

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE **DATE:** 10 December 2014
BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL TEAM
MANAGER
DISTRICT(S) SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL **ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**
Staines
Mrs Saliagopoulos

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION **GRID REF:** 505309 172122

TITLE: MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION SP13/00956/SCC

SUMMARY REPORT

Land at Hengrove Farm, London Road, Staines

Importation of 'as raised' sand and gravel from Homers Farm on to land at Hengrove Farm and processing involving continued use of the existing processing plant and associated mineral infrastructure until 30 November 2018.

This proposal would enable 0.749 mt of concreting aggregates to be worked at Preferred Area G: Homers Farm, Bedfont by utilising the existing mineral processing plant at the application site. The applicant has stated that there is insufficient space to accommodate the processing plant and ancillary development such as a silt lagoon at Homers Farm. They are therefore seeking to transport the mineral approximately 2 km south west along the A30 to the application site for processing. The mineral working at Hengrove Farm is also operated by the applicant.

Mineral extraction and restoration at Hengrove Farm has been delayed following the granting of planning permission for a number of short term extensions of time including to allow for an easterly quarry extension onto land known as Hengrove Park. However, this quarry extension did allow a workable high quality mineral reserve to be extracted and processed as part of a single operation through an existing site. This was in accordance with the principle of sustainable development by making the most efficient use of resources and avoiding the sterilisation of minerals.

Unfortunately, despite being granted planning permission in August 2009, mineral extraction at Hengrove Park was delayed until October 2012 due to a number of unforeseen delays having been encountered during the preliminary stages. These included the signing of the lease to work the land, agreements having to be reached on the relocation of the bund and erection of the close boarded fence along the boundary with Ashford Park Primary School; the archaeological works having taken longer at the site than originally anticipated after evidence of materials of Saxon origin having been found; and needing to reach an agreed methodology with the Environment Agency for positioning of the clay seal around the site.

However, mineral extraction at Hengrove Farm has now largely ceased although there is understood to be a relatively small quantity of sand and gravel reserves remaining beneath the processing plant which would be worked following the processing of the mineral to be extracted at Homers Farm.

Objections have been raised by Spelthorne Borough Council and the Ashford North Residents Association. However, technical consultees, such as the Environment Agency and the Highways Agency, raise no objection subject to conditions being attached to any planning permission.

The site is within the Green Belt, however policy states that mineral working need not be inappropriate, as long as high environmental standards are maintained, and the site is restored to an afteruse that is in keeping with Green Belt policy. This site would be restored (via separate planning application SP/13/00958/SCC) and there is no reason to believe that high environmental standards would not be maintained during the working and subsequent restoration at the site. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect upon the environment or upon local amenity, with the imposition of the proposed conditions. Officers therefore consider the proposals are in line with the NPPF and the development plan

The recommendation is PERMIT, subject to conditions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Henry Streeter (Sand and Ballast) Ltd

Date application valid

17 June 2013

Period for Determination

7 October 2013 (extension agreed until 16 January 2015)

Amending Documents

- Additional Environmental Statement Addendum 2013
- Email from applicant received on 17 October 2013
- Proposed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy received 28 October 2014

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES

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

	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Need for the development	Yes	45-58
Restoration & Aftercare	Yes	59-62
Hydrology and Flood Risk	Yes	66-77
Noise	Yes	78-82
Air Quality	Yes	83-86
Ecology	Yes	87-89
Landscape & visual impact	Yes	90
Birdstrike	Yes	91
Archaeology	Yes	92-95
Traffic and Transport	Yes	96-102
Green Belt	Yes	104-106

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Plans

Plan 1 - Site Plan

Plan 2 - Drawing no 518/32C – Proposed Revised Site Layout

Plan 3 – Plan showing separate application site areas for ref SP/13/00956/SCC;
SP/13/00958/SCC & SP/14/00570/SCC

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1 – Land at Hengrove Farm

Aerial 2 – Application site area

Site Photographs

Photograph 1: looking north over restored area of Hengrove Farm with processing plant in the background

Photograph 2: processing plant

Photograph 3: processing plant and area

Photograph 4: site offices

Photograph 5: stockpiling area

BACKGROUND

Site Description

1. The application site known as Hengrove Farm is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt some 1.5 km east of Staines and 1 km north west of Ashford. Hengrove Farm is bounded and accessible from the London Road (A30) to the north, beyond that is the Staines South Reservoir. Staines South Reservoir is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and part of the South West London Waterbodies Site a Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site. The western boundary of the existing quarry abuts a cemetery and allotments and further to the west are the residential properties of Shortwood Avenue. The southern boundary of the application site is formed by footpath 26. To the south east of Hengrove Farm quarry beyond Footpath No 26 lie the three ponds and the grounds of the Ashford Fish Farm. The footpath divides the south-western section of the site. The small part of the site to the south of the footpath has been designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and as an area liable to flood. Further to the west lies the Shortwood Common SSSI.
2. The north eastern boundary of Hengrove Farm quarry currently abuts Hengrove Park, a recreation ground, which is being worked for sand and gravel. The south eastern boundary of Hengrove Farm abuts a strip of land that has formerly been worked for sand and gravel and restored to agriculture but is currently being used as a temporary recreation ground whilst mineral extraction takes place at Hengrove Park. Immediately beyond the temporary recreation ground lies Ashford Park Primary School and its playing fields.

Planning History

3. Planning permission (ref: SP97/0399) for the extraction of sand and gravel at Hengrove Farm with the formation of a new access to the A30, the erection of processing plant, the refilling with inert wastes and progressive restoration to agriculture was approved on 24 June 1999. Details of mitigation for the proposed SNCI on the southern portion of the site (ref: SP00/0527), a scheme of archaeological investigation (ref: SP99/0563) and an aftercare scheme (ref: SP02/0350) were approved in May 2002.

4. Planning permission was granted (ref: SP05/0517) in August 2005 for the extraction of sand and gravel from an area of some 1.8ha (a strip of land that was then currently in agricultural use between the existing quarry site and the boundary of Ashford Park Primary School playing field) as an extension to the existing Hengrove Farm site to be carried out over an 18-month period. Planning permission was granted (ref: SP05/0635) in September 2005 to continue activities and utilisation of ancillary mineral infrastructure at Hengrove Farm for a further 18 months whilst mineral was extracted from the adjoining 1.8ha of land. Details of a scheme for surface water drainage pursuant to Condition 29 of planning permission Ref: SP05/0517 was approved in November 2005 (ref: SP05/00863).
 5. Planning permission was granted (ref: SP09/0102) in August 2009 for the extraction of sand and gravel from a site known as Hengrove Park of some 3.7 hectares, relocation of existing bund, creation of further bunds, refilling with inert wastes and progressive restoration to agriculture and recreation; and a temporary change of use of some 0.9 hectares at Hengrove Farm from agriculture to recreation. Two concurrent applications, one being for an extension of time for extraction of sand and gravel until December 2012 and the subsequent restoration of Hengrove Farm by June 2013 (ref: SP09/0190) and the other being for an extension of time for retention of a barn until June 2013 and retention of a lean-to building until September 2013 (ref: SP09/0189) were also submitted alongside SP09/0102 and permitted in June 2009. These were to enable mineral extracted at Hengrove Park to be processed at the Hengrove Farm processing plant and transported from the site via the A30.
 6. Planning permission was granted (ref: SP11/0223) in December 2011 for an extension of time for the completion of mineral extraction at Hengrove Park by 31 December 2012 and restoration of the land to recreation use by 30 September 2013 and restoration of the temporary recreational land to agriculture by 30 September 2014 without compliance with Conditions 3, 4 and 5 of planning permission ref: SP09/0102.
 7. Two concurrent applications, one being for a further extension of time for the completion of mineral extraction at Hengrove Park and subsequent restoration by 30 September 2014 with restoration of the temporary recreation ground to agriculture by 30 September 2015 (ref: SP12/01421); and the other being for an extension of time for completion of mineral extraction and restoration at Hengrove Farm by 31 December 2015 (ref: SP12/01416) were permitted on 18 December 2012.
 8. Planning permission was approved on 2 July 2014 (ref SP/14/00570/SCC) for the continued extraction of sand and gravel from a site of 3.7 hectares, relocation of existing bund, creation of further bunds, refilling with inert waste and progressive restoration to agriculture and recreation and a temporary change of use of 0.9 hectares at Hengrove Farm from agriculture to recreation; with the completion of site restoration by 30 September 2014, and the return of the temporary recreation area to agriculture by 30 September 2015; without compliance with Conditions 1, 7 and 32 of planning permission ref: SP12/1421 dated 18 December 2012, so as to allow the site to be restored in accordance with a revised restoration plan.
 9. Two concurrent planning applications at land at Hengrove Farm (ref SP/13/00958/SCC) and Homers Farm (ref SP/13/00141/SCC) are due to be considered at today's Planning & Regulatory Committee. Plan 3 attached to this report shows the separate application site areas for references SP/13/00956/SCC; SP/13/00958/SCC and SP/14/00570/SCC.
-

THE PROPOSAL

10. The applicant has submitted planning application ref: SP13/00141 to the County Planning Authority (CPA) seeking planning permission for the extraction of sand and gravel from some 10.5ha of land at Homers Farm with a new access to Short Lane and associated infrastructure. Homers Farm is some 2km north east of Hengrove Farm adjacent to the A30.
11. The applicant does not intend to process the sand and gravel at Homers Farm as the applicant states there is not the space there for the processing plant and ancillary elements that would be required i.e. a silt lagoon. Instead the applicant is seeking to transport the sand and gravel by heavy goods vehicle (HGV) from Homers Farm to Hengrove Farm via the A30 for the sand and gravel to be processed using Hengrove Farm's processing plant and associated mineral infrastructure. The applicant states that mineral extraction at Homers Farm would cease December 2018. If the planning application ref: SP13/00141 were to be permitted, planning permission is therefore required for the importation of sand and gravel from Homers Farm to Hengrove Farm as 'as raised' mineral (i.e. mineral extracted from a site that is then transported to another site for processing). The applicant is seeking planning permission to enable this to happen at Hengrove Farm for a period until December 2018. The proposal would result in approximately 50 two way HGV movements per day taking mineral from Homers Farm to Hengrove Farm and back to Homers Farm along the A30.
12. The applicant also proposes, as part of this application, to reduce the operational area of Hengrove Farm to the minimum area required for processing mineral, i.e. around the plant, silt lagoon, stockpiling area and ancillary structures. The aim of this is to minimise the working area and limit its impact on the Green Belt and landscape for the proposed extended period of time that the site would remain operational for if SP13/00141 were to be permitted. This would involve moving the perimeter bunds currently around Hengrove Farm, away from residential properties to the east and moving them further northwards.
13. The separate proposal for extraction at Homers Farm was originally submitted in combination with proposals for the importation of 'as raised' mineral into Hengrove Farm, in addition to the delayed restoration of Hengrove Farm. Filling of Hengrove Farm is now complete, other than the area which is now proposed for processing mineral from Homers Farm. In 2013, the applicant provided a cumulative impact assessment of the potential traffic impact of all HGVs from Homers and Hengrove, covering traffic and air quality issues.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

14. Spelthorne Borough Council: Strongly object on the grounds that it would result in an unacceptable extension of time of processing until 2018.
15. Spelthorne Borough Council Pollution Control Officer (PCO):
"Environmental Health have not received any complaints regarding dust nuisance from the existing processing plant at Hengrove Farm within the last three years, therefore it is considered that the dust management measures currently employed on site through the Dust Management Plan are sufficient to control dust and avoid nuisance complaints from the nearest receptor locations. However, continued boundary monitoring from October 2012 identified an episode where one of the dust monitors (located on the northeastern site boundary) was close to but did not exceed the trigger level stated in the Dust Monitoring Scheme and Action Plan."

In consideration of the current application for the importation of 'as raised' sand and gravel and continued use of the processing plant the potential for significant dust is likely to be greater during the moving and re-siting of the bunds if not controlled appropriately. The Partridge Associates drawing no. 518/32C 'Proposed Revised Site Layout' indicates that the existing western bund will remain in situ with only the eastern bund being relocated further west thereby increasing the buffer distance between the residential properties fronting London Road and the edge of operations. The drawing illustrates that the eastern bund is to be constructed to a height of 5.0m and seeded. It is unclear from the application how long the works to relocate the existing bunds will take, what the timescales are between relocation and seeding (therefore reducing the potential for wind whipping) and what mitigation measures will be employed to manage the materials during the process.

The applicant currently has a Dust Action plan and Dust Monitoring Plan in place which provides mitigation measures employed during the continued use of the processing plant. The control of dust to acceptable levels during the relocation of the bunds will therefore be reliant on the continued implementation of these measures on the proposed works which form part of continued operations at the site. We would recommend therefore that the measures outlined in the Dust Action Plan and ongoing boundary monitoring as per the Dust Monitoring Plan are continued through the works detailed with this application and that this be secured by condition.

Environmental Health received a complaint regarding odour from the site from a resident in Kenilworth Road (to the northeast of the site) in June 2012. The odours were traced to the stripping of overburden within the Hengrove Park extension works. Given the duration of time the existing bunds have been in-situ there is potential that the excavation, exposure and movement of these materials may give rise to similar odours. Are the applicants able to demonstrate what mitigation measures are in place to control potential odours from the works? If permission is granted, can the control of odours from the exposure of long term stockpiles be controlled by appropriate condition?"

Officer's note: The applicant responded to the comment of Spelthorne's PCO that they had no knowledge of any odour complaints from the site when it was being stripped. The applicant highlighted that there would be no reason why the moving of the existing bunds, which are composed totally of soils, should cause any odour. The applicant confirmed that moving the bunds would take from 4-6 weeks, which would then be seeded immediately. The County Air Quality Consultant's comments on dust are provided later in this report.

16. Hounslow Borough Council (Neighbouring Authority): *'It is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the highways network within the London Borough of Hounslow. The processing of minerals using existing plant at Hengrove rather than setting up a new facility at Homers Farm is preferred in terms of its visual impact on the Borough's Green Belt.'*

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

17. County Environmental Assessment Officer: On 23 April 2013, the County Environmental Assessment team issued a Screening Opinion stating this application is not considered, in isolation, to constitute 'EIA development'. However, given that this application and the other Hengrove application (ref SP13/0955/SCC) are fundamentally linked to the Homers application (ref SP/13/00141/SCC), and taking account of the likelihood of significant cumulative effects, it is the opinion of the County Planning Authority that in-combination of the three proposals constitute EIA development. As such, the CPA requested that the ES submitted in support of the separate Homers application was updated (via a Regulation 22 response) to reflect the combined impacts of the three applications and this was done (see application ref SP/13/00141/SCC considered at today's meeting).

18. County Air Quality Consultant (CAQC): No objection.
19. Highways Agency: No objection, subject to conditions
20. County Highway Authority (CHA): The proposal would result in an increase of HGVs on both carriageway that would be less than half the capacity the A30 can carry. The Highways Agency are responsible for the A30 and they have no objection to the proposal.
21. Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions.
22. County Noise Consultant: No objection.
23. Natural England: "As Hengrove Farm has been operational as a working quarry and has been processing material for a few years, we do not anticipate that continued processing (of material from Homers Farm) will be an issue with the nearby SSSI".
24. County Landscape Architect: No objection.
25. County Geological Consultant: No objection or necessary conditions.
26. County Ecologist: No ecological grounds for refusal, scheme of mitigation already approved, no conditions or informatives required.
27. County Archaeologist: No objection.
28. Thames Water: No objection with regard to sewerage infrastructure.
29. Affinity Water: No response.
30. BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding: No objection.
31. English Heritage: No objection.
32. Surrey Wildlife Trust: No objection.
33. Health and Safety Executive: No response.
34. National Grid: No objection subject to informatives.
35. Ministry of Defence (RAF Northholt): No objection.

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

36. Ashford North Residents Association: Object for the following reasons:
 - On-going impact on homes from noise, dust and vehicles
 - After heavy rain surface water fails to drain away, which will exacerbate flooding
 - Site is close to Shortwood Common, impact on SSSI
 - Further extensions of time are unacceptable/not justified
 - A precedent might be created, the applicant might find other sites and Hengrove would remain open indefinitely
 - Impact on house prices
 - Lorries leaving the site are causing danger on the A30 and are speeding
 - The wheel wash is not working properly with sand and gravel deposited on the road
 - Constant beeping of lorries causes disturbance
37. Staines Town Society: No response.

38. The Neighbourhood Society (Ashford): No response.
39. Stanwell Village Residents Association: no response.
40. Shortwood Common Residents Association: No response.

