

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 29 January 2025 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

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

**Members:**

\*= in attendance

Ernest Mallett MBE\*  
 Jeffrey Gray\*  
 Scott Lewis\*  
 Catherine Powell\*  
 Jeremy Webster\*  
 Edward Hawkins (Chairman)\*  
 John Robini\*  
 Victor Lewanski\*  
 Richard Tear\*  
 Jonathan Hulley  
 Chris Farr

**1/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Jonathan Hulley and Chris Farr.

**2/25 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

The Minutes were APPROVED as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

**3/25 PETITIONS [Item 3]**

There were none.

**4/25 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]**

There were none.

**5/25 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

Cllr Steven McCormick submitted one Member Question. The question and response were published in a supplementary agenda on 28 January 2025.

As a supplementary question, Cllr Steven McCormick asked whether Surrey County Council officers could confirm if properly constructed boreholes, as recommended by the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Contaminated Land Officer, would be required for the applications referenced in the initial question.

In response, the Planning Development Manager stated that, given that the applications were still under consideration, it was not possible to confirm the precise conditions or requirements that might be attached to any eventual permission. However, the Planning Development Manager assured that the

team was fully aware of the comments made and that they would be carefully addressed in the final assessment and any subsequent conditions, should permission be granted. The Manager also confirmed that the Member would be kept informed as the matter progressed.

In response, the Member clarified that the question regarding the boreholes was focused on pre-approval investigative work, rather than post-approval planning conditions, as it pertained to assessing whether any contamination had already affected the site or the aquifer, and was not related to conditions that may be applied following the committee's consideration. The Planning Development Manager confirmed that a response would be provided outside the meeting.

#### **6/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]**

Cllr Scott Lewis noted that he was the ward councillor for the two planning applications listed on the meeting's agenda.

#### **7/25 MINERALS/WASTE RU.21/0115 - LAND AT ADDLESTONE QUARRY, NATIONAL GRID ENTRANCE, BYFLEET ROAD, NEW HAW, SURREY KT15 3LA [Item 7]**

##### **Officers:**

Janine Wright, Principal Planning Officer

##### **Officer Introduction:**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report, and update sheet, and provided a brief summary. Members noted that the application was for the retention of existing plant and continued extraction of sand and gravel and bagshot beds from 61 HA with importation of inert waste and progressive restoration of the site partly to agriculture and partly to reedbed shallows without compliance with Conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16 of planning permission ref: RU09/1103 dated 11 December 2015 in order to extend the time period for mineral extraction and restoration, allow revision to the approved plans and drawings, provide details of amended surface water management scheme and revise timing of submission of aftercare and ecological management scheme. Full details of the application were outlined in the published agenda.

##### **Speakers:**

On behalf of applicant, Vilna Walsh (supported by Joe Hawkins) made the following points:

1. Cappagh became the operator of the quarry in 2014 and secured permission in December 2015 to complete site restoration by December 2020.
2. Significant remedial work was required post-permission due to the site being mothballed by previous operator Cemex in 2009. Progress was further delayed by uncertainty surrounding Brexit and the subsequent

- economic downturn. The COVID-19 pandemic also had a major impact, with the site being shut or operating on a skeleton crew.
3. The establishment of the Aggregate Recycling Facility (ARF) had ensured ongoing filling of remaining void space.
  4. The site operated with Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements that were well below the cumulative limit set.
  5. 75% of the site had been restored, with 32 hectares now functioning as a working farm.
  6. Positive enhancements to the restoration plan included the planting of 719 trees and over 5,200 shrubs, provision of a mink trap in alignment with local water vole population support, and installation of owl boxes and enhanced wildlife features, including a wildlife lake.
  7. That the applicant was committed to completing the restoration to a high standard within the proposed timeframe, and that the operation of the ARF was crucial to achieving this goal.

**Points of clarification:**

A Member asked about starting work in Summer 2025 on a piece of land that had not yet been developed. In response, it was clarified that ongoing restoration had been taking place throughout the period, and there remained a small area, approximately 30,000 tonnes of material, which still needed to be extracted. This extraction was expected to be completed over a short period of weeks, rather than months, and was targeted for the summer period as the weather is drier. Further to this, It was confirmed that the sand extraction would proceed in the summer, but if it could not due to weather issues, then it would not impact the overall timeline.

