junction to access the site. Extending the hours of working would not alleviate this situation. Employees leaving Slyfield Industrial Estate had to wait over an hour to leave at the junction with the Woking Road.
- The Planning and Highways Services should liaise to ensure that when Community Recycling Centres were redeveloped, that the road infrastructure be improved to carry the increased traffic.
- There had been an issue relating to odours from the site for several years from the turnover of waste. There had been several initiatives established to reduce the level of odour from the site but if it continued into the evening then the residents would have to contend with odours into the evening.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the report stating that the proposal for extended hours at Slyfield Community Recycling Centre was to permit the redevelopment of Martyrs Lane Community Recycling Centre. Therefore this application would only be a temporary permission.

There had been several objections to the application including issues such as noise, odour and traffic congestion. Issues relating to odour was a concern for

the Environment Agency and objections should be made directly to the Agency.

He acknowledged that there were capacity issues relating to Moorfield Road but this was an industrial estate and therefore would have heavy vehicles using the site from other users as well/

The lighting scheme was similar to that used at the Witley Community Recycling Centre.

During discussion on the item, the Committee made the following comments:

- Members acknowledged that Morefield Road did need to be redeveloped to cope with the transport using the road and urged more liaison between the Planning and Highways Services and the Local Committees on these issues.
- Clarification was requested on whether the Committee could write to the Highways Service and request that Morefield Road be redeveloped. [The Development Control Team Manager advised that this was more relevant to the Local Committee.]

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

97/09 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION GU09/0694: APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT (HABITATS REGULATIONS 1994): LAND AT LYNCHFORD LANE, FARNBOROUGH [Item 12]

This was an application for the development of a waste transfer and recycling facility on a site area of 0.5 hectares (ha) of which some 0.10 ha lies within Surrey and some 0.43 ha lies within Hampshire.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the item stating that the application site at Lynchford Lane for the proposed waste recycling and transfer facility was not covered by any statutory nature conservation or landscape designations at the local, national or higher levels. However, the site was located in close proximity (within 2.5 kilometres) to the Ash to Brookwood Heaths SSSI, which is a constituent part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area for Conservation (SAC).

Therefore a screening of the need for an appropriate assessment had been carried out to consider the impact this development could have on the SSSI, SPA and SAC mentioned above. The officer view was that an appropriate assessment didn't need to be carried out. Natural England, the statutory consultee had concurred with that view.

RESOLVED

That the Screening Opinion in relation to the Appropriate Assessment in Annex 1 to the agenda report be ADOPTED.

98/09 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION WA08/2010: RUNFOLD AGGREGATES, FARNHAM QUARRY, FARNHAM [Item 14]

This retrospective application for the installation and use of temporary site infrastructure including 5 aggregate storage bays, site office/storage facility, portaloos, storage of associated infrastructure and associated signage to facilitate the recycling operation allowed under planning permission ref: GU05/0731 and WA05/0721 dated 18 October 2005 was WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA.

99/09 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION WA09/0772: CHIDDINGFOLD WASTE WATER TREATMENT WORKS, CHIDDINGFOLD [Item 14]

This was a retrospective planning permission for the construction and use of a Works Motor Control Centre Kiosk of 8.7m x 2.5m x 3.09m high; an REC Intake Kiosk of 2.56m x 1.96m x 2.7m high; and a Duty/Standby Washwater Kiosk of 0.8m x 2m x 1.25m high; all constructed in glass reinforced plastic.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the item stating that the proposal was within the Area of Outstanding National Beauty, Area of Great Landscape Value and the Green Belt. Therefore the Committee needed to be convinced that there were very special circumstances for the application that outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

He stated that the officer view was that the need for the improved quality of the discharge into the Chiddingfold Stream constituted very special circumstances for the development.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

100/09 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION RU09/0466: LYNE LANE COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE, CHERTSEY [Item 15]

This was an application for the use of the existing Community Recycling Centre without compliance with Condition 3 of planning permission ref: RU06/0716 dated 6 November 2006 by extending the hours of operation to 20.00 hours Monday to Sunday including Public Holidays for a temporary period of 7 months.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the item stating that the proposal for development within the Green Belt. Therefore the Committee needed to be convinced that there were very special circumstances for the application that outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

He stated that the officer view was that the need for the improved quality of the site constituted very special circumstances for the development.

