

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 30 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
Mr Jonathan Essex
Mrs Margaret Hicks
Mr George Johnson
Mr Christian Mahne
Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
Mr Michael Sydney
Mr Richard Wilson

Apologies:

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Mrs Carol Coleman

83/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Carol Coleman and Natalie Bramhall.

84/14 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

It was noted that minutes of the meeting on 16 July 2014 would be confirmed at the meeting on 3 September due to the short timescale between the July meetings.

85/14 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

86/14 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

87/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

88/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

There were none.

89/14 MINERALS/WASTE TA/2013/1799 :MERCERS SOUTH, NUTFIELD, REDHILL, SURREY, RH1 4EU [Item 7]

An update sheet was tabled and is attached as Annex 1.

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Louise Calam, Principal Transport Development Planning Officer

Nicola Downes, Transport Development Planning Officer

Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager

Speakers:

Dr Sowton, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points he raised included:

- He disputed the accuracy of the assertion in paragraph 152 of the officer report that there is no evidence that dust from the sand extraction and emissions from HGV traffic pose an unacceptable risk to health. He highlighted the published results of international studies which leave no room for doubt about the harm to human health. For example, a study published this year shows the increased chance of coronary heart disease associated with breathing in particulate matter.

Chris Hoskins, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points he raised included:

- He was a chartered civil engineer with expertise in reservoirs. He was unaware of anyone involved in drawing up the planning application having expertise in reservoirs. He argued that the proposals were naive and do not adequately acknowledge risk.
- The proposal retains Glebe Lake as a resource but allows extraction very close to it. There have already been flooding incidents, with levels in Glebe Lake overflowing onto farm land and gardens.

The applicant, Peter Crate of J & J Franks addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- His company had worked with local residents, councillors and experts in drawing up these proposals. An examination in public had taken place. In 2012 further land had been acquired to provide alternative access to the site.
- The site is needed. There has been a 40% increase in demand for minerals but there is only one soft sand quarry left in Surrey. The Mercers Farms site is the biggest contributor to the Surrey Minerals Plan and will help sustain recovery in the South East.
- While he wasn't a scientist or an expert in dust and HGV emissions, he had been advised that he levels meets with Government Guidance. The company had Environmental accreditation and was regularly upgrading vehicles to meet environmental standards.

- Reservoirs are defined as man-made voids. The speaker Chris Hoskins had agreed that Glebe Lake was not a reservoir in a letter on the application. Glebe Lake is a key part of the site and will be actively managed during site operations. As the quarry approaches Glebe Lake, new measures will be put in place based on technical advice.

The local Member, Helena Windsor addressed the committee and raised the following points:

- The application was being considered on a date when many people are away on holiday. Two Parish Councils had requested an adjournment but this had not been granted.
- The report shows the Nutfield Marsh Residents Group as having had no comment but they had commented by the deadline.
- The village to the east of the site would continue to be blighted even with an alternative access route in place. While the access route would bypass Godstone Village (a historic village), it would go east through Bletchingley which has a number of listed buildings and the Godstone Triangle. She queried if there was enough information about the size and weight of the HGVs and the impact on local residents. She also asked if any work had been done to look at other alternatives.
- Sutton and East Surrey Water plc continue to voice concerns about hydrology impacts. This had been consistently raised throughout the public inquiry.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Planning Development Control Team Manager introduced the report and stressed that the application was for planning permission for a temporary period. In response to technical concerns which had been raised, the Planning Development Control Team Manager highlighted that there had been no objections from the council's technical consultants or the Environment Agency, subject to certain conditions being in place. He reminded the committee that it should assume that other regulatory regimes are working correctly and that sufficient controls will be in place.
2. The Chairman informed observers that the committee had undertaken a site visit to Mercer South and that this had been well-attended.
3. A Member highlighted the environmental impact of quarrying and that sustainable impacts should be a golden thread through all plans.
4. It was commented that HGV traffic from the site was previously expected to travel along Nutfield Marsh Road and Cormongers Lane, and Cormongers Lane joins the A25 where the speed limit is 30mph. The proposed new access that is to be constructed from the site will join the A25 where the speed limit is 40mph. So it was questioned whether the new access would be safer because of the higher speed limit at this point. The Transport Development Planning Officer responded that a speed survey has been carried out along the A25 in the location of the new access, and the visibility splays at the new access have been designed in accordance with the 85th percentile speeds recorded during the survey. The proposed access is therefore considered to be safe and appropriate for the speed of traffic along

