

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE **DATE:** 26 MARCH 2008

BY: PLANNING MANAGER

DISTRICT(S) REIGATE & BANSTEAD
BOROUGH COUNCIL

ELECTORAL DIVISION:
Earlswood & Reigate South
Frances King

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION

GRID REF: 527693 148270

TITLE: MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION RE08/0253

SUMMARY REPORT

Land at Earlswood Community Recycling Centre, Horley Road, Earlswood, Redhill

Redevelopment of Earlswood Community Recycling Centre (CRC) to create a split level facility for the receipt of civic amenity waste without compliance with Conditions 2 and 10 of planning permission ref: RE06/2004 dated 12 January 2007 to allow for a revised site layout.

The recommendation is subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure, to PERMIT subject to conditions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Surrey Waste Management Ltd

Date application valid

31 January 2008

Period for Determination

1 April 2008

Amending Documents

There are no amended documents.

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES

This section identifies and summarises the main planning issues in the report. The full text should be considered before the meeting.

	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Metropolitan Green Belt	No	15 – 29
Waste	Yes	30 – 44
Transport	Yes	45 – 54
Visual	Yes	58 – 61
Woodland and Ecology	Yes	62 – 68
Noise	Yes	69 – 72
Drainage	Yes	75 – 76
Dust and Odour	Yes	77 – 80
Contamination	Yes	81 – 82

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan Plan

Aerial Photographs Aerial

Site Photographs

- Figure 1 Illustrates the site entrance looking south, to the south of this entrance is the proposed development site showing the existing vegetation along Horley Road.
- Figure 2 Shows the view of the development site from the Cul-de-sac off Maple Road which lies directly south of the site.
- Figures 3a and 3b Illustrates the views toward the proposed site from the residences along Maple Road.
- Figure 4a and 4b Shows the view from the intersection of Horley and Maple Road where the development site is beyond the immediate open area.

BACKGROUND

Site Description

1. Earlswood Civic Amenity (CA) site (also known as a Community Recycling Centre (CRC)) is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt approximately 2km south of Redhill and approximately 3km south east of Reigate. The residential area of Earlswood lies approximately 1.1km north east of the site. The current site occupies an area of 0.27 hectares and operates as a civic amenity site. The site is bounded to the east by the A23, Horley Road, with allotment gardens and a football ground immediately beyond this. The London Victoria to Gatwick Airport railway line runs behind this. To the north of the site lies Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Depot with Earlswood Common beyond this. Land to the south of the existing CA site, formerly occupied by an incinerator, is an area of open land comprising

hardstanding, scrub and trees currently utilised for the storage of skips and containers. Beyond this area lie a series of allotment gardens and the residential area of South Earlswood. To the west of the site lies the operational Earlswood Sewerage Treatment Works with open land beyond.

2. Currently the CA site consists of up to 15 skips and recycling bins located on one level which are open to the public to recycle or dispose of household and general garden waste between 8am to 5:30pm Monday to Friday and 9am to 5pm Saturday and Sunday. To dispose of their waste into the containers members of the public have to climb up side access steps. Because of the restricted size of the site, to allow the recycling skips or containers to be removed when full, the tip area of the site is required to close temporarily to members of the public to enable heavy goods vehicles to enter, load, turn and leave the site. There are two vehicular access points off the A23 into the existing site, one from the south eastern end, accessed by members of the public, and one at the south western end of the site for use by staff and the operator. However on 12 of January 2007(ref. RE06/2004) a permission was granted for the site, which this application requires assessment against
3. The application area comprises of the existing CA site and approximately 1.75 hectares immediately to the south of the CA site where skips and containers are currently stored.

Planning History

4. Planning permission for the civic amenity operations was originally granted (RE80P/285) in 1980. In 1992 consent was granted (RE92/0207) to redevelop the site including land to the south as a refuse transfer station, civic amenity site and recycling centre, but this has not been implemented. A Materials Recovery Facility was permitted on that land to the south in July 1998 (RE98/ 0082) but the permission was not implemented and has now lapsed. In July 1998 planning permission was granted for two applications – the continued use of land for the deposit and temporary storage of glass cullet (broken glass suitable for re-melting) in three bays (RE98/0567); and for the continued use of land as a civic amenity site (RE98/ 0568). The construction of four covered bays for receipt and temporary storage of recycled materials was granted planning permission (ref: RE02/ 1340) in December 2002.
5. Recent case history includes the granting of planning permission in January 2007 (ref: RE06/2004) to re-design the layout of the CRC site to provide a split-level recycling facility to improve recycling provision and waste separation at the site by expanding the existing site. The planning application made provision to expand the site both southwards and south westwards from the existing operational area to increase the total site area to 2.05 hectares. Access was to remain from the A23 but new internal access arrangements would be provided including the installation of a one-way internal road system, which would run along the perimeter of the site. Members of the public on entering the site would utilise this internal road, driving up a ramp (1.5m in height to provide the split level) to the appropriate bin to deposit waste. Space would be provided between the recycling containers and bins and the parking bays to allow the public to walk to recycling containers to dispose of waste safely. Heavy goods vehicles would utilise the central area of the community-recycling centre to collect and remove full recyclable containers and skips from site

with this area not being accessible by members of the public. This area would also contain staff parking, a weighbridge and office. Access to this area would be gained from the proposed roundabout, and from the area via the perimeter road.

6. On 10 April 2008 an application for the non-compliance with conditions 2 and 10 of planning permission ref: RE06/2004 Dated 12 January 2007 to allow for a revised layout of the site.
-

THE PROPOSAL

7. The applicant is seeking to modify the internal layout of the CRC site as permitted by planning permission ref: RE06/2004. The applicant has yet to commence development at the site and is seeking to modify the design to provide more improvements to the layout. The applicant has stated that in doing this, this would further facilitate recycling by providing a greater variety of recycling containers and the flow and efficiency of traffic through the site. The applicant does not propose to alter the site entrance, the provision for a split-level facility or the segregation of members of the public from heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).
 8. The proposed changes to that permitted under planning permission ref: RE06/2004 are to alter the orientation of the layout, with the area to the west being shortened by approximately 30 metres and the area to the south being lengthened by approximately 25 metres. On entering the site, members of the public would be directed firstly to the area for small recyclables, which would be all on one level. After which members of the public would be directed around the perimeter road up the 1.5m high ramp towards the split-level facility. Vehicles would then follow the perimeter road around towards the internal roundabout and out of the CRC site.
 9. The hours of operation at the site would remain as set out in planning permission ref: RE06/2004 with the CRC open to the public for the recycling of waste at the following times:

Monday – Friday	8am – 5:30pm
Saturday & Sunday	9am – 5pm
 10. It is not anticipated that the number of HGVs visiting the site would change and all vehicle-running services at the site would be hard surfaced. The volume or types of waste brought to the site is not expected to increase from its current annual tonnage of 10,500 tonnes, however the applicant anticipates that recycling rates may increase as a result of the improvements. The applicant also proposes to install a new office/ welfare facility on the upper level of the split-level facility.
 11. A noise impact assessment, traffic impact assessment, Phase 1 Habitat survey, Phase 2 Environmental Site Investigation, Visual Impact Assessment and proposed tree and shrub planting; and drainage details have been submitted in support of the application. A Design and Access statement has also been submitted.
-

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 12 Reigate & Banstead Borough Council | No objection on the basis that an appropriate condition be imposed relating to the construction of the access to Horley Road. |
|---------------------------------------|---|

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 13 County Highway Authority –
Transportation development control | No objection, but propose a condition requiring access to Horley Road being constructed in accordance with approved plan EW1A dated 21/11/07 prior to operation and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved plan. |
| 14 The Environment Agency | Views are yet to be received |
| 15 County Ecologist | Views are yet to be received |
| 16 Landscape Architect | Views are yet to be received |
| 17 Arboriculturalist | Permission was granted previously for the removal of the two White Willows as required maintenance of the site and therefore no objection to the proposal. |
| 18 Surrey Wildlife Trust | Views are yet to be received |
| 19 Thames Water | Views are yet to be received |
| 20 Sutton and East Surrey Water Plc | Views are yet to be received |
| 21 County Noise Consultant | No objection to the proposal |

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

- | | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| 22 Salfords | Views are yet to be received |
| 23 Sidlow | Views are yet to be received |

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

- | |
|---|
| 24. The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices and an advert was placed in the Surrey Mirror on the 28 th of February 2008. A total of 28 of owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. |
|---|

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

25. This application is for the redevelopment of the existing Earlswood CRC site without compliance with Conditions 2 and 10 of the Planning Permission Ref. RE06/2004. The Conditions relate to the layout and design of the CRC site. The site is subject to the constraints of Metropolitan Green Belt policy, where the acceptability of extending existing site is inappropriate development which may only be permitted where very special circumstances exist that clearly outweigh the harm that will arise in the Green Belt and any other harm. The grant of planning permission in January 2007 for a similar development is a material consideration in determining this proposal. The proposal also requires assessment and should be acceptable from an environmental and amenity perspective.
26. The proposed development will be considered against both national policy and the regional and local planning policy contained within the South East Plan (draft), Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997, Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) 2006 and Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005. The main issues when assessing the application relate to the need for additional space above that which was previously permitted and its effect on the Green Belt, and the removal of existing trees and its effect on neighbourhood amenity.

The Metropolitan Green Belt

National Policy

Planning Policy Guidance 2 – Green Belt

Regional Policy

Regional Spatial Strategy – South East Plan (draft March 2006)

Policy W17 – Location of Waste Management Facilities

Surrey Structure Plan 2004

Policy LO4 – The Countryside and Green Belt

Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997

Policy WLP5 – Development in the Green Belt

The Proposed Surrey Waste Plan 2006 (submission draft)

Policy CW6 – Green Belt

Policy WD1 – Civic Amenity Sites

District Policy

Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005

Policy Co 1 – Setting and Maintenance of the Green Belt

27. The Earlswood Community Recycling Centre (CRC) is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Government policy on Green Belt is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2) “Green Belts” (Revised January 1995). Paragraph 1.4 of the guidance outlines that the most important attribute of the Green Belt is its openness and states that *“the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl through keeping land permanently open”* to ensure that development occurs in locations allocated in development plans. Paragraph 3.2 of the guidance note states that *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted”*. There is a presumption against development other than for a small range of uses deemed to be

compatible with the objectives of the Green Belt. Where a proposal is for inappropriate development *“very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”*. Waste related development is by definition inappropriate.

28. Further consideration is provided in Paragraph 3.13 with regards to the re-development of land which is located within the Green Belt for infrastructure developments or improvements, stating *“when re-development of land occurs in the Green Belt, it should as far as possible contribute to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts”*. The use of land should be in accordance with the objectives set out in PPG2, that is, the enhancement and retention of attractive landscapes, access to the open countryside and to secure nature conservation interests.
29. The South East Regional Assembly (SEERA) took responsibility for regional planning and transport in April 2001, immediately after the publication of RPG9. Since that time SEERA has undertaken a review of selected policies in Regional Planning Guidance Note 9 (RPG9). These reviews have included Waste Management and Minerals. In March 2004 the ‘Proposed Alterations to Regional Planning Guidance, South East – Regional Waste Management Strategy’ was published. Following an Examination in Public, the ‘Proposed Changes to Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals’ was published in August 2005, and adopted in June 2006. The Regional Minerals and Waste chapters will be incorporated into the Regional Spatial Strategy, when this is adopted. Government approval is expected in 2008.
30. The Draft South East Plan (June 2006) sets out regional planning guidance and recognises policy constraints such as Green Belt, it states in 10.239 that waste management facilities should not be precluded from designated areas such as Green belts if the objectives of more sustainable forms of waste are to be met. This is reinforced in Draft Policy W17 (Location of Waste Management Facilities) stating *“...waste management facilities should not be precluded from the Green Belt where the development would not compromise the objectives of the designation.”*
31. Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy LO4 (The Countryside and Green Belt) guides the control of development within the Green Belt stating, *“that the openness and intrinsic qualities of the countryside will be protected”*. Although the policy states that there is a presumption against inappropriate development, it recognises that some operational development, such as waste management, may be acceptable within the countryside where need is justified and adverse impacts can be satisfactorily managed.
32. Policy WLP1 (Waste Strategy Approach) of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 states that development will only be permitted where the wider material benefits to be derived from a proposal clearly outweighs any material adverse environmental impact associated with the development. Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP5 (Development in the Green Belt) states that waste related development would be in conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt and would not maintain openness, and would therefore be inappropriate and only permitted in very special circumstances where considerations exist that warrant an exception being

made to the Green Belt policy. However, it is recognised that some operational development will be acceptable in the Green Belt where need is justified and adverse impacts can be satisfactorily managed.

33. Pending adoption the Surrey Waste Plan (2006) has the status of material consideration with very considerable weight in the determination of a planning application for waste development. The weight to be attached to such policies depends upon the stage of preparation or review. The Surrey Waste Plan has been through Examination in Public and the Inspectors report has been published and conditions a material consideration to which considerable weight can be attached. Policy CW6 (Green Belt) seeks to ensure that the Green Belt policy serves its proper purpose whilst making provision exceptionally for necessary waste management development. Policy WD1 (Civic Amenity Sites) outlines a number of existing sites where improvements would be sought, of which Earlswood has been identified for an extension. The Inspectors accepted this proposal. The Surrey Waste Plan advises that whilst waste management facilities should be sited within urban areas, these opportunities are limited and consideration should be given to the reuse of previously developed, contaminated, derelict and disturbed land and land in waste management use; before Green Belt sites. The document also states that there is an immediate and acute shortfall of waste management facilities within the South East region, including Surrey, and to ensure necessary waste management infrastructure is delivered to meet challenging targets set at national and regional levels, a range of facilities is required at a range of scales with some waste management facilities to be located within the Green Belt where other non Green Belt sites are unavailable. Civic Amenity sites located within Surrey provide vital facilities for the deposit of waste which is not normally collected by the weekly collection service, contributing towards increasing reuse and recycling of waste.
34. Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005 Policy Co1 (Setting and Maintenance of the Green Belt) states that planning permission will not be granted for development that is inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it is justified by very special circumstances.

Harm to the Green Belt

35. The application site lies within the Green Belt where there is a general presumption against inappropriate development. Waste management operations, including recycling, are not deemed to be compatible with the objectives of the Green Belt and maintaining openness and are therefore considered to be inappropriate development. The proposed changes to alter the orientation of the layout with the area to the west being shortened by approximately 30 metres and the area to the south being lengthened by approximately 25 metres, would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore it is for the applicant to demonstrate that there are very special circumstances that overcome this harm to the Green Belt.

Very Special Circumstances

36. Earlswood CRC is currently the only civic amenity site within the Borough of Reigate and Banstead and is one of a number of waste management sites geographically

spread across the County. However the site is listed in Policy documents as a designated site for this purpose and the proposal is to improve traffic flow and the operational efficiency of the site.

37. The proposed extension is into a currently unused space situated between the development and residential housing. The site is also screened to the north by buildings situated within the existing Reigate and Banstead Borough vehicle depot, the existing sewerage treatment works to the west, and mixed vegetation to the south and east. Given its position in the built environment it is considered that there would be a limited adverse impact on the wider Green Belt landscape.
38. Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) refers to the protection of Green Belts. It goes on to say that *'the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities... together with the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether planning proposals should be given planning permission.'* The need for the redevelopment of Earlswood CRC site is therefore a key consideration as it forms part of a wider network of re-organisation to upgrade and improve waste facilities at CRC sites throughout the county to assist in moving waste up the waste hierarchy. This further proposal aims to improve the efficiency and operation of the site.
39. In support of the application, the applicant has submitted information describing the need for the redevelopment at Earlswood CRC in terms of meeting national and regional targets for landfill diversion and recycling as specified within the Landfill Directive (to reduce biodegradable municipal waste to landfill to 75% of that produced in 1995 by 2010, 50% by 2013 and 35% by 2020 respectively). CRCs can assist in achieving targets for recycling within the County, and Officers consider that the proposed layout of the Earlswood CRC will further assist in improving the efficiency and waste recovery at the site.

Conclusion on Green Belt

40. Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 recognises the benefits of, and supports, improvements to CA facilities stating within paragraph 5.2 that *"their development into comprehensive waste recycling centres will be encouraged"*. Officers consider that the proposal is appropriately sized to meet the operational requirements of improved recovery and otherwise does not constitute a change of use of land at the CRC site. It is also material that planning permission has been granted for a similar development. Officers consider that the proposal is necessary to provide a qualitative improvement to the operation of the site and cannot be located elsewhere as it directly relates to the existing waste use at the site and will otherwise enable the handling of waste at a higher level in the hierarchy. Very special circumstances are therefore judged to exist to justify the granting of planning permission in terms of need, the ancillary nature of the development and the qualitative improvement achieved.
41. Given the location, nature and scale of the additional land take proposed at the site, Officers do not consider that the new CRC footprint will adversely impact on the wider Green Belt landscape. Taking this into account and given the very special circumstances referred to above, Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable

and, subject to other amenity and environmental considerations, may be permitted as an exception to the provision in the context of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy LO4 and Local Plan Policy.

WASTE MANAGEMENT SITE AND THE EFFECTS GENERATED FROM THE REDESIGN

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 10 – Planning for Sustainable Waste Management
Waste Strategy for England 2007

Regional Policy

Regional Spatial Strategy – South East Plan (Draft June 2006)

Policy W3 - Regional Self-sufficiency
Policy W4 - Sub-regional Self-sufficiency
Policy W5 - Targets for Diversion from Landfill
Policy W6 - Recycling and Composting Targets
Policy W8 - Waste Separation
Policy W17 - Location of Waste Management Facilities

Surrey Structure Plan 2004

Policy DN18 - Waste Management

Joint Municipal Waste Management Plan 2006 – Surrey Local Government Association

Policy 5 and relevant actions

Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997

Policy WLP8 – Civic Amenity and Transfer Sites
Policy WLP10 - Provision of Sites – General Approach
Policy WLP11 - Provision of Sites – General Approach

Surrey Waste Local Plan 2006

Policy CW5 – Location of Waste Facilities
Policy CW7 – Environment, Health and Amenity
Policy WD1 – Civic Amenity Sites
Policy WD2 – Recycling, Storage, Transfer, Materials Recovery and Processing Facilities (Excluding Thermal Treatment)
Policy DC1 – Safeguarding Sites
Policy DC2 – Planning Designations
Policy DC3 – General Considerations

District Policy

Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005

Policy Cf2 – Community Facilities: Design and Layout

42. Government guidance on sustainable waste management practices is addressed through Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) 'Planning for Sustainable Waste Management' which should be read alongside the 'Waste Strategy 2000'. The overall objective of PPS10 is to protect human health and the environment and to encourage more sustainable waste management by moving waste up the 'waste hierarchy' including provisions for recycling and the reuse of previously developed land. The guidance also states that when identifying sites and areas for waste management facilities planning authorities should assess the site's suitability for

development against the physical and environmental constraints on development, the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community; and the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure. Annex E of PPS10 sets out locational criteria by which the suitability of sites should be assessed including visual intrusion, potential land use conflict, noise and vibration, and air emissions including dust. These aspects are dealt with later in the report.

43. The national policy document “Waste Strategy for England (2007)” was produced by DEFRA in May 2007 and sets out its vision for sustainable waste management. Key to this strategy are the following objectives; to decouple waste growth (in all sectors) from economic growth and put more emphasis on waste prevention and re-use; to meet and exceed the Landfill Directive diversion targets for biodegradable municipal waste in 2010, 2013 and 2020; to increase diversion from landfill of non-municipal waste and secure better integration of treatment for municipal and non-municipal waste; to secure the investment in infrastructure needed to divert waste from landfill and for the management of hazardous waste; and to get the most environmental benefit from that investment through increased recycling of resources and recovery of energy from residual waste using a mix of technologies. Key to this development is the investment in waste infrastructure.
44. Regional planning guidance in the form of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the South East (the South East Plan, draft June 2006) acknowledges national policy demands to increase the proportion of waste recovered through the processes of recycling, composting and recovery of energy; and to reduce the proportion of waste sent to landfill. The RSS sets out a resource management approach, which looks to take account of the use of resources when managing waste and reflect the waste management hierarchy. The plan also recognises, through emerging policies, the need for net regional self-sufficiency (draft Policy W3) and sub-regional self-sufficiency (draft Policy W4) within the county.
45. The need to reduce waste being sent to landfill and to prioritise processes, which moves waste up the waste hierarchy, is acknowledged in draft policies W5 (Targets for Diversion from Landfill) and W6 (Recycling and Composting Targets). Accordingly targets have been set to increase the amount of waste recycled and composted from 9 million tonnes (35% of all waste) to 15 million tonnes (55%) by 2015 and 20 million tonnes by 2025 (65% of all waste). Draft Policy W6 states that to increase capacity of recycling within the region consideration should be given to upgrading or expanding existing sites as they already have an established waste management use and may have the necessary infrastructure in place. The RSS further reflects that to improve recycling rates within the region new methods of collection, separation and increased participation is required and outlines this within draft Policy W8 (Waste Separation) stating that the highest recycling rates of municipal waste appear to be achieved where together with kerbside collections, the development of facilities to process recycled materials or recover materials with provision of bins to encourage materials separation at civic amenity sites.
46. The draft RSS acknowledges the need for a “*wide range of new waste management facilities across the region*” being developed as close to the source of waste as possible. However, it also recognises that there are likely to be competing demands for urban and previously developed land and acknowledges that existing facilities

with established waste management use should be safeguarded and expanded where necessary. This is reflected in draft Policy W17 (Location of Waste Management Facilities) which provides a number of criteria by which the suitability of existing sites and potential new sites should be assessed including good accessibility and transport connections; compatibility with land uses namely previous or existing industrial land use, mineral working sites, contaminated or derelict land; and being able to meet a range of locally based environmental and amenity criteria.

47. The Joint Municipal Waste strategy (2006) identifies the County Council as the Planning Authority for Surrey and further states the role involving the identification and allocation of land that is suitable for the development of waste management facilities. The implementation of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy requires the upgrading and re-branding of the Civic Amenity Sites to Community Recycling Centres, and identifies Earlswood as one of these sites. Policy 4 (Recycling and Composting) sets out targets for each household recycling and composting by the year 2010, 2015 and 2025. The associated relevant Actions (Recycling Facilities) (Civic Amenity Sites) state that authorities will provide and continually improve the range of materials collected and the systems by which this is undertaken.
48. Policy CW5 (Location of Waste Facilities) of the Surrey Waste Plan (2006) (SWP) gives priority to sites previously developed or used as waste management facilities, while Policy CW7 (Environment, Health and Amenity) notes that protection of the environment, health and amenity will be provided through development control policies. Policy WD1 (Civic Amenity Sites) provides for extension of existing civic amenity sites and identifies Earlswood as one of these sites and again is reinforced by Policy WD2 (Recycling, Storage, Transfer, Materials Recovery and Processing Facilities (Excluding Thermal Treatment)) in regard to securing planning permissions for Earlswood's development. Policies DC2 (Planning designations) and DC3 (General Considerations) aim to protect existing sites however, ensuring proposals will not be granted for waste related development if they generate a significant adverse impact and/or provide information on the mitigation, avoidance and/or minimising these adverse impacts. However due regard will be given to existing waste facilities and relevant policies.
49. Policy Cf2 (Community Facilities: Design and Layout) of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005 sets out a number of criteria which aim to safeguard the appearance and the character of the natural and built environment with respect to a set of criteria relating to design guidance applicable to new or extended community facilities. Criteria (ii), (iv), (vi) and (vii) of Policy Cf2 state that community facilities should respect the scale and form of the general pattern of development; comprise a layout and design which does not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining properties; incorporate additional landscaping where appropriate; and incorporate facilities for the disabled and for the easy movement of perambulators, pushchairs and wheelchairs.

Site Redesign Acceptability

50. The types of locations considered appropriate for the use of land for a civic amenity site are set out in Policy WLP8 (CA and Transfer Station Sites) of the Waste Local

Plan 1997. They include land uses or land allocated in a local plan for industrial or storage purposes; or as an extension to or as a redevelopment of, existing transfer stations. The consideration of sites appropriate for waste use, including handling and treatment, is covered by Policies WLP10 (Provision of Sites – General Approach) and WLP11 (Provision of Sites – General Approach) of Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997. These policy requirements are reinforced by Policy 5 and associated actions in The Joint Municipal Waste Strategy (JMWS) (2007), and the Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006). These policies promote the establishment and improvement of facilities for the handling of waste on land with an existing waste use where it would be in keeping with development. They provide for waste arising from the built development and assess potential and/or actual adverse impacts generated and where necessary, mitigate and/or avoid these adverse effects.

51. Recycling rates within Surrey are currently below the national average. Consequently an independent study carried out by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (“Improvement Plan for Civic Amenity Sites in Surrey County Council”, February 2005) focused on how Surrey could improve its recycling performance identifying problems at CA sites which inhibit recycling including *“insufficient prioritisation for separation of bulk recyclables, a high level of unauthorised trade input, frequent security problems, generally low staff morale”*. The report compares the performance of CA sites within Surrey against the projected England average CA site recycling rate and concludes that the network of CA sites within Surrey are below average. All CA sites within Surrey were reviewed and specific improvements recommended for each site including Earlswood CRC.
52. The proposed redevelopment is located on a well-established existing site for civic amenity purposes supported by WLP8. The proposal involves extending CA activities beyond the existing operational CA site to an underused area previously occupied by an incinerator. The site is located adjacent to other industrial uses, mainly the Thames Water Sewerage Treatment Plant to the west and the Reigate and Banstead Borough Depot to the north. The principle of the development for civic amenity purposes on this Green Belt site was originally accepted in 1992 (ref: RE92/0207) with the principle of a larger development on this Green Belt site being accepted in 1998 when planning permission (ref: RE98/0082) for construction of a MRF was granted.
53. The applicant considers that there will be no increase in the amount of waste throughput at the site above the general growth forecasts (0.5% waste growth assumption) as a result of the proposal. Similar redevelopment at other sites has not indicated any material increase in tonnage but an improvement in recycling rates as a consequence of increased recycling efficiency and segregation of waste at the site. The proposal involves no changes to the hours of operation from existing. The applicant has stated that the construction phase for the redevelopment of Earlswood CRC would take place from Spring 2008 and completed in that year, during which it is anticipated that the site would continue to be open to members of the public for recycling purposes. The site may, however, have to operate at a slightly reduced capacity when, for example, the shared access is being constructed. Should the site need to be closed during this time, members of the public would be redirected to other nearby CRC sites.

54. The proposed design will retain the split level facility design in keeping with Policies WLP8 and WLP10 as the proposal will still be located on unused land to the south of the existing operational CRC area which is currently utilised for skip storage on an area of hardstanding; and an area where an incinerator was once situated.
55. The report produced by DEFRA's ("Improvement Plan for Civic Amenity Sites in Surrey County Council", February 2005) also states that the existing design and layout within the CRC are poor, recommending layout changes including *"create space on the main site for the development of separate HGV and public vehicle areas; and provide an area for site users to recycling their small recyclables away from the main CA site activity"*. The area proposed to site the newly redesigned split level facility is an area of land that is currently not utilised. Although not in a beneficial use at present, there is no evidence to suggest that it is not capable of being used for a beneficial use. The proposal also aims to retain the area to the north, which is currently utilised for civic amenity activities, as an area for skip storage enabling the efficient use of the site. For site preparation the applicant proposes the removal of some scrub and two Willow trees, however they will retain land around the split-level facility with enhanced landscaping between the site and the residential area to the south of the site.
56. The proposal may marginally assist the County Council in meeting both national and regional targets for recycling of materials thereby assisting in moving waste up the waste hierarchy in accordance with national and regional policy and the development plan; and improving recycling rates within the county. The proposal will allow the efficient use of space within the site increasing the recovery of recyclable materials, and retains the health and safety for members of the public. Officers therefore consider that the proposal is in accordance with the above-mentioned policies in PPS10, the draft South East Plan (2006), Surrey Structure Plan (2004) and Surrey Waste Local Plan (1997).

TRANSPORT AND ACCESS

National Policy

Planning Policy Guidance 13 – Transport

Regional Policy

Surrey Structure Plan 2004

Policy DN2 - Movement Implications of Development

Policy DN3 – Parking Provision

Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997

Policy WLP7 - Environmental Protection and Public Safety

Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) 2006

Policy CW5 – Location of Waste Facilities

Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Traffic

57. Government advice with regards to transport matters is set out within Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13) "Transport" which recognises that land use planning has a key role in delivering an integrated transport strategy through shaping the pattern of development. The core objectives are outlined within Paragraph 4, which

are to “*promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight*” and to “*reduce the need to travel*”. Traffic related impacts associated with waste developments are also covered within PPS10. Annex E of PPS10 outlines traffic and access issues as key locational criteria in the identification of suitable sites.

58. Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy DN2 (Movement Implications of Development) states that development will only be permitted where it is, or can be made, compatible with the transport infrastructure within the area and should the transport implications of development lead to a harmful impact on other people or the environment, mitigation measures should be included. The supporting policy text states that traffic generated by development can place a strain on the surrounding transport network in terms of safety, capacity and environmental considerations, and that mitigation measures which minimise the adverse environmental impact of road traffic generated by new development should be forthcoming. Policy DN3 (Parking Provision) of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 recommends a maximum parking standard should be set according to the location, type of development and public transport accessibility.
59. Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) states that proposed development must demonstrate that there will be no significant adverse effects on people, land, infrastructure or resources in relation to traffic generation, access and the suitability of the highway network; and where appropriate mitigation should be identified.
60. The location of waste facilities is noted in Part (vi) of Policy CW5 (Location of Waste Facilities) of the Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006). In B45 (Policy Amplification), it states that priority should be given to those sites that are located closer to urban areas as they are the main sources of waste, with good access to the strategic road network. The consideration of traffic generation characteristics is also incorporated in Part (x) Policy DC3 (General Considerations) of the Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006). An assessment of the level and type of traffic generated and the impact of that traffic, suitability of the access, including access to and from the primary route network, and works necessary to accommodate the development has been carried out.
61. Earlswood CRC is located off the A23 Horley Road. DEFRA’s “Civic Amenity Site Improvement Plan for Surrey County Council” highlights a number of issues with the current design and layout for Earlswood CRC with particular reference to traffic impacts. Within the documentation recommendations, it states that “*any improvements should incorporate the separation of public traffic and service vehicles*” particularly because at present the site has to close to members of the public to facilitate the servicing of skips which consequently can lead to queuing of cars backing out onto the A23 generating safety issues of its own.
62. The proposal is to increase the site area of the CRC from the previously permitted split-level facility. It retains a perimeter road, a five ‘arm’ internal roundabout junction within the site (some 40m from the A23). The fifth ‘arm’ providing for HGV Skip access (separate from the public waste processing area). The proposal provides a new road layout including the reorientation of the internal layout to the south of the site. This parking provides access to herringbone and parallel parking bays for direct

waste disposal from vehicles, and limits vehicle distraction of the internal flow of vehicles on site. In addition there is provision for staff parking, and a weighing station. Key aspects of the new design with regard to traffic effects are the reduction in public car parking spaces. This could have an effect on the number of queuing vehicles. The applicant undertook a queuing analysis where it was found that this would have a limited effect on queuing. In addition to this while the site has a new site layout it now has the capacity to stack 33 vehicles in a queue as opposed to four in the previously permitted layout.

63. This keeps the HGVs separated from the public, however in the site layout the County Highways Authority requested a barrier to be installed to separate the skip storage area in the northern part of the CRC from the access road and roundabout so as to prevent HGVs from reversing out of this area. No objection was received from the County Traffic Development Control (TDC), TDC Officers consider the layout retains the split level facility - separating the public from the HGV traffic and reduces parking spaces but provides for ample queuing. The County TDC have no objection to the proposal on basis that a condition pertaining to the design and access onto Horley Road be imposed. Officers consider the proposal will enable a safer and more efficient flow of traffic through the site and with the proposed added queuing distance a more positive effect on the local road network.

Vehicle and Pedestrian Access

64. The site is located in a semi-urban environment. While still located some distance from residential areas, it is sufficiently close to service both Reigate and Redhill. The facility is well placed for the strategic road network with access straight onto the A23 which links up with the A2044 centred between the M23 and the M25.
65. The proposal retains the design involving small recyclable containers on the same level as parking bays; provides a split level area where the access road is raised to a level in alignment with the tops of the larger containers so that members of the public may drop their waste from above into the containers, and retains safety railing of 1.2m in height along the eastern edge of the upper level where the skips are to be located. Dedicated space has been provided surrounding the edges of the recyclable containers and skips to allow members of the public to walk between different recycling containers to deposit waste in a safe manner and to aid movement around the split-level facility without using a car. The additional use of bollards behind parked cars will stop vehicles obstructing the footpath and there is provision for disabled parking located at points next to pedestrian spaces which provide adequate allowance for wheelchairs.
66. Officers believe this site's location with access to main arterial routes, the design for pedestrian access with the bollard provision, herringbone parking providing space between the bollard and footpath, and provision for disabled users offers additional effects.

ENVIRONMENT & AMENITY

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 10 – Planning for Sustainable Waste Management

Regional Policy

Surrey Structure Plan 2004

Policy SE1 - Natural Resources and Pollution Control

Policy SE3 - Flooding and Land Drainage

Policy SE6 – Biodiversity

Policy SE8 – Landscape

Policy SE9 – Trees and Woodland

Policy DN18 - Waste Management

Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997

Policy WLP7 - Environmental Protection and Public Safety

Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) 2006

Policy CW7 – Environmental, Health and Amenity

Policy DC3 – General Considerations

District Policy

Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005

Policy Pc2G – Local Nature Conservation Interest

Policy Pc4 – Tree Protection

67. Government guidance in the form of Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS 10) states in paragraph 29 that waste planning authorities when considering planning applications for waste management facilities should consider likely impacts on the local environment and on amenity, and refers to Annex E of the guidance. Annex E are a details of locational criteria, which it states waste management authorities should consider in determining the suitability of sites. The Development Plan, through the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 also seek to protect the environment. The County Council will need to be satisfied that the impact of such proposals can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources.
68. In the previous site design (Ref: RE06/2004) a Screening Opinion was carried out under Regulation 7 of the Town and County Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 to ascertain whether the proposal falls within the requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment. The proposal represents the enhancement and redevelopment of existing facilities on site and the provision of new containers to increase recycling efficiency at the site for members of the public. No additional land take beyond the ownership boundaries is planned. There are no designations affecting the site under Regulation 2, i.e. sites defined in the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations as 'sensitive' such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Parks, AONB, and international conservation sites. The 02/99 Circular also emphasises that proposals for Civic Amenity sites are unlikely to require the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. A screening opinion was adopted by the Authority on 20 October 2006 advising that the proposed development is considered unlikely to give rise to significant risks of environmental effects as defined by the EIA Regulations and does not require a formal EIA.
69. As the proposed redesign of the site is a similar layout to that approved (permission Ref: RE06/2004) with a new internal layout within the 'red line boundary' officers believe it is unlikely to have significant effects (as per those defined in the EIA Regulations) and therefore does not require a formal EIA to be undertaken.

Visual Impact

70. Policy SE8 (Landscape) of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 states that development should seek to retain the distinctiveness of the County Landscape Character Areas, conserving and enhancing the diversity of the Surrey landscape. The policy advises that development should contribute to meeting local countryside management project objectives, in particular improvements to areas where landscape is becoming degraded, especially on the urban fringe. Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) requires consideration of the visual and landscape impact of the development on site and surrounding land. The site lies in the Low Weald area of Surrey as defined in "The Future of Surrey's Landscape and Woodlands" (Surrey County Council, 1997). This area is characterised by a small-scale agricultural landscape with many trees, hedges and belts of woodland.
71. Policy CW7 (Environment, Health and Amenity) of the proposed Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006) states, *"that in considering proposals for waste management facilities the protection of the environment, health and amenity will be provided through development control policies."* The relevant development control Policy is DC3 (General Considerations), where Part (vii) requires the applicant to provide an assessment of the visual and landscape impact of the development on the site and the surrounding land including townscape.
72. The current proposal retains the split-level facility design and location to the south of the existing CRC site - within the ownership boundaries. However it proposes to alter the internal layout by pulling back the boundary to the west by approximately 30 metres and pushing out boundary to south by approximately 25 metres. Whilst this takes the site boundary further away from the A23 it will also require the removal of some established trees, and brings the development closer to residential properties on Heston and Maple Road to the south. When comparing the proposal with the permitted design (ref. RE06/2004) it is relevant to consider the height of the structures and the proposed visual screening. The proposed height of the upper level of the split level facility will be retained at 1.5m, the safety rail height is retained at 1.2m, the site office will be located in almost the same location on the upper level of the split-level and is to be shortened from 2.2m to 2m. The surrounding palisade fence is to be retained at 2.5m. In this regard the potential visual effect of this development from what was previously permitted is the impact of the removal of trees and the movement of the site closer to the residents to the south. To combat this effect the applicant proposes the planting of native tree and shrub species along the western and southern periphery of the site. The planting will cover a total area of more than 3000m².
73. A Visual Impact Assessment has been carried out to investigate the visual characteristics of the site and the degree of visual effect that the proposal would have upon the visual amenity of the site and its surroundings and forms part of the application documents. The report concludes that the site is visually well contained by existing built form and mature trees. The report states that views of the proposed development immediately following completion of construction would be limited to glimpsed and filtered views from the A23, Maple Road and residential properties to

the south of the site with some moderate visual impact from the proposal on the neighbouring properties at least in the short to medium term. The views of the County Landscape Architect reported to the Committee in an update sheet.

Ecology and Woodland

74. Surrey Structure Plan Policy SE6 (Biodiversity) requires development to contribute to actions safeguarding and managing habitats and features within the landscape, which are of importance for wild fauna and flora. The policy advises that development should seek to retain such features and their management will be encouraged. The protection and management of trees and woodland in Surrey are protected by Policy SE9 (Trees and Woodland) which seeks to ensure that the extent of tree cover in the county is maintained and that proposals for new development should demonstrate how new planting and existing trees and woodland will be effectively managed and integrated whether in town or country.
75. Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) of the Waste Local Plan 1997 states that planning permission for waste related development will not be granted unless it can be demonstrated that any material adverse impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not lead to the loss or damage to flora and fauna and their respective habitats at the site or on adjoining land; or adversely affect woodland. Policy CW7 (Environment Health and Safety) promotes the protection of the environment which is reinforced by the development control Policy DC3 (General Considerations) from the Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006). Part xi of Policy DC3 assessment and where appropriate mitigation to minimise or avoid adverse impact on open spaces, settlements, agricultural uses and woodland.
76. The Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 Policy Pc2G (Local Nature Conservation Interest) states that the retention and enhancement of sites and features including trees, hedgerows and other forms of wildlife corridor which contribute to the local diversity and nature conservation interest in the area, will be considered in any development proposals. Policy Pc4 (Tree Protection) of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 requires development to comply with the latest arboricultural standards in respect of any tree works or development near to trees.
77. The site is not covered by any ecological designations. Earlswood Common Local Nature Reserve and Site of Nature Conservation Interest lies approximately 150m to the north of the site separated by the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Depot; and Burnt Oak Farm Site of Nature Conservation Interest lies approximately 310m to the south west. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the site was provided with the previous planning application, which concluded the site is of little ecological or biodiversity interest. Surrey Wildlife Trust and the County Ecologist have assessed the proposal and are satisfied with regards to ecology.
78. The proposed reorientation of the site to the south and the need for hardstanding has resulted in the removal of two trees. There are currently 21 trees within the site (excluding dead trees). An Arboricultural method statement was prepared to identify trees to be removed, protected and retained. Two trees listed in this report required removal due to their condition. The trees are both White Willows which are currently

failing and show much decay. In addition to these two trees, seven other trees were also noted to require removal due to Arboricultural reasons.

79. The Habitats Survey Report (2006) noted breeding birds on the site. These species are protected during the breeding season (beginning of March to the end of July) and it is recommended any clearance work should be conducted outside of this season. The applicant in consultation with the County Ecologist cleared these trees before the end of February thereby limiting the impact on potential breeding species (2 trees of the existing 21). The applicant has not included proposals for the existing hedges on the southern boundary, however their protection can be enforced by condition. The views of the County Arboriculturalist and Landscape Architect will be reported to the Committee as an update sheet.
80. While there will be some limited loss of habitat Officers consider that the proposed planting more than compensates for any impact and should have a positive benefit on amenity and local ecology.

Noise Impact

81. Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control) of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 promotes a more sustainable environment by requiring that developments comply with prevailing standards in minimising forms of pollution, such as noise. The policy states that development will not be permitted which by reason of noise would be harmful to the environment or to other land users in the area. The policy supporting text further endorses this by stating that development should not prejudice the quality of important elements of the natural environment. Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) of the Waste Local Plan 1997 requires proposals to provide appropriate information to demonstrate material adverse impacts in terms of noise, not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources; and requires steps to be taken to mitigate the impacts on residential amenity from noise. Policy CW7 (Environment Health and Safety) promotes the protection of the environment which is reinforced Policy DC3 (General Considerations) of the Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006). Part (ix) of Policy DC3 requires assessment and requires where appropriate mitigation to minimise or avoid adverse effects of noise on residential amenity.
82. Surrey County Council has produced its own guidelines "*Guidelines for Noise Control Minerals and Waste Disposal (1994)*". Paragraph 39 of the Guidelines states that waste sites not forming part of a minerals site restoration should be assessed using BS 4142 (Industrial Noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas) and further in the paragraph 43 that "*sites for the transfer, treatment or processing of waste will normally be in urban areas. This could pose problems of noise because of their proximity to noise sensitive premises*".
83. A Noise Assessment formed part of the planning application and concluded that noise from the CRC will not be significant at the Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSR) (i.e. residences). The BS 4142 assessment for the CRC found that the rating level (the noise level of an industrial noise source which includes an adjustment for the character of the noise) would be at least 8dB below the background noise level, which is considered less than marginal significance and therefore complaints would not be expected. The Surrey Noise Guidelines advises that development should be

inaudible for night time noise and requires that the development comply with the LA90 (background noise) minus 5dB(A). The proposal will be located adjacent to the existing sewerage treatment works and the Reigate and Banstead Council depot and is an activity similar to that, which currently operates at the site. The proposal is to provide a split-level facility by raising the level 1.5m around the HGV operating site. This is considered to significantly screen impulsive noises from the HGVs such as the delivering or removing of containers. The proposal does increase the footprint of operational activity at the site southwards towards the residential area of South Earlswood. However the applicant anticipates there should not be an increase in the amount of waste throughput at the site above the general growth forecasts (0.5% waste growth assumption).

84. The County Noise Consultant has assessed the proposal and considers the effect on noise levels will be small. Because the raised areas of the design have changed slightly there will be a marginal increase in acoustic screening and so it is not expected that any significant noise impacts will be generated from this development set for the site. The proposed activities are predicted to be well below the maximum criteria ($53L_{Aeq}$), It is considered a condition should be imposed restricting the noise generated from the site to not exceed $50L_{Aeq(30mins)}$.

Lighting

85. Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control) states that development must comply with prevailing standards for the control of emissions to air, including light pollution; and that development will not be permitted which would be harmful to the environment or to other land users in the area. The Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) states that planning permission for waste related development will not be granted unless it can be demonstrated by appropriate supporting information that adverse effects on residential amenity including glare can be controlled to achieve necessary and appropriate mitigation. The Institution of Lighting Engineers (ILE) states that sky glow (the brightening of the night sky above towns and cities): glare (uncomfortable brightness of a light source when viewed against a dark background); and light trespass (the spilling of light beyond the boundary of a property on which the light source is located) are all forms of obtrusive light and constitute light pollution. The ILE recommends that specifically designed lighting that minimises the upwards spread of light and keeps a glare to a minimum should be utilised and that care should be taken when selecting lighting to ensure that the units chosen will reduce spill light and glare to minimum.
86. The site is located adjacent to an operational sewerage treatment works and the Reigate and Banstead Council Depot approximately 120m south of Earlswood Common. The closest residential properties are located approximately 55m south of the site and the residential area of South Earlswood extends beyond them southwards. To the east of the site lies the A23 with allotment gardens, a football ground and a railway line. Operational lighting currently used at the site will be retained and it is anticipated that additional lighting will be required for the new split-level facility to ensure the safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians for the new-elevated internal roadway. It is recommended details of any lighting requirements for the new-elevated internal roadway should be the subject of a planning condition. On

this basis Officers consider potential adverse lighting effects can be suitably mitigated.