The neighbouring landowner had objected to the application on access arrangements and that the noise from the site would continue into the night. However, the officer view is that these issues have been mitigated against by the conditions within the report.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

101/09 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION WO09/0459: LAND AT MARTYRS LANE COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE, WOKING [Item 17]

This was an application for amended details of the layout of the Community Recycling Centre pursuant to Condition 1 of planning permission WO08/0541 dated 24 July 2008.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the item stating that this proposal was linked to another item on the agenda (Item 18). This was a minor amendment to the planning permission given by the Committee on 24 July 2008 (ref: WO08/0541).

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to conditions set out in the agenda report.

102/09 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION WO09/0336: LAND AT MARTYRS LANE COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE, WOKING [Item 18]

This was an application for details of a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works pursuant to Condition 11 of planning permission ref: WO08/0541 dated 24 July 2008.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the item stating that this proposal was linked to another item on the agenda (Item 17). This was a minor amendment to the planning permission given by the Committee on 24 July 2008 (ref: WO08/0541).

This proposal was required to ensure that there was the correct drainage system at the Community Recycling Centre. The scheme met the needs of the statutory consultees.

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

103/09 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL GU09/0810: LAND AT MERROW CofE INFANT SCHOOL, MERROW [Item 19]

This was an application for the installation of a canopy to create outdoor play/learning area.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the item stating that there had been representations made objecting to the application on noise grounds. He stated that the officer view was that the introduction of the canopy would not significantly increase the level of noise on the site, the activity would already be being carried out at the site.

It was noted that the sixth paragraph of the Summary Report should read: "In this regard, officers consider the proposal will not have an adverse impact on neighbourhood amenity in terms of noise generation."

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

104/09 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSALS GU09/1989 AND GU08/1990: LAND AT HOLLY LODGE PRIMARY SCHOOL, ASH VALE [Item 20]

These were applications for

- 1.) Construction of timber clad, shallow pitched roof classroom block comprising four classrooms and ancillary office, storage space and toilets; removal of two existing demountable classrooms (GU08/1989)
- 2.) Construction of aluminium clad, flat roof classroom block comprising four classrooms and ancillary office, storage space and toilets; removal of two existing demountable classrooms. (GU08/1990).

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix I** to these minutes) were tabled.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the report stating that both Guildford Borough Council and Ash Parish Council had objected to application GU08/1990 based on the use of aluminium clad on the outside of the building. This had been amended to be green plastic that reflected the look of wood. This had been deemed acceptable in the officer's view.

The Chairman drew Members attention to the update sheet in which it stated that Condition 4 be deleted. The Development Control Team Manager advised that the reason for this was that this action had already been completed.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

105/09 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL GU09/0836: LAND AT ST. MARYS CofE INFANT SCHOOL, GODALMING [Item 21]

This was an application for the erection of 1.35m high close boarded fence on school boundary to Shackleford Road as replacement for existing boundary fence.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the report stating that there had been two objections to the proposal. The officer view was that the building was fit for purpose and inkeeping with the area.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report.

106/09 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL RE09/00393: LAND AT WOODMANSTERNE PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOODMANSTERNE [Item 24]

This was an application for the erection of double demountable classroom unit.

The Development Control Team Manager introduced the report stating that this proposal was designed to relieve overcrowding within the school. It was proposed to be located within the Green Belt. Therefore the Committee needed to be convinced that there were very special circumstances for the application that outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.

The officer view was that the need for the qualitative improvements that would be created through the proposal outweighed the harm to the Green Belt. He stated that there had been no alternative sites outside of the Green Belt.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED, subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report and the referral of the application to the Secretary of State as a Departure.

107/09 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL TA09/0593: LAND AT HAMSEY GREEN INFANT SCHOOL, WARLINGHAM [Item 25]

This was an application for the erection of a children's centre building and ancillary outdoor facilities within the grounds of an existing infant school.

An update sheet (attached at **Appendix J** to these minutes) were tabled.

The proposal was for a Children's Centre in the context of a national Government drive to improve facilities for children. This was the reason for the need for the development.

The site was close to a pocket of depreivation which the centre was identified to address. The proposal was orientated around access to the site being by pedestrians so there would not be a significant increase in the traffic generated from this application. There were no better alternative sites for this development.

RESOLVED

That the application be PERMITTED subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report and the referral of the application to the Secretary of State as a Departure.

[Meeting ended at 4.30pm]

Chairman

Update On Item 7

**Application for Village Green Status
Land at The Green, Windmill Drive, Leatherhead**

The background documents should read:

“All documents quoted in the report”

rather than...

- Applications for the registration of land as town or village green numbers 1845 and 1851 with supporting evidence.
- Inspector's report.
- Objection from Lacey Simmons Ltd.
- Objection from Surrey County Council.

Update to Item 9

**Minerals and Waste Application: WA08/2038
Normandy Auto Salvage, Chapel Farm, Normandy, GU3 2BJ.**

Retrospective application for a weighbridge and weighbridge office and staff facility building, new 3.2m and 2.4m high boundary walls, a surface water drainage system and external lighting.

Update on Outstanding Consultations

Three Valleys Water : No views received.

Surrey Wildlife Trust : No views received.

Responses from local residents

Nine further responses have been received making a total of 44. The following additional points were received that are not included in the original reports (see Page 7):

- Local residents have never been aware of the previous occupier dropping a large concrete block onto vehicles to crush them. To suggest that this was something local residents had to put up with is wholly inaccurate. *This was information supplied by the applicant and has recently been reconfirmed by the applicant who is still in contact with the previous owner.*
- That there was never an existing building with a floor area of 300m². *This is disputed by the applicant, by County Officers who saw the original site and the evidence of aerial photographs. Over half of the site now shown as car parking was covered by two buildings that adjoined each other with open land between them and No 1 Chapel Farm. These can be seen on the aerial photographs, one has a brownish roof and the other white. There was also a small office attached to the white roof building that is shown with a grey roof. Together these had a floor area of over 300m².*

ConditionsHours of Work (Condition 2)

The condition to be amended as set out below following discussions with the applicant:

- 2 No lights shall be illuminated nor shall any operations or activities authorised or required by this permission be carried out outside the following hours:

Monday – Friday	07.00 to 17.30
Saturdays	07.00 to 17.00

There shall be no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Surface Water (Conditions 5 & 6)

When the recommended conditions were received from the Environment Agency (EA) the Planning Liaison Officer was contacted because it was considered that this information had been included in the original application. Further internal consultations are currently being carried out at the EA but to date a reply has not been received, although it is expected shortly. Normal practice would be for Officers in consultation with the Chairman, to retain, delete or amend, one or both of the conditions, if one or both of the applications are permitted, when the decision notice is prepared.

RECOMMENDATION

That the additional comments from local residents be noted and that the changes to conditions be agreed.

Update to Item 10

**Minerals and Waste Application: WA08/2038
Normandy Auto Salvage, Chapel Farm, Normandy, GU3 2BJ.**

Retrospective application for the erection of a depollution structure and the provision of a portacabin to be used as a weighbridge office and staff facilities and the retention of a night watchman's caravan all for a temporary period of one year.

Update on Outstanding Consultations

Three Valleys Water : No views received.

Surrey Wildlife Trust : No views received.