- this section of the A25. The Chairman suggested that speed limits should be considered at the local committee.
5. It was suggested that Phase 4 could be refused as this brings the travelling dust within reach of the nearest residents. The Planning Development Control Team Manager highlighted a proposed pre-commencement condition to set up a dust monitoring scheme. This will pick up both nuisance dust and dust which has an impact on health. This will lead to an Action Plan which can be tweaked over time. It will be a living document and set up controls on dust.
 6. A Member suggested that in a letter at the beginning of July, the Environment Agency had maintained an objection. He queried whether this was withdrawn. He also highlighted the objections of Sutton and East Surrey Water plc. The Planning Development Control Team Manager confirmed that the Environment Agency has no objection to the proposal. The letter from February which was acknowledged as received by Tandridge District Council on 3 July was just asking for clarification. He said that the committee should note the concerns of the water company but stressed that the key test was the views of the Environment Agency, as this is the statutory consultee. This was backed by the Planning Inspector at the Public Inquiry.
 7. Officers confirmed that residents do not have a right to a view.
 8. It was suggested that Tandridge District Council be asked to monitor pollution across a wider area to assure residents about pollution levels and the impact to health. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that borough and district councils interpret their responsibilities with regard to environmental health differently.
 9. A Member suggested that a liaison group be set up between the applicant and local residents. The Planning Development Control Team Manager stated that liaison group would be expected for a site of this size. It cannot be conditioned but is recommended in the Statement of Community Involvement.
 10. The Planning Development Control Team Manager confirmed that the planning application was for a time-limited period. The end date was 2036.
 11. A member of the committee described the application as exemplary and highlighted that the long term average concentration of PM_{10} is well below the long-term Air Quality Strategy objective. He pointed out that throughout Surrey there was extraction of minerals and traffic. The pollution should be judged against the background pollution and the site is adjacent to a highway.
 12. It was pointed out that an alternative route would be the Haul Road from the M25 but this would also attract many objections. It was also highlighted that the A25 was the major road out of the south west before the M25 was built and therefore can handle the proposed increase in traffic. Another Member pointed out that the M25 was built because the A25 was felt to be inadequate. Road designations cannot be set in stone.
 13. A Member queried what would happen if monitors were to show an excessive amount of dust and pollution which is hazardous to health. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that the monitoring scheme specifies where the apparatus would be located and how data should be collected. An action plan would be created, eg to include a requirement to keep the haul road wet. Standards would be set eg on how many times the limit could be exceeded within

a year. The action plan would be amended as the development progresses. This is a retrospective control but it gathers a collective body of information over time.

14. A Member reminded the committee that generally it was encouraged not to look at the big picture with regard to planning applications although there was a lot of discussion with regard to the contribution of this site to the Minerals Plan. However, he agreed that the application was of a better quality than many others he had experience of.
15. Planning Condition 8 with regard to allowing an average of 150 HGV movements per day, not exceeding 240 movements on a single day was queried. It was suggested that the movements be limited to no more than 150 on a single day. The Chairman responded that it was normal practice to condition average movements but allow for peaks. The Transport Development Planning Officer confirmed that seasonal activity would result in more or less movements at different times of the year. The Planning Development Control Team Manager informed the committee that the Planning Inquiry had agreed with the limits being proposed and it would be unreasonable to put further limits on.
16. The Chairman addressed the concern expressed about the timing of the committee meeting. He explained that it was coincidence that it had come to the meeting at the end of July and that all applications were brought to committee as soon as possible following the end of the public consultation. He also highlighted the Update Sheet which addressed late representations.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That the application be PERMITTED subject to conditions, for the reasons stated in the report.