A Member asked when unused items, such as excavation units, would be removed from the quarry. They expressed concern about the timeline for completing restoration by 2029 and inquired whether these items would be removed sooner or towards the end of the process. In response, It was explained that a tender process had been initiated for contractors to demobilise and demolish the unused items, as this task required technical proficiency beyond the site's operational capabilities. Additionally, other items on the site had been removed over the past 6 to 9 months, in line with previous monitoring reports, and this process would continue.

A Member raised concerns about complaints from residents, particularly regarding trucks on the highway not being properly managed. They requested to be sent Cappagh's policy on waste deliveries, specifically details on what hauliers must adhere to. In response, It was confirmed that any previous complaints raised by Surrey had been addressed with letters sent to the relevant companies. It was stated that Cappagh followed a zero-tolerance policy on these matters. It was also noted that not every HGV passing by Addlestone Quarry was delivering to the site, and there had been instances where complaints were not relevant to Cappagh or the site. It was further stated that Cappagh would provide the requested information.

A Member referenced the site visit and inquired whether there was an average number of vehicle movements for the last three-month period available. In response, It was explained that the current conditions for both permissions set a cumulative average of 200 HGV movements per day over a 5.5-day working week. When the application was made, the estimated number of HGV movements was around 120 per day, primarily for bringing material to the ARF for recycling, with 90% of that material being sent back out as recycled material. The rest remained on-site without generating further vehicle movements. Over the past year, the highest quarter recorded around 104 HGV movements per day, while the lowest was around 82 movements. This provided ample headroom for future increases, should there be a need to attract material directly to the site for recycling or filling. A request was made for a copy of this data which was agreed.

A Member expressed relief that the large structures observed during the site visit would be contracted out for removal. They noted that, currently, there were no conditions in place requiring the removal of these structures before 2029, and raised concerns based on experiences with other sites where structures were left until the end, causing financial difficulties for removal. The Member asked if there was any possibility of committing to a phased restoration with intermediate milestones for removing some of the redundant equipment, given the amount observed on-site and the likely high cost of removal. In response, The Chairman expressed some hesitation about asking the applicant to make a commercial decision in advance, acknowledging the understanding behind the request but noting that there may be other mitigating commercial circumstances not yet considered. The Planning Development Manager explained that, while the committee was discussing the current applications, the planning team's role also involved ongoing monitoring of the site. If issues arose that were beyond the scope of the applications, they could still be addressed, and enforcement action could be taken if necessary.

A Member expressed concern about the potential outcome if the time extension for the application was not granted, asking if there was another plan in place. In response, the speaker explained that without the time extension, there would be no approved planning permission or restoration plan to follow. The speaker noted that the current proposal improved upon the previous plan and that officers would need to assess what steps would be required to resolve the situation. This could involve a new application, which would come with its own time implications and potential enforcement issues.

A Member asked for details on the depth of the topsoil and inquired about the plans in place to assist the farmer in improving the quality of the grass to enable further grazing. In response, the speaker explained that the depth of the topsoil was approximately 300mm, with an additional 300mm of subsoil beneath it, totalling around 600mm of soil. Once seeded, the land was handed over to the farmer to maintain and cultivate for agricultural use. This

approach was demonstrated by 70% of the site being actively used for agriculture, including cattle, sheep, and other livestock.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Chairman moved the recommendation which received unanimous support.

**Actions / Further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

The Committee unanimously agreed to PERMIT application RU20/0115 subject to the conditions outlined in the report and update sheet.