Responses from local residents

Nine further responses have been received making a total of 44. The following additional points were received that are not included in the original reports (see Page 7):

- Local residents have never been aware of the previous occupier dropping a large concrete block onto vehicles to crush them. To suggest that this was something local residents had to put up with is wholly inaccurate. *This was information supplied by the applicant and has recently been reconfirmed by the applicant who is still in contact with the previous owner.*
- That there was never an existing building with a floor area of 300m². *This is disputed by the applicant, by County Officers who saw the original site and the evidence of aerial photographs. Over half of the site now shown as car parking was covered by two buildings that adjoined each other with open land between them and No 1 Chapel Farm. These can be seen on the aerial photographs, one has a brownish roof and the other white. There was also a small office attached to the white roof building that is shown with a grey roof. Together these had a floor area of over 300m².*

ConditionsHours of Work (Condition 2)

The condition to be amended as set out below following discussions with the applicant.

The night watchman's caravan has also been excluded from the time limits.

- 2 No lights shall be illuminated nor shall any operations or activities authorised or required by this permission (with the exception of the night watchman's caravan) be carried out outside the following hours:

Monday – Friday 07.00 to 17.30
Saturdays 07.00 to 17.00

There shall be no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Duration (Condition 3)

Change date from 22 July 2009 to 22 July 2010.

Surface Water (Conditions 6 & 7)

When the recommended conditions were received from the Environment Agency (EA) the Planning Liaison Officer was contacted because it was considered that this information had been included in the original application. Further internal consultations are currently being carried out at the EA but to date a reply has not been received, although it is expected shortly. Normal practice would be for Officers in consultation with the Chairman, to retain, delete or amend, one or both of the conditions, if one or both of the applications are permitted, when the decision notice is prepared.

Condition 8 should be headed: Car Parking and Vehicle Loading/Unloading/Turning

RECOMMENDATION

That the additional comments from local residents be noted and that the changes to conditions be agreed.

Update On Item 8

Minerals and Waste Application WA09/0737
Witley Community Recycling Centre, Petworth Road, Witley
Details of a scheme of lighting pursuant to Condition 29 of planning permission
ref: WA08/2128 dated 25 April 2009

1. Three further letters of representation have been received raising the following comments:
 - Concern about the height and number of lighting columns – need to ensure these are at the absolute minimum
 - The lighting especially on the raised area will be highly visible to properties
 - The current site only has 3 lights which have not been a problem – a simulation of the proposed lights should be done
 - Would like to see a condition restricting use of lighting to the hours which the CRC is open to and for 30 minutes after and this condition strictly adhered to
 - Request a condition that security lighting is not on permanently but only comes on if activated
 - Consideration should be given to impact of scheme on residents

Officer comment: a condition has been recommended limiting the operational hours of the lighting to that of the CRC. With regard to security lighting the applicant has stated that the CCTV camera night service will utilise infrared to trigger alerts to a monitoring centre and that no white light would be automatically switched on as a result of an intruder triggering the system. The applicant states that if management were called to the site, the staff would naturally need to activate the lights manually to check the site and all lights would operate on a photocell timer system to ensure that they are turned off when staff vacate the site.

2. Paragraph 17 should read: - Historic/Listed Buildings Officer :
 Welcomes the fact that no lighting columns are proposed on the exit past the listed building (Lion Gate Court). Recognises that there will inevitably be some light pollution from the site but any impact on the special interest of the listed building from the light columns themselves and the light during hours of darkness will be negligible in this particular instance.
3. Paragraph 36 refers to the county lighting consultant suggesting flat glass residential distribution luminaries and lowering the wattage be considered. This should read that whilst the applicant is unable to lower the wattage, they are providing the flat glass residential type luminaries.
4. Paragraph 39 – in addition to the bund, an acoustic fence 4m in height is to be constructed along the western perimeter edge of the CRC raised area. This would result in the top 2m of the columns on the raised perimeter being visible from beyond the site

Update to Item 22
Surrey County Council Proposal – Regulation 3: SU09/0244
Land at Frimley C of E School, Frimley Green Road, Frimley Green

Para 4

The school playing field, including the application site, is designated a Green Space within the Settlement Area in the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000.