90/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EL2014/2144: LAND AT HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, HURST ROAD, WEST MOLESEY, SURREY KT8 1QW [Item 8]

An update sheet was tabled and is attached as Annex 2.

As items 8 and 9 deal with retrospective applications, the Chairman asked the Principal Lawyer to explain the legal situation. The Principal Lawyer explained that Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 clarifies that a retrospective planning application must be dealt with as if it is a conventional planning application. Being retrospective is not grounds for refusal.

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Louise Calam, Principal Transport Development Planning Officer
Nicola Downes, Transport Development Planning Officer
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager

Speakers:

John Lewis, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points he raised included:

- The demountable unit had already been built and therefore the conditions being imposed were nonsense.
- He suggested an additional condition that the side gate be closed or additional parking restrictions are put in place which are enforced by Elmbridge Borough Council.
- More residents would have liked to attend and speak to the committee but due to the timing of the meeting they are on holiday.
- Many parents park on kerbs.
- A neighbour who is a midwife had been blocked into her drive by a parent and so could not get to an emergency birth. The parent's response to was to shout abuse.

Sue Ebbinghaus, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points she raised included:

- She had lived in Garrick Gardens for many years. Over time it had changed as the school had grown and traffic had increased.
- Cars blocking driveways had led to residents missing trains and GP appointments. She had had to arrange a funeral around timing for school traffic.
- Parents can be abusive when challenged.

Jo Wales, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points she raised included:

- She had been a teacher at Hurst Park School and her son had attended it. Traffic and parking had been a perennial issue.
- The current difficulty was the result of Surrey County Council policies. In the past school land had been sold to build houses. As a result there are now not enough school places and schools are being expanded to cope.
- The nursery is opened and closed twice a day which results in traffic and parking problems throughout the day.

The local Member, Ernest Mallett, wished to participate as part of the committee rather than speak as the local Member.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Planning Development Control Team Manager introduced the report.
2. The local Member informed the committee that parking restrictions had previously been put into Garrick Gardens. Most of Garrick Gardens has dropped kerbs and there are yellow lines where they aren't dropped. The issue is one of enforcement. Further restrictions would be to the detriment of residents and their guests. He highlighted the new Hurst Park School which would lead to this site being closed and would therefore relieve residents of this problem in the medium term. He argued that shutting the side gate would lead to a dangerous

situation at the Hurst Road entrance to the site. He also explained that school sites had been disposed of during a drop in birth rates and that there had recently been an increase in birth rates leading to the need for more school places.

3. It was suggested that a liaison group between residents and the school would help address issues.
4. Concern was expressed about schools being expanded into 'giant' schools with people being forced to travel further and therefore making Surrey more car-dependent.
5. Members felt that the committee was in a difficult position as it could not vote against an application where pupils are waiting for school places. The Principal Lawyer clarified that Members must decide based on the information in front of them and not be bound by the application being retrospective or feeling that there is any pressure on them.
6. The recycling potential of demountable buildings was queried. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that the committee could require that a demountable building be removed but not that it be reused. The Chairman suggested that the committee had to assume that Property would seek to reuse demountable buildings.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, application number EL2014/2144 be PERMITTED subject to conditions, for the reasons set out in the report.

91/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EP14/00362: LAND AT THE VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL, BEACONSFIELD ROAD, LANGLEY VALE, EPSOM, SURREY KT18 6HP [Item 9]

An update sheet was tabled and is attached as Annex 3.

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Louise Calam, Principal Transport Development Planning Officer
Nicola Downes, Transport Development Planning Officer
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager

Speakers:

Chris Frost, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points he raised included:

- He had been the local County Councillor when the school was built. The officer report had recommended that permission be refused because of residential amenity issues. The concerns were overcome with the addition of a condition to limit the number of cars parked

outside the school to 30. Local residents were told that the school would not be able to expand as the site was too small.

- There was impact on residential amenity into the evenings because of parents' evenings etc.
- He highlighted the reduction in parking for staff. This was formally being reduced by three spaces but in fact was being reduced by five spaces as two further members of staff were currently able to park in informal car parking spaces.