**8/25 MINERALS/WASTE RU.21/0085 - LAND AT ADDLESTONE QUARRY, NATIONAL GRID ENTRANCE, BYFLEET ROAD, NEW HAW, SURREY KT15 3LA [Item 8]**

**Officers:**

Janine Wright, Principal Planning Officer

James Lehane, Principle Transport Development Planning Officer

**Officer Introduction:**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report, and update sheet, and provided a brief summary. Members noted that the application was for the continued use of land for the importation of construction, demolition and excavation (C, D & E) waste and the siting of an aggregate recycling facility, involving the placement of mobile crushing and screening plant to enable the recovery of recycled aggregates for sale and export without compliance with Conditions 1, 2 and 9 of planning permission ref: RU.16/1960 dated 16 June 2017 in order to extend the time period of the development and for retention of bund on northern boundary. Full details of the application were outlined in the published agenda.

**Speakers:**

On behalf of applicant, Vilna Walsh (supported by Joe Hawkins) made the following points:

The speaker noted that the two applications were closely interconnected, with the need to fill the quarry being entirely dependent on the recycling facility. They reiterated the points made in their initial submission, adding that they wanted to emphasise the highly sustainable nature of the facility. They highlighted its significant contribution to aggregate supply in the wider area, as well as its role in filling the void and completing the site restoration.

**Points of clarification:**

A Member asked about the drainage plans and whether they were adequate to prevent flooding in nearby areas, particularly for neighbouring properties, especially given the increasing amount of rainfall. In response, the speaker explained that the drainage plans had been reviewed and assessed by the relevant officers and authorities, including the Environment Agency (EA). It was confirmed that the proposed drainage plans were considered acceptable.

A Member asked about noise testing and how it was monitored, noting that several properties had raised concerns about noise. They inquired about the methods used to test noise levels, how it was reported, and how residents would be reassured regarding the issue. In response, the speaker explained that noise impacts had been reassessed during the updated submission. Target noise levels were set for the nearest sensitive receptors, ensuring they would not be breached. The assessment was based on a worst-case scenario, where all equipment and extraction activities occurred simultaneously, despite being at different ends of the site. The noise measurements from this scenario were well below both the background levels and the target levels set in the conditions.

A Member asked whether there was a community liaison group in place to share information about the recycling facility, particularly regarding the 90% of material being sent out as recycling and the 10% staying in for infill. They inquired about how this information was tracked and whether it was shared with the community or only with the relevant authorities. In response, the speaker explained that there was no community liaison group in place. Further to this, the Member acknowledged the benefits of increased recycling but pointed out that it reduced the amount of material going into the restoration process, impacting the site's restoration timeline. While they understood the technological improvements and the drive for higher recycling, they highlighted the downside of less material being used for restoration. The Member suggested adding a condition to track and ensure a reasonable percentage of material was still being used for restoration, as opposed to the site becoming solely a waste processing facility, which would differ from the original purpose of the application. A Member added that the Ward councillor should also be kept informed which was agreed. The Planning Development Manager suggested that instead of proposing specific wording for the condition, if the committee was inclined to secure such a condition, the final wording could be agreed upon in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman after the meeting. The Committee supported the proposal.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Principal Transport Development Planning Officer acknowledged the condition limiting vehicle movements to 200 per day and noted a decline in HGV movements in the area. With the current conditions in place, the officer expressed confidence that there would be no material impact on highways. The officer also mentioned discussions with the case officer and recommended adjustments to the vehicle

movement condition. The 200 movements per day limit would remain, but the wording would be revised to make it a strict limit, removing the reference to averages. Records would be collected using automatic traffic counters, ensuring reliable and regularly shareable data. Instead of being available on request, the data would be provided quarterly for ongoing monitoring and review.

2. In response to a Member query, the Principal Planning Officer stated that the County's consultees had reviewed the information provided by the applicant regarding air quality and were satisfied there would be no impact. The officer also mentioned that conditions regarding dust management and control had been included in the decision notice.
3. The Chairman moved the recommendation which received 8 votes for, 0 against, and 1 abstention.

**Actions / Further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

The Committee agreed to permit application RU21/0085, subject to the conditions outlined in the report and update sheet, along with an additional condition requiring quarterly reporting of the volumes and breakdown of materials imported and recycled at the aggregates recycling facility. It was also agreed to notify the ward member of the information. The final wording of the condition would be agreed upon in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman after the meeting.

**9/25 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 9]**

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 11.35 am

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank