TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE **DATE:** 7 January 2015

BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL TEAM MANAGER

DISTRICT(S) SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL **ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**
Laleham & Shepperton
Mr Walsh
Staines South & Ashford West
Daniel John Christopher Jenkins

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION **GRID REF:** 505420 169924

TITLE: **MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION SP/2012/01132**

7

SUMMARY REPORT

Land at Manor Farm, Ashford Road and Worple Road, Laleham and land at Queen Mary Quarry, west of Queen Mary Reservoir, Ashford Road, Laleham, Staines, Surrey.

Extraction of sand and gravel and restoration to landscaped lakes for nature conservation after-use at Manor Farm, Laleham and provision of a dedicated area on land at Manor Farm adjacent to Buckland School for nature conservation study; processing of the sand and gravel in the existing Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) processing plant and retention of the processing plant for the duration of operations; erection of a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant within the existing QMQ aggregate processing and stockpiling areas; installation of a field conveyor for the transportation of mineral and use for the transportation of mineral from Manor Farm to the QMQ processing plant; and construction of a tunnel beneath the Ashford Road to accommodate a conveyor link between Manor Farm and QMQ for the transportation of mineral.

The Manor Farm/Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) application site, some 43.9 hectares (ha) in total, is situated between Staines upon Thames to the north and Laleham to the south. The site is in two parts: land at Manor Farm (some 33.4 ha) in agricultural use situated to the east of Staines Road (B376) and Worple Road and west of Ashford Road (B377), Laleham and land at Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) (including part of the lake and existing processing plant site), to the east of Ashford Road and west of Queen Mary Reservoir.

To the north of Manor Farm lies residential housing, Buckland Primary School and Greenfield Recreation Ground. To the east lies a further part of Greenfield Recreation Ground (with enclosed children play area), residential housing and the QMQ and Queen Mary Reservoir. To the south lies the Queen Mary Reservoir water intake channel and Greenscene Nursery with open farmland and Laleham Village beyond. To the west lies residential housing, a garden centre, and the Staines and Laleham Sports Association Ltd (SALSAL) sports facility, and further to the west and south west the River Thames.

The QMQ part of the application site comprises the southern part of the lake (formed by previous sand and gravel working), land to the east of the lake and west of the reservoir and the quarry processing plant site and accesses off the Ashford Road (B377) and the A308 (Kingston Road/Staines Road). The closest residential properties to the QMQ part of the application site are to the west on Ashford Road.

Public Right of Way Footpath No30 (FP30) crosses the application site at Manor Farm running between the Ashford Road in the south east to FP28 and FP29 in the north. FP28 links up to Berryscroft Road to the north and FP29 which runs east to west along the northern boundary of the eastern part of the application site to link up with the Ashford Road. There are no public rights of way crossing the QMQ part of the application site.

7

The application site is situated in the Metropolitan Green Belt (Green Belt), the Spelthorne Borough Council Air Quality Management Area and the Heathrow Airport bird strike safeguarding zone. The application site is within a major aquifer and mostly within a groundwater source protection zone 3 for public water supply (Chertsey). The majority of the Manor Farm part of the site and the lakes at QMQ and parts of the land adjacent to the River Ash are within a Floodzone 3. The majority of the processing plant site at QMQ, and land between the River Ash and the lake, and the northern parts of the Manor Farm site are within a Floodzone 2.

The application site lies within 2 kilometres (km) of the Thorpe Park Number 1 Gravel Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Staines Moor SSSI, both of which also form part of the South West London Waterbodies Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site, and within 2 kilometres of the Thorpe Hay Meadows and Dumsey Meadow SSSIs. The majority of the land at QMQ is designated as the West of Queen Mary Reservoir Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and there are a number of other SNCIs within 1 km of the application site.

The Manor Farm site would be worked wet and progressively restored in four phases: phase 1 to the east of FP30 and phases 2 to 4 to the west of FP30, which remain open. No mineral extraction would take place within 100 metres of a residential building. Soils and overburden would be used to construct noise/visual screen mounds up to 3 metres high between the workings and adjacent development.

All mineral excavated at Manor Farm would be transported by conveyor belt to the QMQ processing plant, passing in tunnels under FP30 and the Ashford Road. The conveyor would cross the southern part of the lake at QMQ on a causeway and then run northwards to the processing plant. There would be two accesses for transport of plant and equipment and to the site compound, one off Worple Road and off the Ashford Road (between numbers 151 and 133).

Related to this application, application ref SP13/01003 proposes a partial realignment of the route and siting of the conveyor belt within the QMQ site. The two developments are interdependent and, if permitted, would be implemented as one. An environmental assessment has been undertaken and an overarching ES submitted with the applications.

Sand and gravel extracted at Manor Farm would be processed in the existing QMQ mineral processing plant. The application proposes installing a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant at the QMQ processing plant site to be used in connection with mineral extraction at Manor Farm. It would then remain in use in association with current importation and processing of as raised sand and gravel, and recycling operations up to the end of 2033.

The application site at Manor Farm is identified as preferred area J in Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document (DPD) for future extraction of sharp sand and gravel, where it is considered that mineral working is possible without posing significant adverse impacts on the environment and local community, and key development requirements identified to be addressed as part of any application proposal.

The implications of the proposed development have been assessed in terms of impacts on the local environment and amenity. Issues assessed include highways, traffic and access; flood risk, water quality, groundwater and land drainage; landscape and visual impact; noise; air quality and dust; rights of way; biodiversity and ecology (species and designated areas); historic environment and archaeology, restoration and after-use, airport safeguarding/safety /infrastructure; and lighting.

Spelthorne Borough Council has objected on grounds of noise and dust. Local residents and Buckland School object on grounds of need and the issues set out above which, where material, have been taken into consideration. No objections have been received from technical consultees, though some raise matters they recommend or consider should be addressed through the imposition of planning conditions.

Minerals can only be worked where they are found. Aggregate minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and quality of life which includes maintaining and repairing existing development and infrastructure such as houses, schools and roads. Assessment of the current landbank position has demonstrated a strong and urgent case of need for additional reserves of primary land won sand and gravel to be permitted in Surrey in order to maintain a steady and adequate supply.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) indicates that development involving mineral extraction (and initial/primary processing) in the Green Belt is not inappropriate provided openness is maintained and the development does not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. Proposals should provide for restoration and aftercare to be carried out to high environmental standards at the earliest opportunity. Other mineral development such as concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and require very special circumstances to be demonstrated, which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, before planning permission can be granted.

The proposed development at Manor Farm, and use of the processing plant and site infrastructure at QMQ, are temporary uses of the land, and would therefore preserve the openness of the Green Belt in the long term. Any harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt from the mineral extraction at Manor Farm would be limited in extent and duration. The proposed restoration is to a nature conservation use, a use appropriate to the designation and objectives for the use land in the Green Belt. The proposed extraction and primary processing of minerals is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and complies with national policy in the NPPF and relevant development plan policies.

The concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and for the duration the plant are on site and operational, would result in a moderate impact on openness. There would be no permanent harm to openness and adequate provision exists through the approved restoration scheme for the QMQ site for restoration of the land to an appropriate afteruse. No other harm has been identified. Officers consider very special circumstances exist to justify the grant of temporary planning permission for siting and use of the plant at QMQ for the duration of mineral extraction at Manor Farm and thereafter in connection with the exisiting planning permissions for imporataion and processing of as raised sand and gravel and recycling of construction and demolition waste at QMQ.

Having had regard to the environmental information contained in the Environmental Statement, national and development plan policy, consultee views and concerns raised by local residents objecting to the proposal, Officers consider, subject to imposition of conditions, and a section 106 legal agreement to secure the long term management of the restored site and limit HGV vehicles numbers in combination with the ongoing operations at QMQ for importation and processing of as raised mineral and recycling, for which draft heads of terms are set out in the Annex, together with controls through other regulatory regimes, the development would not give rise to unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts and the development is consistent with the NPPF and the development plan.

In summary the proposal to extract minerals is in accordance with a DPD allocation and otherwise satisfies a clear need with regard to a national policy requirement to maintain a landbank and so maintain a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. The Manor Farm site can be worked and restored in a manner which does not conflict with Green Belt policy or lead to any other harm. The concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant may be permitted as an exception to policy given the very special circumstances which exist and the lack of any other harm to residential amenity and the purposes of the Green Belt in the long term.

7

The recommendation is that, subject to the prior completion of a section 106 legal agreement to secure the long term aftercare management, (including bird management) of the land at Manor Farm and to limit the number of HGV movements in combination with planning permission refs SP07/1273 (SP13/01238) and SP07/1275 (SP13/01239) to no more than 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day for which draft Heads of Terms are set out in the Annex, to PERMIT subject to conditions and informatives.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Brett Aggregates Ltd

Date application valid

31 July 2012

Period for Determination

20 November 2012

Amending Documents
Letter from Wardell Armstrong dated 13/11/2012 (not 2013 as on letter), W A Hines & Partners Report dated 2.11.12, Appendix 7.1 Restoration and maintenance plan, Drawing EIA 7.1 Dated March 2012 Phase 1 Habitat Map, Drawing PA19 Dated 31/10/12 Topsoils Classification and Distribution, Photoview 08 Appendix 6.2, letter from Wardell Armstrong dated 3 May 2013 (ref ST12377/RJK/011) (five page letter with enclosures), Drawing PA10 Rev B ConveyorTunnel General Arrangement dated 12/02/13, Drawing PA16 Rev C Proposed Worple Road Access dated 12/02/13, Drawing PA17 Rev C Temporary Proposed Ashford Road Access dated 12/02/13, Auger Borings of Manor Farm, Laleham, Bioscan Report No E1660/SEI/V1 April 2013 (Proposed Conveyor Linking Manor Farm To The Existing Processing Plant At Queen Mary Quarry dated April 2013 Assessment of the ecological impact on the West of Queen Mary Reservoir SNCI), letter from Wardell Armstrong dated 3 May 2013 (ref ST12377/RJK/011) (3 page re landbank), letter from Wardell Armstrong dated 11/06/13 (ref ST12377/LET013), Addendum to the Environmental Statement dated June 2013, letter dated 1 November 2013 from Richard Kevan, Wardell Armstrong, Annotated copy of Drawing No EIA9.8 Conveyor Route Details (with pipe details and spacings) dated 04/11/13, Sketch drawing ref SK12377/SK1 Floodplain compensation and Causeway Drainage Proposal dated 04/11/13, email dated 22 November 2013 from Richard Kevan, Wardell Armstrong, Overhead Power Cables above Proposed Conveyor drawing ref QMQ 016 (PDF document), letter dated 3 December 2013 from John Gibson, Wardell Armstrong (note the two drawings referred to are the same those received with the 22 November 2013 email), letter dated 16 January 2014 from John Gibson, Wardell Armstrong, Drawing No EIA9.3 Rev E Phase 1 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation, letter dated 6 February 2014 from John Gibson, Wardell Armstrong, Drawing No EIA9.4 Rev B Phase 2 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation, letter dated 20 February 2014 from John Gibson, Wardell Armstrong, letter dated 8 April 2014 from John Gibson, Wardell Armstrong, Drawing No PA6 Rev F Phase 1 with cross sections, letter dated 24 April 2014 from John Gibson, Wardell Armstrong,

Drawing No PA7 Rev D Phase 2 with cross sections, Drawing No PA8 Rev C Phase 3 with cross sections, Drawing No PA9 Rev C Phase 4 with cross sections, Drawing No EIA9.4 Rev C Phase 2 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation, Drawing No EIA9.5 Rev B Phase 3 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation, Drawing No EIA9.6 Rev B Phase 4 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation, email from Nicola Dibble Wardell Armstrong dated 30 April 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
Procedural matters	N/A	89 -93
Minerals issues (need and location)	Yes	94 -138
Highways, traffic and access	Yes	139 -167
Flood risk, drainage, hydrology and hydrogeology	Yes	168 – 176, 177 – 226
Landscape and visual impact	Yes	168 – 176, 227 – 263
Noise	Yes	168 – 176, 264 – 293
Air quality and dust	Yes	168 – 176, 294 – 311
Rights of Way, leisure and recreation	Yes	168 – 176, 312 - 335
Biodiversity and ecology (species and designated areas)	Yes	168 – 176, 336 – 352
Historic environment and archaeology	Yes	168 – 176, 353 - 368
Restoration and after-use	Yes	168 – 176, 369 – 401
Airport safeguarding/safety/infrastructure	Yes	168 – 176, 402 – 407
Lighting	Yes	168 – 176, 408 - 409
Cumulative impact	Yes	168 – 176, 410 – 415
Other matters	N/A	416 – 417
Green Belt	Yes	418 - 463

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan

Plan1	Application area
Plan 2	Location plan (applicant drawing no. PA1 Rev A March 2012)
Plan 3	Extraction phases and site compound (annotated applicant drawing no. EIA9.8 Rev B March 2012)
Plan 4	Queen Mary Quarry Proposed Site Layout (applicant drawing no. PA18 Rev B March 2012)
Plan 5	SP13/01003 planning application site showing proposed revised conveyor route within Queen Mary Quarry (applicant drawing no. ST13443-PA2)
Plan 6	Manor Farm restoration detail plan (applicant drawing no. PA13 Rev B March 2012
Plan 7	Approved restoration plan for Queen Mary Quarry (applicant drawing no. PA15 Rev A March 2012)

(Full size versions of plans 2 to 7 will be on display at the meeting.)

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1
Aerial 2
Aerial 3

7

Site Photographs

Figure 1	View across land in proposed Phase 1 extraction area (taken from a point on Footpath 29 (FP29) at the boundary with the Greenfield Recreation Ground).
Figure 2	View looking north across land in proposed Phase 1 (taken from a point just off to the east of FP30).
Figure 3	Land west of the B377 Ashford Road (location of proposed new access and conveyor tunnel).
Figure 4	Land at Queen Mary Quarry with the B377 Ashford Road in the foreground (proposed conveyor route).
Figure 5	Existing agricultural access off Worple Road (proposed access point).
Figure 6	View taken from within field to the rear of properties on Pavilion Gardens looking south across field west of FP30 (proposed access route off Worple Road, site compound and land within northern part of proposed Phase 2 extraction area).
Figure 7	View taken from point adjacent to FP30 looking over land at Manor Farm west of FP 30 (proposed extraction Phases 2, 3 and 4).
Figure 8	View across land at Manor Farm west of FP30 taken from a point on western boundary with Staines and Laleham Sports Ground (proposed extraction Phases 2, 3 and 4).
Figure 9	View of lake at Queen Mary Quarry (route for proposed conveyor causeway).
Figure 10	View over existing Queen Mary Quarry processing plant site taken from reservoir embankment (location for proposed concrete batching plant and mixer truck parking area).
Figure 11	View over southern part of existing Queen Mary Quarry processing plant site taken from reservoir embankment (location for proposed aggregate bagging plant).

BACKGROUND

Site description and planning history

1 The Manor Farm/Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) application site, some 43.9 hectares (ha) in total, is in two parts, see Aerials and Plans 1 and 2. It includes land at Manor Farm (some 33.4 ha), situated to the east of Staines Road (B376) and Worple Road and west of Ashford Road (B377), Laleham; and at Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) (including part of the lake and existing processing plant site) to the east of Ashford Road and west of Queen Mary Reservoir, Laleham, Staines upon Thames.

2 The Manor Farm part is situated between Staines upon Thames to the north and Laleham to the south. To the north lies residential housing, Buckland Primary School and Greenfield Recreation Ground. To the east lies a further part of Greenfield Recreation Ground (with enclosed children play area), residential housing on the Ashford Road, the QMQ and Queen Mary Reservoir. To the south lies the Queen Mary Reservoir water intake channel and Greenscene Nursery and further south lies open farmland and Laleham Village. To the west lies residential housing, a garden centre, and the Staines and Laleham Sports Association Ltd (SALSAL) sports facility, and further to the west and south west the River Thames and Penton Hook Lock/Marina.

3 To the east of the Ashford Road is QMQ which comprises the land west of Queen Mary Reservoir gravel pits and silt lagoons and the current processing plant site and mineral stockpiling area associated with the extraction of minerals from Queen Mary Reservoir. The Manor Farm/QMQ application site includes land in the southern part of the QMQ site and the processing plant site and accesses off the Ashford Road (B377) and the A308 dual carriageway (Kingston Road/Staines Road), see Plans 1 and 2.

4 The River Ash runs between the QMQ and the reservoir. To the north runs the Staines Reservoirs Aqueduct over which the quarry haul road leading to the A308 passes over, and beyond that the A308 and residential housing and the Ashford Manor golf course. To the north east is an electricity substation and electricity pylons traverse the site. Fordbridge Park lies to the northwest. To the south runs the Queen Mary Reservoir water intake channel and farmland, with the Shepperton Aggregates Home Farm Quarry beyond. To the west is the Ashford Road and residential housing with the Manor Farm part of the application site beyond.

5 The closest residential properties to the Manor Farm part of the site are at Pavilion Gardens, Brightside Avenue and Berryscroft Road to the north; at Bingham Drive, Abbott Close and Honnor Road to the north east; at the Ashford Road, Greenway Drive and New Farm Close to the east; and at Staines Road, Worple Road, Northfield Road, Willowmead, Northfield Court, Laleham Close and Hernes Close to the west. The closest residential properties to the QMQ part of the application site are on the western side of the Ashford Road.

6 Public Right of Way Footpath 30 (FP30) crosses the mineral application site at Manor Farm from the Ashford Road in the south east to FP28 in the north. FP28 connects up to Berryscroft Road to the north. FP28 and FP30 link up with FP29, which then runs along the northern boundary of the site (and proposed phase 1) crossing the Greenfield Recreation Ground to the Ashford Road. There are no public rights of way crossing the QMQ part of the application site.

7 The application site is situated in the Metropolitan Green Belt, the Spelthorne Borough Council Air Quality Management Area and the Heathrow Airport bird strike safeguarding zone. The application site is within a major aquifer and mostly within a groundwater source protection zone 3 (SPZ3) for public water supply (Chertsey). The majority of the Manor Farm part of the site and the lakes at QMQ and parts of the land adjacent to the River Ash are within a Flood Zone 3 (which for fluvial (river) flooding are areas which may be affected by a 1:100 year fluvial flood (high probability of flooding)). The majority of the processing plant site at QMQ, and land between the River Ash and the lake, and the northern parts of the Manor Farm part of the site are within a Flood Zone 2 (areas which may be affected by an extreme 1:1000 year fluvial flood (medium probability of flooding)). Small areas within the southern part of the processing plant site at QMQ and other small areas (the latter falling outside the application site boundary) are within Flood Zone 1 (areas with a low probability of flooding). (Flood Zones refer (ignoring flood defences) to the annual probability of river and sea flooding occurring expressed either as annual probability of a flood event occurring, or a percentage, e.g. 1 in 100 year or 1%.)

8 The application site lies within 2 kilometres (km) of: Thorpe Park Number 1 Gravel Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Staines Moor SSSI (both of which also form part of the South West London Waterbodies Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site), and Thorpe Hay Meadows and Dumsey Meadow SSSIs. The majority of the land at QMQ is designated as the West of Queen Mary Reservoir Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI). There are a number of other SNCIs within 1 km of the site: the Queen Mary Reservoir SNCI, River Thames SNCI (Spelthorne and Runnymede), Penton Hook SNCI, and Laleham Burway Golf Course SNCI, and within 2km of the site Abbey Lake SNCI, Littleton Lake SNCI, Shepperton Quarry SNCI and Chertsey Waterworks SNCI.

7

9 The application site lies in an area with a long history of mineral working. In 1978 the Secretary of State refused a previous planning application for extraction of sand and gravel from land at Manor Farm. That application included erection of processing plant at Manor Farm, importation of waste materials to backfill the excavation and restoration back to original ground levels. An application (ref SP10/0738) submitted in 2009 by Shepperton Aggregates proposing extraction of mineral from the Manor Farm site, and transporting the mineral by conveyor to Shepperton Quarry for processing, was withdrawn in mid 2011.

10 Land at Manor Farm is identified as a Preferred Area (Preferred Area J) in the Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document (DPD) for future extraction of concreting aggregate for the period 2009-2026, which together with the Core Strategy DPD comprises the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011, adopted in July 2011. Key development requirements are set out for each preferred area, which need to be addressed as part of any future proposals for mineral extraction. For Manor Farm these include: access; local amenity; biodiversity; heritage; hydrology; air quality; aerodrome safeguarding and restoration.