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

41. The application was publicised by the posting of 3 site notices. Further, an advert was placed in a local newspaper (Herald and News). A total of 749 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. A total of 2 letters of representation were received for this application, raising the following relevant comments on this application (*rather than the Homers application considered at today's meeting*):
- The proposal would cause too much inconvenience by 50 ballast lorries crossing the A30 daily from Homers to Hengrove.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

42. The County Council as Minerals Planning Authority (for clarity, Officers refer to the County Council as the County Planning Authority – ‘CPA’ elsewhere in this report) has a duty under Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to determine this application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. At present in relation to this application the Development Plan consists of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD (2009), Allocations DPD (2009); and the Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 Saved Policies.
43. On the 27 March 2012 Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Technical Guidance), which took immediate effect. The NPPF replaces 30 Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance Notes, Minerals Policy Statements and Minerals Policy Guidance Notes and related Practice Guides, some Circulars and letters to Chief Planning Officers and constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and decision-takers in relation to decision-taking (determining planning applications) and in preparing plans. The new National Planning Policy for Waste was published on 16 October 2014 and replaces Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) Planning for Sustainable Waste Management.
44. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which the document states should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. The NPPF makes clear the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which has three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. These give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of mutually dependent roles: an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. The NPPF sets out 12 core land-use planning principles that should underpin both decision-taking and plan making. The Government launched an on-line version of National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on 6 March 2014 to support the NPPF.

MINERALS DEVELOPMENT AND NEED

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Policy MC1 – Spatial strategy – location of mineral development in Surrey

Policy MC7 – Aggregates Mineral Supply

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document

Policy MA1 – Aggregate Supply

Policy MA2 – Preferred areas for concreting aggregate

45. The NPPF and its technical guidance sets out the Government's approach on the management and planning's role with regard to minerals. Paragraph 142 states that minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life, and it is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. It explains that since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long term conservation. Paragraph 144 sets out a number of bullet points that should be considered when determining planning applications. Those that are relevant to this proposal include:
- giving great weight to the benefits of the mineral extraction including to the economy;
 - ensure in granting planning permission for mineral development that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/ or from a number of sites in a locality;
 - ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions are controlled, mitigated or removed at source and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties; and
 - provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards through the application of appropriate conditions and that bonds or other financial guarantees to underpin planning conditions should only be sought in exceptional circumstances.
46. Paragraph 145 requires mineral planning authorities to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. The paragraph sets out a number of bullet points as to how this can be achieved including by preparing an annual Local Aggregate Assessment, taking account of published National and Sub National Guidelines on future provision, using landbanks of aggregates mineral reserves principally as an indicator of the security of aggregate minerals supply and to indicate the additional provision that needs to be made for new aggregate extraction. The paragraph recommends making provision for the maintenance of landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel. The length of the landbank is used to assess the balance of meeting the demand for aggregates and keeping the number of operations and permitted reserves to a minimum to reduce environmental consequences.
47. The Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD 2011 sets out the County Council's approach to the provision of mineral resources within the plan period up to 2026 alongside ensuring protection of the environment and residential amenities. Paragraph 1.7 recognises that minerals make a significant contribution to our quality of life with an adequate supply of aggregate minerals be required for building and repairing houses, roads, schools and hospitals. Policy MC1 sets the spatial strategy for the location of mineral development in Surrey. It states that mineral extraction of concreting aggregates will be concentrated on the river terrace gravels of the Thames in north west Surrey with preferred areas for future sand and gravel production being identified in the Primary Aggregates DPD. The application site is located within north west Surrey on the Thames gravels so the proposal meets the requirements of this policy.

48. The Core Strategy seeks to ensure a supply of aggregate minerals over the plan period for the county which echoes the requirements of the NPPF. Paragraph 5.12 states that proposals for mineral extraction within the preferred areas will be determined in the context of the apportionment to the county and the landbank position at the time when applications are considered. The paragraph goes on to say that the landbank position will be monitored annually and if below seven years, the deficit situation will be a material consideration in determining applications on preferred areas. Policy MC7 of the Core Strategy states that preferred areas will be identified in the Primary Aggregates DPD for soft sand and concreting aggregates which, with identified reserves, are sufficient to enable the production of around 24 million tonnes of aggregate between 2009 and 2026. The policy goes on to state that the mineral planning authority will seek to maintain a landbank of at least seven years for aggregates based on the apportionment set in the regional spatial strategy (which has since been revoked). This enables production at an average rate of 1.4mtpa between 2009 and 2026.
49. The Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates DPD recognises that resources of primary aggregates, particularly concreting aggregate, are becoming increasingly scarce as remaining resources become more constrained; whether because of their potential impact on local communities or the environment or because they are too small to be economically viable. Policy MA1 of the Primary Aggregates DPD requires provision to be made for the supply of around 24 million tonnes of primary aggregates, comprising 15 million tonnes of concreting aggregate and 9 million tonnes of soft sand between 2009 and 2026. The policy states that preferred areas will be identified which together with permitted reserves will enable production of concreting aggregate at an average rate of 0.90mtpa. The policy does also state that in determining proposals for mineral working, regard will be paid to the level of permitted reserves, and the need to maintain continuity of supply in terms of an appropriate landbank.

Officer's assessment

50. Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD 2011 (SMP CS DPD) Policy MC7 states that preferred areas will be identified in the SMP Primary Aggregates DPD (SMP PA DPD) for soft sand and concreting aggregates which, with identified reserves, are sufficient to enable the production of around 24 million tonnes of aggregates between 2009 and 2026. Policy MA1 of the SMP PA DPD 2011 states that preferred areas will be identified, which together with permitted reserves will enable production of concreting aggregate at an average rate of 0.90 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) in the period 2009-2026. The County Council's recent Local Aggregate Assessment published in November 2014 (LAA) proposes no changes to the minerals provision rate contained in the SMP.
51. The results of the Aggregates Monitoring Survey 2013 indicate that reserves of concreting aggregates were 1.76 million tonnes at the end of 2013. This gives a landbank of just 1.9 years for concreting aggregates. There is therefore a pressing need to replenish permitted reserves of concreting aggregates in the county which are running very low. This proposal would enable 0.749 mt of concreting aggregates to be worked at Preferred Area G: Homers Farm, Bedfont by utilising the existing mineral processing plant at the application site. The applicant has stated that there is insufficient space to accommodate the processing plant and ancillary development such as a silt lagoon at Homers Farm. They are therefore seeking to transport the mineral approximately 2 km south west along the A30 to the application site for processing. The mineral working at Hengrove Farm is also operated by the applicant.

52. Mineral extraction and restoration at Hengrove Farm has been delayed following the granting of planning permission for a number of short term extensions of time including to allow for an easterly quarry extension onto land known as Hengrove Park. However, this quarry extension did allow a workable high quality mineral reserve to be extracted and processed as part of a single operation through an existing site. This was in accordance with the principle of sustainable development by making the most efficient use of resources and avoiding the sterilisation of minerals.
53. Unfortunately, despite being granted planning permission in August 2009, mineral extraction at Hengrove Park was delayed until October 2012 due to a number of unforeseen delays having been encountered during the preliminary stages. These included the signing of the lease to work the land, agreements having to be reached on the relocation of the bund and erection of the close boarded fence along the boundary with Ashford Park Primary School; the archaeological works having taken longer at the site than originally anticipated after evidence of materials of Saxon origin having been found; and needing to reach an agreed methodology with the Environment Agency for positioning of the clay seal around the site.
54. However, mineral extraction at Hengrove Farm has now largely ceased although there is understood to be a relatively small quantity of sand and gravel reserves remaining beneath the processing plant which would be worked following the processing of the mineral to be extracted at Homers Farm. The application site was last monitored on 2 September 2014 and the Site Visit Report indicated that the minerals processing plant had recently been operational to process the remainder of the site derived materials, with the processed saleable minerals stored in large stockpiles surrounding the processing plant. Furthermore, the report notes that infilling had been completed in the extension area in the eastern part of the site (Hengrove Park) with the land having been brought up to final levels. Landscaping and planting would need to be completed before the area could be re-opened to the public and this was expected to take place in October 2014.
55. Delays in restoration have environmental costs and NPPF paragraph 144 and SMP CS DPD Policy MC17 requires the restoration of mineral workings to be completed at the earliest opportunity and to a high standard. It is acknowledged that the proposal would further delay the completion of restoration at Hengrove Farm and prolong the impact of mineral activity with restoration being delayed by a further 5 years until December 2020. This will result in short term harm to the Green Belt as operations would continue for longer than was initially anticipated. Furthermore, it will also result in approximately 50 two way HGV movements per day taking mineral from Homers Farm to Hengrove Farm and back to Homers Farm along the A30 Trunk Road.
56. Nevertheless, these additional impacts are considered to be outweighed by other factors. These comprise: (i) enabling Preferred Area G: Homers Farm, Bedford identified in SMP PA DPD Policy MA2, to come forward for the extraction of 0.749 million tonnes of concreting aggregates; (ii) the urgent and pressing need to replenish dwindling permitted reserves of concreting aggregates to maintain continuity of supply; (iii) the resulting increase in the landbank for concreting aggregates by 0.8 years; (iv) reducing the requirement for ancillary development at Homers Farm enabling mineral extraction at the Preferred Area to commence more quickly, the impact of the development to be reduced, and for restoration to be completed at an earlier date; and (v) making effective use of existing mineral infrastructure in the locality. There are no reasons to indicate that the delay will prevent the application site from being restored to a high standard. Furthermore, the applicant is seeking as part of the proposal to minimise the impact of continuing mineral development at Hengrove Farm by reducing the operational area of the site to the minimum area required for processing the mineral. This will reduce the impact of continuing mineral activity on the openness of the Green Belt and also help to limit the landscape impacts of the development.