Paras 14 – 20

Further representations have been received from 6 persons who have already made representations. The following new issues are raised;

- the two current planning applications at this site are intrinsically linked and should be considered together at the same meeting; consideration of this application should be postponed for clarification and further consultation
- They are considered to overlap in their impacts on traffic and Green Space.
- The school wish to see the applications considered in parallel.
- To require objectors to travel to two separate meetings is incompatible with sustainable travel policies.
- Details of proposal in relation to the extent of use outside school hours provided by the school for the purposes of the planning application contradict the details contained in its application for lottery funding which envisage higher levels of non school use.
- Further consultations should be carried out on the change which has occurred in the stated weekday finish time of the MUGA from 16.00 on the original application form to 16.30 in later correspondence referred to in committee report. This time will coincide with swimming pool users and have traffic impacts. Noise consultant has commented on the basis of 16.00 finish. Further consultation should be carried out with highway authority as a consequence of this change
- Application form does not provide information on prior consultation by applicant with neighbours
- Application states that there are no changes proposed to pedestrian or vehicular access points. This is incorrect.

The school have requested that this application be determined now, in order that funding for this project can be secured. Financial considerations are not a planning consideration. However, given the latest information provided by the school about the limitations which will be placed on the use of the MUGA (para 9 of the report) officers consider this proposal not to have any material traffic generating impacts beyond those which would be associated with the school's playing fields as they currently exist. There are therefore no overlapping traffic considerations between the two proposals.

Clear statements have been made in the application about the extent to which the proposed MUGA would be used outside school hours, and that it would not be made available for non-school users. Planning conditions reflect these statements and it is for the applicant to decide whether they are able to implement the permission with

those restrictions in place in the form of enforceable planning conditions. The lottery funding bid does not form part of the planning application.

In the course of considering this application, the nature of the proposed use of the MUGA has emerged as being for school activities, some of which will take place after school. These are considered to be less formal than, for example, fixed time lets if the MUGA were to be made available through lets to the wider community. A slight variation in the estimates of the finish times given at various times is not, therefore, surprising. Officers do not consider the proposed finish time of 16.30 would give rise to an unacceptable impact or is significantly material so as to warrant re-consultation.

Use of the MUGA for school uses only will not generate additional traffic after school. The provision of after school activities potentially reduces the intensity of the afternoon pick up period by spreading activity over a longer period. The use is not in itself considered to have any additional significant traffic impacts. If significant highways and traffic consequences of an overlap with swimming pool use are identified, these can be considered in deciding whether permission is granted retrospectively for the retention of the swimming pool, and under what restrictions.

Prior consultation by the applicant with neighbours or the local community, though advisable is not mandatory. Officers consider that consultations carried out by the planning authority post-submission have adequately established the views of local people about the proposal.

The proposal **does not** involve any physical alterations to pedestrian or vehicular accesses from the highway.

Update to Item 23
Surrey County Council Proposal – Regulation 3: EL09/1021
Land at Esher High School, More Lane, Esher

Para 8

County Arboriculturist: no objection, subject to replacement planting taking place in the same locality as the trees to be removed.

The arboriculturist considers the trees to be removed could have been classed as Category B trees under the BS5837 methodology, and have been misidentified as *fraxinus excelsior* (ash). They are in fact *fraxinus angustifolia*, (narrow leaved ash). He considers that given their relatively small size, the tree-lined boundaries of the site and the proposal for replanting, their amenity value is limited to their immediate vicinity and they have no amenity significance other than for the school itself. The application refers to replanting 'elsewhere on the school site' but this should take place in the immediate vicinity of the classroom.

Recommended condition 4 secures submission of details of tree planting. The required details include locations for new planting, and that approval will enable a suitable location to be secured.

