

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 23 April 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
Mrs Carol Coleman
Mr Jonathan Essex
Mrs Margaret Hicks
Mr David Ivison
Mr George Johnson
Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
Mr Michael Sydney
Mr Richard Wilson

40/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were no apologies.

41/14 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed by the Committee.

42/14 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

43/14 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

44/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

45/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

There were none.

46/14 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION EL/2013/1251: WEYLANDS TREATMENT WORKS, LYON ROAD, WALTON ON THAMES, SURREY KT12 3PU [Item 7]

AN UPDATED SHEET WAS TABLED AND IS ATTACHED AS AN ANNEX TO THE MINUTES.

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager
 Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Mark O'Hare, Senior Planning Officer
 Barry Squibb, Noise Consultant
 Nancy el Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Speakers:

Joseph Hocking, a local resident made representations in objection to the application, points raised included:

1. The application is located on an unacceptable location on green belt land and would result in an increase in HGV traffic.
2. Although the applicant says the treatment works would treat local waste, there is also waste coming to the works from areas 30 miles away.
3. The increase of traffic and HGV movement would have a negative impact on daily life for residents in the area.
4. The current site is poorly maintained with an unauthorised access into the site. Permitting this application would increase poor maintenance of the works.

Mick Flanningan, a local resident made representations in objection to the application, points raised included:

1. One of the access roads into the site, Rydens Road is residential and not suitable for HGVs and large traffic movement.
2. There are six schools in the area which will be affected by the increase in HGV movements.
3. There have been a number of fatal accidents in the area which will increase with the increase in traffic movements. The guard rails at Hersham station have been damaged by HGV's coming in from the treatment works and a number of roads have also been damaged because of increased traffic movement.
4. The applicant is unclear on material being put into the treatment works so cannot assure safety to surrounding area.

Pamela Ling, local resident, made representations in objection to the application, Points raised included:

1. There will be no benefit to local residents but an increase in noise, congestion and pollution.

2. Although the applicant talks about enhancing the landscape, this would benefit residents very little as they won't be able to see the impact of this.
3. HGV access is better at other sites which should be deemed more suitable for treatment works.
4. Petitions have been signed in support of rejecting this application.

Kevin Gleeson, a local business owner, made representations in objection to the application, Points raised included:

1. The application is harmful and inappropriate in terms of green belt policy. Very special circumstances do not exist for increasing the current scale of this site.
2. The application is detrimental to local businesses for example; a new access to Lyon road would significantly disadvantage businesses in the area.
3. The information which has been provided in respect of traffic generation numbers is insufficient. The speaker suggested that traffic impact be listed as an additional reason for refusal.

The agents of the applicant, James Waterhouse and Richard Fitter addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

1. Very special circumstances exist for developing this site. The Surrey Waste Plan clearly states the requirement to dispose of waste in a safe manner.
2. The applicant has provided a full traffic impact assessment and states that there would be a less than 1% increase of traffic on roads except Lyon Road due to the application. There is a draft delivery service plan which would help minimise the impact of traffic.
3. Do not feel increase in traffic will affect highway capacity and amenity.
4. Improvements will be made to signage to the roads in the area.

Rachael I Lake, also addressed the Committee. Key points raised include,

1. The increase to the size of the site would be considerable if the application is permitted.
2. There would be detrimental affects to businesses in the area.
3. Roads around the area have been severely affected as they are not suitable for large HGV movements.
4. Member's allocation money has been put into Rydens Road to include a pedestrian crossing to improve safety measures.

Key Points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Planning Development Control Team Manager who explained that this was a large application for a sophisticated recycling process which would generate electricity and create renewable waste. The proposal includes a new access to the site with the rear including a restoration area. A petition has been submitted with over 2000 signatures with the main refusal on the grounds of impact to green belt. Officers have asked the applicant to provide information which has not been provided to the satisfaction of

officers. The site would be taking waste from a 30 mile radius catchment area. Officers feel that insufficient information has been provided to permit this application.