Liz Frost, a local resident, made representations in objection to the application. The points she raised included:

- When the school had been built, residents had been assured that the site was too small for expansion.
- Conditions on parking had not been complied with or enforced.
- The school is situated at the top of a steep, narrow cul de sac. As it takes time to load and unload children, and cars are blocked from leaving by cars trying to reach the school, many parents simply park across driveways etc.
- There had been near misses between cars and this is a dangerous situation for pedestrians, especially children. An additional 30 children implies that they will be coming from outside the village and will therefore be driven to school.
- The School Travel Plan had not been complied with.

The local Member, Tina Mountain, had not registered to speak.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Planning Development Control Team Manager introduced the report. He explained that this was an application for a temporary permission to deal with a bulge in a single year. The current capacity for the school would not be reached even when taking account of the bulge.
2. Members queried whether a temporary period of seven years was sufficient. Officers explained that seven years would see the bulge year group through primary school. The Chairman informed the committee that the school was not obliged to keep the demountable for the full seven years if it is found that it is no longer required.
3. A Member argued that allowing six months from occupation of the development for the submission of a school travel plan was too long. To have value it should be submitted by the start of the school year. The Planning Development Control Team Manager felt that this would be an unreasonable requirement given the short time this would allow for the plan to be developed. The Chairman stressed that the priority should not be for the school travel plan to be produced as soon as possible but for it to get proper buy-in from all those involved.
4. Members queried whether the demountable could be relocated so as to not block the car parking spaces. The Planning Development Control Team Manager informed the committee that there were no other options for locating the unit.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, application number EP14/00362 be PERMITTED subject to conditions, for the reasons set out in the report.

92/14 ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRE APPLICATION GUIDANCE AND LOCAL FEE SETTING FOR COUNTY COUNCIL MATTER DEVELOPMENT [Item 10]

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

- The Planning Development Control Team Manager introduced the report. He clarified that local authorities were able to recover costs incurred in providing pre-application advice but not to make a profit. In charges being recommended are comparable to what other local authorities have although where local authorities are reviewing their schemes they are finding that have under- rather than over-estimated costs.
- Members queried whether the charges proposed fully reflect the service provided. It appears that applicants are getting a good deal. It was also queried whether a free level one should be offered or if there should be a nominal fee for level one which is offset against other levels of advice. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that the charges replicates what other local authorities are doing. It was not possible to charge for information which the planning service is obliged to provide. A reasonable level of service is being offered for free and gives an entree into the service.
- There was concern that tax-payers already pay for the planning service and applicants pay a substantial planning fee. It was suggested that once charges are introduced they tend to increase rather than decrease.
- Members queried whether there would be any charge to objectors requesting information. The Planning Development Control Team Manager informed the committee that there was no proposal to charge objectors for information. They can generally access all the information they need already and can also utilise Freedom of Information requests.
- There was concern about blurring the division between poacher and gamekeeper. If applicants paid for pre-application work and the application is then reviewed by the same planning officer, would any advice be publicly available. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that information is likely to be publicly available unless it is exempt for financial reasons. With regard to consultants having a conflict of interest, they would have to declare an interest and the Council would call in a fall-back consultant.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

To APPROVE the implementation of the proposed pre-application guidance procedures and charging scheme to be introduced by the 15 September 2014, and to be reviewed after the first year and thereafter as appropriate.

93/14 ENFORCEMENT & MONITORING UPDATE REPORT [Item 11]

Photographs were tabled and are attached as Annex 4.

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Ian Gray, Principal Planning Enforcement Officer

Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer introduced the report and explained the photographs.
2. Members welcomed the report and asked if it would be possible to be brought an update on a quarterly basis. Officers explained that this would be administratively onerous and would take resources away from enforcement action.
3. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer confirmed that he was getting co-operation from local enforcement officers. He explained that all councils were under the same pressures and support will fluctuate over time. If he had any particular issues he was able to raise them with the Planning Development Control Team Manager.
4. Officers informed Members that the planning service has no control over where material is moved to. In the past enforcement notices had attempted to include this but the Planning Inspector had said that this was not in the council's authority. However, the Environment Agency is encouraged to check where the material is going so that it isn't just moved to another problem site.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

To NOTE the Enforcement and Monitoring Update Report.

94/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 3.15 pm

Chairman

Planning & Regulatory Committee 30 July 2014

UPDATE SHEET TO AGENDA ITEM 7

Minerals & Waste Application: TA/2013/1799

Mercers South, Nutfield, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 4EU

Extraction and screening of sand from Mercers South with progressive restoration to agriculture using inert waste materials, together with: the construction of a new dedicated internal access from the A25; screening bunds; the provision of a welfare/office block and mobile home to accommodate staff and security personnel; a wheelwash, weighbridge and associated office; car parking area; reinstatement of rights of way network, woodland, historic hedgerows and ditch to include landscape and ecological enhancements, on a site of 52.2 ha and the temporary diversion of public footpath 173 for the duration of the operations.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

Parish /Town Council and Amenity Groups

44 Nutfield Marsh Residents Group

Object. Raise the following comments:

- Air pollution – health risk from emissions due to increased HGV traffic, odour,
- Transport - safety through narrow sections of A25 in Nutfield, Godstone and Bletchingley, vibration from HGVs and damage to our heritage, safety for cyclists, risk to users of M23 from sand and dust, parking of HGVs out of hours,
- Landscape Impact – adverse impact on local amenity groups, loss of trees and tranquillity, significantly would affect distinctive character adjacent to AONB and AGLV,
- Wildlife – detriment to local wildlife, in particular bats, great crested newts, snakes, badgers and deer,
- Hydrology – present extreme weather has seen local flooding, concerns over pumping of water on flooding, detriment to watertable and potential pollution from neighbouring landfills
- Bunds and Clay Storage Area - will cause noise, dust and disturbance to local properties, contribute to flooding, clay storage up to 6m and visible from surrounding areas
- Hours of working – light pollution from winter working, Saturday working impinges on quality of life

(Officer comment: The above issues have already been covered within the report)

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE
30 JULY 2014
UPDATE TO AGENDA ITEM 8**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL REGULATION 3 APPLICATION: EL2014/2144
LAND AT HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, HURST ROAD, WEST MOLESEY,
SURREY KT8 1QW**

**INSTALLATION OF DEMOUNTABLE UNIT COMPRISING TWO CLASSROOMS
FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD OF 3 YEARS.**

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The references to the Development Plan documents and policies under the heading of Impact on Residential Amenity (following paragraph 24 in the Officers' report) should be amended to read as follows:

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011

Policy CS 11 – Local Character and Design

Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000

Policy COM4 – Provision of Educational Facilities

CONDITION 1 AND REASON – Temporary Permission

Condition 1 needs amending to relate to the temporary modular building. The reason requires re-wording appropriately. The revised wording by Officers is as follows:

Condition 1 The classroom building hereby permitted is for a temporary period of three years from the date of this decision.

Reason To reflect the terms of the application and in the interests of the amenities and environment of the local area pursuant to Policy COM4 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

CONDITION REGARDING HOURS OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY

A complaint has been received from a local resident about the hours of construction activity extending beyond those normally allowed. An additional planning condition and reason are needed to regulate the situation. The wording recommended is as follows:

Condition 7 In carrying out the development hereby permitted, no construction activities shall take place except between the hours of 8.00 and 18.00 between Mondays and Fridays and between 8.00 and 13.00 on Saturdays. There shall be no working on Sundays or bank and public/national holidays.

Reason In the interests of the amenities of the area pursuant to Policy CS 17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy COM4 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE
30 JULY 2014
UPDATE TO AGENDA ITEM 9**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL REGULATION 3 APPLICATION: EP14/00362
LAND AT THE VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL, BEACONSFIELD ROAD, LANGLEY
VALE, EPSOM, SURREY KT18 6HP**

**INSTALLATION OF DEMOUNTABLE CLASSROOM UNIT COMPRISING ONE
CLASSROOM AND ANCILLARY FACILITIES FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD OF 7
YEARS.**

FURTHER INFORMATION FROM THE APPLICANT

The applicant has provided the following additional information relating to the proposed development. The comment of Officers follows each point.

- The site is restricted and the loss of 2 parking spaces is regrettable but unavoidable. Officer comment: It is agreed that the constraints of the site make this loss unavoidable. It is considered that the loss will not make the on-street parking situation significantly worse and that the impact on residential amenity can be mitigated satisfactorily by applying planning conditions (see paragraph 39 of the officer's report).
- The school has a capacity of 210 pupils. The enrolment is currently less than this number and this capacity will not be reached even with the increase by up to 30 pupils as a result of the current 'bulge'. It is expected that 11 rather than 30 additional pupils will be admitted to the school in September 2014. Officer comment: The potential physical capacity is for 30 additional pupils.
- The development is expected to result in an increase in staff numbers from 41 to 42 or 43, comprising a full time teacher and potentially a part time teaching assistant. Officer comment: It is considered that as with the decrease in 2 parking spaces noted above, the increased staffing level will have a small but manageable effect.
- The County Council's Environmental Sustainability Community Engagement Team has recently been commissioned to review and update the School Travel Plan (STP) at this school, to enable a new STP to be prepared and implemented in the autumn of this year. Officer comment: It is the understanding of Officers that there is no current STP. The County Highway Authority, endorsed by planning officers, recommends that a new STP be prepared and submitted to the County Planning Authority for written approval, followed by the implementation, monitoring and updating of the STP (see paragraphs 38 to 40 of the officers' report). Condition 4 requires the STP to be submitted within 6 months of the occupation of the demountable unit. Implementation of the STP will be an ongoing process.
- The development will not result in a loss of external play space. Officer comment: The footprint of the new building is mostly occupied currently by the 2 parking spaces, a bin store and a shelter. It is therefore unlikely that the area is not used as play space.

FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Four additional representations have been received since the officers' report was completed. The points raised are outlined below, followed by the comment of Officers:

- The development will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and parking issues, especially for access by emergency vehicles, refuse lorries and race horses. Residents' drives will continue to be obstructed. Officer comment: Paragraphs 37 to 40 in the officers' report deal with the transportation impacts of the proposal, paragraph 39 noting the particular importance of the School Travel Plan (STP) in keeping the impacts of traffic and parking on local residential amenity to an acceptable level. Condition 4 requires the submission of a School Travel Plan to the County Planning Authority (CPA) for its approval (by means of a subsequent planning application), followed by the implementation, maintenance, monitoring and updating of the STP, to the satisfaction of the CPA. The advice of the County Highway Authority (CHA) will be sought on the details contained in the STP and any planning conditions needed to ensure its effectiveness.
- Suggestions that the School Travel Plan (STP) should also cover the operation of a minibus service from September 2014 (possibility from the village hall to and from the school), staff members using this service, car sharing, a 'walking bus', parents living in the village walking their children to and from school, the school managing and enforcing traffic and parking at evening and weekend events. Officer comment: see above.
- The County Council should monitor the measures in the STP each term and have the results placed on the Council's web site. Officer comment: The CPA together with the CHA will decide on how the STP can best be monitored and whether any planning conditions are needed.
- Inequitable enforcement of parking restrictions on local roads [residents sometimes receiving fines when parents do not]. Officer comment: This enforcement is not within the remit of the County Planning Authority but is the responsibility of the Borough Council and the Police.
- The loss of on-site car parking including 2 'unofficial' spaces has made the parking situation worse. Officer comment: Paragraph 39 in the officers' report concludes that the potential adverse effect on residential amenity due to transportation implications (including on-street parking) can be mitigated satisfactorily by the imposition of planning conditions. Officers recommend an additional condition requiring the removal of the new building after the 7 year period has expired, followed by the reinstatement of the hardstanding on which the building is being erected. This will enable resumption of the parking use of this area.
- A number of requirements in Conditions 8, 9 and 10 of the planning permission for the original school have not been complied with (including the monitoring of on-street parking, and the operation of a 'park and ride' minibus service. Officer comment: The aspect of the original planning conditions is considered in paragraphs 46 and 47 of the officers' report.
- The school should spread open evenings over a greater number of days. Officer comment: An Informative is recommended encouraging this to be done (see below).
- The continuing deterioration of local roads will be made worse. Officer comment: Paragraph 38 in the officers' report concludes that the relatively small number of additional vehicles generated by the proposed development will not unduly worsen the existing condition of the local roads.