Para 10

A further 9 representations have been received, raising the following additional issues;

- The proposal is an undesirable precedent for development in the Green Belt; very special circumstances advanced in support of inappropriate development are absent or flimsy; the method for calculating physical capacity of school buildings does not support conclusion that new buildings are in order to provide the additional places needed. Unsuitability of Hinchley Wood School could be addressed by provision of artificial turf sports facilities
- The application should be referred to the Secretary of State
- Applicants' statement that woodland belt offers screening is erroneous as trees are deciduous; conclusions on screening are contradicted by proposals for new tree planting; trees planted elsewhere on site will not address visual impacts of proposal on nearest residents; destruction of long-established trees is unacceptable; challenge the arboricultural assessment's grading of trees to be removed as of relatively low amenity value
- Lack of information on nature of foundations; no assessment made of impact on trees on adjoining land or protection of them during construction
- Alternative locations exist within the site which would not impact upon neighbours; other possibilities have not been adequately researched other locations should be reconsidered, proposal should be amended and consultations carried out on revised proposal
- Application fails to take account of ecological interest of adjoining woodland belt and pond; has potential to harm this habitat through noise and overshadowing by proposed building and should be subject to ecological assessment

- Presence of elevated flat roof close to boundary makes rear gardens less secure compared to existing chain link fence boundary; will lead to litter problems in gardens and trespass;
- Owners of adjoining property cannot be held liable for injury to trespassers using classroom to gain access to their property or damage to classroom as a result of their trees overhanging the boundary
- Building style is an eyesore and does not match existing buildings; temporary buildings are likely to become permanent
- There is no benefit to the local community from provision of additional classrooms
- Elmbridge Borough Council responded to consultation in advance of considering representations made during consultation period
- Application form incomplete in respect of details of pre-application discussions held with planning authority and ability of planning officers to inspect site from public land. This information is being sought under Freedom of Information legislation.
- An inappropriate application form has been used; no evidence that member authority to make a planning application, required under planning legislation, has been obtained
- The County Council probably does not own the land. Application cannot therefore be determined as the required notice has not been served on landowner
- Provisions of Disability Discrimination Act apply. Object if interests of disadvantaged people are not reasonably met.

After Para 8 Add the following, in relation to potential ecological and biodiversity impacts;

The County Ecologist has been consulted on the proposal and in particular on the suggestion that the proposal should have been subject to an ecological assessment. He has commented that the proposed location is closely mown amenity grassland which is of limited biodiversity importance and does not function as an important wildlife corridor. It is not considered to affect the functioning of the adjoining land as a habitat or corridor. The trees to be removed are a non-native variety of ash, and their replacement, if with the genuinely native variety, would be a benefit to biodiversity. He does not consider the development would have a significant impact on biodiversity, nor that ecological surveys are necessary for this proposal. He draws attention to para 99 of PPS9, which states that developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by the development. As the proposed location is of low ecological value, it does not warrant a habitat survey.

Para 15 Add;

The LEA have confirmed that the physical capacity of the current Esher High buildings has been calculated by applying the formula prescribed by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and used nationally for calculating the number of pupil places which can be provided by any school and to inform the statutory admissions process. The formula establishes a maximum and minimum capacity. It is usual for the net capacity to lie between the maximum and minimum. In the case of Esher High, the calculated **maximum** capacity is 887, which produces a PAN of 177, which means the school is already slightly short of the accommodation it should have for the number of pupils it admits (180). Education officers emphasise that workplaces

are **not** equivalent to pupil places. The number of workplaces identified in the methodology may have suggested to others that the school has spare capacity.

Education officers consider that the formula has been properly applied and shows that to accommodate additional pupils, further accommodation must be provided at Esher High.

Education officers state that to bring the playing field provision at Hinchley Wood up to the level required for its existing roll would require an artificial surface of 15000m² (equivalent to more than two full size football pitches). Planning officers consider that the need to make provision of this sort in association with a further increase in roll here is sufficient reason to exclude it as a reasonable alternative to development of classroom accommodation in the Green Belt at Esher.

After para 27 Add the following;

Procedural Issues

The applicant has confirmed that the County Council is the freehold owner of the site and has provided the planning authority with a copy of the deeds. The diocese does not have a qualifying interest in the land for the purposes of Article 6 of the General Development Procedure Order. The County Planning Authority is therefore satisfied as to the accuracy of the certificate of ownership accompanying the application..

The form used for this application is the national standard application form, which was introduced by the government for all applications (other than those for minerals development) in 2008. Use of the national application form is mandatory for all applications made after 6 May 2008, by virtue of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Amendment) (England) Order 2008.

The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 do not include any requirement for member authority to be obtained to the making of a planning application under Regulation 3.

Referral of Green Belt development proposals to the Secretary of State is governed by the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, which applies to applications made after 20 April 2009. This application would have had to be referred under the Direction it replaced. The new Direction is intended by the Government to reduce the number of small scale applications being referred to it.

The new Direction requires referral of development proposals which constitute inappropriate development

- a.) where buildings of more than 1000m² are proposed or
- b.) where development by reason of scale, nature or location would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposed building is 165m². Officers consider, for the reasons set out in para 16, that the impact on openness is limited because of the small scale and location of the proposal close to large group of long established buildings, that the application therefore does not fall within the scope of the Direction and need not be referred to the Secretary of State.

Item 11
Minerals and Waste Application: GU08/1472
Land at Wisley Airfield, Nr Ockham, Surrey

Please note the following amendments to the committee report:

Landscape and Visual Impact

Paragraph 97 and 98 should now read as follows:

- 97 The site lies in the Thames Basin Lowlands Regional Character Area, which is characterised by small-scale lowland farmed landscape lying within a generally flat but gently undulating clay vale and a mosaic of small fields interspersed by oak/ash woods and shaws, field ponds, meadows, heathland and individual mature tree specimens. Guildford Borough Council has undertaken a more recent Landscape Character Assessment of the Borough (January 2007), with the application area falling within the Ockham and Clandon Wooded Rolling Claylands (E2). However, the SCC Landscape Officer does not consider that the typical characteristics are immediately relevant to this site, but rather reflect the wider setting of the Character Area. The site is also close to the Wisley Wooded and Settled Heath Landscape (G2), which is dominated by the woodland heath lands of Wisley and Ockham Common and also includes the RHS Gardens at Wisley. The SCC Landscape Officer raised no objections on landscape grounds, subject to some minor changes with planting. The issue of the impact on the SNCI has been referred to the County Ecologist. Overall the considered view from the SCC Landscape Officer is that the combination of topography and vegetation cover locally, combined with new landscape components, will provide adequate containment of the proposed facility in the location selected.
- 98 However, for the Appeal and Public Inquiry, the Secretary of State has requested that further information be submitted in respect of the visual impact of the proposed development (including light pollution) especially from Elm Corner and from RHS Gardens Wisley, which is to be addressed within the EIA (not submitted at time of writing this report). Officers' therefore consider that the proposal is acceptable from a landscape viewpoint and is in accordance with the Development Plan, subject to a satisfactory visual impact assessment, as required by the Secretary of State, being submitted.

RECOMMENDATION

To resolve that the Authority would refuse if it were still able to determine the application.

Reasons for the refusal of planning permission and development plan policies relevant to the decision.

Reasons:

1. The proposal constitutes inappropriate waste related development in the Green Belt, which would cause harm and in view of the further information to be submitted on need, alternative sites and emissions for the Appeal process, the

applicant has not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist. Accordingly the proposal would conflict with Policies SP5 – Green Belts and W17 – Location of Waste Management Facilities of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (the South East Plan) 2009, Policy CW6 - Development in the Green Belt of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and Policy RE2 - Development in the Green Belt of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003.

2. In view of the need for further information to be submitted with regard to the control of pathogens and ammonia levels, there remain uncertainties regarding the potential risk from emissions, and therefore the applicant has failed to demonstrate whether or not the proposed development would endanger or have a significant adverse impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and RHS Wisley Gardens, or whether any risks or adverse impacts could be controlled to acceptable levels. The proposed development is therefore not in accordance with Policies W17 – Location of Waste Management Facilities, NRM5 – Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity and NRM9 – Air Quality of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (the South East Plan) 2009, Policies DC2 - Planning Designations, DC3 - General Considerations and WD2 - Recycling, Storage, Transfer, Materials Recovery and Processing Facilities of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and Policy NE1 – Potential Special Protection Areas and Candidate Special Areas of Conservation of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003.

**Update on Item 16
Minerals and Waste Application GU09/0835
Slyfield Waste Management Facility**

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

15 Jacobs Well Residents Association

Comments that whilst this application appears to be the solution to try and spread the traffic movement in and out of Slyfield Industrial Estate there is concern that there will be lorry container movements along Jacobs Well Road at unsociable hours including weekends. In summer and autumn there are many walkers, joggers that use this road. The Residents Association requests that commercial waste movement is not permitted during the extended hours and that these hours should be used for household waste only especially in the evenings and Public Holidays.

17 To date, a further letter of representation has been received objecting to the proposal on traffic grounds, bringing the total to 7 letters of representation, 6 objecting to the proposal and 1 in support.

Update to Item 20
Surrey County Council Proposal – Regulation 3: GU08/1989 and
GU08/1990: Land at Holly Lodge School, Stratford Road, Ash Vale

Amending Documents

Letter dated 15/07/09 and plan Hollylodge 01. This is a minor alteration to the dimensions of the flat roof option (application no. GU08/ 1990).

Email dated 20/07/09 and attachments containing ground gas monitoring data and analysis.

Para 13

The parish council maintains a strong objection to the flat roofed option.

Para 24

A full report and analysis of the ground gas monitoring undertaken at the site has been submitted. It concludes that no special measures need to be taken in the design of the building to address possible ground gas penetration. The Borough Council's EHO concurs with this conclusion.

Recommendation

Delete condition 4 and reason.

Update to Item 25
Surrey County Council: Application TA09/593
Land at Hamsey Green Infant School, Tithepit Shaw Lane, Warlingham

Erection of children's centre building and ancillary outdoor facilities within grounds of existing infant school

RESPONSE FROM COUNTY COUNCIL ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER

An Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted as part of the application for the Children's Centre. The Statement assesses the structural condition of trees in the vicinity of the proposed building and recommends that four trees be felled to make way for it. Three trees are proposed to be planted.

The Arboricultural Officer has commented that the proposed development is within acceptable thresholds from an arboricultural perspective, despite the loss of four trees and the fact that the new building would encroach marginally on the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of two trees to be retained. He has expressed concern with the chances of survival of the size (14 to 16cm diameter) of the two Tulip Trees proposed to be planted, and recommends that they be a diameter of 8 to 10cm to give these trees a more reasonable chance of success. The Arboricultural Officer recommends that conditions be imposed to ensure adherence to arboricultural requirements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the following conditions and reasons be added to those in the Officers' report:

Conditions:

3. The development hereby permitted shall adhere to the sequence of proposed arboricultural operations as identified in the Arboricultural Method statement and Survey for Hamsey Green Infant School Surrey, Revision B (04.06.09).
4. Within a year of the commencement of the development hereby permitted, trees shall be planted in the areas for re-planting as shown on the plan at Appendix D in the Arboricultural Method statement and Survey for Hamsey Green Infant School Surrey, Revision B (04.06.09).
5. Within 6 months of the date of planning permission, the applicant shall submit for the approval of the County Planning Authority detailed specifications for the proposed replacement trees, specifically tree sizes (8 to 10cm diameter), planting positions and planting arrangement and defined maintenance regime including watering.
6. The landscaping works required under Condition 4 shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following the completion of the development hereby permitted. Thereafter the landscaping scheme shall be maintained for a further period of 5 years, such maintenance to include the replacement of any tree which is uprooted or destroyed or dies or becomes, in the opinion of the County Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective. The

replacement tree shall be of the same species and size as that originally planted and shall be planted in the same position unless the County Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reasons:

3. To ensure the health and appearance of trees on the site, in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy BE1 of Tandridge District Local Plan 2001.
4. To ensure the health and appearance of trees on the site, in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy BE1 of Tandridge District Local Plan 2001.
5. To ensure the health and appearance of trees on the site, in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy BE1 of Tandridge District Local Plan 2001.
6. To ensure the health and appearance of trees on the site, in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy BE1 of Tandridge District Local Plan 2001.