2. Members of the Committee agreed that the report from the officer was balanced and represented both sides of the argument for and against the application.
3. A Member commented that the application satisfied all the conditions identified in Surreys Waste Strategy and therefore it would be difficult to defend the rejection of this application at an appeal.
4. The county council sends out waste to various other parts of Surrey so having the applicant process waste from other areas should not be regarded as a major issue.
5. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that the site has a lawful use for waste processing. In response to a Member query about the difference in recommendations between Charlton Lane and Weylands it was stated that in the case of Charlton Lane, the applicant had supplied information on the origin of the waste to be handled but in the current application for Weylands there was no information about the source of waste arisings for the facility.
6. Members felt there was no clarity around what work was going on at the site during the Committees site visit. It was commented that there was a need for work on the site to be regulated as there was currently work going on which was not permitted.
7. Referring to figure 3, it was commented that the HGV drive times would greatly increase as waste was coming in from other areas around Surrey. This would potentially cause issues around parking for HGV's especially over night.
8. Some Members of the Committee felt it would be difficult to defend the application at an inquiry as there had been instances were similar applications had been permitted by the county planning authority. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained the main reasons for the officer's recommendation were because of a lack of information provided by the applicant.
9. Referring to the officer's recommendation three, the Transport Development Planning Team Manager explained that the NPPF permits refusal on transportation grounds when the cumulative impact of development is severe although insufficient information had been submitted with the application to determine whether the cumulative impact was severe or not.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That the application for EL/2013/1251: Weylands Treatment Works, Lyon Road, Walton on Thames, Surrey KT12 3PU is **REFUSED** for the reasons listed in the report.

Committee Next Steps:

None

The Committee adjourned from 11.45am to 11.55am.

47/14 MINERALS/WASTE RE/P/13/00944/CON: SALFORDS RAIL YARD, SALFORDS, REDHILL, SURREY RH1 5DE [Item 8]

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager
 Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Mark O'Hare, Senior Planning Officer
 Barry Squibb, Noise Consultant
 Nancy el Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman explained that the local member for the area agreed with the views of the Parish council which are listed on paragraph 41 of the report.
2. The Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager introduced the report to the committee and explained the site was 4km south of Redhill and would be used as a rail related facility. The application provides a new dedicated access and has received objections from Salford and Sidlow parish councils and six residents. Key issues have been raised around traffic and access but no objections have been raised by technical consultees.
3. A member of the committee asked for more clarity in respect of the existing level of HGV trip generation from Salbrook Road. It was explained by the Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager that the level of HGV use on the site would be higher than the inspectors estimate. There was no breakdown for the number of HGV's that would be coming onto the site as the applicant had not submitted this information.
4. It was asked where this application was in terms of the waste hierarchy. The Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that the application met key development criteria. It was commented that material would be delivered to the site via rail and road but the figures for this were not available.

5. Operating hours were conditioned to be from 7am-5.30pm with no activities being carried outside of these hours. Conditions relating to hours of working and lighting had also been included as part of the report.
6. There was discussion from the Committee around including a condition limiting overall vehicle movement to and from the site. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that a limit on HGV numbers was not considered necessary by the County Highways Authority as there was already a condition proposed to limit the quantity of material to be processed.
7. A vote was taken and it was decided not to include a condition relating to vehicle movements.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That the application for RE/P/13/00944/CON: Salfords Rail Yard, Salfords, Redhill, Surrey RH1 5DE is **PERMITTED** subject to conditions set out in the report.

Committee Next Steps:

None

48/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSALS: EL2013/1469 AND EL2013/4366: LAND ADJOINING ARRAN WAY, ESHER; LAND AT GROVE FARM, ARRAN WAY AND CRANMERE PRIMARY SCHOOL, THE DRIVE, ESHER & LAND AT GROVE FARM (PART), OFF ARRAN WAY, ESHER, SURREY, KT10 8BE [Item 9]

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager
 Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Chris Northwood, Senior Planning Officer
 Nancy el Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Planning Development Control Team Manager who explained that the application had previously been discussed by the Committee at its meeting in February and had been deferred due to concerns raised over parking. Paragraph 3 of the report provides details of additional parking measures to be implemented.

2. Concerns were raised over parking for staff and drop off points which were addressed as key issues at the meeting in February. Although the school explained that they would have difficulty managing a car park, some Members felt there was more danger with not having a car park.
3. The possibility of agreeing to a unilateral undertaking was discussed.
4. Members commented that although parking was available on Douglas Road this would not fulfil the total number of parking spaces required to ease congestion around the school. Encouraging parents to park their cars on Douglas Road could also be seen as a possible risk for pedestrian's using the road.
5. Members queried additional parking spaces around the school. Officers commented that no additional spaces had been created but changes had been made to improving local roads and site storage for cycles. Officers explained that only a certain number of changes could be made when taking account of the space available.
6. The Chairman referred to an email from the head teacher of the school which explained that the senior leadership team and governors of the school were not in favour of a car park on the grounds of the school (attached as annex to the minutes). A Member of the Committee commented that although the school were not in favour of a car park this did not necessarily mean they did not want a car park.
7. It was commented that the costs for maintaining a car park could be a burden on the school as this cost would not be covered by the Local Authority.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That the application for EL2013/1469 AND EL2013/4366: Land adjoining Arran Way, Esher; land at Grove Farm, Arran Way and Cranmere Primary School, The Drive, Esher & Land at Grove Farm (part), off Arran Way, Esher, Surrey, KT10 8BE is **PERMITTED** subject to referral to the Secretary of State and subject to conditions set out in the report.

Committee Next Steps:

None

The committee adjourned for lunch from 1.05pm to 1.45pm. David Ivison sent his apologies for absence from the afternoon session of the Committee.

49/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL WA/2014/0105-LAND AT GRAYSWOOD C OF E INFANT SCHOOL, LOWER ROAD, GRAYSWOOD, SURREY GU27 2DR [Item 10]

AN UPDATED SHEET WAS TABLED AND IS ATTACHED AS AN ANNEX TO THE MINUTES.

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager
Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager
Nancy el Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Planning Development Control Team Manager who explained that the current application was on green belt land. The design of the building would accommodate a pitched roof which is in accordance with the current Victorian design of the building. The site of the school is not in close proximity to residential amenity and will require the removal of some trees.
2. A Member of the Committee raised concerns over the loss of six trees as part of the application and reasons why there was no proposal to replace these. The Planning Development Control Team Manager explained that because the loss of six trees was a small amount, it was not considered a biodiversity resource as such.
3. It was explained that a number of letters had been received in support of the proposal.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

RESOLVED:

That the application for WA/2014/0105-Land at Grayswood C of E Infant School, Lower Road, Grayswood, Surrey GU27 2DR is **PERMITTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Committee Next Steps:

None

50/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S LOCAL LIST: REQUEST FORMAL ADOPTION OF LOCAL LIST FOR THE VALIDATION OF COUNTY DEVELOPMENT AND COUNTY MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATIONS [Item 11]

Declarations of interest:

None

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager
 Alan Stones, Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Control Team Manager
 Nancy el Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers clarified that the local list requirements is significantly more detailed and makes cross reference with the national list.
2. It was explained that the government had introduced a power for the applicant to put forward a challenge to the planning authority on any information it disagreed with on the local list.
3. Members of the Committee asked officers for a copy of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The Planning Development Control Team Manager stated that he would email an electronic copy to Members of the Committee.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

For Members of the Committee to be sent a copy of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

RESOLVED:

That the Planning and Regulatory Committee formally adopt the local list of validation of county development and county matters planning applications.

Committee Next Steps:

None

51/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The next meeting will be held on 21 May 2014 in the Ashcombe, County Hall.

Chairman

UPDATE SHEET TO AGENDA ITEM 7

Planning and Regulatory Committee 23 April 2014

Minerals and Waste Application: EL/2013/1251

Site: Weylands Treatment Works, Lyon Road, Walton on Thames, Surrey KT12 3PU

Application: Development of a Waste Recycling and Recovery Park on a site of 10.74 hectares (ha), with a new access to Lyon Road (closing the Molesey Road access), comprising: (detailed/full application) a 5, 300 m² 6MWe Autoclave and Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility incorporating offices, staff welfare and an education centre, with a 25 m Stack, 4no. AD Tanks, a 4 m Stack, 16 no. parking spaces, other associated infrastructure, and a 3.33 ha Restoration Area; and (outline application with all matters reserved excluding access and scale) a 1.76 ha Materials Recycling Facility, a 0.93 ha Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Area, a 0.61 ha Skip Hire Facility, and a 0.57 ha Storage/Distribution (B8) and Light Industry (B1C) area, with associated infrastructure

Please note the Committee Report should be amended / corrected as follows:

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

Paragraph 26: In a letter date 11 April 2014, Elmbridge Borough Council responded to the receipt of further information from the applicant in February 2014 as follows:

“It is considered that notwithstanding the findings of the Vehicle Kilometre Saving Report that this is not considered to overcome objection reason (iii), namely that the proposed development would result in a detrimental impact on traffic levels in the surrounding area and local infrastructure due to the lack of suitability of the local road network, contrary to the provisions of saved Policies MOV4 and MOV15 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000 and Policy CS25 of the Core Strategy 2011. Similarly, it is not considered that the evidence put forward is adequate to overcome objection reason (i) namely that the case for very special circumstances is insufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, nor does the evidence address objection reason (ii) concerning potential impacts of emissions from the proposed anaerobic digestion plant on surrounding residential areas.”

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

Paragraph 56: As of 22 April 2014, a petition has been received by the County Planning Authority with 2663 signatures, which raised objections for the following reasons: ‘the residential roads surrounding the Hersham Trading Estate are unsuitable for the volumes of predicted HGV traffic’; and ‘expansion of the current operation is unacceptable over-development of this small Green Belt site’

Paragraph 58: As of 22 April 2014, 768 residents have responded via email / letter.

Officers note: In response to the above, Officers consider that no additional points to those set out in the Committee Report have been raised.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Gillian Freeman
To: Cllr John Furey
Date: 11/04/2014 12:22
Subject: Cranmere Primary School expansion plans

Dear John,

I should like to confirm that the Governors and Senior Leadership Team are not in favour of a 200 space car park on the grounds of the new build. We would not have the resources to maintain or man this area, and we do not believe that access to such a car park would be feasible along the narrow entry road of Arran Way.

If the creation of this car park is the only way that planning approval would be granted, we would have to find a way to make this work. We would rather have a new school with a problematic car park than lose our new school.

We do, however, wish that more car parking spaces could be provided for staff and visiting professionals. Maintaining the existing ratio of provision is not realistic, as we currently have insufficient places for our staff. Although several are part time, they all arrive to start work at 9am and are all in school every morning. We feel that, if the plans could be adapted to allow more spaces to keep staff and visitors off the surrounding roads, this would be a real benefit to neighbours, as, unlike parents' cars dropping off and collecting, staff cars would be there all day.

We also feel that providing more staff car parking would give a message to the planning committee that there is a willingness to compromise to meet their concerns.

I am sending this e-mail from my private address as the school holidays make it more difficult to access my school e-mails, but I am happy to be contacted either via head@cranmere.surrey.sch.uk or this account.

Thank you for your words of encouragement today.
With best wishes,

Gillian Freeman
Headteacher, Cranmere Primary School

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning and Regulatory Committee

Item 10

Surrey County Council Proposal – Regulation 3: WA/2014/0105 Land at Grayswood C of E Infant School, Lower Road, Grayswood, Surrey GU27 2DR

Update, 22nd April 2014

Under

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

Surrey Hills Planning Adviser (AONB) – *delete* 'comments awaited' *insert*

'From an AONB aspect the principle of the development to meet locally generated needs is supported. Surrey Hills Management Plan 2009 - 2014 Policy LU7 actually encourages development in support of local communities. It reads as follows:

“Proposals which support the social and economic wellbeing of the AONB and its communities, including affordable housing, will be encouraged providing they do not conflict with the aim of conserving and enhancing natural beauty.”

A similarly worded policy was been included in the consultation draft management plan 2014 – 2019 and currently proposed final plan the Surrey Hills AONB Board is recommended at its meeting on 16 April to commend to the constituent Surrey Hills planning authorities.

It is difficult to think of another development that would be more deserving in an AONB village than a school for local young children. As in other areas of Surrey the local demand for Infant/ First School places is outstripping the scope for existing school buildings to accommodate them.

The site is located adjacent to the village cricket green and together with the pub all form the central feature of Grayswood. Due to the contours of the land and some existing tree cover the site and the proposed development would not interact with the wider landscape. Therefore any development impact would be very local. The main public viewpoint would be a little distance away from the A286 Grayswood Road where any buildings would be seen against a treed backcloth. There are also some boundary trees but they cannot be relied upon to be in existence during the lifetime of the development. The main proposed buildings would also be located in the generally less noticeable part of the site.

I consider that the form and design of the proposed extensions have been sensitively handled. The articulated layout and form of the proposed total development would be appropriate to its village setting and the elevational design reflects some of the architectural elements of the existing school building. The result should be an attractive development where it should be evident that a successful effort has been made for the development to sit comfortably within this part of Grayswood. I would have preferred for there not to have been the large rooflights on the village green side of the hall. In this tallest and bulkiest part of the development the rooflights are likely to reflect light and draw attention to the large roof and be a less sensitive design element compared to the remainder of the development. However, I do not

feel strongly about this point and am not sure how publicly noticeable they would be in practice.

Care will be needed over the choice of external materials including the need for plain roofing tiles and brickwork to match existing and the colour of any staining of the vertical timber cladding.'

(Officer comment: The comments made regarding the rooflights are noted and have been further considered by officers. The rooflights are proposed to provide satisfactory daylighting within the hall and minimise the use of artificial light. They cannot be located on the other slope as this is to be used for photovoltaic cells as that elevation faces south. Given the tree screening it is not considered that the rooflights will be unduly prominent in the landscape.)

Dawn Horton-Baker