Drainage and Water Issues

87. Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control) seeks protection of the environment by requiring development to comply with prevailing standards for the control of emissions to water, stating that development which requires the provision of new water supply or sewage treatment infrastructure, should not prejudice existing water quality or river flows. Policy SE3 (Flooding and Drainage) of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 states that new development should not lead to an increase in run-off, which would exacerbate flood risk elsewhere and the regulation of run-off will be required as part of development proposals. Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) requires that proposals do not cause any contamination of ground and surface water or have any adverse impact on groundwater conditions and the hydrology of the locality. Policy DC3 (General Considerations) from the proposed Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006) requires assessment and where appropriate mitigation to minimise or avoid adverse effects of contamination of ground and surface water and the appropriate drainage of the site, adjoining land and risk of flooding.
88. The existing CRC site, which will be used for storage of recycling containers and skips, has a hardstanding surface and provision for surface water drainage. The open land to the south has some small areas of hardstanding where recycling containers and skips are currently stored but this area is predominantly overgrown with vegetation. The proposal does involve an increase in hardstanding at the site including the new internal road layout and areas for container storage. The Environment Agency has been consulted with regards to the proposal however no comments had been received prior to finalising this report. The proposed works with regard to surface drainage are not dissimilar to the previous application permitted in January 2007 (ref. RE06/2004) and further details have been submitted by the applicant and forms part of this application

Dust, Odour and Litter

89. The Development Plan through the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control), seek to provide general protection to local environmental features and the environment and amenities of local residents. The Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) requires that the site does not have any adverse effects on residential amenity in relation to odour and dust emissions. The Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006) Policy DC3 (General Considerations) Part (ix) requires assessment and where appropriate mitigation to minimise or avoid adverse effects on residents including dust, odour and litter.
90. The proposed redevelopment of the site has the potential to give rise to dust, odour emissions and litter from the movement of vehicles within the site and the handling of materials. The proposal will bring the activities of the CRC closer to residential properties on Maple Road by approximately 25m so that the closest residential properties located in the cul-de-sac off Maple Road would be approximately 55m from the proposal area. Residential properties also lie approximately 180m south of

the proposed CRC development boundary beyond the allotment gardens. Whilst dust and litter has not been raised by the representations received for this application, there are concerns with regards to odour. The Environment Agency and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Environmental Health Officer confirm that no complaints have been recorded for this site with regards to dust, odour or litter.

91. The existing area currently used by members of the public to deposit recyclables has a hard standing surface thereby reducing the generation of dust at the site by vehicle movements. The proposal would also increase the amount of hard standing present at the site by extending the operational CRC aspect southwards to the underused area, which is within the site's boundaries. The applicant has stated that the proposal does not involve any change in the amount or type of waste that is currently being handled by the site, however the proposal is to allow for materials received at the site to be completely containerised, similar to other civic amenity sites, where members of the public place waste directly into containers from above. The recycling containers and bins will have parking bays immediately adjacent so that members of the public can drive up to the skip and deposit recyclables directly from their vehicles into the containers. This will avoid the need to carry waste up side access stairways reducing the risk of spillages or leaving waste on the hardstanding which in turn would reduce the risk of waste being blown from the immediate area. The applicant has stated that HGVs removing full containers for off-site disposal or further processing will be sheeted or have the skips enclosed.
92. The site is expected to receive green waste, which has the potential to create odour problems if inefficiently managed or left to decompose. Further to discussion with regard to the previous application (RE06/2004) the applicant has met the request of the Environment Agency and the Reigate and Banstead Environment Health Officer (EHO) to control the odour arising from green waste by the regular changing of the green waste containers, when full or in any event by midday Monday, Wednesday and Friday of each week. Officers consider this aspect can be controlled by the imposition of a suitably worded condition.

Contaminated Land

93. Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control) of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 states that development will not be permitted in the vicinity of known sources of pollution or hazard. Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) states that waste related development proposals should demonstrate that any material adverse impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources with regards to polluting substances to the atmosphere or land within or adjoining the site. Where the proposed Surrey Waste Plan (submission draft) (2006) Policy DC3 (General Considerations) Part (i) and (iii) requires assessment and where appropriate mitigation to minimise or avoid adverse effects associated with the release of polluting substances, to the atmosphere or land arising from facilities and transport, and contamination of ground and surface water.
94. Part of the unused area at Earlswood CRC site was previously utilised for an incinerator plant, which was later demolished. The proposed redevelopment involves the construction of hardstanding and a split-level recycling facility on part of this land. The Environment Agency have commented on the previous application (RE06/2004)

with regards to potential contaminated soils at the site, and whilst raising no objection have stated that soil on the site is likely to be contaminated. In most circumstances, contaminated soils are regarded as waste, therefore their storage, treatment and disposal are subject to waste management licence legislation in including the Duty of Care Regulations 1991 (as amended), the Waste Management Licensing Regulations 1994 (as amended) and the Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005. Since the proposal involves the development of the same site in a similar fashion the Environment Agency may require that all waste, including soil, from the site should be adequately categorised before it is removed from site and that an informative can be added to this effect.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, contained in the Preamble to the Agenda is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.

Adverse impacts generated by this proposal will be mitigated by conditions and that they do not constitute any interference with any convention right.

CONCLUSION

95. There is a current planning permission for the redevelopment and improvement of the site and the current proposal seeks to amend this. The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt and therefore planning permission may only be granted where very special circumstances are demonstrated which clearly outweigh the harm in terms of inappropriateness and any other harm. This is a well-established waste facility servicing the Borough of Reigate and Banstead and the surrounding area. The redevelopment of the site will not introduce any new activities, and though the redevelopment involves expanding the CRC operational area southwards into an area previously occupied by waste operations, the proposal will not involve expansion of the site beyond its ownership boundaries. The applicant has stated the proposal should not increase the amount of waste received and handled at the site but that increased efficiency at the site as a consequence of the redevelopment will produce a greater variety of containers and may increase recycling rates as experienced at other sites within the County. The redevelopment will enable the County to deal more effectively with the materials brought to site for recycling and would improve public safety. It is considered the applicant has demonstrated very special circumstances in terms of need and the qualitative improvement to the range of waste facilities to justify development in the Green Belt; and Officers consider that harm to the Green Belt has been minimised. The limited scale and design of the development should not give rise to any harm or adverse noise or visual impact. Consultees and Council officers have ensured effects associated with contamination and nuisance effects can be dealt with via condition. It is on this basis that officers consider that the proposal may be permitted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is, that subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure, to PERMIT subject to conditions.

Conditions

General

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. The applicant shall notify the County Planning Authority in writing within seven working days of the commencement of the implementation of the planning permission.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the terms of this permission, the submitted documents and plans contained in the application; and no variations or omissions shall take place without the prior approval in writing of the County Planning Authority.
- 3 No operations or activities authorised or required by this permission shall be carried out except between the following times:

0800 to 1730 hours Monday to Friday excluding Public Holidays
0900 to 1700 hours Saturday, Sunday and Public Holidays

nor shall there be any working on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Year's Day.
- 4 This condition shall not prevent the following activities:
 - Tidying up of the site and routine maintenance including the loading and transfer of skips during the 30 minute period before and after public opening times; and
 - Lighting for security purposes.

Woodland and Ecology

- 5 Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, details of a full Arboricultural method statement and tree protection scheme shall be submitted and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained strictly in accordance with the approved details.
- 6 Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, details of a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives; management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Drainage

- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works has been submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the construction of impermeable surfaces draining to the system.

Lighting

- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not commence operation until the details of any external lighting system or floodlighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The submitted scheme shall include height of the floodlighting posts, intensity of the lights specified in LUX levels, spread of light including approximate light spillage to the rear of the posts in metres, and any measures proposed to minimise the impact of floodlighting. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Noise

- 9 The level of noise arising from any operation plant or machinery associated with the site, when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 3.6 metres from the façade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building shall not exceed 50 L_{Aeq} during any 30 minute period.

