

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 16 July 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

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

Members Present:

Mr Keith Taylor (Chairman)
Mr Tim Hall (Vice-Chairman)
Mr Ian Beardsmore
Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Mr Jonathan Essex
Mr George Johnson
Mr Christian Mahne
Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
Mr Michael Sydney
Mr Richard Wilson

Apologies:

Mrs Carol Coleman
Mrs Margaret Hicks

74/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Carol Coleman and Margaret Hicks.

75/14 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record.

76/14 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

77/14 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

78/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

79/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

There were none.

80/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EL/2014/0363: LAND AT FORMER JOHN NIGHTINGALE SCHOOL SITE, HURST ROAD, WEST MOLESEY, SURREY KT8 1QS [Item 7]

AN UPDATE SHEET WAS TABLED

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager

Speakers:

John Fryer, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application and the points raised included:

- Parking conditions outside of the school is a dangerous environment for all. The safety provision for school children has not been considered in detail.
- An independent engineer's assessment states that the Bishop Fox Way is too small in width for cars to park during school pick up and drop off times.
- Staff parking on site is inadequate but there seems to be ample space on site.
- Residents have both the support of Dominic Raab MP and Elmbridge Borough Council.

Lionel Haywood, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application and the points raised included:

- No objection to the school in principle but do not think the parking and highways issues have been carefully considered.
- The roads around the vicinity of the school are not designed to carry heavy traffic. Need for a drop off/pick up point within the school grounds.
- Parking around the estate will create a number of safety issues and will decrease the quality of life in the area especially for the elderly residents.
- There will be traffic impacts on residents from evening events held at the school.

Rupert James Sibley, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application and the points raised included:

- Support the principle of more school places but believe that safety is also crucial
- Have been told many will be walking to school therefore we should have a pedestrian entrance to the south west of the school.
- Width of the roads will make it difficult for large traffic movements

- There is room on the school site for pick up/drop off and plans to include this need to be drawn up.

Nicola Parkins, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application and the points raised included:

- The parking assessment for parking on the road is inaccurate - a decision cannot be made until the Surrey school parking guidance is revised.
- Roads around the area are narrow with tight junctions; parking issues would be exacerbated with allowing parking outside the school.
- There is room on the school site for pick up/drop off and plans to include this need to be drawn up.

The agent of the applicant, **Rachael Fisher, Senior Consultant Highways and Transportation, Atkins** addressed the Committee and raised the following points;

- The highways issues raised by residents have been cleared by Surrey's highways department. On street parking outside the school would be monitored as part of the transport assessment.
- Officers believe that the onsite parking spaces for staff is sufficient.
- There is insufficient space for a drop off/pick up point on site and would be classed as inappropriate. Mitigation measures have been put in place.
- On street parking is currently ongoing in the area outside the school.
- Creating additional access to the school from the South West and South East of the school would create safeguarding issues and would not be feasible due to land ownership restrictions.

The local Member, **Stuart Selleck**, a local Member from a neighbouring division addressed the committee and raised the following points:

- Supports the speakers who raised genuine concerns
- There will be serious problems if the intention is to put yellow lines around the Bishop Fox estate.
- The possibility of using a car park at Mole Hall will not alleviate the parking problems in the area.
- The Bishop Fox estate will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic around the area.

Key Points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Planning Development Control Team Manager who explained that the majority of objections focused on traffic safety issues. The application site was split into three flood zones; flood zone 1 in the north of the application was low risk and permitted building on it. Flood zone 2 was medium risk and flood zone 3 was at high risk of flooding. The physical constraints on the site meant that the site could not be used as residents requested. Proposals for tree loss has been included as part of the conditions of the application.

2. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager explained that a majority of the children currently attending the school did so through sustainable modes. As the building is confined to hard standing there is no possibility of having a pick up/drop off point in the school ground; the applicant has stated that Mole Hall can be used to help facilitate this. The parking survey undertaken shows that there is capacity for on street parking outside the school with the transport plan proposing mitigation measures.
3. Although Members had no issue with the additional school places required by the county, Members of the committee raised concerns around the possible negative effects of the application on local residents especially with regards to highways issues. There was further concern that the transport plan would not be as reliable in bad weather.
4. A Member commented that the homes on the Bishop Fox estate were in danger of being flooded and that this issue would be exacerbated if the build went ahead. It was commented that it would be possible to park on flood zones.
5. Although Members understood the need and urgency around additional school places, the requirement for staff parking and pick up/drop off points were discussed as possible conditions of the application.
6. Concerns were raised that not enough attention had been given to the removal of trees on the site. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager explained that the county landscape officer was happy with the replanting provision.
7. A Member of the committee highlighted the suggestion of the Design and Procurement BREEAM Assessment that the proposed building could achieve an 'excellent' BREEAM rating and queried why officers were only proposing to condition the achievement of a 'very good' BREEAM rating. It was explained that a very good BREEAM standard was the standard all Surrey schools aimed for and is reasonable in terms of the conditions. The aim for a very good BREEAM standard was also complicit with the boroughs planning policy.
8. It was clarified that the applicant was committed to providing a park and stride as a condition to the application and would do so before the school was opened. Some Members were concerned that the specific land associated with the park and stride could be sold on in the future and leave no pick up/drop off provision.
9. It was commented that current county parking policy discouraged parking on site so as to increase sustainable modes of transport. Officers explained that there was a possibility that an additional 50-60 parking spaces could be created using the play area on site.
10. Members of the Committee asked for updated information from the EA with regards to flooding issues on and around the site.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, application no. EL/2014/0363 be **PERMITTED** subject to conditions for the reasons set out in the report, which were amended as follows:

Condition 3

3. (a) Within 6 months of the date of the planning permission hereby granted, *a scheme for additional parking for staff vehicles and a drop off and pick up facility on the former John Nightingale School site*, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing.

3. (b) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the scheme for *additional parking for staff vehicles and a drop off and pick up facility* has been fully implemented in accordance with the details approved pursuant to Condition 3(a). Thereafter the approved scheme shall be fully maintained for the benefit of the development hereby permitted.

Condition 5

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the School Travel Plan dated January 2014 shall be updated and submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing and thereafter shall be implemented, maintained, monitored and further updated to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

Condition 15

No later than 12 months of the first occupation of the building hereby permitted, an assessment shall be carried out by an accredited person confirming that the development has achieved a standard of sustainable construction that would have achieved a BREEAM rating '*excellent*' and that assessment has been submitted to and receipt of which acknowledged by the County Planning Authority.

Committee Next Steps:

None

81/14 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION MO/2013/0176: SWIRES FARM, HENFOLD LANE, CAPEL, SURREY RH5 4RP [Item 9]

Item 9 was moved forward on the agenda as members of the public were waiting to speak and hear consideration of that item.

AN UPDATE SHEET WAS TABLED

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager

Speakers:

Neil Duggin, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application and the points raised included:

- Object to where the application site is located on the farm.
- Smell and noise from activity carried out on the farm will have an impact on nearby residents.
- Even though a sound survey has been carried out locals feel that noise will affect residents.
- There will be an effect on local roads in the area from the increase in traffic movements. This has a negative impact on residents who would like some peace and quiet.

Anthony Brady, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application and the points raised included:

- Raised concerns over the human impacts to bio aerosols emissions that would be released.
- The report is three years old and seems to have very little change made to it.
- The proposed area is of natural beauty and introducing the proposed facility would be negative for the landscape.

Edward Ford (the applicant) and Alison Crooks (the agent), addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- An independent ecologist has undertaken an ecology survey on the site with no objections being received from Natural England and the Surrey County Council Ecologist.
- Landscaping was revisited and the layout reassessed. This was the best site within the holding for this type of facility which had minimum impact on residents.
- Commissioned an independent air quality consultant whose findings have been accepted by SCC and the EA.
- This would be a low key operation with the plant not being in constant use but being used similarly to agricultural machinery. Operations would not be utilised on the weekends.
- There was an agricultural and business need for this facility which provided a sustainable solution with environmental gains. Compost from facility will be used on own land.

The local Member, **Helyn Clack** was unable to attend the meeting but sent through the following comments;

“I have read through the report and as the farm track joins Henfold Lane just south of the boarder of my division, I recognise that Holmwood will have more concerns about traffic movements. Our rural roads are already well used by all kinds of vehicles as well as farm vehicles and any additional traffic caused by changes in planning use must be considered very carefully.

This application was previously withdrawn because it was considered inappropriate development in the green-belt and that applicant had failed to demonstrate that there were sufficient very special circumstances to justify the proposal.

I am in principal against development taking place in green-belt but also recognise the need for land management, diverse farming and sustainability. I recognise and agree with many of the issues raised by local residents and road users in the paper

I would not want this site to develop into a full blown waste recycling plant at any stage in the future and it should not be extended in any way if permission is granted. I note the conditions and the recommendation of the Planning officers and am hopeful that the planning committee will address and ensure that these conditions are robust if they are to support the officer's recommendation to approve and that you will explore that the previous reasons it was withdrawn for have been addressed more than adequately”.

Stephen Cooksey, a local Member with a division adjoining the site addressed the committee and raised the following points:

- Is the local member of an adjoining division which borders the application in question- agree with the objections raised by Mole Valley district council.
- Application constitutes inappropriate development on the green belt and will lead to a deterioration of the landscape.
- Do not believe this is the right site to hold his type of facility.
- Local roads cannot hold the increase in traffic from the site. This will in turn create safety concerns.
- Concerned that information from the applicant was used as evidence in the officer's report.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Planning Development Control Team Manager who explained that the applicant had submitted two previous applications in relation to this site in 2008 and 2012 which were subsequently recommended for refusal and withdrawn. It was explained that the current application activity was not prohibited but care would have to be taken with operations. The new application has included the removal of a bund which had been included in the 2008 and 2012 applications. The activity on the site moves waste up the waste hierarchy and makes good use of the waste plan. Air quality assessments have been undertaken to take account of the bio aerosol emissions. Although the development is inappropriate, officers feel there are very special circumstances due to the lack of available alternative sites.

2. Officers explained that in the past previous applications had been rejected because of the high usage of HGV's but in this application light good vehicles would be used instead, meaning fewer HGV movements down Henfold Lane.
3. The Planning Development Control Team Manager stated that the nearest residential property was more than 250 meters to the west.
4. Concerns were raised over the bio aerosols which would be released from the site. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that the EA was responsible for carrying out a risk assessment on this and the committee should not duplicate policy.
5. Members queried why the bund had been removed from the current application. Officers explained that the bund had been removed as the bund was no longer necessary and would have an impact on the landscape.
6. Clarification was sought around operating hours on the site. It was explained that the bulk of the operation would be undertaken between Monday and Friday with Saturday mornings being used to receive green waste on the site. Saturday working hours could only be restricted if the committee recognised some harm.
7. A member of the committee commented on the need to remember that the site was located on working countryside and the application in question would reduce HGV numbers.
8. Referring to paragraph 76, the existing Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) had been used to inform the current application in question.
9. A Member of the committee queried around the possibility of including warning signage for cyclists around Mill Road. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager explained that the current safety signage on the road had taken account of all road users.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and informatives for the reasons set out in the report.

Committee Next Steps:

None

82/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EP/13/01703/CMA: LAND AT STAMFORD GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL, CHRISTCHURCH MOUNT, EPSOM, SURREY KT19 8LU [Item 8]

AN UPDATE SHEET WAS TABLED

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager

Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager

Speakers:

The local member, **Stella Lallement** addressed the committee and raised the following points:

- The roads around the school cannot support additional parking increases even though the transport assessment stated that there would be an additional 100 parking spaces outside the school.
- There is likelihood that the roads outside of the school will be made into resident parking spaces which will cause traffic disruption.
- There is a need for pick up/drop off points although planners say there is no room for this.
- Would like to include two conditions- one for the provision of a footway through the allotment to the school site and the second for the provision of a car park for staff outside the application site.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Planning Development Control Team Manager who explained this application was for the provision of an additional one form entry facility ready for September 2015 intake. There is an absence of an alternative in the area with the scale of the current proposal being proportionate to the need.

1.45pm Cllr Michael Sydney left the meeting

2. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager explained that the resulting increase from the development would lead to a slight increase in the number of cars as a majority of the pupils live near the school. The school currently has no transport plan in place and modelling suggests there is inadequate space for a pick up/drop off point.
3. Members queried whether it was possible to locate a car park on the additional land behind the school. Officers explained that this land was owned by a third party.
4. There were discussions around the possibility of having an access to the school through the allotments to the south of the school. It was explained that Epsom and Ewell borough council who owned the allotment land were not in favour of this access.
5. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager explained that the Service had approached Epsom and Ewell on the issue of access who confirmed they were unhappy with access through the allotments.

A condition relating to an access via the allotments to the south of the site had been included in the report with Epsom and Ewell stating they would use all best endeavours to fulfil this.

6. The committee agreed to include an additional informative to look at the land at the back of the school as a possible location for a car park.
7. Although Members accepted the principle need for additional school places, they recognised that there was an issue with staff car parking on the site.
8. There is a draft travel plan in place which the travel plan officer has commented on. The officer hopes the school will take these comments on board.
9. Members agreed that local councillors in Epsom and Ewell should approach their local officers on access issues related to the school.
10. The Transport Development Planning Team Manager confirmed that Ethel Bailey Close was not public highway but owned by a third party.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, application EP/13/01703/CON be **PERMITTED** subject to conditions for the reasons set out in the report and the following additional informatives:

Informative

- a) That Epsom and Ewell Borough Council is encouraged to consider the requirements of the school with regard to access and parking when considering future planning applications in vicinity of the western gate.
- b) That Epsom and Ewell Borough Council is encouraged to enable an additional pedestrian/cycle access to the school via the allotments to the south of the site.

Committee Next Steps:

None

Meeting closed at 2.05pm

Chairman

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE
30 JULY 2014
UPDATE TO AGENDA ITEM 7**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL REGULATION 3 APPLICATION:
LAND AT JOHN NIGHTINGALE SCHOOL SITE (NEW HURST PARK PRIMARY
SCHOOL), HURST ROAD, WEST MOLESEY, SURREY
KT8 1QS**

**ERECTION OF NEW SINGLE, ONE AND A HALF AND TWO STOREY HURST
PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL (420 PLACES) AND NURSERY (30 PLACES)
TOGETHER WITH PROVISION OF 26 PARKING SPACES, AND CYCLE AND
SCOOTER PARKING; ACCESS OFF HURST ROAD; LAYING OUT OF OUTDOOR
LEARNING AND PLAY AREAS AND SPORTS PITCHES; LANDSCAPE
PLANTING AND ECOLOGICAL HABITATS.**

FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS AND PETITION

Five additional representations have been received since the Officers' report was completed. A petition signed by 6 local residents has also been received. All of these representations and the petition raise concerns relating to traffic and parking, issues which with one exception are noted in paragraphs 25 to 27 of the report. The exception is the point that the amendments to the Transport Assessment do not overturn the fact that the roads in the Bishop Fox Estate are narrow cul-de-sacs which were not designed to accommodate a significant amount of on-street parking.

Paragraphs 37 to 58 in the Officers' report deal with transportation issues. Paragraph 43 concludes that surrounding residential roads could provide sufficient parking capacity to accommodate 142 cars, the maximum number estimated to arrive at peak morning and afternoon times for the school. The matters of the parking of staff vehicles and the influence of the School Travel Plan are discussed in paragraphs 45, 46 and 56. In paragraph 58 Officers conclude that an off-site 'park and stride' facility is considered necessary to mitigate the potential adverse impact on local residential amenity arising from traffic congestion and on-street parking. The conditions require provision of a 'park and stride' facility to take some pressure away from the residential roads in the vicinity of the school.

A last minute representation has been received. The points raised are outlined below, followed by the responses by officers in brackets:

- the need for a drop-off and pick-up facility on the school site or on the verge along Hurst Road, as well as the need for more parking space on the site [The verge provides insufficient space for this facility, leading to vehicles queuing on Hurst Road which is an A-class road. There is insufficient space on the site for the facility since the built element including car parking and space for service vehicles needs to be kept of the area prone to flooding].
- there is sufficient space on the site for this facility and the additional parking provision by sacrificing some of the over generous sports provision [The sports provision meets with requirements and should not be sacrificed to provide additional on site parking. Further parking will be provided at the off-site 'park and stride' facility].
- concerns with on-street parking in the Bishop Fox Estate [Officers accept that parked cars may cause inconvenience and have amenity impacts on residents; however these impacts will be ameliorated by the proposed off-site

'park and stride' provision and otherwise are not considered to amount to significant harm. The roads are of adequate width to allow a vehicle to pass a parked car. There are two vehicular access points to the Estate. Traffic in the Estate will be travelling at slow speeds as a result of on-street parking. Therefore, Officers do not consider that the situation will be dangerous].

- an experiment conducted by residents shows in photographs the issue with on-street parking [The photographs show that there is sufficient width to permit parking on one side of the roads in the Estate, which is in accordance with the findings of the revised parking capacity survey].
- the proposed access to the school site from Freeman Drive is very narrow and there are houses very close by [This access point is for pedestrians only and is to enable children living locally to reach the school without having to walk to the main entrance on Hurst Road].
- attached extract from a report by an independent engineer, questioning the increase in staff numbers compared with the existing school; noting the need to increase on-site parking for staff vehicles in accordance with the Surrey Transport Plan and to avoid staff parking in local residential roads; identifying congestion, chaos, and safety issues in the Bishop Fox Estate at drop-off and pick-up times; questioning the parking capacity figures in the original version of the Transport Assessment (since revised to reduce the capacity figures significantly); and notes a lack of provision for short term parking of coaches [It is not clear who prepared the report. It was based on the on revision 1.0 of the Transport Assessment and not on the latest version dated June 2014. The increase in staff numbers was provided by the applicant. Accidents outside primary schools are very rare. Coaches call infrequently at primary schools. Coaches could either stop on Hurst Road or reverse into the school site. Unless they are taking children to the school (or collecting them) coaches will not conflict with traffic at peak times for the school. The County Highway Authority and the County Planning Authority have actively encouraged the applicant to look at 'park and stride' sites, and this aspect of the scheme has been addressed in the Officers' report. Staff travel and parking will need to be addressed through the School Travel Plan].
- there are inaccuracies in the documentation supporting the application, especially the Transport Assessment and the School Travel Plan [The inaccuracies are acknowledged but as a matter of fact they do not in themselves discredit the analysis].
- the proposal conflicts with a policy in the NPPF [paragraph 35] that calls for 'safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians; the proposal does not comply with the County Council's Transport Plan and Parking Strategy [Each development proposal is considered on its own merits taking into account site specific issues and constraints. In many cases a drop-off and pick-up facility will not be suitable or able to be accommodated. Thus the lack of provision will not constitute an overriding constraint].
- the decision on the proposal should await completion of the County Council's review of policies on parking provision for school developments [The review is unlikely to make a difference in this case due to the physically constrained nature of this site, as noted above].

SUMMARY OF PUBLICITY UNDERTAKEN AND KEY ISSUES RAISED BY PUBLIC

The text at the end of the first bullet point in paragraph 26 is repetitive.

SUGGESTION FROM ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL ABOUT A 'PARK AND STRIDE' OPTION

The Officers' report [paragraph 11, point (i)] indicates the response of Officers to the suggestion by Elmbridge Borough Council that the car park at the Molesey Cemetery be used for 'park and stride' purposes. Officers consider the existing use to be incompatible with a 'park and stride' use associated with the school.

SUSTAINABILITY – BREEAM ASSESSMENT

Paragraph 119 in the Officers' report notes that the Design and Procurement BREEAM Assessment concludes that a rating of about 84% (exceptional) could be achieved by the new school. However, the outcome is likely to be approximately 60% (very good), a rating which has been achieved for other new schools granted planning permission in the County.

CONDITION RELATING TO THE SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN

Condition 6 in the Officers' report is confusing and Officers recommend that the wording be revised.

THE NUMBERING OF PLANNING CONDITIONS

In the final formatting of the report the conditions were inadvertently renumbered. The correct numbering is set out in the table below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Deletion of the words "which has narrow and winding roads with no pavements" at the end of the first bullet point in paragraph 26.
2. Condition 6 be revised to read as follows:

Within 6 months of the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the School Travel Plan dated January 2014 shall be updated and submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing and thereafter shall be implemented, maintained, monitored and further updated to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

3. Condition 12 be amended to read as follows:

No later than six months after the commencement of the development hereby permitted, further details of the landscape planting and habitat creation schemes submitted with the application shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. Such details shall include:

- (i) Soft Landscape Plans
- (ii) Landscape Management Plan
- (iii) a sectional drawing of the tree pits for the larger trees proposed to be planted along Hurst Road.

4. Condition 13 be deleted.
5. That the remaining conditions be numbered as follows:

Conditions in Officers' report	Renumbered conditions
4(b)	3(b)
5	4
6	5
7	6
8	7
9	8
10	9
11	10
12	11
14	12
15	13
16	14
17	15
18	16

6. That the reasons remain as in the report.

UPDATE SHEET

Minerals and waste application MO/2013/0176

Swires Farm, Henfold Lane, Capel, Surrey RH5 4RP

Open windrow composting facility for green waste comprising: hard standing, weighbridge, 2 portacabin offices, portaloo, internal access road and landscaping.

Description of the Development

1. The description of the development detailed on page 1 of the Officers report is incorrect.
2. On 11 February the applicant submitted a range of amending information in relation to the proposal which included a revised site layout. This revised site layout excluded the landscape bund originally proposed to be located along the southern boundary of the application site. Consequently, with the agreement of the applicant, the description of the development was changed from:

(1) Open windrow composting facility for green waste comprising: hard standing, landscape bund to southern boundary, weighbridge, 2 portacabin offices, portaloo and internal access road

to

(2) Open windrow composting facility for green waste comprising: hard standing, weighbridge, 2 portacabin offices, portaloo, internal access road, and landscaping

3. Mole Valley District Council and all other consultees and interested parties were made aware of this change. However, Officers did not amend the committee report, which was 'work-in-progress' at the time, to reflect this. Consequently, the true and accurate description of the development should read as per (2) above not (1) above.

Additional Condition

4. The terms of the application are that all compost to be produced on the application site shall be used on the agricultural landholding comprising Swires and Lodge Farms. The proposal does not include provision for the export of compost produced on the application site by way of the local highway network nor does it include the commercial sales of compost.
5. So as to secure these terms of the proposal Officers recommend that a further condition is imposed on any permission granted. This additional condition should read:

No compost produced as a result of the development hereby permitted shall be exported from the application site such that it is transported on the public highway nor shall any commercial sales of compost produced on the application site take place. **Page 15**

Reason: So as to comply with the terms of the application.

Additional Representation

6. Following submission of the final report prepared by Officer to Committee Services, on 9 July 2014, a further letter of objection was sent to the County Planning Authority in respect of the proposal.
7. This letter makes reference to the unsuitability of Mill Road to accommodate vehicles associated with the proposal and raises concerns in respect of the speed of vehicles travelling along the local highway network and the safety risk that they may pose to non-vehicular users of the same. Further concern is raised in respect of the congestion that associated vehicles may cause and the impact the proposal may have on the adjacent Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
8. The concerns raised in this letter are common to a significant majority of the letters of objections sent to the County Planning Authority in relation to the proposal. Officers have sought to address these concerns in the relevant sections of the Officers report namely: Highways, Traffic and Access (paragraphs 78 – 113) and Landscape and Visual Impact (paragraphs 195 – 216).
9. Officers do not consider that this additional letter of objection raises any new matters which have not already been considered and addressed by Officers.



This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

UPDATE SHEET

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EP/13/01703/CMA

DISTRICT(S) EPSOM & EWELL BOROUGH COUNCIL

Land at Stamford Green Primary School, Christ Church Mount, Epsom, Surrey KT19 8LU

Single storey classroom block extension comprising 9 new classrooms and ancillary spaces; new hard surfaced play area and games court; alterations to pedestrian routes within the site and associated external works.

Aerial Photograph

2 amended aerial photographs are attached to be substituted for the existing ones which are not the correct site.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

A further letter of objection has been received (taking the total to 19) which raises similar issues to those that are already summarised in the report.

The petition referred to in paragraph 16 has continued to be signed on a daily basis since the report was finalised and at the time of the production of this update sheet the number of signatures had increased from 191 to 227. The committee will be advised if the number of signatures has increased any further on the day of Committee by presenting officers.

This page is intentionally left blank