57. Spelthorne Borough Council strongly object to this application, on the grounds that it would result in an unacceptable extension of time of processing until 2018, though Officers note that they have raised no objection to the current Homers Farm application (ref SP/13/00141/SCC) which would export 'as raised' sand and gravel to the application site. Separately, residents argue that further extensions should not be allowed at this site and they are concerned that the site would remain open indefinitely.
58. On the basis of the factors outlined above, however, Officers consider that the proposal would comply with government advice set out in the NPPF in terms of taking account of the need to supply a range of aggregates, the locations of permitted reserves relative to markets and the productive capacity of permitted sites. Officers note that suitable conditions can be attached to any planning permission (and enforced) to ensure the cessation of activities on or before 30 November 2018, in order that the site be restored to agriculture by 31 December 2020 (i.e. via planning application ref SP13/00958/SCC).

RESTORATION & AFTERCARE

Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD 2011

Policy MC17 – Restoring Mineral Workings

Policy MC18 – Restoration and Enhancement

Surrey Minerals Plan Site Restoration SPD 2011

Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009

Policy EN8 – Protecting and Improving the Landscape and Biodiversity

59. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that land worked for mineral extraction should be reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place, taking account of biodiversity and recreation amongst other factors. Paragraph 144 states that restoration and aftercare should be carried out to high environmental standards. Policy MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD 2011 states that the mineral planning authority will encourage and work with mineral operators and landowners to deliver benefits such as enhancement of biodiversity interests and improved public access. Policy MC17 states that restored sites should be sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area. Surrey Minerals Plan Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document 2011 states that there will be continuing demand for agricultural restoration and agricultural after-use remains an important element in restoration of mineral sites in Surrey.
60. Policy EN8 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 states that the Council will seek to protect and improve the landscape and biodiversity of the Borough by a number of measures including working with partners in the public, private and voluntary sectors to develop and secure the implementation of projects to enhance the landscape and create or improve habitats of nature conservation value, and to secure the more effective management of land in the Borough; and ensuring that new development, wherever possible, contributes to an improvement in the landscape and biodiversity and also avoids harm to features of significance in the landscape or of nature conservation interest; It also states that the Council will safeguard the Borough's Common Land and work with other interested parties to protect and where appropriate enhance its nature conservation and recreation value.
61. Whilst areas of the site have been worked, filled and restored, the processing plant and stockpiling areas have not been worked for minerals as yet. Prior to extraction, Hengrove Farm was in arable use and it is still proposed to restore the site to an agricultural afteruse in accordance with the restoration requirements of planning permission SP97/0399 dated June 1999 and the detailed scheme of aftercare approved in May 2002 (ref: SP02/0350). This proposal would delay the restoration but there is no reason to believe that this delay would have an unacceptable impact nor result in the standard of restoration not meeting the Green Belt policy requirement of providing a good quality restoration. This proposal accords with the principles of sustainable development by

making the best and most efficient use of available resources and avoiding sterilisation of minerals.

62. The application site is therefore to be restored to an agricultural afteruse in accordance with the restoration requirements of planning permission SP97/0399 dated June 1999 and the detailed scheme of aftercare approved in May 2002 (ref: SP02/0350). There is a part overlap of the approved schemes from 1999 and 2002 and the more recent 2014 planning permission. As noted above, planning permission was approved on 2 July 2014 (ref SP/14/00570/SCC) to allow the area of Hengrove Park (northeast of the application area) and a strip of land adjoining the western boundary of Ashford Park Primary School (southeast of the application site) to be restored in accordance with a revised restoration plan. The conditions at the end of this report therefore refer to those previously (and not since superseded) approved drawings dated 1997 (restoration and contours) and 2002 (aftercare and planting). For example, Condition 16 below states: *'All restoration and landscape planting shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the Planting Plan Drawing No 518/12B dated February 2002 approved under consent Ref: SP02/0350 dated 20 May 2002 and the landscape restoration plan 518/11A Dated June 1997, as amended by planning permission ref SP/14/00570/SCC dated 2 July 2014.'* Officers consider that subject to the appropriate conditions, the application accords with relevant policy and guidance in terms of the site's restoration by 31 December 2020.

ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Policy MC14 - Reducing the adverse impacts of mineral development

Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009

Policy SP6 – Maintaining and Improving the Environment

63. Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Core Strategy DPD recognises that minerals development proposals can impact on a number of environmental areas. The policy states that minerals development will be permitted only where a need has been demonstrated and sufficient information has been provided so that the minerals planning authority can be satisfied that there would be no significant adverse impacts arising from the development. The policy requires potential impacts relating to a number of issues to be considered. In relation to this proposal the relevant issues are noise, dust, fumes, vibration and illumination including that from traffic (i), flood risk and land drainage (ii), the appearance, quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness (iii), the natural environment including biodiversity (iv), sites of potential archaeological interest or their setting (v), soil resources (vii), the need to manage risk of bird striking aircraft (viii), cumulative impacts arising from the interactions between mineral developments and between mineral and other forms of developments (ix); and any other matters (x).
64. Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD Policy SP6 (Maintaining and Improving the Environment) seeks to improve the quality of the boroughs environment by contributing to improving air quality within the borough, protecting and enhancing areas of existing environmental character including SNCIs, areas of landscape value and areas of open space of recreational and amenity value; and promoting improvement of poor quality environments both within the Green Belt. The NPPF paragraph 109 sets out the broad terms that the document seeks to undertake with regard to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. It states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: 1) Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; 2) Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; 3) Minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible; and 4) Prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

65. On 23 April 2013, the County Environmental Assessment team issued a Screening Opinion stating this application is not considered, in isolation, to constitute EIA development. However, given that this application and the other Hengrove application (ref SP13/0955/SCC) are fundamentally linked to the Homers application (ref SP/13/00141/SCC), and taking account of the likelihood of significant cumulative effects, it is the opinion to the County Planning Authority that in-combination of the three proposals constitute EIA development. As such, the CPA requested that the ES submitted in support of the Homers application was updated (via a Regulation 22 response) to reflect the combined impacts of the three applications.

Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Flood Risk

66. The NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by applying the Sequential Test; then if necessary, applying the Exception Test; safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management; using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding; and where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to facilitate the relocation of development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.
67. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the Sequential Test, and if required the Exception Test, it can be demonstrated that: 1) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; and 2) development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including by emergency planning; and it gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems. The technical guidance to the NPPF states that a site-specific flood risk assessment is required for all proposals greater than 1ha in Flood Zone 1. This should consider the vulnerability of the site to flooding from other sources as well as river and sea flooding, the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere through the addition of hard surfaces and the effect of the development on surface water run-off.
68. Policy LO1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD seeks to reduce flood risk within the borough and sets out a number of ways the policy intends to do this including refusing applications made in Flood Zone 3 that reduce storage capacity, requiring all development proposals over 0.5ha within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA); and not permitting residential development or change of use or other 'more vulnerable' uses within Zone 3a or 'highly vulnerable uses' within Zone 2 where flood risks cannot be overcome. Spelthorne Borough Council's Flooding Supplementary Planning Document states that all land uses are acceptable within Zone 1.

Submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)

69. The applicant sets out that Hengrove Farm is shown to be located partially within Flood Zone 2 by the Environment Agency flood map, while the Spelthorne Borough SFRA indicates that part of the site may be impacted by the 1:100 +20% flood. However, given the relatively short term nature of the proposals, the predicted future 1:100 year flood level was not considered strictly relevant for the purposes of the submitted FRA. The overall flooding risk to the site was considered to be low, and given that the site is an existing mineral processing site, the importation of gravels from Homers Farm was not considered likely to have any significant impacts in terms of flooding. Safety risks at the site associated with flooding were considered to be low by the applicant and not affected by the import of material. Although the site is on the edge of the 1:1000 year floodplain, the applicant highlights that the flood maps indicate that dry access and egress would be available via the main site entrance from the A30.
70. In respect of surface water management, the applicant sets out that the site comprises rough ground with limited hardstanding located close to the entrance. Drainage is via infiltration and run-off, primarily to the silt pond which occupies a significant of the reduced site that would be operational during the importation of material from Homers Farm. The applicant sets out that there would no changes to the site drainage as a result of the proposals and they understand that water from silt pond is discharged via an outfall. Nevertheless, the applicant notes that there would be no new discharge and no increase in the discharge rate as a result of the proposals.
71. Given the site's location, the applicant notes that there would be a number of indicators of potential flooding before the site was affected, such as prolonged heavy rain, flooding of nearby higher risk areas and warnings from the Environment Agency and local media. Drainage is currently via infiltration and run-off, primarily to a silt pond which covers a significant proportion of the site that would be operational during the import of material from Homers Farm. As such, the applicant argues that there would be no significant impact on the site drainage or on run-off rates from the site as a result of the proposals.

Officer's assessment

72. The County Geotechnical Consultant (CGC) commented on this application and noted that the site is partly in the EA's Flood Zones 1 and 2. The CGC also noted that the noise bunds are some of the stockpiles are partly within the area shown as Flood Zone 2. Mineral workings and processing (except for sand and gravel working) were noted to be classified as 'less vulnerable' within the NPPG and appropriate to all flood zones except Flood Zone 3b. The CGC noted that as the proposal are temporary and short term, the impact of climate change is not relevant and the appropriate 'design event' for considering the impact on flood risk is the 1 in 100 year event. The bunds and stockpiles were noted to be located outside the modelled 1 in 100 year flood extent and therefore no mitigation was required for the loss of flood storage. Additionally, the CGC noted that there was no impact on flood flows and safe access and egress were available. Overall, the CGC confirmed that the FRA was appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposals and was in accordance with the NPPG.
73. The Environment Agency (EA) also commented on this application in July 2013 and stated that the proposed development would only be acceptable if a planning condition is imposed requiring the following drainage details: *'Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Hengrove Farm for Henry Streeter Limited (130456/R001) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water runoff rates should not be increased. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details.'* In order to discharge this surface water condition, the EA stated that the following information must be provided: a) where infiltration forms part of the proposed drainage strategy, soakage test results should be submitted. A desk based

study would also be appropriate; and b) a topographical survey highlighting potential surface water flow routes, demonstrating that the additional proposed noise bunds will not affect overland flow paths or increase surface water flood risk off site.

74. In respect of ground water and contaminated land advice, the EA stated that they have reason to believe the Kempton Park Principal Aquifer (sands gravels and groundwater) at Homers Farm may be affected by hydrocarbon contamination. Therefore the sands and gravels proposed for import to Hengrove Park may require treatment as part of processing. The processing and treatment of imported materials associated with this development will require an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010, from the Environment Agency, unless an exemption applies. The applicant has a permit for Hengrove Farm but must make sure that covers the import, screening, processing and any treatment of material from Homers Farm.

Noise bund surface water run-off

75. On 1 October 2013, the EA commented that although the existing drainage scheme could remain in place, they would need further information to demonstrate that the new noise bunds would not increase surface water runoff rates or increase risk off site. For example, the EA requested evidence that the bunds would not interfere with surface water flow routes.
76. On 17 October 2013, the applicant responded that from the time work commences on site to reduce the operational area the amount of material stored in heaps and bunds would actually start to reduce. What is proposed is to create a smaller enclosure for the operational area, using on site material. Where there are already bunds in place, these would be retained exactly where they are. The enclosing bund, where it does not exist at present, would be created using subsoil and overburden from the stored material on site. Where this coincides with the new bund, this would be removed before the new bund is created, and use for restoration purposes. Lastly, the applicant set out that the new enclosing bunds provide for gaps in the north, and in the south, which would allow for surface water to flow through, and that there would be an increased flow path from north to south in the eastern part of the site, where a significant section of the northern bund is to be removed, as well as the existing storage mounds (which could currently impede drainage). On 5 November 2013, the EA subsequently confirmed that they were satisfied with the additional information and that it adequately confirmed that surface water risk would not be increased off site because of the noise bunds. The EA stated that they therefore have no objections to this application.

Conclusion

77. Residents have raised concerns that flooding would be exacerbated by surface water from the site. However, Officers note that neither the County Geotechnical Consultant nor the Environment Agency raise objections to this proposal following the provision of further information. Officers therefore consider that, subject to the conditions/informatives recommended above, the proposal is in accordance with planning policy in respect of hydrology, hydrogeology and flood risk issues.

Noise and Vibration

78. The NPPF paragraph 123 states that planning decisions should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development and to mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise. The NPPF technical guidance provides specific advice with regard to noise emissions from minerals development. Paragraph 28 of that guidance states that where there are unavoidable noise emissions, these should be controlled, mitigated or removed at source with MPAs setting their own appropriate noise limits. Paragraph 29 requires minerals development proposals to be accompanied by a

noise emission assessment which should identify all sources of noise alongside including the proposed operating locations, procedures, schedules and duration of work for the life of the operation.

79. Paragraph 30 outlines for minerals development proposals that a noise limit at noise sensitive receptors should not exceed the background level by more than 10dB(A) subject to a maximum of 55dB(A) Laeq (average continuous noise level), 1h (free field) for daytime operations and a maximum of 42dB(A) for night time limits. The paragraph recognises where tonal noise contributes significantly to the total site noise, it may be appropriate to set specific limits for this element. Also peak or impulsive noise such as some reversing beepers may also require separate limits that are independent of background noise. With regard to temporary activities which form part of minerals development such as soil stripping, the construction and removal of bunds and road construction, paragraph 31 recognises that these aspects can be particularly noisy but short term activities that cannot meet the limits set for normal operations. In these cases, the technical guidance advises that there be a temporary daytime noise limit of up to 70dB (A) Laeq 1h (free field) for periods of up to eight weeks in a year at specified noise sensitive properties.
80. As outlined above, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan requires adequate information to be provided with regard to noise alongside mitigation measures where appropriate. Policy EN11 (Development and Noise) of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD seeks to minimise the adverse impacts of noise by requiring development proposals that may generate unacceptable levels of noise to include measures as to how this would be reduced to an acceptable level; requiring appropriate noise attenuation measures where this can overcome unacceptable noise impacts and if not development would be refused.
81. Surrey County Council has produced its own Guidelines for Noise Control: Minerals and Waste Disposal. The guidelines set out noise limits for site preparation and restoration, processing plant and mobile operations such as aggregate extraction. The guidelines echo the NPPF technical guidance with regard to site preparation and restoration works that these activities can generate high noise levels but noise exposure for any one location will normally be limited to a short period of time.
82. The County Noise Consultant advises that the continuation of activities with importation by road will not add any significant noise. However the CNC notes the concerns of the Residents' Association and states that reversing warning devices should not be of the total type. Officers consider that, subject to a suitable condition of reversing alarms, the noise can be adequately controlled and the proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF technical guidance, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan and Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 Policy EN11.

Air Quality and Dust

83. Policy SP6 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy seeks to maintain and improve the quality of the environment of the borough. The policy sets out criteria to achieve this of which criteria b) seeking to improve air quality in the borough is the most relevant. Policy EN3 (Air Quality) sets out measures for improving the air quality and minimising harm from poor air quality including (relevant to this proposal) requiring an air quality assessment for development proposals that involve a large number of vehicle movements and refusing development where the adverse effects on air quality are of a significant scale either individually or in combination with other proposals and are not outweighed by other considerations.