Transport

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not operate for the receipt, handling or transfer of waste until the modified access to Horley Road is constructed in accordance with approved plan EW1 06/09/07. The access shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved plan.
- 11 The development hereby permitted shall not operate for the receipt, handling or transfer of waste until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with approved plan for cars, for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. All heavy good vehicles and private vehicles parking and manoeuvring areas shall be used and retained exclusively for its designated purpose.
- 12 Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of a Method Construction Statement, to include details of:
 - parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
 - loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - storage of plant and materials; and
 - provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones

shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained strictly in accordance with the approved details.

- 13 Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of a physical barrier to separate the skip storage area to the north of the site from the access road and roundabout so as to prevent HGV's from reversing out of this area, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and maintained strictly in accordance with the approved details.
- 14 The green waste-bulking bay shall be emptied when full or in any event by midday on Monday, Wednesday and Friday of each week.

Reasons:

1. To enable the County Planning Authority to exercise control over the site for the development hereby permitted and comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the operation so as to minimise the impact on local amenity in accordance with the terms of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control), Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety).
3. To safeguard the environment and local amenity in accordance with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control), Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety).
4. To enable the County Planning Authority to exercise control over development hereby permitted so as to protect the local amenity and environmental interest in accordance with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policies SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control) and DN18 (Waste Management); and Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policies WLP6 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) and WLP 7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety).
5. To protect trees and hedgerows on the site in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and the environment in accordance with Surrey Structure Plan Policies SE8 (Landscape) and SE9 (Trees and Woodland).
6. To ensure that the landscaping scheme is maintained to provide for the long-term visual amenities of the area/ nature conservation in accordance with Surrey Structure Plan Policy SE8 (Landscape).
7. To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal, and to prevent pollution of the waste environment in accordance with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE3 (Flooding and Land Drainage).
8. To reduce the impact on visual amenities of the locality to comply with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policies LO4 (The Countryside and Green Belt) and SE8 (Landscape); Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policies WLP5 (Development within the Green Belt) and WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) and Reigate

and Banstead Borough Local Plan Policy Co1 (Setting and Maintenance of the Green Belt).

9. To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality to comply with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 (Natural Resources and Pollution Control) and Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety).
- 10, In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, nor cause
11, inconvenience to other highway users, and in the interests of amenity in
12, accordance with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policies DN2 (Movement Implications
13& of Development) and DN3 (Parking Provision) and Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997
14 Policy WLP7 (Environmental Protection and Public Safety) and the proposed
Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3 (General Considerations).

Informatives:

1. The applicant's attention is drawn to the possible need to modify the Working Plan of the Waste Management Licence for the site.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to the need that any site clearance work be conducted outside the bird nesting and breeding season (beginning of March to end of July) and under the supervision of an ecological clerk-of-works.
3. The applicant's attention is drawn to the need that because of non-site noise contributions it will be necessary to measure the noise at a closer location and recalculate the noise at the sensitive location.
4. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (e.g. watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld. Please contact the Consent Department on 08708 506506 for further details.
5. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for dewatering from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse. Please contact the Consent Department on 08708 506506 for further details.
6. Any above ground oil storage tank(s) should be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by a suitable liquid tight bunded compound. No drainage outlet should be provided. The bunded area should be capable of containing 110% of the volume of the largest tank and all fill pipe, draw pipes and sight gauges should be enclosed within its curtilage. The vent pipe should be directed downwards into the bund. Guidelines are available from the Environment Agency.

7. Only roof-water should drain to soakaways on the site because of the potential for groundwater pollution from the site run-off. Run off from the access roads and waste storage areas is "trade effluent" and should discharge only to the foul sewer or to a sealed cesspit.
8. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out works on the highway. The applicant is advised that a licence must be obtained from the Highway Authority Local Transportation Service before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway.
9. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders (Highways Act 1980, Sections 131, 148,149).

Town And Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (As Amended) - Reasons for the grant of planning permission and development plan policies relevant to the decision.

The summary of reasons for the grant of planning permission is as follows:

1. The development does not accord with Policy LO4 (The Countryside and Green Belt) of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policy WLP5 (Development in the Green Belt) of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 and Policy Co1 (Setting and Maintenance of the Green Belt) of Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005. However, the following other material considerations, such as:
 - Need for the development and lack of alternative sites;
 - The current use of the site functioning as a waste management facility;
 - The environmental controls to be gained from the proposal outweigh these policy constraints in the development plan and there are no material considerations, which indicate otherwise.
2. The development will provide the following benefits:
 - a) will provide members of the public with a well organised facility with a greater variety of recycling bins which will further contribute to moving waste management in the County higher up the waste hierarchy reducing the amount of waste being landfilled;
 - b) a positive improvement in the internal traffic flow of the site creating a more efficient facility for users, and providing for more vehicle queuing in busier periods.
3. Any harm can be adequately mitigated by the measures proposed in the application and the conditions subject to which planning permission is granted.

The proposal has been considered against the following development plan policies/provisions:

South East Plan (draft) (submitted to Government on June 2006)

Policy W3 – Regional Self-sufficiency
Policy W4 – Sub-regional Self-sufficiency
Policy W5 – Targets for Diversion from Landfill
Policy W6 – Recycling and Composting Targets
Policy W8 – Waste Separation
Policy W17 – Location of Waste Management Facilities

Surrey Structure Plan 2004

Policy LO4 – The Countryside and Green Belt
Policy SE1 – Natural Resources and Pollution Control
Policy SE3 – Flooding and Land Drainage
Policy SE6 – Biodiversity
Policy SE8 – Landscape
Policy SE9 – Trees and Woodland
Policy DN2 – Movement Implications of Development
Policy DN3 – Parking Provision

Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997

Policy WLP5 – Development Within the Green Belt
Policy WLP7 – Environmental Protection and Public Safety
Policy WLP8 – Civic Amenity and Transfer Station Sites
Policy WLP10 – Provision of Sites – General Approach
Policy WLP11 – Provision of Sites – General Approach

Proposed Surrey Waste Plan 2006

Policy CW6 – Green Belt
Policy WD1 – Civic Amenity Sites
Policy CW5 – Location of Waste Facilities
Policy WD1 – Civic Amenity Sites
Policy WD2 – Recycling, Storage, Transfer, Materials Recovery and Processing Facilities (Excluding Thermal Treatment)
Policy DC1 – Safeguarding Sites
Policy DC2 – Planning Designations
Policy DC3 – General Considerations
Policy CW7 – Environmental, Health and Amenity
Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005

Policy Co1 – Setting and Maintenance of the Green Belt
Policy Cf2 – Community Facilities: Design and Layout
Policy Pc2G – Local Nature Conservation Interest
Policy Pc4 – Tree Protection

CONTACT SHAUN JARMAI
TEL. NO. 020 8541 9897

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Government Guidance

Waste Strategy for England 2007, DEFRA

Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2) "Green Belts", January 1995

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (PPG13) "Transport", March 1994

Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) "Planning for Sustainable Waste Management", July 2005

Development Plans

Changes to Waste Management Decision Making Principles in Waste Strategy, July 2005

Joint Municipal Waste Management Plan 2006 – Surrey Local Government

The South East Plan (draft, June 2006)

Surrey Structure Plan, 2004

Surrey Waste Local Plan, 1997

Proposed Surrey waste Plan, 2006

Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005

Other Documents

Guidelines for Noise Control Minerals and Waste Disposal – Surrey County Council
September 1993

"The Future of Surrey's Landscape and Woodlands" - Surrey County Council 1997

"Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution", The Institution of Lighting Engineers, 2005