- Residents having their human rights ignored by only being advised of the proposed development in June and not having an opportunity to have an input into the project. Officer comment: The aspects of consultation with and notification of neighbours is considered in paragraph 50 of the officers' report. Paragraphs 52 and 53 consider the human rights implications of the proposal.
- The erection of the new building occurring prior to planning permission being granted. Officer comment: See paragraph 51 in the officers' report.
- The suggestion that the Committee refuse the application on grounds of lack of control by the school over traffic generation and because there is no existing STP as required by the planning permission for the original school. Officer comment: The officers' report recommends the proposed development for permission based on educational need, parental preferences and an analysis of potential alternative sites, and the officers' view that planning conditions will satisfactorily ameliorate the adverse impacts on residential amenity of increased traffic congestion and pressure for on-street parking.
- The assumption that if planning permission is refused, the building will be removed. Officer comment: See the Officer comment immediately above.
- A follow-up to a previous Freedom of Information (FOI) request has been made, asking for details to be provided of all monitoring information relating to the STP submitted with the original planning application. Officer comment: The FOI process is separate from the planning process.

CONDITION 1 AND REASON – Temporary Permission

Condition 1 needs amending to relate to the temporary modular building and to require the hardstanding on which the building is being erected to be restored to enable the parking of cars. The reason requires re-wording appropriately. The revised wording recommended by officers is as follows:

Condition 1 The classroom building hereby permitted is for a temporary period of seven years from the date of this decision, on or before which date the building shall be removed and the land restored to hardstanding.

Reason To reflect the terms of the application and in the interests of the amenities and environment of the local area pursuant to Policies CF1 and CF4 of the Epsom and Ewell District-wide Local Plan 2000.

INFORMATIVE

In response to a suggestion made by a local resident in a recently received representation (see above) it is recommended that an additional Informative be added in response to a suggestion from a local resident as noted above.

Informative 4. It is suggested that the school seek to increase the number evenings when open evenings and similar events held after normal school hours, in order to reduce traffic congestion and pressure for parking on local roads.

This page is intentionally left blank

Fig 1 : Adams Bristow Yard: Unauthorised storage of inert waste and skip waste.



Page 19



Minute Item 93/14



Fig 2 : Unauthorised storage of both inert and skip waste.



Page 20



Fig 3 : Site cleared of all inert and skip waste.



Page 21





Fig 4 : Site cleared.

Page 22



Fig 5 : Barnfield: Unauthorised waste deposit, transfer & disposal - 2009.



Fig 6 : Unauthorised waste deposit, transfer & disposal – 2010.



Fig 7 : Unauthorised waste deposit, transfer & disposal – 2010.



Fig 8 : Unauthorised waste deposit, transfer & disposal – 2010.
Starting to reduce the ground levels around the beech tree where
waste has been tipped

Page 26



Fig 9 : Unauthorised waste deposit, transfer & disposal – 2012.
Skips & waste cleared, just the hardcore remaining.



Fig 10 : Field Common South – A total of 5 Yrs + from establishing the breach to remediation.

Woodyard: timber & composting.



Scrapyard & breaking.



Fig 11 :



Landscaper contractors yard



Log storage area



Fig 12 :



Timber burning, soil & hardcore tipping area.



Clearance of this area



Fig 13 :

Area of land raising at rear of lake.



Landscape contractor's compound.



Fig 14 : Two companies with adjacent skip yards:
used for waste deposit, transfer & recycling.



Page 32



Fig 15 :



Page 33



Fig 16 :



Fig 17 : Ecologically beneficial woodpiles



Page 35



Fig 18 :



Fig 19 : Regeneration of the area that had been landraised within the willow copse.



Page 37



Fig 20 : Hurtmore Golf Course - Access track: removed and restored.

Page 38



Fig 21 : A total expenditure of £1.2M + spent on site remediation.

Large bund removed and depression reinstated



Page 39



This page is intentionally left blank