84. As set out above, both Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan and Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan seek to ensure that minerals and waste proposals do not cause significant adverse harm with regard to dust or air quality. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that consideration should be given to the presence of AQMAs and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local area and that planning decisions should ensure that any new development in AQMA should be consistent with the local air quality action plan.
85. The County Air Quality Consultant (CAQC) has assessed this proposal and raises no objection. In respect of dust issues, the CAQC notes that the proposal includes a small change to the site layout to provide a compound enclosed by a bund, however all activities will remain within the same site boundary. Otherwise activities will remain within the same as set out in the current permission. On that basis, there is unlikely to be any changes to the magnitude of the source of emissions. The risk of dust effects is not likely to be affected by the time extension. The control/mitigation measures proposed for the scheme, together with the approved Dust Action Plan and Dust Management Plan should ensure that there would be no significant adverse impacts and this is not dependent on the duration of the proposed working. Therefore, the proposal to delay the cessation of activities and restoration should have no significant additional impacts on dust.
86. In respect of cumulative air quality impacts of Homers/Hengrove, the CAQC highlights that the applicant has stated that the activities at Homers and Hengrove would overlap for four months. As the separation distance between the activities is 2km, the applicant has stated that there is unlikely to be a risk of cumulative dust effects. On that basis, we agree with this conclusion. Overall, Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in terms of air quality/dust/odour.

Ecology

87. As outlined above, Policy MC14 requires consideration to be given to the impact of minerals development proposals on the natural environment and biodiversity. Policy MC2 states that mineral development that may have a significant effect on Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas or sites identified under the Ramsar Convention will be subject to appropriate assessment. The policy goes on to state that permission will not be granted where there is any likelihood of adverse impact on the integrity of the area. The policy further states that mineral development that may have a direct or indirect significant adverse impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest will be permitted only if it has been demonstrated to be in the public interest; and the applicant can establish that development and restoration can be carried out to the highest standard and a manner consistent with safeguarding the specific relevant interests.
88. Policy EN8 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD seeks to protect the biodiversity of the borough by safeguarding sites of national and international importance, ensuring new development, wherever possible, contributes to an improvement in biodiversity and avoids harm to features of nature conservation interest; and refusing planning permission where development would have significant harm on features of nature conservation interests. The NPPF paragraph 109 requires the planning system to aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF also states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.
89. Officers note that residents have raised concerns that the application site is close to Shortwood Common SSSI. However, on the basis that no objections have been raised by Natural England or Surrey Wildlife Trust and that the County Ecologist has no objection or recommendations for further ecological work, Officers consider that this

application complies with relevant policy and guidance in respect of ecological issues and impact on nearby sensitive ecological sites.

Landscape and Visual Impact

90. Safeguarding and improving the boroughs landscape is sought by Policy EN8 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD by refusing planning permission for development proposals that may cause significant harm to the landscape, ensuring new development wherever possible contributes to an improvement in the landscape; and safeguarding sites of importance. Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2014 also seeks protection of the landscape. The County Landscape Officer has no objection to this proposal and no recommendations for further work. On the basis of the agreed restoration and aftercare scheme for the site (as discussed earlier in this report), Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in terms of landscape and visual impact, and is in accordance with the relevant policies relating to landscape.

Birdstrike

91. Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2014 outlines the need to assess the potential impact of proposals upon the danger of birds striking aircraft. As this site is in very close proximity to Heathrow Airport, this risk needs to be carefully considered. Birds are often attracted to certain types of sites, for example those with large water bodies, and certain types of plants, for example those producing berries. BAA's safeguarding team and RAF Northholt have not raised objections to the proposal. Officers therefore consider that the proposal is acceptable in terms of birdstrike.

Archaeology

92. Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan, as detailed above, requires consideration of the impact of development upon sites of potential archaeological interest. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected. The NPPF describes a heritage asset as a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Paragraph 128 goes on to explain that the level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on its significance.
93. Policies BE24, BE25 and BE26 of the Spelthorne Local Plan were saved as part of the 2007 requirements. Policy BE24 states that any development affecting a site or monument of County archaeological importance will not normally be permitted. Policy BE25 sets out a number of criteria that should be considered where development is being proposed within areas of high archaeological potential. This criteria includes an initial assessment of the archaeological value of the site, a field evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application; a preference to preservation *in situ* or an agreement to ensure that damage to the remains is minimal; and a requirement that a condition be imposed to secure a full archaeological investigation and recording of the site. Policy BE26 requires that sites that are beyond areas defined as high archaeological potential, there will be a requirement that a scheme of archaeological assessment or evaluation appropriate for the site concerns to be submitted with any new development proposal for a site larger than 0.4ha.

Applicant's submission

94. Following discussions between the applicant and the County Archaeological Officer, information was sought with regard to the archaeological implications of the proposed removal and remodelling of bunds in the north east sector of the application site. Subsequent to discussions with the various parties involved with the quarry, it became

clear to the applicant that much of the proposed bund work is over previously worked ground which had already been cleared of archaeology and as such these works would have no archaeological implication. However, although some previous disturbance to the ground beneath the footprint of the northern tip of the existing bund had been advised, it was unclear as to how much this may have affected any archaeology present. A Mitigation Strategy for the area concerned was then agreed between with the applicant's specialist and the County Archaeological Officer. As such, in the event that archaeology is present and needs to be excavated 'archive consolidation, finds processing, assessment and archive deposition' will be undertaken together with appropriate analysis and publication dependent upon the significance of the results.

Officer's assessment

95. The County Archaeological Officer confirms that the proposed mitigation strategy for the archaeological assessment and mitigation of this site/proposal is acceptable and it details the outline of the work to be undertaken. As usual, any archaeological work would need to be preceded by an acceptable specification/method statement from the archaeological contractor commissioned to undertake the work, and the work secured by maintaining the conditions on any permission. Officers therefore consider that, with the imposition of the recommended condition, archaeological investigation at the site will be carried out to the appropriate standard, and any archaeological finds present at the site will be satisfactorily recorded. Officers therefore consider that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and the Spelthorne Borough Local Plan saved policies detailed above.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

96. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment with decisions taking account of whether a safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved. The paragraph goes on to state that "*development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe*". Policy MC15 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy recognises at paragraph 7.1 that one of the most significant impacts of mineral working in Surrey and the one that can cause much public concern, is lorry traffic generated from the transportation of minerals. Paragraph 7.3 recognises that for short distances, conveyors and pipelines can be an effective alternative to lorries and are commonly used to transport mineral within sites or from one site to another nearby for processing. Paragraph 7.4 and 7.5 recognise that whilst alternative forms of transport of minerals is preferable and sustainable, the use of rail or water are often impractical in Surrey given that the mineral is often used locally and that such methods of transport can only be used where the mineral is being transported between fixed points where there are sidings or wharves available. Paragraph 7.10 goes on to outline that where possible movement of minerals by road should be confined to the motorway or the primary road network.
97. Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy states that applications for minerals development should include a transport assessment of potential impacts on highway safety, congestion and demand management. The policy requires that proposals should address alternatives to road-based methods of transport and that mineral development involving transportation by road will be permitted only where: i) there is no practicable alternative to the use of road based transport that would have a lower impact on communities and the environment; ii) the highway network is of an appropriate standard for use by the traffic generated by the development or can be suitably improved; and iii) arrangements for site access and the traffic generated by the development would not have any significant adverse impacts on highway safety, air quality, residential amenity, the environment or the effective operation of the highway network.

Officer's assessment

98. The County Highway Authority (CHA) have reviewed this proposal and note that Hengrove Farm has an existing access, which was constructed following planning permission (ref SP97/0399) on 24 June 1999. The CHA concludes that neither application at Hengrove Farm would have an additional impact on the A30 trunk road (controlled and maintained by the Highways Agency) or on SCC maintained roads. The existing access at Hengrove Farm was permitted with anticipated traffic flows of 400 daily movements as proposed under application SP97/0399. That access has been constructed to a high standard and found to be acceptable to the Highways Agency. Additionally, the CHA note that as the proposal for extraction at Homers Farm has been submitted in combination with proposals for the importation of 'as raised' mineral into Hengrove Farm and the delayed but then the effective restoration of Hengrove Farm, all of which could generate HGV movements, the applicant has provided a cumulative impact assessment of the potential traffic impact of all HGVs. The predicted traffic associated with Hengrove Farm is shown in the tables below.

Period	Hengrove Farm						Total
	Aggregates for processing		Processed export aggregates		Restoration fill		
	In full from Homers	Out empty	In empty	Out full	In full	Out empty	
March 2015 - June 2016	27	27	0	0	0	0	54
June 2016 – Nov 2018	27	27	38	38	0	0	128
Dec 2018 – August 2019	0	0	38	38	50*	50*	176

* these HGV movements are associated with the infilling of Hengrove Farm and are already permitted albeit for an earlier date as currently permitted

Period	Aggregate vehicles for Homers		Processed export aggregate		Restoration fill				Total
	In empty	Out full	In empty	Out full	In full to Homers	Out empty from Homers	In full to Hengrove	Out empty from Hengrove	
March 2015 - June 2016	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
June 2016 – Nov 2018	27	27	38	38	39	39	0	0	208
Dec 2018 – Aug 2019	0	0	38**	38**	64	64	50	50	304

** this mineral is extracted from beneath the existing processing plant and these HGV movements are permitted albeit for an earlier timeframe

99. On the basis of the above figures, the CHA note that the maximum number of HGV movements per day cumulatively from all three proposals would be 304 however it should be noted this is only for a nine month period. Additionally it should be noted that 100 of these HGV movements are associated with the infilling of Hengrove Park which is already permitted under planning permission references: SP/12/01416 and SP/12/01421 dated 12 December 2012. The longest period of time where there is a high number of HGV movements is between June 2016 to August 2019 however not all of these HGV movements will travel on the same part of the A30. During this period of time some 132 two way HGV movements per day would be generated from Homers Farm (extraction and infill); and some 128 two way HGV movements would be generated from Hengrove Farm (importation of aggregate and relating to processing mineral).
100. When taking into account the direction of travel of HGVs carrying aggregate material and assuming all the fill material at Homers Farm arrives from the west alongside 25% of the traffic relating to the export of processed materials from Hengrove Farm, the CHA note that a maximum of 152 HGV movements per day would be added to the section of the A30 between Homers Farm and Hengrove Farm split equality between the two carriageways. To the west of Hengrove Farm, the increase in traffic would be 138 HGV movements per day for both carriageways which would represent the fill traffic travelling to and from Homers Farm and 75% of the export traffic to and from Hengrove Farm. As noted above, the number of HGVs travelling north eastbound were 667 and 571 south westbound in December 2012. Adding 76 HGVs per day to the total traffic flows on either carriageway would represent an increase of around 1% giving the total proportion of HGVs per day of just under 8% on the north westbound carriageway and around 6.5% on the south westbound carriageway. The hourly link capacity assessment of the A30 allows for HGV content of up to 15%. Therefore the proposal would result in an increase of HGVs on both carriageway that would be less than half the capacity the A30 can carry.
101. The Highways Agency (HA) are responsible for the A30 and they have no objection to the proposal, subject to a condition as set out below. The HA commented that the A30 right turn lane on the north eastbound carriageway opposite the Short Lane junction is designed solely for traffic entering the residential area (London Road and Desford Way) on the south side. The A30 is a high speed dual 2 lane carriageway and consequently for traffic safety reasons U-turns are forbidden at this location. Accordingly, the turn has a no U-turn sign. There is a high quality alternative turning arrangement for traffic egressing the site to get to the A30 south westbound via the Clockhouse Roundabout located approximately 1km east of the junction with Short Lane. As such, the HA requested the following condition:
- 'The access and egress movements of all vehicles associated with the operation of the Homers Farm and Hengrove Farm sites must not involve the use of the right turn facility from the north eastbound A30 carriageway opposite Short Lane towards the London Road access to Desford Way, The applicant is required to produce a routing agreement covering all traffic to this effect covering all heavy vehicle movements to and from both Homers Farm and Hengrove Farm.'*
102. On the basis of the comments of the CHA, and the recommended condition from the HA, Officers therefore consider that the traffic generated by the development would not have any significant adverse effects on air quality, residential amenity or the local environment, and that the application complies with relevant guidance and policy in respects of traffic and transportation issues.

Other Issues

103. In respect of the concerns raised that lorries leaving the site are speeding and causing a danger to other drivers, Officers note that the Highway Agency (who control the A30) have raised no objection to this application subject to the imposition of an appropriate condition as set out above. If any vehicle on the A30 is breaking the speed limit, this would be a matter for the Police. In respect of concerns raised that the wheel wash is not working properly, at the time of writing this report, Officers are not aware of any complaints made that the wheel wash is not in operation, A condition is nevertheless recommended at the end of this report to ensure the wheel wash facility is retained and in good working order for the duration of the proposed operation. Lastly, with reference to residents' concerns that the proposal would devalue neighbouring properties, this is not a material planning consideration.

GREEN BELT

104. Policies MC3 and MC17 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy and GB1 of Spelthorne Local Plan 2001 Saved Policies seek protection of the Green Belt. Policy MC3 states that mineral extraction in the Green Belt will only be permitted where the highest environmental standard of operation are maintained and the land restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with Green Belt objectives, such as nature conservation, agriculture or forestry, within agreed time limits. The policy states that development will not be permitted where it would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and maintaining openness. The supporting text acknowledges that almost all mineral working in Surrey is within the Green Belt. Policy MC17 requires proposals for mineral working to provide for restoration and management to a high standard, with a restoration sympathetic to the character and setting of the area and the land should be capable of sustaining the appropriate afteruse. Policy GB1 of the Spelthorne Local Plan 2001 saved policies states that development will not be permitted within the Green Belt, where it would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and maintaining its openness.
105. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF explains that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts, and that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 80 goes on to explain that the Green Belt serves five purposes, which are checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, prevent neighbouring towns merging, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Paragraph 87 states that inappropriate development within the Green Belt is harmful to the Green Belt, and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF explains that certain forms of development are not inappropriate within the Green Belt, as long as they preserve the openness of the Green Belt, and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. It lists mineral extraction as a form of development that is not necessarily inappropriate.
106. Given the location of the site within the Green Belt, it is necessary to consider whether high environmental standards would be maintained during operation, and whether restoration of the site will be achieved to a good standard, with an appropriate afteruse consistent with Green Belt objectives. Mineral working is a temporary use of land, and minerals can only be worked where they are found. During mineral extraction, there would be some temporary impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt, and upon openness, due to the perimeter bunds, soil stockpiles, machinery, site office and increased traffic. However, there is adequate provision in place for their removal on cessation of the extraction and restoration and the additional traffic would cease at that time also. Therefore they are a temporary use of the land and do not permanently impact on the openness nor the visual amenities of the Green Belt which would both be restored, nor conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Officers therefore consider that the proposal is not inappropriate within the Green Belt, and

therefore is in line with the development plan and the NPPF with regard to Green Belt policy.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

107. The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, contained in the Preamble to the Agenda is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.
108. The proposal involves the extraction of sand and gravel with restoration to agriculture. It is recognised that the proposal has the potential to impact on residential amenity in terms of noise, air quality, traffic, visual impact and in terms of groundwater and nature conservation. These issues have been assessed and Officers consider that the scale of the impact is not sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1 and the impact can be mitigated by conditions and controls under the Environmental Permit. As such, this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right
-

CONCLUSION

109. The site is within the Green Belt, however policy states that mineral working need not be inappropriate, as long as high environmental standards are maintained, and the site is restored to an afteruse that is in keeping with Green Belt policy. This site would be restored (via separate planning application SP/13/00958/SCC) and there is no reason to believe that high environmental standards would not be maintained during the working and subsequent restoration at the site. Officers do not consider that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect upon the environment or upon local amenity, with the imposition of the proposed conditions. Officers therefore consider the proposals are in line with the NPPF and the development plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is to PERMIT, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

Approved Documents

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following plans/drawings:
 - Drawing No. 1732/9 – Plan showing location of Homers and Hengrove Farms, dated December 2012
 - Drawing No. 518/33B – Site location plan, dated March 2013
 - Drawing No. 518/32C – Proposed revised site layout, dated 18 March 2013
2. From the date of this permission to the cessation of operations hereby consented, a copy of this permission including all documents with this permission, shall be displayed on the site during working hours in a position which is readily accessible to any person undertaking the development.

Limitations

3. The operations hereby permitted shall cease on or before 30 November 2018 and the site shall only import 'as raised' sand and gravel from the site known as Homers Farm.

4. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary under Article 3 and Parts 4 or 19 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or any subsequent Order, no plant, buildings or machinery whether fixed or movable, shall be erected on the application site without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority in respect of the siting, detailed design, specifications and appearance of the installation.

Hours of operation

5. No light shall be illuminated nor shall any operation or activities authorised or required by this permission be carried out except between the following times:

0700-1800 hours Monday - Friday
0700-1300 hours Saturdays

there shall be no working on Sundays or Public, Bank or National Holidays at any time.

Access

6. Prior to commencement of development, a routing agreement covering all heavy goods vehicle movements to and from Homers Farm and Hengrove shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The routing agreement shall include measures to ensure that the access and egress movements of all vehicles associated with the operation of the application site will not involve the use of the right turn facility from the north eastbound A30 carriageway opposite Short Lane towards the London Road access to Desford Way.

Dust

7. The on-site wheel wash facility (adjacent to the A30 access) shall be retained in good working order for the duration of the development hereby approved, in order that the operator can make all reasonable efforts to keep the public highway clean and prevent the creation of a dangerous surface on the public highway.
8. The Dust Monitoring Scheme and Action Plan Issue No 06 dated 30 September 2010 approved under Ref SP10/0477 dated 20 December 2010 shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the development hereby approved.
9. Having regard to the Dust Action Plan referred to in Condition 8 above, no activity hereby permitted shall cause dust to be emitted from the soil processing area and stockpiling area so as to cause nuisance or loss of amenity at sensitive receptors. Should such emissions occur the relevant activity shall be suspended until it can be resumed without causing any unacceptable emissions.
10. Notwithstanding the requirements of Conditions 8 and 9 above, the operators shall employ appropriate control and mitigation measures in accordance with Section 6 `Proposed Mitigation Measures` provided within the Air Quality Assessment September 2008 and amending information dated 24 April 2009 approved under Ref SP09/0102 dated 5 August 2009. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the report and complied with at all times.

Noise

11. The acoustic bunds hereby approved on the eastern and southern boundary of the working site area (as shown on approved Drawing no 518/32C dated 18 March 2013) shall be constructed at a height of no less than 5 metres on the eastern boundary (graded 1:1 on western inside face and 1:3 on eastern outside face) and at a height of no less than 4 metres on the southern boundary (graded 1:1 on northern inside face and 1:3 on southern outside face) and shall be retained for the duration of the proposed development. The existing acoustic bunds on the western and northern sides of the site (as shown on approved Drawing no 518/32 dated February 2013) shall also be retained for the duration of the proposed development. All acoustic bunds shall be kept in good condition.
12. The level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at or recalculated as at a height of 1.2 m above ground level and 3.6 m from the facade of any residential property or other occupied building which faces the site shall not exceed 55 dB(A) Leq. during any 1 hour period. The level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at or recalculated as at a height of 1.2 m above ground level and 3.6 m from the facade of the adjacent Hengrove Primary School shall not exceed 50 dB(A) Leq. during any 1 hour period
13. All plant and company owned HGVs operating at the site shall be fitted with reversing alarms which do not emit a warning noise that could have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

Archaeology

14. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.

Surface Water

15. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed Flood Risk Assessment for Henry Streeter Limited (ref 130456/R001 dated 26 March 2013) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Surface water runoff rates shall not be increased. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details, and the details shall include:
 - a) where infiltration forms part of the proposed drainage strategy, soakage test results should be submitted. A desk based study would also be appropriate; and
 - b) a topographical survey highlighting potential surface water flow routes, demonstrating that the additional proposed noise bunds will not affect overland flow paths or increase surface water flood risk off site.

Restoration and Aftercare

16. All restoration and landscape planting shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the Planting Plan Drawing No 518/12B dated February 2002 approved under consent Ref: SP02/0350 dated 20 May 2002 and the landscape restoration plan 518/11A Dated June 1997, as amended by planning permission ref SP/14/00570/SCC dated 2 July 2014.
17. The scheme of aftercare shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved under planning consent Ref: SP02/0350 dated 20 May 2002.

REASONS FOR IMPOSING CONDITIONS:

1. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
2. To enable the prompt and effect restoration of the site and to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
3. To enable the prompt and effect restoration of the site and to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
4. To protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document; Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008; Policy BE25 – Archaeology, Ancient Monuments and Historic Landscapes of the Saved Polices Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001; and Policies SP6 - Maintaining and Improving the Environment, LO1 – Flooding, EN4 - Provision of Open Space and Sport and Recreation Facilities, EN8 - Protecting and Improving the Landscape and Biodiversity and EN11 – Development and Noise of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.
5. To protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document; Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008; Policy BE25 – Archaeology, Ancient Monuments and Historic Landscapes of the Saved Polices Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001; and Policies SP6 - Maintaining and Improving the Environment, LO1 – Flooding, EN4 - Provision of Open Space and Sport and Recreation Facilities, EN8 - Protecting and Improving the Landscape and Biodiversity and EN11 – Development and Noise of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.
6. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety particularly the A30, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy MC15 – Transport for Minerals of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
7. To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety particularly the A30, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy MC15 - Transport for Minerals of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
8. In the interests of local amenity and to comply with National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
9. In the interests of local amenity and to comply with National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
10. In the interests of local amenity and to comply with National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, and Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.

11. To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and Policy EN11 – Development and Noise of Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.
12. To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and Policy EN11 – Development and Noise of Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.
13. To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and Policy EN11 – Development and Noise of Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.
14. To ensure the development does not damage archaeological resources and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy DC3 – General Considerations of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
15. To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage and disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy LO1 – Flooding of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.
16. To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the operation so as to secure restoration to the required standard and assist in absorbing the site back into the local landscape in accordance with the terms of Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 Policy GB1 – Green Belt and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
17. To secure restoration to the required standard and assist in absorbing the site back into the local landscape in compliance with Schedule 5 paragraph 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Policy MC17 – Restoring mineral workings of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

INFORMATIVES

1. The County Planning Authority confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of paragraph 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012
2. The Environment Agency has reason to believe the Kempton Park Principal Aquifer (sands gravels and groundwater) at Homers Farm may be affected by hydrocarbon contamination. Therefore the sands and gravels imported to Hengrove Park may require treatment at as part of processing. The existing permit for Hengrove Farm must cover the import, screening, processing and any treatment of material from Homers Farm. The processing and treatment of imported materials associated with this development will require an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010, from the Environment Agency, unless an exemption applies.
2. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

3. National Grid apparatus has been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works as follows: 1) Low or Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity); and 2) Electricity Transmission overhead lines. These are distances defined by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) to allow them to advise on the acceptability of new developments next to hazardous installations and are controlled through the HSE's Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations (PADHI) process. Further guidance on how these are applied can be found on the HSE's website: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.pdf>. Before carrying out any work you must:
- Carefully read these requirements including the attached guidance documents and maps showing the location of National Grid apparatus.
 - Contact the landowner and ensure any proposed works in private land do not infringe National Grid's legal rights (i.e. easements or wayleaves). If the works are in the road or footpath the relevant local authority should be contacted.
 - Ensure that all persons, including direct labour and contractors, working for you on or near National Grid's apparatus follow the requirements of the HSE Guidance Notes HSG47 - 'Avoiding Danger from Underground Services' and GS6 - 'Avoidance of danger from overhead electric power lines'. This guidance can be downloaded free of charge at <http://www.hse.gov.uk>
 - In line with the above guidance, verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, cables, services and other apparatus on site before any activities are undertaken.
4. The applicant should be aware of the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the Safe Use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult any nearby aerodromes before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4 'Cranes and other construction issues' (available at <http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-safeguarding.htm>).

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

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011:

Policy MC3 – Spatial strategy – Mineral development in the Green Belt
 Policy MC7 – Aggregates Mineral Supply
 Policy MC11 – Mineral Extraction Outside Preferred Areas
 Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Minerals Development
 Policy MC15 – Transport for Minerals
 Policy MC17 – Restoring mineral workings

Surrey Waste Plan 2008:

Policy CW6 – Development in the Green Belt
 Policy DC2 – Planning Designations
 Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy 2009:

Policy LO1 – Flooding
 Policy EN3 – Air Quality
 Policy EN8 – Protecting and Improving the Landscape and Biodiversity
 Policy EN11 – Development and Noise
 Policy CC2 – Sustainable Travel

Spelthorne Borough Flooding DPD

Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001:

Policy GB1 – Green Belt
 Saved Policy BE25 – Archaeology, Ancient Monuments and Historic Landscapes

CONTACT

Mark O'Hare

TEL. NO.

020 8541 7534

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The deposited application documents and plans, including those amending or clarifying the proposal, responses to consultations and representations received as referred to in the report and included in the application file and the following:

Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance 2014

National Planning Policy for Waste 2014

The Development Plan

Surrey Waste Plan 2008

Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011

Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates Development plan Document 2011

Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy 2009

Spelthorne Borough Flooding DPD

Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 (Saved Policies)

Other Documents

Surrey Noise Guidelines, 1993

Planning permission ref SP/14/00570/SCC dated 2 July 2014

Surrey Local Aggregate Assessment November 2014

Surrey Aggregates Monitoring Survey 2013

Surrey Planning Enforcement monitoring Site Visit Report dated 2 September 2014

Surrey Environmental Assessment team Screening Opinion dated 23 April 2013