11 The existing QMQ operational mineral site (formerly known as the land west of Queen Mary Reservoir quarry and operated by Reservoir Aggregates) lies to the east of Manor Farm and the Ashford Road. This QMQ site comprises former areas of land worked for sand and gravel, silt lagoons and the mineral processing plant site and stockpiling area associated with the extraction of minerals from Queen Mary Reservoir. Mineral extraction from the land to the west of the reservoir and from within the reservoir itself and processing of that mineral in the processing plant on site commenced in the late 1960s and has continued since under a number of planning permissions including for various buildings associated with mineral extraction and processing.

12 Mineral and waste activity currently taking place at the QMQ site is extraction of sand and gravel from within the reservoir involving removal of part of the breakwater baffle (permission ref SP07/1269); a facility for recycling of construction and demolition waste and production of recycled and alternative aggregates (permission ref SP07/1273); and the importation and processing of ‘as raised’ gravel for processing (permission ref SP07/1275). These permissions were all granted in January 2009.

13 The land at QMQ is to be restored to an after-use of nature conservation with no public access under revised working, restoration and landscaping schemes approved under reference SP07/1276 in January 2009. These provide for the phased restoration of the site and restoration to be completed by the end of December 2038. A section 106 (S106) legal agreement was entered into in connection with this decision and the SP07/1269, SP07/1273 and SP07/1275 planning permissions. The S106 legal agreement secured the long-term aftercare management of the land at QMQ following restoration and landscaping.

14 Applications for approval of details (as required by Condition 6 of SP07/1275 and Condition 7 of SP07/1269 which had withdrawn permitted development rights for erection of plant and machinery) of the siting, detailed design, specifications and appearance of a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant at the QMQ site were made in 2011, but subsequently withdrawn.

15 Following completion of extraction in the reservoir and mineral processing (permitted under SP07/1269), the processing plant was to be removed. The processing of as raised mineral and the recycling to be undertaken on the former processing plant area are to use mobile plant instead. Under these permissions mineral processing and waste recycling activity is permitted to continue to the end of 2033, and the whole QMQ site restored by the end of 2038.

16 As mineral extraction from the baffle and processing permitted under SP07/1269 was not going to be completed by 31 December 2013, as envisaged at the time the permissions were granted, Brett Aggregates made a planning application in 2013 to extend the time period for completion of extraction of mineral from the baffle and retention and use of the access, haul route and processing plant to 31 December 2016 (ref SP13/01236). If permitted this would need modifications to the current recycling facility, and import and processing of 'as raised' mineral developments permitted under SP07/1273 and SP07/1275 (relating to location and use of processing plant) for which planning applications were also made (SP13/01238 and SP13/01239). These applications were reported to the 11 June 2014 Planning and Regulatory Committee which resolved to grant planning permission subject to the prior completion of a variation to the S106 agreement so it applied to the new permissions and secured the long-term aftercare management of the land at QMQ following restoration and landscaping. The decision notices will be issued once the S106 legal agreement has been completed, expected in mid December 2014.

THE PROPOSAL

17 The planning application is for the extraction of around 1.5million tonnes (mt) of sand and gravel (concreting aggregate) from the Manor Farm part of the application site and restoration to landscaped lakes for nature conservation after-use and provision of a dedicated area on land at Manor Farm adjacent to Buckland School for nature conservation study; installation of a field conveyor for the transportation of mineral and use for the transportation of mineral from Manor Farm to the QMQ processing plant site, and processing of the sand and gravel in the existing processing plant and retention of the processing plant for the duration of operations; erection of a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant within the existing QMQ aggregate processing and stockpiling areas; and construction of a tunnel beneath the Ashford Road (B377) to accommodate a conveyor link between Manor Farm and QMQ for the transportation of mineral.

18 Based on an average annual extraction rate of 330,000 tonnes per annum (pa), (maximum 390,000 tonnes per annum), the application anticipates mineral extraction would take some five years to complete, with a further 12 months to complete restoration. The estimated duration of extraction in each phase is shown below:

Phase	**Estimated duration in months**
1	10
2	19
3	15
4	17
Total	60 (five years)

Subject to planning permission being granted, the application states extraction would commence following completion of extraction from beneath the breakwater baffle in Queen Mary Reservoir. Given the current position at the QMQ site this is expected to be no earlier than 2017. (Under permission (ref SP07/1269) extraction was due to be completed by 31 December 2013. Application SP13/01236 seeks to extend this to 31 December 2016, see paragraph 16 above). The rate of extraction would be dependent on market conditions, and could be quicker or slower than the anticipated average annual extraction rate and five year extraction period stated in the application.

Working scheme

7

19 The Manor Farm site would be worked and progressively restored in four phases, see Plan 3. Phase 1 to the east of FP 30 would be worked in two sub phases, phases 1A and 1B, starting in the centre. Extraction would commence in the southern part of Phase 1A and work northwards to towards FP29 and the Buckland School and Greenfield Recreation Ground. Phase 1B would work southwards from the centre. Phases 2 to 4 (also to be worked as sub phases A and B) lie to the west of Footpath No 30 and would be worked from north to south. No mineral extraction would be undertaken within 100 metres of a residential building, though in some parts of the site construction of noise/visual screening bunds would be within 100 metres of residential buildings as the bunding would be erected between the excavation and properties.

20 FP30 would remain open during the life of the proposed mineral working and restoration. Crossing points for plant and machinery would be provided. Noise/visual screening bunds would be erected to the west of FP30. A temporary culvert (tunnel) would be constructed under the footpath through which the conveyor belt would run to transport mineral extracted from Phases 2, 3 and 4 to the QMQ processing plant. The conveyor belt and tunnel would be removed as part of the restoration work.

21 Soils and overburden from the each extraction phase would be stripped prior to the extraction commencing in the phase and used to construct noise/visual screen mounds up to 3 metres high along the site boundaries between the workings and adjacent development or used in the restoration of an earlier phase of working. Following completion of extraction on each phase the phase would be progressively restored.

22 The site would be worked wet with mineral extracted using a hydraulic excavator and placed alongside the excavation to allow water to drain back into the extraction area. Material would then be loaded by wheeled loading shovel into a field hopper for controlled release onto the conveyor belt for transport to the QMQ processing plant. The conveyor would run from the Manor Farm part of the site on the land between numbers 151 and 133 Ashford Road and then in a tunnel constructed under the Ashford Road. From there it would cross the southern part of the lake at QMQ on a causeway constructed with materials already at the site. The conveyor would then run northwards on the land between the existing lakes and the River Ash/reservoir wall to the processing plant site, as shown on Plans 3, 4 and 5.

23 Following issues raised during the consideration of the application and ongoing discussions between Surrey County Council, the Surrey Wildlife Trust, Brett Aggregates Ltd and others associated with the management plan for the restoration and landscaping of the QMQ site a different route within QMQ for the conveyor was identified which would avoid some areas of habitat and features of ecological interest. This has led to the submission of the QMQ conveyor application ref SP13/01003, see application area on Plan 5, and reported elsewhere on this agenda.

24 The SP13/01003 conveyor application proposes a partial realignment of the route and siting of the conveyor belt within the QMQ site proposed to transport mineral extracted at Manor Farm to the QMQ processing plant, and an additional area of land adjacent to the Ashford Road for use in connection with the construction of the proposed tunnel under the Ashford Road for siting of the conveyor, see Plan 5. The small area of land adjacent to the Ashford Road has been applied for to ensure that sufficient land would be available for the construction of the proposed conveyor tunnel under the Ashford Road. The different route for the conveyor proposed under the conveyor application would make use of largely unvegetated land within the QMQ site adjacent to the existing access track.

Access, traffic and site infrastructure at Manor Farm

25 There are two existing accesses to the Manor Farm part of the application site, one to the west off Worple Road north of the SALSAL facility, and one to the east off the Ashford Road, between numbers 151 and 133.

26 The Worple Road access would be retained and improved for use in connection with the proposed extraction from Manor Farm. The modifications to the access, formation of the access and site compound would take place during operations in Phase1. Access gates would be installed 15 metres in from the road and a single track stone surfaced access road laid from the entrance to a stone surfaced site compound, some 50 metres (m) long by 30m wide, situated in the north western part of the Manor Farm site. Within the site compound would be parking areas for plant and machinery when not in use, private and light goods vehicle parking and site facilities. The site facilities would include two secure portacabins (demountable buildings) to house staff facilities and storage of site consumables, engineering parts etc. Downward directed, sensor activated, lighting for security purposes would be installed at the site compound.

27 The access off Worple Road, and single track access road to the site compound, would be used for cars (staff and visitors) and light goods vehicles (for operating and maintenance staff and deliveries of consumables etc.) The only HGV use of the Worple Road access would be for deliveries of fuel, and twice a year for earthmoving equipment being brought onto and removed off site.

28 A new access off the Ashford Road is proposed adjacent to number 151 Ashford Road. (Originally the proposal was to upgrade the existing agricultural access adjacent to number 133 Ashford Road.) The new access off the Ashford Road would involve gates and provision of a stone surfaced area inside the access. This access would be used for installation of the conveyor route, and during phase 1 for the delivery and removal of plant and machinery in connection with extraction in Phase 1 and site operatives. During the working of Phases 2 to 4 the Ashford Road access would only be used periodically for maintenance of the conveyor.

29 All mineral excavated at Manor Farm would be transported by conveyor belt to the QMQ processing plant, see paragraphs 22 to 24 above and Plans 3, 4 and 5. Where the conveyor crosses the Ashford Road, a 3.4m wide by 2.77m high tunnel would be constructed for the conveyor and inspection and maintenance personnel to pass beneath the road. To cross FP30 the conveyor would run under the path in a tunnel, some 3m wide by 2m high.

Mineral processing, access and traffic at Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ)

30 Mineral extracted at Manor Farm would be processed in the existing QMQ mineral gravel processing plant. Silt arising from the processing of the mineral would be deposited in the existing silt settlement lagoons/lake to the west of the processing plant.

31 The application proposes installing a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant at the QMQ processing plant site, see Plan 4. These would be in place and operational until the end of December 2033 in line with the permitted duration for the existing recycling operation and importation and processing of as raised mineral (permission refs SP07/1273 and SP07/1275).

32 The output from the concrete batching plant would be 20,000 cubic metres (m^3) per annum (pa) (requiring 40,000 tonnes of aggregate). Some 40,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of mineral would be bagged into 850kg and smaller bags for sale. The bagging plant would be housed in a building and the bagged aggregate stored in the open in the storage area to the west of the bagging plant building.

7

33 Access would be by the existing QMQ accesses off the A308 Kingston Road (HGVs in and out) and Ashford Road (HGVs in only). In line with the current arrangements HGV traffic would enter using either access, but all HGV traffic leaving the site would be via the A308 access only.

34 Under the existing permissions at QMQ (exports of mineral arising from extraction at QMQ, imports and exports associated with the recycling operation, and imports of as raised mineral for processing and exports) HGV traffic is limited to a maximum of 300 movements per working day (150 two way movements). (The same vehicle limits would apply to the new planning permissions when issued, see paragraph 16 above.)

35 The anticipated traffic movements arising from the exports of processed mineral from Manor Farm (based on anticipated extraction rate of 300,000 tpa, the output from the concrete batching plant (20,000 m^3) and sales of bagged aggregate (40,000 tpa) in combination with the ongoing recycling operation and import and processing of as raised mineral for the duration of mineral extraction at Manor Farm would be in the region of 259 movements per day (130 two way movements), which is below the 300 maximum movements for the site. During the operational life of Manor Farm, so that the site daily vehicle number limit is not exceeded, the applicant proposes managing the import of as raised mineral for processing and the quantity of construction and demolition waste imported for processing and exports of product.

Hours of operation

36 The proposed hours of working for mineral extraction and restoration at the Manor Farm part of the application site are 7.30 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday. Apart from emergency access the Manor Farm site would be closed on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays.

37 The QMQ processing plant, and proposed aggregate bagging and concrete batching plant would operate 7.30 am to 5.30 pm Monday to Friday and 7.30 am to 1pm on Saturdays. Except for emergency access the QMQ plant site would be closed on Saturday afternoons, Sundays and public holidays.

Restoration and after-use

38 The site would be progressively restored with Phase 1 restored during extraction from Phase 2 and Phase 2 restored during extraction from Phase 3. Part of Phase 3 would be restored during extraction from Phase 4. Completion of restoration of Phase 3 and restoration of Phase 4 would be carried out on completion of extraction on Phase 4. Completion of restoration of the site would be 12 month from completion of extraction in Phase 4.

39 The proposed restoration for the Manor Farm site is to provide an area for nature conservation use. This would comprise open waterbodies with shallow wetland and marsh areas, associated reed beds and marginal planting with willow scrub, and tree and hedgerow planting within the remainder of the site, see Plan 6.

40 Two smaller waterbodies would be created to the east of FP30 footpath on Phase 1 and one larger waterbody with two islands on the area to the west of the footpath. To allow views of the lakes from the rear of properties on Ashford Road advance screen planting to the rear of the properties would be removed as part of the restoration and replaced with thorny scrub. The restoration of the land to the rear of properties in Brightside Avenue would be to open grassland and all conifers and poplars planted as part of advance screen planting removed to allow residents views across the restored site. Post restoration public access across the land at Manor Farm would remain as exists at present along FP30.

41 In the interests of reducing the potential risk of birdstrike from wildfowl using the waterbodies the lakes, islands, and water margin areas would be designed and planted with plant species to prevent colonisation and use of the lakes by bird species that are considered a birdstrike risk to aircraft. In the interests of public safety public access to the waterbodies would be restricted, by fencing and strategic planting. Restricting public access would also discourage feeding of birds (which would encourage birds that present a risk to aircraft to use the site).

42 The applicant proposes to create a conservation study area, secured by a 2.1m high green palisade fence, including a small pond with marginal species, and planting of a variety of native tree and shrub species, on land south of FP30 adjacent to Buckland Primary School. The creation of the study area would be subject to the agreement of the school Governors and is proposed to facilitate safe, outdoor study and encourage improved biodiversity. In addition to the study area there would be the potential to create controlled supervised access for pupils to other areas of the restored site.

43 On the QMQ part of the application site the conveyor link would be removed. The material used to construct the causeway across the southern part of the lake would be placed in the lake as part of the approved restoration proposals for the site, which in this part of the site is creation of reed swamp and reed beds, see Plan 7.

Environmental Statement

44 The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) that contains an assessment of: landscape and visual impact; ecology and nature conservation (species and designated areas); archaeology and cultural heritage; drainage and Floodrisk assessment; hydrology and hydrogeology; noise; air quality and dust; soils and landuse; and transport and highways. For each topic the ES identifies mitigation measures to avoid, reduce and remedy any adverse environmental effects of the proposed development.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

45 Spelthorne Borough Council: Raises strong objection to the proposal on the grounds that insufficient information has been provided regarding the noise and air quality impact and mitigation and additionally the feasibility of restoration of the site to its current state by backfilling using the conveyor systems needs to be re-examined. (In view of the concerns of local residents about noise and air quality (dust) the borough council have asked for information on both noise and air quality that would normally be required by condition, e.g. dust assessment and action plan, to be submitted prior to determination of the application. It considers provision of the information at this stage would give more confidence to residents that these are issues that can be addressed.)

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

46 Environment Agency: No objection subject to five conditions (relating to flood risk) being applied to any planning permission granted. Without the conditions the Environment Agency would object to the proposal as they consider the development would pose an unacceptable risk to the environment.

47 Health and Safety Executive: No objection

48 Heathrow Airport Safeguarding: No aerodrome safeguarding objection subject to imposition of a planning condition to secure a bird hazard management plan.

49 Natural England:Ecology - No objection in relation to protected species or designated sites. Does not consider the proposal will impact on the South West London Waterbodies Special Proteciton Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site or the seven SSSIs which are entirely within or part of the SPA/RAMSAR site.

7

Agriculture/Soils – No objection subject to imposition of planning conditions to safeguard soil resources and promote a satisfactory standard of reclamation.

50 Surrey Wildlife Trust: For the Manor Farm part of the site it consider the survey work and mitigation proposals appear to address the areas of significant interest on this part of the site. Provided the mitigation proposals are fully implemented the development should not result in significant adverse effect on important habitat and legally protected species on this part of the site. SWT is generally supportive of the restoration proposals which (if implemented in full) could deliver a higher level of biodivserity value for the site post development.

For the QMQ part of the site SWT consider information has been provided to enable the planning authority to assess the ecological impact on the West of Queen Mary Reservoir SNCI, and the potential status and impact of the proposed development on protected and important species on the site. It is concerned that the construction of a mineral conveyor belt system could still have a significant adverse effect on the West of Queen Mary Reservoir SNCI.

51 Highway Authority (Transportation Development Planning Group): No objection subject to conditions and informatives.

52 Rights of Way: No objection to the application subject to a number of requirements to protect the right of way and its use.

53 County Air Quality Consultant: No objection subject to conditions. Recommends conditions requiring i) adoption of a Dust Action Plan (documented site-specific operational plan to prevent or minimise the release of dust from the site) which should be submitted to and approved by the county council; and a programme of ongoing dust monitoring to validate the outcome of the assessment and to check on the continuing effectiveness of control/mitigation measures (the monitoring programme to be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority (CPA)).

54 County Noise Consultant: No objection. Is satisfied that the proposed development can be carried out within the provisions of the Surrey Noise Guidelines.

55 County Heritage Conservation Team – Archaeological Officer: No objection subject to planning condition to secure implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved by the CPA.

56 County Ecologist and Biodiversity Manager: No ecological objections or observations to make. There would be no significant adverse impact on ecology and the restoration scheme should provide a biodiversity enhancement through the creation of new habitats.

57 County Landscape Consultant: No objection. Has reviewed the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development and concludes that the development is acceptable in landscape and visual terms. Made a number of recommendations relating to visual screening of the site compound, planting details (species and density), post restoration management, and use of soils.

58 County Geotechnical Consultant: No objection subject to conditions relating to soil handling, pollution control (submission of site operational plan including ground and surface water pollution control measures), provision of a comprehensive groundwater monitoring plan.

59 Thames Water: There are public sewers crossing or close to the development. In order to protect public sewers approval is required from Thames Water where the erection of a building, extension or undepinning work would be over the line of, or would come within three metres of a public sewer. There is a foul sewer and manhole in the Ashford Road in the location where the conveyor tunnel is proposed and the developer needs to contact Thames Water Developer services regarding asset protection of the sewer during and after construction.

60 Affinity Water (formerly Veolia Water Partnership): No objection subject to appropriate monitoring and remediation methods being undertaken to deal with any existing pollution being found on site in order to protect public waters supplies.

61 National Grid (National Transmission System): The proposed development is in close proximity to National Grid's gas and electricity transmission assets including underground gas pipeline and High Voltage Transmission Overhead Line and associated equipment at QMQ. No objection to the proposal. Has provided information on detailed requirements that must be followed by the applicant when planning and undertaking the development.

62 Esso Petroleum Co Ltd (Fisher German): The company have apparatus (oil pipeline) situated near the proposed development. No objection so long as the proposals adhere to the "Special Requirements for Safe Working" and covenants in the "Deed of Grant".

63 Open Spaces Society: No views received.

64 Ramblers' Association (Staines Group): No objection.

65 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB): No views received.

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

66 CLAG2 (Campaign Laleham Against Gravel 2): Object for the following reasons:

a) *Amenity*

- Manor Farm is surrounded by residential properties.
- Schools, sporting facilities and a parent and toddler club are nearby. The proposal would impact on all the above in terms of disturbance, noise, dust and quality of life.
- The close proximity of the proposed site to schools, houses and recreational facilities presents a health risk to all residents as a result from noise, dust and pollution out spill.
- Evidence from other aggregate sites in the local area suggests noise will be a significant issue for local residents, particularly those who work at night.
- It will have a disruptive effect on teaching in the local primary schools.
- Security lighting, triggered by "appropriate movement sensitive switches" will be installed at the car/plant hard-standing at the Worple Road entrance adjacent to the sports club. This can be triggered by animal movement and will impact on those houses facing the compound contributing to disturbed sleep.
- Human rights – To approve the plan will be a breach of the Human rights Act especially Article 8.

Noise Assessment

- The applicant has undertaken a noise assessment scientifically, this should be done locally.

7

Health, Safety and Security

- Safety risk from the gravel pit workings as they will be out of view behind bunds. The conveyor belt is unsupervised and out of view of site workers along much of its length so is a risk for people.
- Lakes when complete will be a hazard. It will be almost impossible to secure the site.
- The proposed "nature conservation area" next to Buckland School for their use includes a pond which presents a potential risk to children.
- The storage of fuels and chemicals at the proposed site compound adjacent to the Staines and Laleham Sports Ground is unacceptable.
- The proposal presents an increased risk of drowning, flooding and the infestation of flies. Erection of fencing, warning signs and planting to prevent access and forming the lake edges so they are shallow is not sufficient to reduce the risks.
- Creation of yet more expanses of water in the area must increase the incidence of flocking birds and presents an increased risk of birdstrike to aircraft using Heathrow.

Footpaths

- It is unclear how Footpath 30 can remain open during construction of the conveyor tunnel. No health and safety measures are mentioned in the application.
- Obstructing a public right of way is a criminal offence. The proposal will lead to people walking the footpath being stopped from time to time for health and safety reasons.

b) *Green Belt*

Visual Amenity

- Over 30 years ago a similar application was rejected on appeal for reasons including: the Green Belt: the Green Belt function of the site separating Staines upon Thames from Laleham; and although noise would be controlled to an acceptable level, the noise attenuation barriers and the bridges over Public Footpath 30 would represent a substantial visual impact.
- There is more housing around the site now than there was 30 years ago.

Policy

- The proposal does not meet the required conditions for mineral extraction in the Green Belt set out in Policy MC3 – Spatial strategy on Mineral Development in the Green Belt as environmental standards are not of the highest level (noise, dust, traffic), not agreed time limits and restoration to lakes is not a beneficial landuse.

Loss of Green Belt

- Concerns about loss of valuable Green Belt/agricultural land and replacement with marsh lands and lakes which require management and maintenance in the long term to deter vandals.

c) *Alternative Sites*

- There are other locations for extraction not surrounded by housing and schools.
- Despite the current application proposal changing to involve transporting mineral to QMQ instead of Shepperton Quarry nearly a mile away, the applicant has used the restoration scheme from the previous Shepperton Aggregates application. It would have been extremely difficult to transport waste over this distance to Manor Farm, but it wouldn't have been impossible, but wasn't considered as Bretts said it could not be done.
- The action group consider the current application to be new and should be treated as such. These is no reason why a second conveyor cannot be installed to transport waste to the site from QMQ, which has very good road access via the A308, and where there is sufficient space within the site to off load waste before loading onto the conveyor and transporting it to Manor Farm.

d) *Gravel Reserves*

- Research shows that the gravel from Manor Farm is not needed for Surrey to fulfil its quota. Aggregate sales in Surrey and elsewhere at this time are at an all time low.
- The applicant's consultant quotes incorrect figures about the current landbank and makes out need is greater than it actually is and assumes Surrey needs a landbank.
- Government quotas based on historical data are no longer relevant and future increases can be met from marine dredging or rail imports

e) *Hydrology / Flooding*

- CLAG2 calculate that the gravel workings will contain approximately 3.5 billion litres of water. Where will it come from? Excavation of the scale proposed must have an impact on surrounding water flows/levels and therefore stability of property.
- Digging more gravel pits could adversely affect the ability of the area to deal with surface water, drainage and create a higher flood risk.
- The fields bordered by Brightside Avenue, Pavilion Gardens and Worple Road at Manor Farm has had unprecedented flooding. These fields were flooded and had large areas of standing water on them following the extremely high level of rainfall conditions over the winter/spring of 2012/13 and 2013/14 Creation of vast lakes would exacerbate the problem of flooding.
- The amendments to the application refer to areas of land being identified as "compensation for temporary bunds" (as a result of loss of floodplain). Creation of lakes will lead to large areas of floodplain, which by definition is land, being lost.
- Gaps now proposed in Bund A could be eroded by water flow and get blocked resulting in increased flood risk.
- There is evidence lakes formed by gravel extraction become self sealing from the water table which will lead to increased risk of flooding.
- Flooding has occurred in the vicinity of the route of the proposed conveyor belt where it crosses under the Ashford Road; this included the discharge of sewage. As the area already floods when water in the lake is free flowing putting in any obstruction will increase risk of flooding.
- More frequent weather patterns and climate change must be taken into consideration in the applicant's hydrology report and when determining planning applications.

7

f) *Local Roads and Site Access*

Congestion and Traffic

- Worple Road is already a busy through route especially early to mid morning and late afternoon to early evening. The extra traffic accessing the site will add to congestion and threaten the safety of all, especially children walking to school.
- Transporting stock grazing the site post restoration by road vehicle to the different parts of the site will add to traffic congestion and pollution.

Road Suitability for Site Servicing Vehicles

- Worple Road with its chicanes and speed humps is unsuitable for use by the size and type of vehicle to be used to deliver plant and machinery (16.633m/54 feet long low loader).

g) *Nature*

- Waterbodies will lead to increase in flying insects and which will cause nuisance and health risk to residents.
- Bats, a protected species abound in the area. Surveys are necessary.
- Aerial photographs show a variety of established trees on the site, there doesn't appear to be an obligation on the operator to ensure established trees are preserved; some trees have already been removed from the perimeter.
- Application wrong as how can long (nearly 17m low loader) access the site off Worple Road without having to remove any trees?
- Loss of trees and existing habitats used by animals, birds and insects, particularly bats and other protected species won't be mitigated for by proposed mitigation.
- Already have large areas of Waterbodies / water in the area so question the need for further water / wetland habitats.

h) *Timescale*

- The rate of extraction would be affected by market conditions. This means the community will be expected to endure uncertainty and disruption for an indeterminate time which is unacceptable.

i) *Community Benefits and Legacy*

- There will be no benefit to the local community from the proposal. There will be no prospect of significant employment.
- There will be no public access to the restored site.

j) *Restoration Impact*

Long-term Maintenance

- There is no incentive for Brett Aggregates to maintain the site. The unmaintained woodland along the Ashford Road [QMQ] does not instil confidence in their commitment to management and maintenance of sites.

Loss of Agricultural Land

- The land is valuable agricultural land, formerly arable (cereal production) until downgraded to grazing by the owner.

- Returning the unexcavated land to agricultural/grazing use, as proposed is totally unrealistic given the small amount of land that will be left.
- Agricultural land should be safeguarded for use in food production, as advocated by Government.
- There is no need to put in waterbodies or lakes.

Restoration and Surrey Minerals / Waste Plan Policies

- By not restoring to an agricultural afteruse the applicant's proposal does not accord with Surrey Minerals Plan Policy MC3 – Spatial Strategy Mineral Development in the Green Belt.
- The proposal contradicts Section 6.29 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) and Primary Aggregates DPD.
- Referring to the Surrey Minerals Site Restoration SPD 2011, the applicant's proposal falls short of Surrey's own vision for and approach to the restoration of mineral sites.

Alternative Restoration Options

- There has been no consideration of the possibility for using a reverse/return conveyor to bring inert material to fill the holes and restore the site. Backfilling the site means it can be restored to agricultural land.
- Brett Aggregates state that, due to the size and therefore weight of inert fill, it is not possible to use a conveyor to transport inert fill material from the Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane site. This is not necessarily the case. The SMP 2011 Inspector's report clearly states: "*lack of suitable access for HGVs for the importation of inert fill restricts opportunities to restore the entire area to existing levels; create areas of open space and open water unless a feasible and acceptable method of importation of fill can be found, enabling an alternative restoration option to be considered.*" Alternative restoration would be possible using the concrete crusher at QMQ to break the size of the waste down, and using a second conveyor so it can be transported by conveyor to backfill Manor Farm.

67 Charlton Village Residents' Association: No views received.

68 Laleham Residents' Association: No views received.

69 Manor Farm Eastern Boundary Residents Association: No views received.

70 Manor Farm Residents' Association: Object for the following reasons:

Noise – clarification sought on noise generated and numbers and types of equipment to be used. Sound assessment appears to use sanitised scientific figures. Noise levels from QMQ have increased. Noise from reversing warnings at QMQ quite obtrusive. Query about daily average number of reversing movement at QMQ and average decibel output of the vehicle reversing warning system used at the site.

Buckland School – Have discussed proposal for wetland wildlife area for use by school with headmistress and govenors of Buckland School. School concerned about reference in title/description of the proposal implying compliance with proposal. Reference should be removed. School already have own wildlife area and pond within school grounds. Query about proposal in Stanwell and restoration (pond/lake) being passed because of benefit to the community.

Monitoring and company record in maintaining site at QMQ - Query about who monitors sites and is QMQ monitored. Reports to the Residents' Association about high levels of noise and dust from the site during the summer of 2013. Query about maintenance of the fence along the Ashford Road boundary and maintenance of the woodland, and how can the county council consider the Manor Farm application given the operator Brett's inability to maintain their existing operation at QMQ.

7

Flooding – Did the flooding experienced in late 2013/early 2014 raise matters such as unforseen possible river levels, inability of land to drain as predicted etc. which had hitherto been overlooked and should now be reassesed?

How does excavation and creation of lakes containing millions of gallons of yet more water fit in with proposed flood defences for Staines upon Thames? Existing flood defences on the local stretch of the River Thames are inadequate to meet the weather conditions just faced in the UK and future climate change effects on weather. Permitting further extraction will ignore the obvious and undermine the ability of this part of the Thames basin to accomodate flooding let alone considering improving it. Greed for gravel ignores risks to the community and only satisfies government demand for revenue. Wrasbury was a good example of what happens when water levels rise and previous excavations restored to water join up when water levels rise. Should reconsider both the Manor Farm and Milton Park Farm planning applications in regard to flooding embracing criteria previously ignored.

71 Surbiton & District Bird Watching Society: No objection. Likes the idea of the nature reserve for use by Buckland School. However, overall feels the restoration is unlikely to add to local biodiversity in terms of birds and questions the need for and reasoning behind the design to reduce risk of birdstrike.

72 Shepperton Residents' Association: No views received.

73 Spelthorne Natural History Society: No views received.

74 Queen Mary Sailing Club: No views received.

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

75 The application was initially publicised in September 2012 by the placing of an advert in the local newspaper; posting of ten site notices and sending some 994 neighbour notification letters to the owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties and those people who had made representations on the SP10/0738 planning application (by Shepperton Aggregates) for mineral extraction at Manor Farm which was withdrawn in by 2011.

76 Amendments to the application and amplifying information and information relating to the Environmental Statement provided in response to a request for further and other environmental information under Regulation 22 of the EIA Regs were publicised in July 2013 and January 2014. The publicity involved newspaper advert, posting of 10 site notices and notifying all those originally notified in 2012 plus anyone who had made written representations on the planning application.

77 Part of the proposed development (concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant at Queen Mary Quarry) is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, the original advertisement for the application did not refer to the application being a departure from the development plan. The application was therefore re publicised in December 2014 as a departure from the development plan. The publicity involved newspaper advert, posting of 10 site notices and notifying by letter all those originally notified in 2012 plus anyone who had made written representations on the planning application. The period for receipt of representations runs up to the end of Monday 5 January 2015. Any representations

received after the report has been published will be reported in the update sheet in line with current procedures.

78 To date written representations objecting to the planning application have been received from 296 members of the public, organisations and groups. Some of the letters raise objection on the same grounds as CLAG2, see above. The grounds for objecting and issues raised in the letters from the remainder are summarised below.

a) Amenity

Pollution / Air Quality and Health Impacts

- Vehicle emissions with increase Asthma and have other health impacts.
- Dust and air pollution from extraction will have health impacts.
- Canada Geese are a health hazard.
- The area already has high pollution levels from Heathrow, M25, M3 and River Thames.
- Site will attract fly tipping and attract rodents.
- Waterbodies will lead to flying insects which pose a health risk.
- The recent Environmental Audit Committee report argues air pollution is a public health crisis and this area is already heavily polluted; the proposal will add to this from traffic and dust working against the Government objective to reduce pollution.

Dust

- Dust from the site will settle on cars, windows and vegetation having a health impact.
- The proposal will add to dust soiling already taking place in the area.
- The dust will take a long time to settle once working has stopped.
- The site should use dust suppression sprays as is done in Europe.
- Fine particles pose a health hazard.
- Dust will have impacts on health for vulnerable sectors of the population such as school children and the elderly. Respiratory and skin problems and cancer will increase.
- Dust will impact on schools.
- Dust will affect crops and soil at nearby allotments and gardens.
- Noise and Dust will affect health.

Lighting

- Security lighting (which can be triggered by animals) at the car/plant hard-standing at the Worple Road entrance will cause a nuisance to residents overlooking the site. Residents already have a nearby sports facility using lighting until late at night.

Noise and Vibration

- Noise will impact on shift workers, school children and retired people.
- Noise impact at schools will affect children and their education.
- Brett cannot confirm that noise levels would be acceptable.
- There is insufficient evidence to assess noise levels.
- Noise from the QMQ site at present levels is unacceptable; the proposal will add to an already noisy site.
- The site would have an unacceptable impact on residents near Ashford Road.
- High and low frequency noise from the site will impact on pets and wildlife.
- Mineral and waste traffic in the area already creates an unacceptable level of noise and vibration which affect houses.

- Reversing bleepers on the loading shovel will create considerable noise.
- The submitted Noise Assessment has been done 'scientifically', it should be done locally.
- Noise at other mineral sites causes problems in the area.
- The gaps in Bund A for Phase 1 may lead to unacceptably high noise levels for residents.
- Noise will ruin outdoor leisure space (at houses, footpath, Greenfield Recreation Ground, schools, SALSAL).

Hours of Operation

- 0730 start – does this mean machinery started? If so will mean activity starts at 0700 as staff arrive and will disturb residents.
- The weekday hours are too long.
- The plant should not operate on a Saturday morning.
- 07.30 – 18.00 hours will cause disturbance to children at schools and the elderly.
- Brett says they will start at 07.30 but Brett have vehicles on the road from 06.00.

Site proximity to other land uses / development

- The site is too close to residential areas; two infant and junior schools, nurseries; footpaths and leisure facilities (Greenfield Recreation Ground, SALSAL sports and social club, sailing facilities at Queen Mary Reservoir.
- Will have adverse impact on leisure and recreation in area contrary to Government drive to increase physical activity and health of population; will impact on use of adjoining open space and leisure facilities, such as archery at the SALSAL ground.
- Extraction within 100 metres of properties is too close, much closer to housing than previous gravel plant.
- Alternative uses / development should be considered for the site.
- Impact on 133 Ashford Road from proposed Ashford Road entrance (visual impact and loss of privacy due to closeness of access to property, and noise and dust). [Officer note: the proposed access off Ashford Road was altered from upgrading the existing access next to No. 133 to the other side of the field (next to 151 Ashford Road) as a result of discussions with owner of property. In addition fencing would be erected between No. 133 and the site to screen the proposed access and conveyor.]

Cumulative Impact

- Too many Minerals and Waste Sites: Charlton Lane, Shepperton Quarry, QMQ, Council Depot Ashford Road
- Future impact of possible Heathrow expansion (traffic and pollution), Football Academy at Laleham Park.

Amenity Space

- The proposal will result in a loss of open green space in the area.
- Users of the Greenfield Recreation Ground next to the site will be affected.
- Dog walkers will lose open space to walk their dogs.
- Trees proposed in the plan will block the views of residents.
- The development will have an adverse impact on local leisure and recreation.
- Bunds, fences and trees will block out the daytime sunlight at properties.
- Noise and dust will impact on residents of properties backing onto Manor Farm who won't be able to open their windows or use their gardens.
- The proposal will lead to rodents and fly-tipping.

Visual Impact

- There will be a loss of privacy on 133 Ashford Road.
- New access onto Ashford road is out of keeping with rural nature along Ashford Road. It will be a concrete eyesore.
- Loss of outlook and views from the rear of properties.
- The application and buildings proposed will be an eyesore. Screen bunding will not compensate for loss of views.
- The erection of a concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant and the conveyor belt will be eyesores.

b) Green Belt

- Waterbodies do not represent an appropriate Green Belt after use.
- The land is Green Belt, it should not be used for a concrete and gravel processing factory. If permit these will have no option but to permit the extraction from Manor Farm.
- In previous refusal 30 years ago the site was considered to fulfil an important Green Belt function separating Staines upon Thames and Laleham, particularly noticeable from the local footpaths and from a local point of view assisting in maintaining the sense of being on the urban fringe. This still stands.
- The proposal does not meet the requirements for mineral extraction in the Green Belt (Policy MC3).
- The development would represent a substantial visual impact which is unsuitable in the Green Belt.

c) Alternative Sites

- Extraction should be done under golf courses, not on land close to housing.
- Gravel should be dredged from the Thames.
- Spelthorne is being ruined by mineral and waste sites and the resultant waterbodies and reservoirs.
- Previous applications in the 1970s were refused on amenity and Green Belt grounds which still stand today.
- Brett entered into an undertaking not to work Staines Moor, the same should apply here.
- Why not put hold on this application and look again at the 2011 survey of Mineral Extraction sites?

d) Gravel Reserves / Mineral Uses

- Demand for gravel is low. The development is not needed.
- The Manor Farm development is not needed to meet Surrey's quota.
- Government quotas are based on historical data and are no longer relevant
- The applicant quotes incorrect figures about the current land bank.
- Surrey will not run out of gravel.
- Future demand for gravel can be met from marine dredging and rail imports.
- Surrey has met its requirement for gravel extraction, this development is unnecessary.
- Mineral extraction should be in the countryside, not here near residences.
- The site was identified as a Category 2 site in the 1993 Surrey Minerals local Plan as it was deemed no method of working or safeguards could overcome the environmental disturbance that would result. Do not see how this has changed.
- The current land bank is 3.72 mt. At the current rate of sales this will last for 18 years or until 2030. There is no need for the development.

- The Regional Minerals Strategies are no longer relevant today.
- There is sufficient sharp sand and gravel (allowing a 10 per cent increase) to last from now until 2026 without the need for this development.
- There are larger reserves of aggregate elsewhere in the authority where effects on residential amenity would be less.
- Demand for land won gravel is at its lowest, there will not be demand for the gravel excavated here.
- Land at Manor Farm should never have been included as a preferred site.
- There is enough sand and gravel in the sea bed making this proposal unnecessary.

e) Hydrology / Flooding

- Bunding could increase risk of flooding to housing.
- Tunnel under Ashford Road will make flooding worse / be liable to flooding.
- The Environment Agency has revised their flood maps
- The proposal will increase flood risk.
- Climate change will make flooding worse than predicted.
- The proposal will alter the water table and increase flooding
- Waterbodies left after mineral extraction lead to increased risk of flooding.
- Flooding will occur on local roads and footpaths
- Recent flood events in 2013/2014 have not been considered.
- The service road at Worple Road already floods.
- Northfield Road already floods, the proposal could increase this.
- No Flood Risk Assessment has been made.
- The Flood Risk Assessment should be redone.
- The area is susceptible to flooding from river water and sewage water.
- The area has enough water, more waterbodies will increase flood risk.
- Sewage pipe problems near the conveyor tunnel should be fixed before this application is considered. This application could make this worse.
- The area suffers from flooding already
- The removal of soil on Manor Farm will increase flood risk.
- The Broadway, Laleham already has drainage issues.
- If pumps fail at the Queen Mary Reservoir intake channel, there is a serious flood risk.
- The Environment Agency says that due to floods in the area, house building and gravel extraction will need to be reassessed.
- The creation of lakes on agricultural land removes floodplain and increases flooding.

Water Environment (Quality / Levels)

- The site is on an aquifer, there is a risk of pollution to groundwater, impact on the aquifer and an increase in Weil's disease due to more waterbodies.
- The water table in the area is high.
- Changes to the water table could affect water supplies at the allotments on The Broadway, Laleham.
- Extraction close to property may lead to damage to buildings through vibration and / or changes to the water table in the area provoking subsidence.
- The proposal will have an impact on the surrounding water flows / levels and therefore on property stability.

f) Highways, Traffic and Access

- The proposal will add to and increase congestion.
- Worple Road is already busy and busy at peak times; site traffic will add to congestion and threaten the safety of children walking to school.

- Worple Road is unsuitable for HGV traffic.
- The proposal will increase the risk of accidents on Worple Road.
- Width restrictions already impact on access out of Florence Gardens, the proposal will increase this impact.
- Mud on the road from the proposal will be a major skid hazard and cause accidents.
- Ashford Road access is unsuitable for site vehicles.
- Worple Road is unsuitable for 16.633 m/54 feet long low loader.
- Local roads at Laleham Village make the roads unsuitable for HGV / site traffic.
- There should be a weight limit on local roads.
- The proposal worsens the impact of traffic on people in Laleham.
- Traffic associated with the site has caused damage to the walls of listed buildings due to vibration.
- Currently 66 lorries are allowed past Laleham Primary School and even this number puts children at risk. Residents have endured this for years on the understanding it would only last for 16 years, but this plan will mean it continues for another 5 to 10 years. The additional proposals at QMQ indicate these HGV movements will continue to 2033, far in excess of all previous assurances.
- Traffic restrictions in Laleham are ignored by site vehicles.
- Tunnel under Ashford road will cause congestion when constructed; the road will need to be closed. The road already has problems with drainage and the surface.
- Site traffic will worsen the poor condition of local roads.
- Site traffic will discourage cycling and walking. Already a danger walking along the Ashford Road, particularly at the bend between the Ashford Road and Laleham Broadway.
- Site vehicles will intimidate local drivers, be noisy, speed and emit fumes.
- Local roads are not designed for the type of traffic from mineral sites.
- There will be an increase in traffic from the Queen May Quarry site.
- Increased site traffic will worsen vibration problems for local residents.
- Site traffic at the QMQ on Ashford road will damage business at a new children's nursery.
- If permitted should have condition to split the traffic between Worple Road and Ashford Road entrance so it is shared equally.
- There is no proposal to convey mineral from Littleton Lane to the Queen Mary site. Access through Queen Mary to the A308 should be made for transporting mineral from Littleton Lane site to remove traffic from Laleham.
- HGVs travel through Laleham, is this what is intended for Conservation Areas?
- A secluded and possibly ancient right of way will be lost forever.
- The proposal will have impacts on public rights of way.

g) Nature / Biodiversity

- The site is grassland and has built up a diverse ecosystem with bats, owls, jays, woodpeckers, little owl, red kites, herons, geese, kestrels, buzzards, kites and insects such as Stag Beetles that use the site.
- The Environmental Statement is insufficient.
- The replacement of grassland with another waterbody is unacceptable.
- Removal of habitat for Stag beetles and Song Thrushes is contrary to the Borough Biodiversity Plan.
- The removal of trees will impact on species.
- The site is a SSSI due to bats.
- Rare smooth snake have been seen in the fields, has a relevant survey been done?
- The proposed Buckland School nature reserve won't ameliorate the impact of habitat loss. The school already has a nature reserve in the grounds already.
- The removal of established protected Oak trees is unacceptable.
- Application wrong as will have to remove trees at Worple Road entrance.

- The wooded area within Home Farm in Laleham is ancient woodland.
- The grassland and habitats on the site area a balanced eco-system which will be damaged and removed.
- Cement dust will affect trees and vegetation.
- Spelthorne has no rolling green hills or forests but far too many gravel pits, reservoirs and areas of stagnant water from endless mineral extraction.

7

h) Timescale / Duration

- The timescale of the site is uncertain. The proposal will blight the area for at least 7 years. Could go on for years and years given applicant's history of continually applying to extend sites.
- Was told when moved to Laleham in 1971 that gravel raising in the area would cease in approximately 20 years.
- A reasonable end date should be proposed. 25 years duration would result in an unacceptable impact on residents.
- The rate of extraction depends on market conditions. This means there is no definite timescale for the development. Need a reasonable end date imposed, not 2033/2038.

i) Community Benefits and Legacy

- The proposal will not create significant employment in the area.
- It does not benefit the local community.
- The area would be blighted and there would be an adverse impact on property values.
- Company will profit from commercial gain at expense of local residents, lack of neighbourliness on part of company, another example of proposal by commercial company looking to profit/take advantage of community assets and local environment.
- Council should consider the future development of this area of Spelthorne, area is well placed to benefit from national infrastructure projects such as Heathrow and Crossrail and knock on effects for the local community which the mineral site could hinder. Borough council worked/working very hard for Staines upon Thames which is undergoing major investment to make it attractive to local businesses and the benefits from this to the local economy.
- No local benefit will derive from the proposal which will create pollution, put added burden to existing road infrastructure, impact on local environment and buildings and create very few jobs.

j) Restoration Impact

- Backfill should be considered instead of wet restoration.
- The site should be restored to its original condition or alternative development.
- Wet restoration cannot be considered as 'restoration'/two pits full of water do not constitute restoration.
- Restoring the site to lakes falls short of Government guidelines for the reinstatement of Green Belt land.
- There are too many waterbodies in the Spelthorne area.
- More waterbodies are not suitable for the area. They pose problems with security, vandalism, crime, safety and risk of drowning.
- Public access should be allowed. A new restoration plan is required to consider other possibilities.

- The provision of tarmac lit paths running close to the rear of properties in Pavilion Gardens should not be allowed. New paths to rear of properties will increase crime. [Officer Note: This doesn't form part of the current application. No new public footpaths would be created.]
- How long will the soil and infill areas take to settle before they can be built on?
- Lakes and footpaths will attract people.
- A high Willow coppice is no compensation to those who enjoy an open outlook from their homes.
- Who will be responsible for the long-term maintenance of the restored site?
- There is no incentive for Brett to maintain the restored site.
- If permitted should be an absolutely legally binding requirement/conditioned so site restored to its current status and use.
- There should be a sensible non negotiable time limit on extraction and restoration.
- Limiting bird use by planting as proposed is unrealistic.
- There are insufficient details of planting at the site.
- The near vertical sides of the lake will collapse over time with unknown consequences.
- Do not want allotments at the back of our house; this will put gardens at risk from instruction. [Officer Note: This doesn't form part of the current application.]
- If it is not financially viable to reinstate the land back to fields, Brett should not be allowed to leave the site as a deep hole filled with water.
- Marshlands and waterbodies will require long term maintenance to avoid becoming a hot bed of vandals and fly tippers.
- The site should be backfilled.
- The water filled gravel pits present a drowning hazard.
- Increased waterbodies will increase bird numbers and risk of bird strike on planes leaving Heathrow.

k) Safety / Infrastructure / Subsidence / Security

- Possible adverse effect on electricity pylons, gas, sewerage and foundations.
- Possibility of undermining at the Queen Mary Reservoir.
- Concerns about security of the site during operations and post restoration.
- Concerns over security at residences bordering Manor Farm.
- The proposal will increase crime and safety hazards in the area.
- The stability of houses close to working could be affected.
- Waterbodies pose a safety risk. The proposal to put in hard stone filled gabions and timber edges around the lakes will make things worse.
- Storage of dangerous fuels and chemicals at the site compound close to residences and sports facilities is unacceptable.
- The conveyor belt is unsupervised and poses a safety hazard / risk.
- Additional birds caused by the waterbodies at the site could increase the incidences of bird strikes of planes at Heathrow. Canada Geese are difficult to control.
- The site poses a safety hazard to children. Areas of the site are unsupervised.

l) Procedural

- The Environmental Statement was prepared by someone who is biased towards Brett as they paid for it. The ES underestimates the impact of the development.
- Neighbour notification was not extensive enough.

- Timing of submission of amendments by Brett in summer holidays (many people away and local newspapers not widely circulated). Neighbour notification only to those who had written in before, most people thought application had been turned down already.
- Site notices were poorly placed and not visible to vehicle drivers.
- Map on county council website misleading re route of conveyor and public footpath.
- Proposal is different to the 2009 Community Consultation Brief in a number of ways.
- Inaccuracies in the application documents, e.g. no reference on plans for Phase 1 of screening of the site compound, how can "average" depth be greater than "maximum" depth?
- Spelthorne Borough Council have rejected the proposal twice.
- None of the committee live locally.

m) Miscellaneous

- Local press reports are that Surrey County Council supports this project.
- The gravel pit undermines the major investment taking place in Staines upon Thames and possible future developments.
- Extracting all the gravel now will undermine future needs to support housing growth.
- Houses could be built on land at the site once extraction is completed.
- The County Council shouldn't overrule the decision of the local council.
- Need to invoke the 30 year rule
- The proposal contravenes Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.
- The import and recycling of construction waste could have a serious and adverse effect on people and the land.
- The Surrey Minerals Plan Restoration Document (annex C) has been avoided. Bare Ground is a neglected habitat but supports a range of specialist species.
- The unexcavated land cannot feasibly function as farmland. There will be no access for cattle except along the public highway.
- Acknowledge not a planning issue but will impact on property prices, will residents get a reduction in their rates, compensation for impact or reduction in value of property?
- Will not be able to get insurance on properties, having lakes will/may mean insurance companies have to be informed which could render the property uninsurable, and won't be able to get mortgages on them, or push up insurance premiums.

n) Heritage

- It will impact on the historic interest in Laleham, parts of which are a Conservation Area.
- The proposal could have archaeological implications as Laleham has a lot of archaeological potential.
- Vibrations from traffic cause structural damage to Grade II Listed Buildings, an historic Church (12th Century Foundations) and School Buildings.

o) Loss of Agricultural Land

- Land used to be arable farming land. Loss of this is unacceptable.
- Gravel should be extracted from underground leaving the land above to be farmed.
- Restored farmland will not be viable as cattle would have to be moved along busy public highways.

79 Comments made by Buckland School:

Buckland Primary School (Chair of Governors)

- Proposal will devastate the environment which the school children currently enjoy and damage it forever. School has always been extremely lucky to be surrounded by quiet and wildlife filled countryside. Proposal presents a serious risk to the health of children and their environment from noise, dust and damage to the land and wildlife while extraction takes place and post restoration from more dangerous pits of deep water in the area which already has Queen Mary Reservoir, the River Thames and deep water gravel pits. We should conserve the land as it is and has been for centuries, more wetlands and marsh areas aren't needed.
- The site will be hazard to children walking and cycling to school from considerably more traffic in Worple Road (including HGVs).
- Given current economic climate is there a need for the sand and gravel?
- This is second application on this site for gravel extraction in two years. Suggest if it is turned down again there is a moratorium put on future applications for at least 20 years.

Buckland Primary School (Headteacher)

- Expresses grave concerns about the proposal which despite the offer of a small area of the site to be given to the school for a nature conservation area the whole school community is still against the scheme. The primary school backs onto the Manor Farm site and the school is particularly appreciative of the natural environment which surrounds the school. The school holds the Eco Schools Green Flag in recognition of the work to conserve the environment and educate children towards a commitment to a sustainable lifestyle. The school grounds are the only opportunity some children get exposed to the natural environment and learning outside is maximised.
- Concerned about: the impact of construction traffic on an already traffic congested area increasing risk of accidents and health and safety of pupils, parents and staff; dust and health impact in particular asthma which is on the increase; noise which will be disruptive to education of pupils at the school and have a negative impact both on indoor and outdoor learning; will impact on sporting activities and play as the site backs onto the school playing fields and playground.
- Given the location within a densely populated area noise vibration and pollution from the development will cause unacceptable stress and tension to the whole community, which will impact very negatively on the well being of children and families.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

80 Surrey County Council as Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) is required under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (1990 Act) when determining planning applications to "*have regard to (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and (c) any other material considerations*". This section of the 1990 Act must be read together with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (2004 Act), which provides that: "*If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise*."

7

81 In this case, following the partial revocation of the South East Plan 2009 on 25 March 2013, the statutory Development Plan for consideration of this application consists of the: Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents (DPD) (SMP 2011); Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document (DPD) for the Minerals and Waste Plans 2013 (Aggregates Recycling DPD 2013); Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 Saved Policies And Proposals as at 28 September 2007 (SBLP 2001); and Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 (SBCS&P DPD 2009). Adopted alongside the SMP 2011 was The Minerals Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

82 Material considerations can include relevant European policy, the March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the March 2014 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), Government Circulars, emerging local development documents in the Spelthorne Borough Local Development Framework which, when adopted, will replace the 2001 local plan listed above; and adopted supplementary planning documents (the Spelthorne Borough Council Flooding SPD, adopted 19 July 2012).

83 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 March 2012 NPPF Technical Guidance provided additional guidance to local planning authorities in relation to development in areas at risk of flooding and in relation to mineral extraction and has been superseded by the March 2014 Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) Planning for Sustainable Waste Management and the companion guide was replaced in October 2014 by updated national waste planning policy for England, National Planning Policy for Waste and guidance in the NPPG.

84 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.

85 The NPPF does not change the statutory principle referred to above that determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is one of those material considerations. The NPPF included transitional provisions for its implementation. For 12 months from the date of publication planning authorities could continue to give full weight to relevant policies in development plan documents adopted in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 since 2004, even if there was a limited degree of conflict with policy in the NPPF. In other cases and following the 12 month period the weight to be given to policies in the adopted development plan documents should be determined according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. Officers consider the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents (DPD) (SMP 2011), SBLP 2001 and Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 (SBCS&P DPD 2009) are, so far as is relevant, up to date and consistent with the NPPF.

86 In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations. As the application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) the environmental information contained in it will be taken into consideration and reference will be made to it.

87 In assessing the application against development plan policy it will be necessary to determine whether the proposed measures for mitigating any environmental impact of the development are satisfactory. Key issues to consider include the impacts of the development on the Green Belt, mineral issues including location and need, access and the impact from traffic generated by the proposal, the impact on local amenity and the environment in terms of noise, dust, and visual impact, biodiversity and ecology in terms of the potential impact on designated sites in the vicinity and ecology on and adjacent to the site, historic environment and archaeology, the potential impact on water supplies and groundwater flows, drainage and flood risk, landscape and visual impacts during working and following restoration, air quality and the objectives of the Spelthorne Borough Council Air Quality Management Plan, and potential bird strike risk from the development during extraction, restoration and the proposed nature conservation after-use.

88 The Planning and Regulatory Committee visited the application site on Friday 8 November 2013.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Environmental Impact Assessment

89 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (EIA Regs 2011) implement the European Directive 85/337/EEC as amended by 97/11/EC, on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment. Schedule 1 of the regulations identifies the types of project (Schedule 1 development) for which an EIA is mandatory irrespective of their location. By virtue of the size of the application site (over 25 hectares) the proposed quarry for extraction of sand and gravel at Manor Farm is Schedule 1 development and requires an EIA. An EIA is a way of providing decision makers with information about the effects a given project could have on the environment.

90 Prior to submitting the planning application the applicant sought a Scoping Opinion from the county council under Regulation 13 of the EIA Regs 2011. The Scoping Opinion offered advice on the EIA and assessment of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the proposed development (ecology, landscape and visual impact, air quality and dust, archaeology, traffic, noise, hydrology and hydrogeology, and Floodrisk assessment and drainage) and to be covered in the Environmental Statement (ES). The planning application is accompanied by an ES, prepared by Wardell Armstrong consultants on behalf of the applicant, Brett Aggregates Ltd.

91 Objectors have raised concern about the EIA undertaken and ES having been prepared by consultants paid for by the applicant. Objectors consider the assessments have underestimated the impact, and the ES should not be paid for by the applicant but be done by an unbiased independent organisation. The EIA process and terminology used in an ES to assess and describe the likely significance of environmental effects of a proposal can be a source of confusion to third parties. There are set processes and agreed methodologies for assessing the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed development used in undertaking an EIA, and reporting in the ES submitted with a planning application. The fact the process is paid for by an applicant is often a cause for concern. However, the responsibility for undertaking an EIA lies with developers so it will be undertaken by consultants paid for by an applicant.

92 Once submitted the ES and planning application is assessed by a range of impartial organisations including statutory and non statutory consultees and the county council as mineral planning authority. Surrey County Council has an Environmental Assessment Team who assesses the adequacy of environmental statements by comparison with the content requirements of the EIA Regulations 2011.

7

93 The ES has been reviewed by the county council's Environmental Assessment Team, based on the review criteria employed by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA). The review concluded that the ES now contains sufficient information to be deemed acceptable under Part I and compliant with Part II of Schedule 4 EIA Regulations 2011. There was clarification sought on some issues including flood risk, noise, visual impact, ecology, soils, which was duly submitted by the applicant.

MINERALS ISSUES

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents (DPD) (SMP 2011)

SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD

Policy MC1 Spatial Strategy – location of mineral development in Surrey
Policy MC5 Recycled and secondary aggregates
Policy MC7 Aggregate minerals supply

SMP 2011 Primary Aggregates DPD

Policy MA1 Aggregate supply
Policy MA2 Preferred areas for concreting supply (Preferred area J: Land at Manor Farm)

Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document (DPD) for the Minerals and Waste Plans 2013 (Aggregates Recycling DPD 2013)

Policy AR1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy AR5 High value recovery

94 As set out in the Consultation and Publicity Section above, CLAG2 and local residents raise various issues relating to need including the location of sites identified for future working in Surrey and proximity to residential areas.

95 The NPPF and NPPG guidance sets out the Government's approach on the management of, and planning's role, with regard to minerals. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states: "*minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, 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. Relevant to this proposal these 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 and any blasting vibrations 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, where necessary. Bonds or other financial guarantees to underpin planning conditions should only be sought in exceptional circumstances.*"

96 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF requires mineral planning authorities (MPAs) to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates through what is known as the Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS). Guidance on this is now provided through the NPPG. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF sets out a number of bullet points as to how this can be achieved including by preparing an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA), taking account of published National and Sub National Guidelines on future provision, using landbanks of aggregate 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.

97 The paragraph requires MPAs to make provision for the maintenance of landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel. An aggregate mineral landbank is the tonnage of already permitted reserves. It is usually expressed in terms of the number of years of supply remaining based on the annual mineral provision rate set out in the Local Aggregate Assessment.

98 Guidance on landbanks in Minerals ID 27 paragraph 080 of the NPPG is that they are principally a monitoring tool to provide a mineral planning authority with early warning of possible disruption to the provision of an adequate and steady supply of land won aggregates in their area. In taking decisions on planning applications Minerals ID 27 paragraph 082 of the NPPG states that "*low landbanks may indicate that suitable applications should be permitted as a matter of importance to ensure the steady and adequate supply of aggregates*." Minerals ID 27 paragraph 084 states that each application should be considered on its own merits regardless of the length of the landbank and although there is no maximum landbank level, a landbank below the minimum level may be seen as a strong indicator of urgent need.

99 The NPPF at paragraph 145 advises that for aggregate landbanks periods longer than 7 years may be appropriate under certain circumstances. These include taking into account the need to supply a range of aggregates, the locations of permitted reserves relative to markets, and the productive capacity of permitted sites. MPAs are also required to ensure that large landbanks bound up in very few sites do not stifle competition.

100 The SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD 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 being required for building and repairing houses, roads, schools and hospitals. Policy MC1 sets the spatial strategy for the location of mineral development in Surrey. The policy 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.

101 In line with the NPPF and NPPG the Core Strategy DPD seeks to ensure a supply of aggregate minerals over the plan period for the county. 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. Regional apportionments have now been abolished, replaced by the reformed MASS and delivery through the LAA. 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. Paragraph 5.13 explains that it is not always possible to achieve an absolute fit with the required landbank at a specific point in time due to the way sites come forward, are permitted and worked.

7

102 Policy MC7 of the Core Strategy states that preferred areas will be identified in the SMP 2011 Primary Aggregates DPD for soft sand and concreting aggregates (also known as sharp sand and gravel) which, with identified reserves, are sufficient to enable the production of around 24 million tonnes (mt) 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 (South East Plan 2009), now incorporated in the MASS and the county council's LAA. The Primary Aggregates DPD set Surrey a mineral provision rate of 1.4 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) between 2009 and 2026 and the retention of this mineral provision rate is supported by the county council's Local Aggregate Assessment November 2014 (Surrey LAA November 2014).

103 The 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 and splits this into separate provision rates for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand, comprising 15 million tonnes of sharp sand and gravel and 9 million tonnes of soft sand between 2009–2026.

104 Policy MA1 states that preferred areas will be identified which together with permitted reserves will enable production of sharp sand and gravel at an average rate of 0.90mtpa and 0.5mtpa for soft sand. The policy also states 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. As highlighted above, the LAA published in November 2014 proposed no changes to the minerals provision rate contained in the SMP 2011.

105 Policy MC5 states that the county council will make provision in the Aggregates Recycling DPD for existing and new facilities to provide productive capacity for the supply of recycled and secondary aggregates at a rate of at least 0.8mtpa by 2016 and of at least 0.9mtpa by 2016. Policy AR1 of the Aggregates Recycling DPD 2013 provides for the county council to take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development when considering planning applications, granting planning permission for proposals that accord with policies in the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As raised sand and gravel, for example, mineral excavated as a result of site preparation activities in advance of construction is also referred to as excavation waste. Excavation waste comprising of sand and gravel is permitted to be brought to the QMQ site for processing under planning permission SP07/1275 (SP13/01239).

106 Processed as raised sand and gravel/excavation wastes are suitable for use in concrete or other uses as replacements for land won primary aggregate. Recycled aggregate, derived from treatment of construction and demolition waste, can be used in concrete production, but must meet a higher specification than required for lower grade uses such as a sub base in construction. The Aggregates Recycling DPD looks to facilities to maximise the amount and range of recyclable material that can be recovered from the waste stream handled at the aggregate recycling facility.

107 Provision of recycled aggregates assists in the replacement of land won primary aggregates. The Aggregates Recycling DPD refers to the importance of existing aggregate recycling capacity, including temporary facilities such as those at QMQ in the provision of sufficient capacity. Capacity at the existing QMQ is up to 100,000 tpa, with planning permission to continue operating until the end of 2033.

Location

108 As outlined in the Consultation and Publicity Section above a number of issues have been raised by objectors relating to the location of the application site in relation to urban areas and proximity to residential properties, schools, public footpaths and leisure and recreational facilities which they consider make the site unsuitable for mineral extraction. Reference is made to the proportion of preferred areas identified in the SMP 2011 in Spelthorne and the past history of mineral working in the borough and impact on the local environment from operational and restored sites, in particular waterbodies. Reference is also made to previous applications at the site in 1976 (ref SP76/60) (dismissed on appeal in 1978) and more recently in 2010 (withdrawn) and the view held that the reasons for refusal still stand today.

109 The Shepperton Aggregates 2010 application for extraction of mineral from Manor Farm and transporting by conveyor to Shepperton Quarry for processing was withdrawn by the applicant after their option to work the Manor Farm site expired and was not renewed. The 1976 application proposed extraction of sand and gravel, erection of processing plant at the Manor Farm site, export of mineral and importation of waste materials for backfilling the site by road via an access onto the Ashford Road between numbers 133 and 151. The applicant for the SP76/60 planning application, Greenham Sand & Ballast Co. Ltd., appealed against non determination. The appeal was dismissed by the Secretary of State in 1978 on the grounds which included the exposed nature of the site and its position in relation to housing, the working of the site and the need for new processing plant on the site would require extensive visual screening and noise protection measures, which would need to remain in place for the duration of working. Both the Inspector and the Secretary of State expressed the view that whilst noise could be satisfactorily controlled the very presence of the screening measures and conveyor bridges over the footpath would be most obtrusive both from ground level and surrounding properties.

110 In addition the site was considered to have local amenity value both visually and recreationally as an area of Green Belt land between Staines upon Thames and Laleham. In relation to access and traffic whilst at the time in 1978 it was considered acceptable to create an access off the Ashford Road, and the road capacity was capable of accommodating the traffic which would be generated, the 1976 proposal would have generated a significant increase in HGV traffic using the Ashford Road. The environmental impact of this, in particular on residents just north of the proposed access road, was considered by both the Inspector and Secretary of State to be significant. In dismissing the appeal the Secretary of State concluded that "*while the environmental impact of traffic generated by the proposal would not be sufficient on its own to outweigh the need for sand and gravel when it is added to the visual impact of the proposal the combined amenity objections are of overriding importance at the present time*".

111 Sharp sand and gravel, as proposed to be worked from the application site, are found in the north west, the most densely settled part of the county. As mineral planning authority, Surrey County Council is responsible for preparing a plan to identify areas for future mineral development and to provide the policy framework against which planning applications will be determined. As a site known to contain mineral deposits that are physically capable of being worked, land at Manor Farm had been identified in the previous minerals plans (North West Surrey Minerals Local Plan 1985 and Surrey Minerals Local Plan 1993), but protected from working on environmental grounds as other areas existed at that time with fewer constraints to working, and were identified to be worked in advance of sites such as Manor Farm.

7

112 The SMP 2011 went through a lengthy and rigorous process of preparation involving extensive technical work and consultation, which culminated in the scrutiny of the documents by an independent planning inspector during a public examination in public (EIP). The plan recognises that Surrey has over many years made a significant contribution to the need for sands and gravel in particular, and that such a level of production cannot be sustained into the future. However Surrey, along with other counties, still needs to play its part in providing raw materials and the SMP adopted in 2011 sets out how that provision will be made over the plan period. The technical work for the SMP 2011 in considering options for future supply demonstrated it was becoming increasingly difficult in Surrey to identify areas for future working.

113 The SMP 2011 recognises the difficulties in balancing meeting the need for mineral development and ensuring the impact from mineral working does not result in unacceptable impacts on local communities and the environment. Preferred areas identified in the SMP 2011 Primary Aggregates DPD provide locations where it is considered mineral working is possible without imposing significant adverse impacts on the local community or on the environment

114 The application site at Manor Farm is situated in north west Surrey and the site identified as one of ten preferred areas (preferred area J) in Primary Aggregates DPD Policy MA2. The site is considered a suitable location under Core Strategy DPD Policy MC1 and Primary Aggregates DPD Policy MA2 for extraction of primary aggregates.

115 Identification of land as a preferred area does not mean planning permission will be granted, nor precisely indicate the extent of mineral working that may be permitted. Key development requirements for each preferred area identify issues needing to be addressed as part of planning application proposals. Detailed assessments submitted with planning applications, and where necessary Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), will be required to support planning applications for mineral working in preferred areas and assessed against relevant development plan policies and issues relevant to the application site and surrounding area (these may be additional to the issues referred to in the preferred area key development requirements).

116 Although the application proposes transporting the mineral to the existing mineral processing plant at Queen Mary Quarry (not Shepperton Quarry as identified in the plan) this is in line with the key development criteria for the Manor Farm preferred area as mineral extracted at the site would be transported off site by conveyor to be processed. Transporting mineral by conveyor to an existing processing plant site would mean no visual impact and environmental disturbance from siting of processing plant at Manor Farm, and need for HGV access for transporting mineral from the site by road. This would reduce the environmental disturbance and visual impact of the proposal at Manor Farm on surrounding land uses. The impact of the proposal at Manor Farm, processing of mineral at the QMQ site and erection of concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant at the QMQ site on environmental and amenity interests are considered later in this report.

Need for sharp sand and gravel

117 As outlined above, national policy requires mineral planning authorities to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate using landbanks of mineral reserves of aggregates 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.

118 An Aggregates Monitoring Survey is undertaken each year to provide data to the minerals industry, mineral planning authorities and government on sales and permitted reserves of primary aggregates. The survey is coordinated by the South East England Aggregates Working Party (SEEAWP) and is undertaken by the mineral planning authorities on an annual basis.

119 Surrey County Council produces an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) covering the period 1 April to 31 March which includes details on production, permitted reserves and the landbank of primary aggregates. Following changes introduced under the Localism Act 2011 planning authorities are now required to publish monitoring information as soon as possible after it becomes available. An Aggregates Monitoring Update is therefore published on the county council website in the spring/summer in advance of publication of the annual monitoring report. From 2012/13 the AMR also includes Surrey's LAA which includes information on mineral production and reserves plus an assessment of all future mineral supply options.

120 The latest information on sales, reserves and the landbank of primary aggregates is contained in the Aggregates Monitoring Update: May 2014 and the November 2014 LAA which reflects the results of the Aggregates Monitoring Survey 2013 (AM2013). This supersedes the data contained in the Annual Monitoring Report 2012/13. The results of the AM2013 indicate that sales of land-won primary aggregates increased to 0.79mt in 2013, comprising 0.33mt of sharp sand and gravel and 0.43mt of soft sand. The small remainder comprised 0.03mt of sand and gravel or hoggin for construction fill.

121 Sharp sand and gravel sales are therefore significantly below the average annual provision rate provided for in the SMP 2011 Primary Aggregates DPD. The AM2013 also reveals that the landbank of permitted reserves fell significantly from 6.7 to 4.4 years between the end of 2012 and the end of 2013. This was due to: a significant reserve reassessment at a major soft sand quarry; the recalculation of soft sand reserves at two quarries primarily containing reserves of silica sand; the expiry of planning permission at another soft sand quarry; and no new permissions being granted for primary aggregate extraction in 2013 to replenish the extraction of permitted reserves during the year.

122 However, based on the amount of permitted reserves remaining at the end of 2013, the granting of planning permission in August 2014 for the extraction of 4.1 million tonnes (mt) of soft sand at Mercers South (permission ref. TA/2013/1799) increased the total aggregate landbank to 7.3 years. This would be further extended by 0.5 years to 7.8 years by the granting of planning permission (application ref WA/2014/0005) for the extraction of 0.77 mt of soft sand at Alton Road, and 0.5 years to 8.3 years by the granting of planning permission (application ref SP13/00141/SCC) for the extraction of 0.75 mt of sharp sand and gravel at Homers Farm which the Planning and Regulatory Committee resolved, at the 3 September 2014 and 10 December 2014 meetings respectively, subject to the prior completion of legal agreements, to grant planning permission for.

123 As referred to in paragraphs 103 and 104 above Policy MA1 (Aggregate Supply) of the Primary Aggregates DPD splits the total primary aggregates supply figure of around 24 mt over the plan period into separate provision rates for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand. This results in an average minerals provision figure of 0.9mtpa for sharp sand and gravel and 0.5mtpa for soft sand. However, it should be noted that the total landbank position masks a significant distortion between the landbanks for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand which fell to 1.9 years and 8.7 years respectively at the start of 2014.

124 Granting planning permission for additional soft sand reserves at Mercers South increased the soft sand landbank by 8.2 years to 16.9 years. Permission at Alton Road would increase the soft sand landbank further to 18.4 years. With no new reserves of sharp sand and gravel being permitted since the start of 2014 (the decision on the Homers Farm planning application referred to in paragraph 122 is not yet issued), and taking account of sales during 2014, the sharp sand and gravel permitted reserves and landbank will have reduced further and the already significant distortion between the separate landbanks for soft sand and sharp sand and gravel at the end of 2013 will have substantially increased.

125 As referred to above the NPPG states at Minerals ID27 paragraph 082 that for decision-making, low landbanks may be an indicator that suitable applications should be permitted as a matter of importance to ensure the steady and adequate supply of aggregates. Furthermore, Minerals ID27 paragraph 084 of the NPPG adds that where a landbank is below the minimum level, this may be seen as a strong indicator of urgent need. Officers therefore consider there is an urgent and pressing need to replenish dwindling permitted reserves of sharp sand and gravel in the county which had fallen to 1.75mt at the end of 2013 and remain extremely low.

7

126 The application states that the mineral at Manor Farm would be worked on completion of extraction from beneath the baffle in the reservoir at QMQ. The Manor Farm reserve would therefore replace QMQ as an operational site extracting reserves of land won primary aggregate, and would serve to provide security enabling phased continuity in supply of sharp sand and gravel in north west Surrey. Working on the basis mineral extracted from Manor Farm and processed at QMQ would supply a similar market area to the current QMQ operation, Officers consider the site to be well placed relative to the local construction market currently served by QMQ in north west Surrey and London.

127 CLAG2 and other objectors refer to: lack of need for mineral from Manor Farm for Surrey to fulfil its quota; that talk of the county soon running out of available gravel is no longer true; that demand remains low and there is uncertainty around when demand will rise, and that when it does it will not rise to the levels reached in the 1990s. Reference is also made to meeting future demand through imports of marine dredged mineral or rail imports. In reaching these conclusions they have misinterpreted the purpose of, and information contained in the Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Report 2009, and not understood the role of the mineral planning system and supply options.

128 It should be acknowledged that there are currently four further planning applications for the extraction of sharp sand and gravel (concreting aggregate). These include three new quarry applications on sites allocated in the SMP 2011 Primary Aggregates DPD comprising Homers Farm, Bedfont (proposing to process at Hengrove Farm); Milton Park Farm, Egham; and Watersplash Farm, Halliford, as well as one application to reopen Addlestone Quarry which was previously mothballed during the economic downturn and where planning permission has expired. Taken together, these four applications propose the extraction of around 4.17 mt of sharp sand and gravel.

129 The Homers Farm application for extraction of 749,000 tonnes of sharp sand and gravel (ref SP13/00141) was reported to the Planning and Regulatory Committee on 10 December 2014 meeting where the committee resolved, subject to the prior completion of a S106 unilateral undertaking relating to vehicle routing on the A30, to grant planning permission subject to conditions. The other three await determination. However, it cannot be assumed at this time that any of these other planning applications will be permitted and as a consequence, their existence cannot influence the determination of this application which should be considered on its own merits.

130 If all five current applications for sharp sand and gravel extraction in the county were permitted, this would increase the landbank for sharp sand and gravel to around 8 years. Therefore, in determining future applications that would increase the sharp sand and gravel landbank above 7 years, in order to comply with NPPF paragraph 145, it may be necessary to justify such future proposals in terms of their contribution to the need to supply a range of types of aggregates, locations of permitted reserves relative to markets, and productive capacity of permitted sites.

131 Officers view the current landbank position as a strong indicator of urgent and pressing need for additional reserves of primary land-won sharp sand and gravel to be permitted to meet the objective of maintaining continuity of supply in terms of an appropriate landbank required by Primary Aggregates DPD Policy MA1. Although, based on the landbank at the end of 2013 the total aggregate landbank of permitted reserves for primary aggregates increased to 7.3 years when the Mercers South permission (soft sand) was granted (and would extend to 7.8 years with the Alton Road resource (soft sand)), there is currently a very significant shortfall in the landbank for sharp sand and gravel.

132 Granting permission for the 1.5mt reserve at Manor Farm would increase the total landbank of primary aggregate in the county by 1.1 years, and the landbank for sharp sand and gravel by 1.7 years. Officers conclude there is a strong case of need for planning permission to be granted for extraction of the mineral from Manor Farm in order to help towards maintaining security of supply and accord with SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD Policy MC7 and Primary Aggregates DPD Policy MA1.

Concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant

133 The proposed concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant would involve development within an existing operational quarry site. The bagging plant would be housed within a building. The plant would be used in association with the mineral extraction and processing proposed at Manor Farm under this application, and the current importation and processing of as raised mineral and waste recycling developments at QMQ (which have planning permission to the end of 2033). The plant would be sited on areas of existing hardstanding in the plant site area, and make use of the existing site infrastructure and facilities at QMQ.

134 The two items of plant would not be involved in the primary processing of the mineral extracted at Manor Farm. Instead they would use sand and gravel processed in the QMQ processing plant. For the duration of extraction at Manor Farm this would involve both mineral extracted at Manor Farm, processed as raised mineral imports and recycled aggregate (planning permissions SP07/1275 and SP07/1273). Following completion of mineral extraction at Manor Farm the raw materials would be supplied from the recycling and as raised processing developments only.

135 Concrete batching plant in north west Surrey, whether sited at mineral sites or elsewhere, supply concrete to the construction market in London and Surrey. Making use of the location of sources of sand and gravel concrete batching plant are often co located at mineral sites. This avoids transporting the sand and gravel raw material to a plant sited elsewhere, for example on an industrial site.

136 Aggregate bagging operations involve specialist plant housed within a building. The proposed aggregate bagging plant would enable aggregate to be sold in quantities ranging from 25 to 850 kilogrammes (kg). It would enable sale of processed minerals in bagged form as well as loose aggregate. Sales of aggregate in bagged form would enable the applicant to supply aggregate in smaller quantities to customers.

137 As is the case with concrete batching plant, co locating aggregate bagging plant at a mineral site enables aggregate to be bagged at source and avoids transporting the mineral to a bagging plant sited elsewhere, for example on an industrial site.

138 Assessment of the proposal against the requirements of relevant development plan policies relating to highways, traffic and transport and protection of the environment and amenity and the Green Belt are considered below.

HIGHWAYS, TRAFFIC AND ACCESS

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document (SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD)

Policy MC14 – Reducing the adverse impacts of mineral development

Policy MC15 – Transport for minerals

Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 (SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009)

Strategic Policy SP7 Climate Change and Transport

Policy CC2: Sustainable Travel

7

139 Government policy on transport is set out in part 4 'Promoting sustainable transport' of the NPPF (paragraphs 29 to 41). The NPPF recognises the important role transport policies have in facilitating sustainable development and in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives with the Government recognising that different communities will require different policies and measures, and the opportunities for maximising sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

140 Developments that generate a significant number of movements are required to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- opportunities for sustainable transport modes to avoid the need for major transport infrastructure (which will depend on the nature and location of the development) have been taken up;
- suitable and safe access for all people can be achieved; and
- cost effective improvements can be undertaken within the transport network to limit the significant impacts of the development,

with development only being refused on transport grounds where residual cumulative transport impacts are severe. In relation to mineral development, plans should set environmental criteria for assessing the traffic impacts of proposals.

141 The traffic generated by transporting minerals is one of the most significant impacts of mineral working and a concern to those living and travelling in the vicinity of a site. Policy MC15 of the SMP2011 Core Strategy DPD states that applications for mineral development should include a transport assessment of potential impacts on highway safety, congestion and demand management and explore how movement of minerals within and outside the site will address issues of emissions control, energy efficiency and amenity. Paragraph 7.3 of the SMP2011 Core Strategy DPD recognises that for short distances conveyors and pipelines can be very effective alternatives to transport of mineral by lorry. They are most commonly used to transport mineral within sites or between sites from where mineral is extracted to the site where it will be processed.

142 Policy MC15 requires applicants to consider alternatives to road transport, though the supporting text at paragraph 7.9 acknowledges that as the majority of mineral produced in Surrey is transported over relatively short distances, transport by lorry is often the only practicable, cost effective option. The policy goes on to state that proposals involving transportation by road will only be permitted 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.'

143 SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 Strategic Policy SP7 seeks to ensure development is located in a way which reduces the need to travel and encourages alternatives to car use. Through Policy CC2 the borough council seeks to secure more sustainable travel patterns through means such as "*only permitting traffic generating development where it is or can be made compatible with the transport infrastructure in the area taking into account:*

i) number and nature of additional traffic movements, including servicing needs;
ii) capacity of the local transport network;
iii) cumulative impact including other proposed development;
iv) access and egress to the public highway; and
v) highway safety."

144 As outlined under the proposal section of the report above all the mineral extracted at Manor Farm would be transported by conveyor to the existing mineral processing plant at QMQ for processing. From here processed mineral (as loose bulk loads or as bagged sand or gravel; or as concrete) would be exported by road via the existing QMQ access onto the A308 Kingston Road. A new access off the Ashford Road and modifications to the existing agricultural access off Worple Road would provide vehicular access to the Manor Farm part of the application site, see Plan 2, Figures 3 and 5 and paragraphs 25 to 28 above for details and how the accesses to the Manor Farm part of the application site would be used.

145 Under the current planning permissions at QMQ HGV traffic involved by the export of mineral arising from extraction, imports and exports associated with the recycling operation, and import of as raised mineral for processing and export of processed mineral is limited to a maximum of 300 movements per working day (150 two way movements).

146 So that the QMQ site 300 daily vehicle movement number limit is not exceeded the applicant proposes managing the imports to QMQ of as raised mineral for processing and construction and demolition waste for recycling and exports of product during the operational life of the proposed extraction at Manor Farm.

147 The anticipated traffic movements arising from the exports of processed mineral from Manor Farm (based on anticipated extraction rate of 300,000 tpa, the output from the concrete batching plant (20,000 m^3) and sales of bagged aggregate (40,000 tpa), together with the ongoing recycling operation and import and processing of as raised mineral HGV traffic generated at the QMQ site for the duration of mineral extraction at Manor Farm would be in the region of 259 movements per day (130 two way movements), which is below the current permitted 300 maximum movements for the QMQ site, see table below:

Predicted HGV Movements associated with the operation of Queen Mary Quarry for the duration of the proposed Manor Farm development	
Activity	**Annual HGV Movements**
Import of 'as-raised' gravel (under Planning Permission SP07/1275)	10,000
Import and export of construction and demolition (C&D) waste for recycling (under Planning Permission SP07/1273)	19,000
Export of sand and gravel in bulk	31,200
Import of cement and export of ready-mix concrete from the proposed concrete batching plant	7,100
Export of bagged aggregates from proposed aggregate bagging plant	4,000
Total Annual HGV Movements	**71,300**
Working Days per Year	275
Average Daily HGV Movements	**259**

Source: Environmental Statement Volume 2a Table 14.1

7

148 As part of the scoping of the EIA it was agreed that as the Manor Farm proposal would be processing mineral at the existing QMQ site and HGV traffic generated by the export of mineral extracted at Manor Farm (in loose bulk or bagged loads of aggregate, or as concrete) would be replacing HGV traffic exporting mineral excavated from within the reservoir, it wasn't necessary for the application to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Officers did not consider it necessary to require the applicant to assess alternatives to road based transport for removal of processed mineral.

149 The key development requirements for the Manor Farm preferred area in the SMP2011 Primary Aggregates DPD relating to access are:

"permanent HGV access to the area is not desirable; temporary access to bring equipment and machinery on and off the site from Ashford Road should be explored; minerals should be moved by conveyor into Littleton Lane Quarry for processing; working of the preferred area should be phased and not occur simultaneously with any working of preferred area F Home Farm Quarry Extension, to avoid any increase in mineral HGV traffic on local roads."

Provision of vehicle access to enable export of mineral by road and importation of material to backfill the site was considered as part of the assessment of the site for inclusion as a preferred area in the minerals plan. Use of a conveyor system was considered to be the only realistic option for moving excavated material to a suitable processing plant. Access off either the Ashford Road or Worple Road was considered unacceptable by the Highway Authority due to difficulties in providing suitable sightlines, traffic calming measures on Worple Road and the environmental impact of HGV traffic on the roads to access the site.

150 When the land at Manor Farm was considered and allocated as a preferred area in the SMP2011 it was envisaged that the excavated mineral would be transported by conveyor to Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane for processing. The use of the Shepperton Quarry processing plant was proposed in the SP10/0173 planning application submitted in August 2010 by Shepperton Aggregates, a joint venture company between Brett Aggregates and Tarmac (now called Lafarge Tarmac), and referred to at the examination in public hearings held between October 2010 and January 2011. Since that time Shepperton Aggregates withdrew their planning application in June 2011 after their option to work the Manor Farm site expired and was not renewed, and the operator at QMQ has changed. QMQ is now operated by Brett Aggregates.

151 At the time the site was being considered for inclusion in the plan working of the Manor Farm site was envisaged to be undertaken concurrently with operations at QMQ (extraction if still ongoing, and waste developments) which had planning permission for operations to continue to 2033, and could generate up to 300 HGV movements per working day.

152 The current application by Brett Aggregates addresses the first three parts of the access key development consideration for the Manor Farm preferred area by proposing to transport the excavated mineral by conveyor to QMQ for processing, and use of accesses off the Ashford Road and Worple Road to bring equipment and machinery on and off the site. The access off the Ashford Road would be used to bring equipment and machinery onto Phase 1 (east of FP 30) for use in connection with extraction and restoration on Phase 1. Once restoration on Phase 1 had been complete and operations have moved to the west of the footpath the access would be used periodically in connection with maintenance of the conveyor. As well as bringing plant and machinery on to the land west of the footpath for working of Phases 2, 3 and 4, the Worple Road access would be used to access the site compound and as described in paragraph 27 above.

153 Mineral extracted at Home Farm Quarry and the extension area (land at Laleham Nurseries and Shepperton Studios) is taken by conveyor for processing at Shepperton Quarry (Littleton Lane). When preferred areas for inclusion in the SMP2011 were under consideration it was understood the mineral extracted at Manor Farm was going to be processed at Shepperton Quarry. So the two sites would not be worked and generate traffic from the Shepperton Quarry site at the same time, phasing the working so the Manor Farm and preferred area F Home Farm Quarry Extension sites were not worked simultaneously was considered appropriate.

154 There is no key development requirement for phased working at either the Manor Farm or the Home Farm Quarry Extension preferred areas, and permitted operations at the QMQ site, as no concerns were identified relating to traffic associated with simultaneous extraction at the sites and the QMQ site. No concerns about simultaneous working at Manor Farm with the Home Farm Quarry Extension, or working the remaining mineral at Shepperton Quarry have been raised by the County Highway Authority. In the circumstances Officers see no valid reason to look to control the phasing of working at Manor Farm as proposed under the current application so working at the Manor Farm and Home Farm Quarry Extension sites does not occur simultaneously.

155 The applicant proposes phasing the working at Manor Farm to follow on from extraction of mineral from beneath the baffle in the reservoir (due to be complete by the end of December 2016), and to manage the quantities of as raised mineral and construction and demolition waste imported to the QMQ during the life of extraction at Manor Farm so HGV traffic generated by the combined operations is within the 300 HGV movements per day limit. This could be secured by planning condition and a S106 legal agreement.

156 The County Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal subject to imposition of planning conditions relating to submission and approval of the detailed design of the accesses off Worple Road and Ashford Road; use of the accesses; removal of the Ashford Road and Worple Road accesses [removal of the Ashford Road access and returning the Worple Road access to its former status (agricultural access)]; timing of the construction of the conveyor tunnels under the Ashford Road and FP30 and removal on completion of extraction; removal of mineral from site by conveyor belt only; provision of parking spaces within the site compound and measures to prevent mud and material being deposited on the public highway.

157 As summarised in the Consultation and Publicity Section above the following concerns about highways and traffic have been raised by objectors in representations and by CLAG2: Congestion and impact on highway safety (from proximity of the Worple Road access to existing traffic calming measures; from traffic that will be generated and use of the accesses to Manor Farm by HGVs and low loaders; mud, sand and gravel on the road); impact from use of roads by HGVs which serve residential areas, two schools, children's nurseries, and a church on residents, pedestrians (in particular children going to and from school) and on other road users including cyclists. Damage that will be caused by the HGV traffic to: road surfaces, street lighting, road signs and buildings (residential properties and listed buildings). Driver behaviour and speeding and suitability of the highway network for mineral traffic (Worple Road, Ashford Road and roads through Laleham in terms of road widths, pavements, traffic calming measures and proximity to junctions), past and current restrictions on use of roads trough Laleham for mineral related traffic and the extended period over which mineral related HGV traffic will impact on Laleham which is well beyond previous assurances; and impact from closure of the Ashford Road during construction of the conveyor tunnel.

7

158 As referred to above it is recognised in government guidance on mineral development and the SMP 2011 that lorry traffic generated by mineral developments is a major concern to the public and one of the most significant impacts of this type of development. Spelthorne Borough is heavily trafficked including HGV traffic travelling to and from development in the borough, and through the borough. The numbers of HGVs travelling on roads in the vicinity site are of concern to local residents. Not all HGV traffic travelling on local roads and through Laleham is associated with mineral and waste sites. Staines Road (B376), Ashford Road (B377), The Broadway and Shepperton Road (B376) form part of the classified road network intended to distribute traffic to and from the strategic road network and HGVs are not prohibited from travelling through Laleham.

159 The Surrey County Council and Surrey Police joint draft Drive SMART Road Safety and Anti Social Driving Strategy and Spelthorne Local Speed Management Plan is aimed at addressing speeding at the worst sites across the county by targeting resources at the sites where they are most needed. A number of roads in the vicinity Manor Farm and QMQ where speeding was of concern were identified for investigation as part of these initiatives, including the B377 Ashford Road from Kingston Road to The Broadway, Laleham, and Staines Road from The Broadway to Worple Road.

160 In relation to HGV traffic associated with sites operated by them, operators do not have responsibility for, or control over, the behaviour of individual drivers when they are driving on the public highway. The applicant, Brett Aggregates, and other operators try to ensure vehicle drivers are aware of local speed limits and local site requirements regarding routes etc. Brett company drivers are required to hold a Mineral Products Qualifications Council (MPQC) Driver Skills Card (previously called EPIC (Extractive Product Industry Council) Certificate) which involves attending a course and passing an exam covering safety awareness on site and on the road. However, concerns about speeding and anti social driving are not reasons to refuse planning permission for development.

161 The HGV traffic associated with transporting mineral from the site would use the existing accesses to QMQ. In via the A308 and Ashford Road accesses, and out via the A308 access direct onto the strategic road network. Traffic to and from the site would make use of the surrounding road network including the Ashford Road and roads through Laleham. The traffic arising from the development would not add to the HGV traffic already associated with the QMQ site which has planning permission to generate 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day. Use would be made of the existing in and out arrangements and wheel cleaning facilities at the QMQ site.

162 The Worple Road and Ashford Road accesses would be used periodically to transport heavy plant and machinery to the Manor Farm site to be used for soil stripping, bund construction, mineral extraction and restoration of the site (including removal of soil bunds and placement of soils). The application states that this traffic is likely to equate to 36 two way vehicle movements per annum. During extraction and restoration the Worple Road access would be used by employees, operatives, maintenance personnel and for deliveries of consumables, of which employee journeys are expected to equate to six two-way movements per day.

163 Objectors are concerned about the traffic using the Worple Road access adding to congestion, and the suitability of the accesses off the Ashford Road and Worple Road for the type of traffic which would use them. The number of vehicles using these accesses each day would be small with occasional use throughout the year associated with delivery and removal of heavy plant and machinery. Additional information about the design of the works to the Worple Road access and proposed new access off the Ashford Road including sightlines was requested and has been provided. This has been assessed by the County Highway Authority and no objection raised. Officers are satisfied the application contains sufficient detail, including vehicle track overlays showing use of these accesses by low loaders, to demonstrate they are suitable for the uses and intensity proposed.

164 There would therefore be some disruption to flow of traffic along the Ashford Road during the tunnel construction period. Closure of the Ashford Road is not expected during construction of the conveyor tunnel. Instead the application envisages traffic would be reduced to a single lane and controlled.

165 The environmental impact from traffic and suitability of the local highway network for the type and amount of traffic that would be generated by the minerals and waste developments at QMQ was assessed at the time the planning permissions at QMQ were granted, and again more recently in association with the three planning applications referred to in paragraph 16 above, and not found to be an overriding constraint to the development.

166 Officers consider this to still be the case with the Manor Farm proposal. Vehicle numbers using the QMQ access would remain unchanged. Whilst there would be a change in type of vehicle involved in export of mineral associated with delivery of extracted mineral as bagged aggregate and concrete, the type of traffic associated with the Manor Farm proposal in combination with the existing permitted waste developments at QMQ would not be materially different to the type of traffic generated at present with extraction of mineral from the reservoir.

Conclusion on highways, traffic and access

167 In, Officers consider the proposal is acceptable and subject to securing controls through planning conditions relating to access, vehicle numbers and protection of the public highway, and a S106 agreement to limit the number of HGV movements in combination with other planning permissions at QMQ to no more than 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day, that the proposal is acceptable and is consistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and relevant development plan policies relating to such matters.

ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY
Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document (SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD)
Policy MC2 Spatial Strategy – protection of key environmental interests in Surrey
Policy MC3 Spatial Strategy – mineral development in the Green Belt
Policy MC14 Reducing the adverse impacts of mineral development
Policy MC17 Restoring mineral workings
Policy MC18 Restoration and enhancement

The Minerals Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document (DPD) (Restoration SPD)
Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 (SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009)
Strategic Policy SP6 Maintaining and Improving the Environment
Policy EN3 Air Quality
Policy EN4 Provision of Open Space and Sport and Recreation Facilities
Policy EN5 Buildings of Architectural and Historic Interest
Policy EN8 Protecting and Improving Landscape and Biodiversity
Policy EN9 River Thames and its tributaries
Policy EN11 Development and Noise
Policy LO1 Flooding

Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 (saved policies) (SBLP 2011)
Policy RU11 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance
Policy RU14 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance
Policy BE 24 Archaeology, Ancient Monuments and Historic Landscapes
Policy BE25 Archaeology, Ancient Monuments and Historic Landscapes

7

168 This part of the report deals with environmental and amenity matters under the headings: flood risk, water quality, groundwater and land drainage; landscape and visual impact; noise; air quality and dust; rights of way; biodiversity and ecology (species and designated areas); historic environment and archaeology, restoration and after-use, airport safeguarding/safety/infrastructure; lighting; and cumulative impact. Some of the development plan policies listed above relate to one of more of the issues, these are outlined here with any policies relevant to particular issues outlined under the relevant part.

169 As referred to in paragraph 95 above the NPPF and NPPG expect mineral planning authorities to ensure that mineral proposals do not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the natural or historic environment or human health. The NPPF states authorities should also take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality. Guidance in relation to implementation of policy in the NPPF on development in areas at risk of flooding and in relation to mineral extraction (including in relation to proximity of mineral workings to communities, dust emissions, noise and restoration and aftercare of mineral sites) is provided in the NPPG. Some of the development plan policies listed above relate to one or more of the issues.

170 SMP 2011 Policy MC2 gives protection to key environmental interests in Surrey setting out the information and assessments for protection of areas of international importance for biodiversity; national designations of ecological importance and heritage designations. Surrey is a densely populated county and mineral resources, especially sharp sand and gravel (concreting aggregate), the mineral that would be extracted, are found in the north west most densely settled part of the county. The SMP 2011 recognises the difficulties in balancing meeting the need for mineral development and ensuring the impact from mineral working does not result in unacceptable impacts on local communities and the environment. SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD Policy MC14 states that proposals for mineral working will only be permitted where a need has been demonstrated and sufficient information has been submitted to enable the authority to be satisfied that there would be no significant adverse impacts arising from the development and sets out matters to be addressed in planning applications.

171 Matters relevant to this application include:

- visual impact and impact on landscape (appearance, quality and character);
- flood risk and effect on the flow and quality of groundwater, surface water, land drainage (of the site and adjoining land);
- potential danger to aircraft and safe operation of airports from birdstrike and structures;
- adverse effects on neighbouring amenity including noise, dust and transport impacts;
- the loss or damage to flora and fauna and their respective habitats at the site or on adjoining land including the linear or other features which facilitate the dispersal of species;

172 SMP 2011Core Strategy DPD Policy MC17 requires mineral working proposals to provide for restoration and post restoration management to a high standard. Sites should be progressively restored or restored at the earliest opportunity with the restoration sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area and capable of sustaining an appropriate after-use. For mineral working in the Green Belt after-uses should be appropriate to that designation, these include agriculture, forestry, recreation and nature conservation. For nature conservation after-uses longer term management beyond the standard five year aftercare advised in national policy would be necessary, which the authority would look to secure through legal agreements. A key objective is for enhancement as well as restoration and through Policy MC18 the county council will work with operators and landowners to deliver benefits including enhancement of biodiversity interests at the site and, where appropriate, as part of a wider area enhancement approach.

173 Objectives of the SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 include "*to protect and improve the quality of the environment, including improving the landscape, promoting biodiversity and safeguarding the Borough's cultural heritage"* through policies including Strategic Policy SP6 Maintaining and Improving the Environment and Policy EN8 Protecting and Improving the Landscape and Biodiversity. These policies seek to protect and improve the landscape and biodiversity and cultural heritage of the borough through:

- safeguarding sites of international and national importance;
- working with others to develop and secure the implementation of projects to enhance the landscape and create or improve habitats of nature conservation value;
- wherever possible ensure that new development contributes to an improvement in landscape and biodiversity and also avoids harm to features of conservation interests;

and states planning permission will be refused where development would have a significant harmful impact on the landscape or features of nature conservation value. Supporting text to Policy EN8 identifies that mineral working has had a substantial impact on the landscape of the Borough and in some areas has resulted in a legacy of poorly restored land. The Borough Council will support measures to improve poorly restored mineral workings and look for the timely restoration to a high standard of current and proposed workings.

174 SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 Policy EN11 seeks to minimise the impacts of noise and sets out a series of criteria by which to achieve this including measures to reduce noise to acceptable levels and ensuring provision of appropriate noise attenuation measures. SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 Policy EN3 states the borough council aims to improve air quality and minimise harm from poor air quality by refusing development where adverse effects on air quality are of a significant scale, and are not outweighed by other important considerations or effects, and cannot be appropriately or effectively mitigated. SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 LO1 Flooding seeks to reduce flood risk and its adverse effects on people and property in Spelthorne through a range of measures including maintaining flood storage capacity within Flood Zone 3; maintaining the effectiveness of the more frequently flooded area (Zone 3b) of the floodplain to both store water and allow the movement of fast flowing water.

175 SBLP 2001 saved policies RU11 and RU14 give protection to SNCIs. Policy RU11 states that proposals will only be permitted within SNCIs where there will be no adverse effect, either direct or indirectly on the ecological interest of the site or where the requirements of Policy RU14 are met. Policy RU14 provides for mitigation and compensation to be provided where exceptional circumstances justify a development which will adversely impact on an SNCI, and requires a demonstration that the harm is kept to a minimum.

176 SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 Strategic Policy SP6 Maintaining and Improving the Environment and Policy EN5: Buildings of Architectural and Historic Interest seek to preserve and protect the borough's cultural heritage architectural and historic heritage including historic buildings and Conservation Areas. SBLP 2001 Policy BE24 states there is a presumption against development which would affect a scheduled or any other nationally important ancient monument or its setting and that development adversely affecting a site or monument of County importance will not be permitted. Policy BE25 requires that for development proposals in areas of high archaeological potential a field evaluation should be carried out where an initial assessment has shown that important archaeological remains may exist, and that conditions should be imposed to ensure that damage to any remains is minimal or avoided.

Flood risk, land drainage, groundwater and water quality

177 The River Ash runs between the QMQ part of the application site and the Queen Mary Reservoir, which is to the east of the QMQ site. The River Thames runs to the south west of the land at Manor Farm. The Queen Mary Reservoir intake channel runs from the Thames along a route to the south of Manor Farm and the southern boundary of the QMQ site.

178 The application site is within a major aquifer and mostly within a groundwater source protection zone 3 for public water supply (Chertsey).

179 Associated with the Rivers Ash and Thames the majority of the Manor Farm part of the site (proposed extraction areas), and the lakes and parts of the land adjacent to the River Ash at QMQ are within a Flood Zone 3 (which for fluvial (river) flooding are areas which may be affected by a 1:100 year fluvial flood (high probability of flooding)) as shown on the Environment Agency's flood maps, Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) Proposals Map and Spelthorne Borough Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). (As the land in the application site is not within an area at risk of sea flooding no further reference will be made to flood risk from this source).

180 The majority of the processing plant site at QMQ, and land between the River Ash and the lake, and the northern parts of the Manor Farm part of the site are within a Flood Zone 2 (areas which may be affected by an extreme 1:1000 year (0.1% probability) fluvial flood (medium probability of flooding)). Small areas within the southern part of the processing plant site at QMQ and other small areas (the latter falling outside the application site boundary) are within Flood Zone 1 and are areas with a low probability of flooding. The land on which the proposed concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant and associated storage, new development within the processing plant site, is located in Flood Zones 1 and 2.

181 As well as flooding from rivers, the application area lies within part of an extensive area around the Queen Mary Reservoir identified as an area at risk from reservoir flooding. The reservoir is a potential source of flooding in the event of failure of the reservoir embankment. Flooding from sewers has occurred locally in the vicinity of the site, such as along the Ashford Road to the south west of Manor Farm.

182 The Environment Agency (EA) Flood maps show small areas within the Manor Farm and QMQ application site area, other land within Manor Farm, such as between the application site and Pavilion Gardens to the north and west of Brightside Avenue, and QMQ, and the surrounding residential areas and local roads including Northfield Road and Worple Road as having a low risk of flooding from surface water. The EA define surface water flooding as flooding which happens when rainwater does not drain away through normal drainage systems or soak into the ground and flows over or lies on the ground instead. As it is hard to forecast exactly where, or how much rain will fall the EA flood maps make it clear this type of flooding can be difficult to predict. Areas on the map shown at risk of surface water flooding are based on factors such as ground levels and drainage. For surface water flooding areas at low risk of flooding have a chance of flooding of between 1 in 1000 (0.1% probability) and 1 in 100 (1% probability) each year.

183 Surface water drainage within the Manor Farm site involves soakage into the ground or discharge into open ditches within the eastern part of the site, and parallel to FP30 on the western part of the site.

184 Government policy on flooding is contained in part 10 'Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change' of the NPPF (paragraphs 93 to 108). Guidance on how the policy should be implemented is set out in the NPPG published in March 2014 (ID7 Flood Risk and Coastal Change) which replaced the earlier NPPF Technical Guidance published at the same time as the NPPF in March 2012.

185 The aims of the planning policy on flood risk, as set out in the NPPF and the NPPG are to ensure flood risk is taken into account in planning decisions/ development management and plan preparation; to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from high flood risk areas; and where development is necessary making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

186 The approach in the NPPF is based on appraising, managing and reducing flood risk and land for development in flood risk areas. The sequential test is to be applied to all levels of the planning process (plan preparation and development management) with the general approach designed to ensure areas at little or no risk of flooding (from any source) Flood Zone 1 (low probability) areas are developed in preference to areas at higher risk of flooding. If there is no reasonably available site in Flood Zone 1, the flood vulnerability of development proposals in Flood Zone 2 (medium probability) and Flood Zone 3 can be taken into account. Flood Zone 3 is sub divided into Zones 3a - high probability and 3b - the functional floodplain. The functional floodplain consists of areas (land and water areas) where flood water has to flow or be stored in times of flood.

187 Different land uses are classified according to their flood risk vulnerability in Table 2 Flood risk vulnerability classification, of the NPPG (paragraph 066 ID7) with development classified as: essential infrastructure; highly vulnerable; more vulnerable; less vulnerable; and water compatible uses. Sand and gravel working is classified as a 'water compatible' use of land. Table 3 of the NPPG (paragraph 067 ID7) sets out Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'compatibility'. As a water compatible land use sand and gravel working is considered appropriate in all Flood Zone areas.

188 A site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) is required for all development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The FRA should identify and assess the risks of all forms of flooding to and from the development and demonstrate how flood risk will be managed through the life of the development, take climate change into account and have regard to the vulnerability of its users. Development should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; result in no net loss of floodplain storage; not impede flood flows; and not increase flood risk elsewhere.

189 The NPPG at ID7 paragraph 002 states that for the purposes of applying the NPPF "*flood risk is a combination of the probability and the potential consequences of flooding from all sources – including from rivers and the sea, directly from rainfall on the ground surface and rising groundwater, overwhelmed sewers and drainage systems, and from reservoirs, canals and lakes and other artificial sources*".

190 In relation to water quality the NPPF looks to the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment through preventing new development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from unacceptable risks of water pollution (paragraph 109), and by taking decisions on planning applications prevent unacceptable risks from pollution by ensuring new development is appropriate for its location (paragraph 120). Where a proposed development has the potential to impact on water quality and is likely to be a significant planning concern, sufficient information should be provided in the planning application to identify the likely impacts, with a more detailed assessment undertaken where significant adverse impact on water quality is likely (NPPG ID34 paragraph 016).

7

191 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC14 requires planning applications to assess, and where necessary identify appropriate mitigation measures, of the effect of proposals on the flow and quality of groundwater, surface water, land drainage (of the site and adjoining land), and risk of flooding; and contamination of ground and surface water. The key development considerations identified in the SMP 2011 for the Manor Farm preferred area J relating to water issues require hydrogeological assessment to assess the impact of working on the aquifer and groundwater flows and to assess possible hydrological connectivity between the area and Thorpe No1 Gravel Pits SSSI; and provide sources of guidance for use in preparing the site specific/project level flood risk assessment covering all sources of flood risk, including a surface water drainage strategy covering the operational and post restoration phases of the proposed development.

192 Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy LO1 Flooding seeks to reduce flood risk and its adverse effects on people and property in Spelthorne through a range of measures including maintaining flood storage capacity within Flood Zone 3; maintaining the effectiveness of the more frequently flooded area (Zone 3b) of the floodplain to both store water and allow the movement of fast flowing water. The Spelthorne Borough Council Flooding SPD elaborates on Policy LO1 providing guidance on factors to be taken into account when preparing and determining planning applications in areas of flood risk and managing flood risk.

Flood risk and land drainage

193 A site-specific/project level flood risk assessment (FRA) has been undertaken and submitted as part of the ES. The FRA assessed the site and water catchment area and identified the potential flood risk impacts to, and as a result of, the proposed development (during operations and post restoration). The potential impacts from and on the proposal were assessed and mitigation measures identified.

194 The proposal involves sand and gravel mineral working classified in the NPPG as a water compatible development considered appropriate in all Flood Zone areas. The risks to the proposed development from different sources of flooding and potential flood risk were assessed. This identified potential flood risk at the site as high from fluvial flooding, groundwater flooding and the reservoir; medium from sewers, and low from pluvial (surface water). The FRA identified that any flooding from rivers or surface water that does occur at the site should not pose a risk to the operations being undertaken. On the Manor Farm part of the application site the two demountable buildings to be sited at the site compound would be sited outside the 1 in 100 year Flood Zone 3, the site would be registered with the EA Floodline flood warning service, and a Flood Warning Procedure put in place.

195 The FRA assessed the potential for flood risks from the proposal which could lead to increased risk elsewhere (off site impacts) and where necessary identified mitigation measures which have been incorporated into the planning application proposal. The potential risks identified and where necessary mitigation measures proposed were as follows:

Disruption to existing land drainage regimes by truncating or removing existing drainage ditches/water courses

196 The excavation of mineral and restoration of the land leaving waterbodies would impact on the existing surface water draining ditches on the land west of FP30. These watercourses and the area of land they currently drain would be excavated during working of Phases 3 and 4, and become part of the lake under the restoration proposals. After restoration the remaining unexcavated areas of land in this part of the site would drain into the waterbody. There is no connection with drainage off site from the ditches, so no off site impact from increased risk of flooding and mitigation was required as a result of removal of the existing ditches on this part of the site.

197 On the land at Manor Farm to the east of FP30 an existing watercourse runs along the length of the line of the footpath and continues southwards beyond the application site. The footpath and watercourse would not be affected by the proposed mineral extraction and off site drainage connectivity maintained during working and post excavation. After restoration the remaining unexcavated areas of land in this part of the site would drain into the waterbodies. No off site impact from increased risk of flooding and mitigation was required as a result of the mineral excavation or restoration proposals on this part of the site.

Increased surface water run off by increasing impermeable areas within the site

198 There would be no increase in impermeable areas/hardstandings at either the Manor Farm or QMQ parts of the application site so no increase in surface water run off, and therefore no mitigation required. (The surfacing of the site compound would not be impermeable)

Loss of floodplain storage capacity

199 The application has considered the potential for loss of floodplain storage capacity by reducing the area of land available for flood water storage from: stripping and storing soils in temporary bunds sited within the 1 in 100 year Flood Zone 3 floodplain within the Manor Farm part of the application site; and within the QMQ part of the application site from the route of the proposed causeway across the QMQ lake taking up existing flood storage capacity within the lake and the siting of the conveyor.

200 The assessment identified that the siting of the conveyor would not take up flood storage capacity, so no mitigation was necessary for this. There would be potential loss of flood storage capacity from the soil bunds and conveyor causeway during the time the soil bunds and conveyor causeway would be in place. The volume of floodplain which would be lost during each phase of working was calculated and compared to the volume of compensatory floodplain that would be created by the proposal.

201 To mitigate for the potential loss of flood storage capacity compensatory flood storage would be provided on a level for level basis, up to the 1:100 year plus allowance for climate change level. The loss of flood storage capacity at the QMQ site would be compensated for within the void area created at Manor Farm. The assessment identified that for each phase significantly more floodplain would be created than would be lost during the proposed extraction works.

Impeding flood water flow by the presence of soil bunds within the floodplain and the causeway across the QMQ lake

202 The general direction of flow of flood water from the River Thames across the application site was identified as being generally from south to north across the application site. For the River Ash the flood flow routes across the QMQ site would be generally from east to west.

203 No mitigation was identified as necessary associated with the River Ash flood water. Mitigation within the Manor Farm part of the application site would be provided by the soil storage bunds and overburden storage aligned (generally in a north to south direction) and where necessary the bunds formed with gaps so they would cause minimal disruption to flood flow routes across the land within the application site, or overland surface water flow routes. The bunds would be temporary and either removed or adjusted on completion of each phase of working.

204 The causeway across the lake in QMQ would be perpendicular to the flood flow routes and the presence of the causeway has the potential to impede water flow. As mitigation pipes would be placed through the bund below the existing water level to allow flows in a south to north direction, siting the pipes below the existing water level would allow flood water to return as the flood and water levels recede.

7

205 In terms of residual risks post extraction the FRA identified that post restoration the proposed sequencing and phasing of the excavation works would ensure that there is no net loss of floodplain storage volume (on a level for level basis) during any phase of the extraction and restoration at Manor Farm, and removal of all temporary soil bunding the proposed development would not cause any negative impact on the flood/drainage regime at the site.

206 Revisions and clarification provided in response to queries from the EA, the County Geotechnical Consultant and CLAG2 relating to the FRA resulted in confirmation about the impact of extraction in Phase 1 on surface water drainage, provision of compensatory flood storage capacity, and provision of gaps in bund A (Phase 1), bund B (eastern side of Phases 2, 3 and 4) and bund D (Phase 4 section of the bund on the western boundary from the south west corner up to a point adjacent to properties on Northfield Road) to enable flow of flood water and surface water drainage.

207 As set out in the Consultations and Publicity Section of the report above local residents, CLAG2 and the Manor Farm Residents' Association have objected to the proposal on flood risk grounds. In summary the representations refer to the local area being at risk already from flooding and experiences flooding of different types, raise concerns that aspects of the development will result in increased risk of flooding (disruption to drainage, impact on water flows from the construction of screen bunds and the conveyor causeway, loss of floodplain by creation of waterbodies instead of returning the site to land, how will the loss of the floodplain from the creation of water bodies be compensated? increased flood risk caused by presence of waterbodies); the flood risk assessment should be redone with modelling taking account of extreme conditions and high water table and the flood event at the end of 2013/beginning of 2014; concerns about the conveyor tunnel making flood risk worse and itself being at risk of flooding; climate change leading to wetter weather and more flooding.

208 No objection has been raised by the EA on flood risk grounds subject to imposition of planning conditions relating to flood risk (including the requirement to undertake the development in accordance with the FRA and mitigation measures proposed and submission of details for approval of the pipes through the causeway across the lake). The County Geotechnical Consultant is also satisfied on flood risk matters subject to imposition of a planning condition to secure submission and approval of details of the pipes through the causeway to ensure hydraulic connection between the two sections of the lake.

209 The application site is situated in an area at risk to flooding from a number of sources, including fluvial flooding from the River Thames which runs to the south west of the site and surface water flooding, and flood risk is a key concern to local residents and businesses, as evidenced by the objections received. The County Geotechnical Consultant has reviewed the submitted FRA and advised that the applicant has undertaken and submitted a detailed FRA undertaken following guidance in PPS25 (since replaced by the NPPF Technical Guidance and more recently the NPPG). Following national guidance the proposed development involving sand and gravel extraction is classified as a water compatible development. As such the proposed development is an acceptable form of development for the flood zones in which it would be located.

210 Following national policy in paragraphs 100 to 104 the FRA has addressed all sources of flood risk in an appropriate manner, assessed the impact of climate change and correctly identified the potential adverse impacts from the development on flood risk (short term loss of fluvial flood storage capacity due to temporary soil bunding around the working areas, temporary causeway across the QMQ lake and surface water run off in the processing plant site). Following clarification on some issues and amendments to the bunding (as referred to above) the consultant advises the mitigation measures proposed (subject to provision to further details of the pipes through the causeway) are appropriate and satisfactory.

211 Comments made in representations about the impact of the proposed bunding deflecting flood water towards residential properties, or the provision of gaps enabling flood water to reach properties are noted. The concerns reflect a misunderstanding about the purpose of the gaps which is to enable flood water flow routes to pass over the site without being impeded so the water doesn't back up or get deflected leading to increased risk of flooding elsewhere. For example, in this case the direction of flood water flow associated with the River Thames is from south to north. Without gaps in the southern part of bund D on the western boundary of Phase 4 adjacent to properties in Northfield Road and Staines Road the presence of the bund could hold back floodwater from flowing onto the land at Manor Farm leading to increased flood risk at properties in Northfield Road.

212 The action group and representations from people living on roads near the site including Northfield Road, Worple Road, Pavilion Gardens and Brightside Avenue and the Ashford Road refer to standing surface water on fields at Manor Farm, road surfaces and at properties, in some instances associated with sewage (which is understood in part to relate to the capacity of the sewerage infrastructure). Capacity of the local sewage network is not an issue as no additional foul water drainage would be generated by the proposal. It does not present an increased risk of flooding from that source. The proposed conveyor tunnel is in the vicinity of the foul sewer and manhole in the Ashford Road and the applicant would need to contact the sewerage undertaker, Thames Water, regarding protection of the sewerage infrastructure during and after tunnel construction.

213 During the winter of 2013/2014 the UK was severely affected by an exceptional run of winter storms which culminated in widespread persistent flooding. A joint Met Office and Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (CEH) report "The Recent Storms and Floods in the UK" February 2014, documents that over the winter the clustering an persistence of storms was highly unusual with December and January being exceptionally wet in the south east. In addition flow rates on the River Thames remained exceptionally high for longer than in any previous flood event. The prolonged wet period and amounts of rainfall led to increasing saturation of the ground, such that following the major storm on 5 and 6 January widespread flooding from tidal, pluvial, fluvial and groundwater sources was inevitable. The report identifies that resulting floodplain inundations were inevitable.

214 As referred to above local roads, properties and land including at Manor Farm (areas within the application site and elsewhere) are at low risk from surface water (pluvial) flooding. Officers consider the source of the standing water on land within Manor Farm witnessed by residents whose properties adjoin the land, and local roads, over the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 winter periods was likely to be surface water flooding resulting from high water table and saturated ground. Given the weather conditions experienced in December 2013 and January 2014 and saturated ground conditions surface water flooding was to be expected, including in locations not previously witnessed by residents.

215 CLAG2 are of the view the FRA should be redone in view of the weather conditions experienced in the country and flood event which impacted in the area local to the application site and elsewhere in Surrey at the end of 2013/beginning of 2014. The EA and the County Geotechnical Consultant Officers have confirmed the FRA remains sufficient to assess the flood risk impacts of the proposal and no further work or modelling is necessary. The EA confirmed that the flooding was a lesser event (probably the 1 in 20 year event) than the 1 in 100yr plus climate change for both fluvial and surface water flooding used by the applicant to assess the impact of the development. As the impact had been assessed on a more extreme event the FRA remained in line with current national flooding policy and both the EA and the consultant were satisfied the impacts had been assessed appropriately and further assessment work was not required.

7

216 The presence of waterbodies on the restored site leading to increased flood risk in the local area is an area of great concern to CLAG2 and local residents. Objectors consider waterbodies have lower water storage capacity than unworked land overlain by soil, the presence of a water body putting adjoining areas and properties at greater risk from flooding (providing examples cited in news reports about flood water coming from former mineral workings). The potential for increase flood risk from the restored site was assessed in the EA and the risk found to be low.

217 Both the EA and the County Geotechnical Consultant have confirmed that in general the creation of new lakes following extraction for gravel provides much more storage than land, particularly where the ground is not very permeable and infiltration rates are poor. Waterbodies therefore have potential to create additional flood storage capacity than existed prior to extraction or where a site is backfilled and restored to land. The additional flood storage is provided between the normal standing water level in the surrounding land (which reflects the groundwater level in the area) and the previous ground level. This is because the volume of the air space in the void left between the standing water level and previous ground level is greater than the air space in soil which will be taken up by water as the ground becomes saturated. Overflow of water from rivers and lakes can be a source of flooding. The local area, including the application site is already at risk from fluvial flooding associated with the River Thames and River Ash. In this case the project level FRA undertaken, and assessment of impact on hydrology, did not identify the proposed restoration with waterbodies as being of concern in terms of flood risk.

Groundwater and water quality

218 The proposed development has the potential to impact on groundwater flows and levels, and on surface and groundwater quality. The ES identified that groundwater flows across the QMQ site (within the lake and through adjoining ground) site are generally in a north east to south west direction. The potential impacts could arise from alterations to the hydrogeological regime in the vicinity of the site from the removal of vegetation, soil stripping, excavation of mineral, construction of the conveyor causeway across the QMQ lake, and landform and waterbodies formed on completion of extraction.

219 Potential impacts on water quality arise from the mineral extraction and processing activities by polluting groundwater and surface water (rivers and waterbodies) during excavation, from discharge of mineral processing water, surface water run off and spillages of oil, fuel or other potentially polluting substances. The impact on of the proposed development on groundwater and water quality is assessed in the ES submitted with the planning application, and where necessary mitigation measures proposed.

220 The assessment identified that as the site would not be dewatered but mineral worked wet, and with restoration to landscape lakes, the potential to impact on groundwater levels and flows is low. The potential impact from the presence of the causeway across the lake on groundwater levels and flow which was assessed and identified there would be minimal impact on levels and no impact on flows and no mitigation was required. Any impact during extraction and restoration would be localised and short term and, given the distance between the application site and local groundwater or surface water abstractions the risk of impact on abstractions was low.

221 To mitigate potential impacts on water quality a number of measures were identified which are proposed in the planning application. These include adoption of good working practices and strict adherence to the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidelines (PPG), in particular numbers 1 General guide to the prevention of water pollution; 2 Above ground storage tanks; 5 Work in, near or liable to affect a watercourse; and 6 Working at demolition and construction sites.

222 A groundwater monitoring programme of water within and adjacent to the site to be developed would be implemented throughout the development, during and following the restoration. Details of the monitoring programme to be agreed in consultation with Surrey County Council and Environment Agency.

223 CLAG2 and local residents are concerned about the effect of the excavation, which would fill with water, affecting water flows and levels locally leading impacting on surrounding properties (leading to settlement), boreholes and aquifers and pollution risk to groundwater.

224 The EA have raised no objection on groundwater or water quality grounds. Affinity Water raise no objection subject to appropriate monitoring and remediation methods being undertaken to deal with any existing pollution being found on site. The County Geological Consultant comments that the operational phase and long term post restoration groundwater impact risks of the proposal are minimised as the site: is to be worked wet and dewatering is not required; and only relatively small areas of the gravel aquifer will be replaced by restoration soils or silt disposal, leaving a large area of lake in hydraulic continuity with the regional groundwater table.

225 The County Geological Consultant has reviewed the assessments undertaken relating to impacts on hydrogeology and groundwater and the groundwater modelling report in the ES. The assessments are considered to be robust and the consultant agrees with the results and conclusions that the proposals will have negligible effect on the sensitive receptors. They recommend, secured by planning condition, implementation of a comprehensive groundwater monitoring plan with additional boreholes to those identified in the plan proposed by the applicant and including monitoring of water levels and groundwater chemistry with annual data reviews, and contingency mitigation measures in the event that unexpected impacts occur. For pollution control the County Geological Consultant recommends provision of a site operational management plan, secured by planning condition, and extended to include ground and surface water management of water pollution control in accordance with EA Pollution Control Guidance.

Conclusion on flood risk, land drainage, groundwater and water quality

226 In conclusion having carefully taken into account concerns of residents and CLAG2, Officers consider that subject to the mitigation measures proposed in the application and recommended in the Environmental Statement and through the imposition of planning conditions and additional controls available through other regimes and regulations relating to the water environment, the proposed development would not result in a materially adverse impact in terms of these and the proposal satisfies the requirements of relevant national and development plan planning policy.

Landscape and Visual impact

7

227 Included in the core planning principles of the NPPF is the requirement for planning (plan making and decision taking) to take account of the different roles and character of different areas "*recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving communities within it*". The impact on the natural environment including from visual intrusion and on the landscape are matters to be considered in determining planning applications to ensure permitted mineral workings do not have unacceptable adverse impacts.

228 The Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP 2011) acknowledges that mineral working can result in significant changes to landscape character, both during the operational life of sites and following restoration. Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011 requires proposals to assess and where necessary mitigate the visual impact of proposals and impact on landscape (appearance, quality and character) and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness. The visual impact on nearby residents and need to phase working to minimize the impact, assessment of the visual impacts of the conveyor required to move minerals off-site are included in the key development considerations for the Manor Farm preferred area.

229 As set out at the start of this Environment and Amenity Section, Spelthorne Borough Council objectives and development plan policies include protecting and improving the quality of the environment, including the landscape and that planning permission will be refused where development will have a significant harmful impact on the landscape (Strategic policy EN8). The contribution mineral working has had on the landscape in some parts of the borough, and legacy of poorly restored minerals workings, is identified as an issue with the borough council looking for timely restoration to a high standard of current and proposed workings.

230 Landscape character assessments have long been promoted by the Countryside Agency (now part of Natural England), who published their final guidance on "Landscape Character Assessment" in 2002 and National Map identifying broad landscape character areas throughout the whole country, of which seven are identified in Surrey. Detailed landscape character assessment work undertaken by the county council published in the 1997 "The Future of Surrey's Landscape and Woodlands" identified and described 25 County Landscape Character areas within the seven national broad landscape character areas.

231 The application site is within the National Countryside Character Area 115, Thames Valley, and within this the Thames Floodplain Landscape Character Area. Included in the key characteristics of the character area are the River Thames and its tributaries; areas of land reshaped by mineral working, with reclamation of former mineral workings resulting in large expanses of lake and wetland providing recreational areas and wildlife habitat, and presence of large reservoirs, many above ground with steep grassed embankments, and in the Greater London fringe area expanded towns with villages and areas of dispersed settlement with housing interspersed with open land elsewhere, and remnant areas of agriculture or market gardening.

232 The land at Manor Farm is situated between Laleham village and the southern extent of the urban area of Staines upon Thames. As can be seen in Figures 1, 2 and 6 to 8 the landform at Manor is generally uniform and flat. It comprises mainly open fields of semi improved grassland, with some fragmented hedgerows and tree belts dividing parts of the site into smaller areas. The application site and land within Manor Farm beyond is enclosed by fencing and perimeter tree (deciduous and evergreen) and hedgerow vegetation, or a combination of both along the boundary which restricts views into the application site from the surrounding area and residential properties backing onto the application site or land beyond to the west, north/north west, east and south west in Brightside Avenue, Pavilion Gardens, Abbot Close, Ashford Road, New Farm Close,

Greenway Drive, Staines Road and Northfield Road. The fencing and boundary planting between the land at Manor Farm and residential properties is of varied heights and types. Within the application site advance planting was undertaken in 2008 along the boundary with FP29 and to the rear of properties on the Ashford Road, New Farm Close, and Greenway Drive.

233 Local residents and the CLAG2 action group have raised various concerns and objections about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development and restoration scheme and after-use including:

- Visual impact from the soil bunding and impact on light at adjoining properties and gardens.
- Visual impact and impact on light at adjoining properties and gardens from tree planting (height of trees and use of coniferous species), in areas of advanced planting and restoration planting.
- Loss of outlook and views to rear of properties during operations and post restoration from loss of views over agricultural fields.
- Visual impact at properties (including that from views over the screen bunds from upper floors of properties), public footpaths and adjoining areas used for recreation from the proposed extraction operations and machinery involved, screen bunds, conveyor belt, new access onto Ashford Road, access and site road from Worple Road, the site compound and lighting, concrete batching pant and aggregate bagging plant at QMQ, and impact of creation of further waterbodies of which there are already enough/too many in Spelthorne.
- The amenity value of the land, impact on local footpaths and substantial visual impacts from the proposed noise attenuation bunding and conveyor bridge over FP30 reasons for refusal/dismissal of the appeal in 1978 remain, though local circumstances have changed as there is now more housing surrounding the site.

234 A Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan have been submitted and included in the ES submitted with the planning application is a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA considered the landscape and visual impact of the proposed mineral working and restoration and development at QMQ within the local area and landscape setting.

235 The LVIA assessed the impact of the proposed development in terms of landscape impact on landform, landuse, landscape structure, roads and public rights of way and the visual impact on settlements and properties including Buckland School, roads and the transport network, public rights of way, areas of public open space and the sports ground to the west. The LVIA assessed the landscape character of the area to be of low to medium sensitivity to the type of development proposed, largely due to the scale and pattern of landform and close proximity of the urban fringe characteristics that exert a strong influence over much of the area. The LVIA identified there was limited visibility of the site from the surrounding area due to the local landscape characteristics and features (generally flat topography, features, and vegetation pattern including along roads and public rights of way and property boundaries), and both the Manor Farm and QMQ parts of the application site being enclosed by vegetation and adjoining development. The nature and extent of visual receptors was very limited, restricted to receptors situated in close proximity to the site at adjacent properties, land and public rights of way.

236 The LVIA assessed the potential visual impacts that would be generated by the different aspects of the proposal: the phased mineral extraction and restoration at Manor Farm, processing at QMQ and transport of mineral by conveyor between the two. This included assessing the sensitivity of a location or receptor, the overall magnitude of the impacts, and overall significance of the changes in relation to the existing baseline situation. Where views are possible the LVIA identified there would be short term impacts generated by the mineral extraction process and associated features such as screen bunding, site

compound, vehicle accesses and the conveyor route within the Manor Farm site, and long term impacts associated with the creation and management of the restoration proposals comprising the formation of water bodies and landscaped edges, removal of existing trees and new planting in gaps in the existing along the route of FP30 and perimeter boundaries.

7

237 Whilst there would be views into the southern part of the QMQ site in the vicinity of the conveyor tunnel and conveyor route the LVIA identified that there are no views from outside the QMQ site of the existing mineral processing plant, and there would be no views of the proposed concrete batching plant or aggregate bagging plant building, which would not exceed the height of the existing plant.

238 The LVIA identified the extent of potential visual impacts upon settlement and properties as being limited to the south of Staines upon Thames and north of Laleham. As well as assessing the impact at properties adjoining the Manor Farm site the potential impact on other sensitive receptors including Buckland School, the Greenfield Recreation Ground public open space areas (both parts), SALSAL , public rights of way and roads and the transport network.

239 The impact on properties on Brightside Avenue adjacent to the northern boundary of the application site and adjacent to the remaining land at Manor Farm between the application site and towards Pavilion Gardens to the north would be influenced by the phase of extraction, orientation of the property, intervening development and vegetation along the route of FP30, advance planting adjacent to FP29. Views of the application site from properties on the eastern, Buckland School side, of the road would be limited by the orientation/aspect of the properties. Views from properties at the southern end of the road would be limited as views are screened by an existing linear belt of trees and vegetation which runs from the line of FP30 westwards to the boundary with the sports ground. Views of Phase 1 at these properties would be further screened by advance planting along FP29 and temporary screen bunding erected along the northern boundary of Phase 1. Screen bunding along the northern boundary of Phase 2 would screen views of the extraction area from these properties and properties on the western, Worple Road side, of Brightside Avenue during Phases 2 to 4. The western section of the existing tree screen along the northern part of Phase 2 would be reduced in length during working of Phase 2.

240 Properties on the southern and on the western part of Brightside Avenue would have views from the side and rear of the properties towards the site compound, vehicle access off Worple Road and site road. Properties between the application site and Pavilion Gardens to the north would get partial views of Phases 2 to 4 from the upper floors of properties, more limited and oblique closer to Pavilion Gardens, and further screened by existing vegetation and the temporary screen bunding around the extraction area. Although the western section of the screen bund would remain in place to screen the site compound the remainder of the screen bunds to the north of Phase 2 would be reduced or relocated as extraction moved south during Phases 3 and 4.

241 Properties in Pavilion Gardens and between Pavilion Gardens and the northern part of the land at Manor Farm (on the eastern side of Worple Road) would have views towards the application site across the land in the northern part of Manor Farm lying outside the application site. From this direction there would be views towards the Worple Road access, access route, site compound and Phase 2, 3 and 4 extraction areas, with what could be seen influenced by distance, property location and orientation relating to the application site and floor of the property, intervening development, vegetation and screen bunding.

242 Views of the site from Buckland School, the part of the Greenfield Recreation Ground and properties in Berryscroft Road and to the north of the application site and Abbot Close, Bingham Drive and Honnor Road to the north east would be limited. Where they occur views from properties would be limited by intervening land/development, vegetation (including the advance planting block adjacent to FP29) and property orientation. There would be no views of Phases 2 to 4 due to intervening vegetation and views of Phase 1 would be of the advance screen planting and temporary screen bund. Views from the school and recreation area

243 To the east views from properties on the Ashford Road to the north east would be screened by intervening vegetation between the application site and Greenfield Recreation Ground (eastern section between the site and the Ashford Road. The boundary vegetation screens views of the site from the recreation ground. To the east properties on Ashford Road, New Farm Close and Greenway Drive have potential views to Phase 1. Views of the extraction area would be limited to the rear and upper floors and partially screened by established vegetation at the properties, trees and hedgerow on the boundary and advance planting undertaken in 2008. Further south along the Ashford Road and The Broadway in Laleham and south east of the application site there would be partial and distant views with screening provided by intervening trees and vegetation on the Manor Farm boundary and along the route of FP30.

244 Properties on the Ashford Road in the vicinity of the conveyor route and new access would be affected by removal of vegetation, the new access off the Ashford Road and the building of the conveyor tunnel under the Ashford Road and into the QMQ site opposite. Numbers 133, 151 and 155 Ashford Road share a boundary with the field for the route of the conveyor and access off the Ashford Road. Views of the field and conveyor route would be from the rear and upper floors of properties, with views screened by intervening vegetation at the properties and along the boundary. On the southern side of the field where boundary vegetation doesn't extend up to the Ashford Road there would be direct close up views from the side and rear of Number 133. The applicant has amended the application to move the proposed access to the northern part of the field away from 131 and the post and wire fence along the unvegetated section would be replaced with a 1.8m high close boarded fence.

245 To the west potential views are of Phases 2 to 4, the site compound and the access and road off Worple Road from properties on Staines Road, Worple Road, Northfield Road and the SALSAL facility. The site compound would be largely screened to view by the boundary vegetation between the site and the sports ground although glimpsed views would be possible from within the sports ground. Due to property orientation potential views from properties in Northfield Close would be limited to the rear and upper floor windows. Boundary vegetation and erection of a seeded screen bund along the length of the boundary would reduce the impacts of extraction during Phases 3 and 4. Potential views from the front of properties on the western side of Worple Road opposite the sports ground and land at Manor Farm up to Pavilion Gardens, and rear of properties on Staines Road would be partial and glimpsed across established vegetation (trees and hedgerows along the roads, and the western boundary of the application site) intervening land, and restricted to upper floors. For properties on Staines Road backing onto the field in the south west corner of the site (where no operations are proposed), potential views of Phase 4 from the rear of the properties would be screened by the existing line of evergreen trees and soil screen bund on the western edge of Phase 4.

246 There would be limited views from the Ashford Road, Staines Road and Worple Road of the proposed development at Manor Farm. Any views would be glimpsed through gaps in vegetation and gateways. Views would be limited by boundary hedgerows and vegetation, vegetation along the roads and intervening buildings and development.

247 Brightside Avenue, Beresford Road, Abbott Close to the north west, north and north east; The Broadway and Ashford Road to the south and south east; Worple Road, Staines Road and Northfield Close to the west, would be limited to varying degrees by the phase of development; distance from the mineral extraction, screen bunding and conveyor route; property orientation; and intervening vegetation and land uses. Views of the QMQ are screened along the Ashford Road by an existing screen bund within the site and the established vegetation within the site.

7

248 Potential views from FP 28 which runs north to south from Berryscroft Road are limited. Potential views across the Buckland School grounds towards Phase 1 would be screened by the school fencing, advance planting and screen bunding. Views of Phases 2 to 4 would be screened by vegetation along the route of FP30 and between the site and Brightside Avenue. Views of Phase 1 would be possible from FP29 as it runs along the northern boundary Phase 1. Along this section mineral extraction operations in Phase 1 would be partially screened by the advance planting along the boundary and screen bunding. Views of Phases 2 to 4 would be screened by the vegetation along the route of FP30. Views from the section of FP29 to the east of the application site as the route crosses the Greenfield Recreation Ground to the Ashford Road would be screened by boundary vegetation and vegetation at properties on the Ashford Road to the south.

249 FP30 runs through the centre of the site. The footpath is lined on both sides by established mixed coniferous and deciduous vegetation, comprising a mature tree belt on the western side and a mature hedge and tree belt on the eastern side The existing vegetation forms an effective screen to Phases 2 to 4 and a partial screen to Phase 1 along much of the route. However, along the route the nature of the vegetation varies and occasional gaps in the hedgerow and beneath the canopy of trees on both sides allow views into the site. From these locations there are clear views of the application site. Bunding would be erected between the footpath route and Phases 2, 3 and 4 (on the western side of the path) to screen operations and reduce the extent of the view. Views in would be possible through gaps in the bunding and vegetation where the conveyor route runs (crossing in a tunnel under the path) and plant and machinery crossing point. Where views in are possible across Phase 1 these would not be screened by bunding.

250 Visual impacts of the proposed development were identified in the LVIA as being limited to:

- Glimpsed views to either side from FP30 of the mineral extraction at Manor Farm. Given the proximity of the footpath to proposed workings and views in the LVIA assessed the impacts from extraction operations in Phase 1 as being substantial adverse on FP29, reducing to slight to moderate beneficial following restoration apart from adjacent to the proposed nature conservation area where the fencing would screen views of the water bodies and restoration planting. For FP30 the impact on views from extraction operations in Phase 1 would be very substantial adverse, and moderate adverse from Phase 2 to 4. Following restoration, which includes replanting missing sections of hedgerow, the impact on views from Phase 1, would reduce to moderate beneficial and substantially beneficial for Phases 2 to 4.
- Glimpsed views of the conveyor route and temporary access from FP30, properties on the Ashford Road in the vicinity of the conveyor crossing tunnel, and users of the Ashford Road. The significance of the impacts was assessed as short term slight to moderate adverse on these receptors.
- Views (partially screened by existing vegetation) from residential properties located directly adjacent to the west (Northfield Road), and north west (Pavilion Gardens), east and south west boundaries (Ashford Road, New Farm Close, Greenway Drive) of the Manor Farm site. Mitigation measures include a 100m standoff between the limit of extraction and grassed temporary screen bunds. The significance of the impact on these receptors was assessed as short term between slight to moderate adverse.

251 Post extraction restoration works include for the removal of the remaining section of the tree screen adjacent to properties in Brightside Avenue, and phased removal of non native species within the advance planting areas and existing hedgerow and boundary vegetation. The removal of tall established trees would result in moderate adverse impact improving to moderate beneficial as the restoration planting establishes.

252 Mitigation measures to minimise the scale of the landscape and visual impact during the operational life of the site have been incorporated into the scheme design. These include blocks of advance tree planting carried out, phased working and restoration of the site, a 100 metre standoff between the edge of extraction and residential properties, erection of temporary soil screen bunds, grass seeded to reduce landscape and visual impacts around the perimeter of the extraction phases, which would be reduced, relocated or removed when no longer required to screen operations, and placing the conveyor in a tunnel across the route of FP30.

253 The County Landscape Consultant has reviewed the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development and concludes that the development is acceptable in landscape and visual terms and raises no objection. The consultant suggested giving consideration to placement of temporary screen bunds either side of the access from the Ashford Road and along the northern side of the site access road from Worple Road to provide some visual screening to the works from adjoining residential properties, planting details (species and density), post restoration management.

254 The proposed mineral working and restoration proposals on the Manor Farm part of the application site would result in a permanent impact on the physical landscape of the site and its setting. The landscape impact would vary during the different operational stages of the phased working and restoration. During the operational life of the site there would be short term landscape impacts generated by the removal of trees and hedgerows in advance of extraction, the mineral extraction process and restoration works, conveying the excavated mineral to the processing site, and associated features such as the screen bunding, modifications to the Worple Road access, site access road, site compound, and formation of the Ashford Road access.

255 Officers agree with the conclusions in the applicant's LVIA that due to the restricted views into the site from surrounding roads the impact in the wider landscape setting is limited.

256 In the local landscape setting where there are unrestricted and partially limited views of the site the landscape impact of the proposed development on the Manor Farm part of the application site would be greater and there would be short term harm to landscape interests which would impact on the amenity of residents, the Buckland School community and people using adjoining recreation and leisure facilities and users of the public footpaths in the vicinity of the site and their enjoyment of this secluded area of open countryside situated between Laleham and Staines upon Thames. The short term harm would be limited in duration and has to be balanced against the need for the mineral and the noise and visual screening purposes of the soil screen bunds and environmental benefits arising from transporting the mineral excavated at Manor Farm to the existing processing plant at QMQ.

257 There would be short term visual impacts at residential properties, Buckland School and adjoin leisure and recreation areas and on users of the public rights of way, in particular users of FP30. The duration of the impact would be short term and change over the operational life of the mineral extraction and transport by conveyor and restoration operations. The visual impact would be mitigated by the measures proposed in the application, which include erection of three metre high soil bunds for visual and noise attenuation purposes.

258 It is acknowledged that screen bunds can be intrusive and cause harm to visual and landscape interests. Objectors have referred to the impact of soil screen bunds included in the reasons for refusal in 1978 of an earlier planning application for mineral extraction at Manor Farm. The nature and scale of the proposal refused in 1978 was different to the current proposal and involved extraction from a more extensive area within the wider area of land at Manor Farm, processing of the mineral in processing plant sited at Manor Farm, export of mineral and importation of waste materials for use in backfilling the site by road via an access off the Ashford Road.

7

259 The impact of the proposed screen bunds in this case has been assessed. Although in some locations the bunds would be in close proximity to footpaths and residential properties, and visible in views impacting on local amenity and the appearance of the area, Officers consider any adverse impact and harm caused by their presence would be short term, and is outweighed by the noise attenuation and visual screening benefits of the bunds and does not justify refusal on grounds of landscape or visual impact.

260 In the longer term post restoration the landscape impact would be significant as the use and character of the land would change from open agricultural grazing land, divided into smaller units by lines of trees and hedgerows, to a nature conservation use with waterbodies and landscaped edges. The concerns expressed by CLAG2 and local residents, in particular those sharing a common boundary with the land at Manor Farm and have direct views over the site, or use of the adjoining land for leisure and recreational uses and users of the public footpaths are acknowledged. In the longer term post restoration there would still be views over, or towards the restored site, but the nature and character of those views in the local landscape setting, and people's amenity and enjoyment of the local landscape would be changed. The applicant's LVIA concluded that the change would be beneficial in landscape terms. Officers agree with this conclusion and consider there would be no significant adverse harm to landscape interests and amenity value of the site in the longer term.

261 On the QMQ site there would be short term landscape impact associated with the construction of the conveyor under the Ashford Road, installation of the conveyor through the site, removal of existing trees and vegetation in the southern part of the site in the vicinity of the Ashford Road and construction of the causeway across the southern part of the existing lake to facilitate this, and operation of the conveyor. Following completion of extraction the conveyor and conveyor tunnel and causeway would be removed and restoration and landscaping undertaken in accordance with the details provided for in this application and the restoration and landscaping scheme for the wider QMQ site approved under ref SP07/1276.

262 Subject to imposition of planning conditions limiting the use of the plant to the same duration as the existing permitted recycling facility and importation and processing of imported as raised minerals operating at QMQ and removal of the plant by 31 December 2033, Officers consider there would be no impact in terms of landscape or visual impact arising from the siting and operation of the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant as these would be sited within the existing processing plant site and not be visible to view from publically accessible areas outside the site due to screening provided by the existing vegetation within the QMQ site, the reservoir embankment and intervening development.

Conclusion on landscape and visual impact

263 In conclusion Officers consider that subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the application and recommended in the Environmental Statement, implementation of the Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan, and long term management of the restored site, which could be secured by a S106, the proposal complies with national and development plan planning policy relating to landscape and visual impact matters.

Noise

264 The NPPF (paragraphs 109 and 123) expects mineral planning authorities, through policies in plans and in determining planning applications, to ensure that noise from new development does not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the natural environment, human health and quality of life. And when determining planning applications ensure that any unavoidable noise is controlled, mitigated or removed at source, and appropriate noise limits established for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties (paragraph 144).

265 The March 2014 NPPG (and previous Technical Guidance to the NPPF) provides guidance and advice on how to assess and manage the noise impact of new development with specific guidance for assessing noise emissions from minerals extraction (part ID 27 Paragraphs 019 to 022). The NPPG states that applicants should carry out a noise impact assessment which identifies all sources of noise taking into consideration noise levels and characteristics, the proposed operating locations, procedures, schedules and duration for each noise source, the life of the proposed development, and likely impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. The guidance sets out matters to be considered for proposals for the control or mitigation of noise emissions. These include: considering the characteristics of the local neighbourhood; assessing the existing noise environment around the application site including background noise levels at nearby noise sensitive properties; and estimating the likely noise to be generated and its impact on the neighbourhood.

266 Guidance is provided on how mineral planning authorities should determine the impact of noise. The NPPG provides noise emission standards and guidance on establishing noise limits, set through planning conditions, for day time 0700 to 1900 operations (normal working hours), evening operations (0900 to 2200) and night time operations (2200 to 0700) at noise-sensitive property. Limits are set for both the day to day normal operations such as extraction, movement of mineral between the working area and processing plant, mineral processing, and short term noisier activities such as soil stripping and replacement, screen bund construction and removal and works associated with construction and maintenance of site roads.

267 For normal operations noise limits should not exceed the background noise level ($L_{A90,1h}$) by more than 10 decibels (dB) during normal (day time) working hours (0700 to 1900). In circumstances where a limit not exceeding the background by more than 10dB ($L_{A90,1h}$) will be difficult to achieve without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator the limit should be set as near that level as possible. In any event the total noise from operations should not exceed 55dB(A) LA_{eq}, 1h (freefield).

268 For the noisier short term activities involved in essential site preparation and restoration work temporary daytime noise limits, for periods up to eight weeks in a year at specified noise sensitive properties, of up to 70dB(A) LA_{eq}, 1h (freefield), can be considered. This is regarded as the normal maximum for periods of up to eight weeks. If the short term activities are likely to take longer than eight weeks a lower limit over a longer period can be considered.

269 Surrey County Council has produced its own 'Guidelines for Noise Control Minerals and Waste Disposal 1994' (Surrey Noise Guidelines). The Surrey Noise Guidelines are based on the approach set out in national guidance at the time, Mineral Planning Guidance Note 11 (MPG11). This was subsequently was replaced by Mineral Planning Statement 2 Controlling and Mitigating the Environmental Effects of Mineral Extraction in England March 2005 (MPS2) and Annex 2: Noise, and more recently the NPPF and associated guidance. The advice in the NPPF in terms of noise emissions and control of noise from mineral working, including noise standards/limits, although less detailed, remains broadly consistent with the Surrey Noise Guidelines.

270 The Surrey Noise Guidelines set out noise levels and limits that would normally be appropriate at any noise sensitive area or development arising from different activities at a mineral site including different limits for temporary activities such as soil stripping and bund construction. The guidelines reflect the national maximum levels of 55dB(A) LA_{eq}, 1h (freefield) and 70dB (A) LA_{eq}, 1h (freefield). Within these upper limits and over the 24 hour period time, varying levels are set out for day, evening and night time periods, which operators should look to achieve with an upper limit set by planning condition.

271 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP 2011) Policy MC14 requires assessment of the impact of noise, including that related to traffic, to be assessed and for proposals to demonstrate that there would not be an adverse effect on local communities and the environment. The key development considerations identified in the SMP 2011 for the Manor Farm preferred area J require the potential environmental impact of noise to be assessed. Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 Policy EN11 Development and Noise seeks to minimise the impacts of noise and sets out a series of criteria by which to achieve this including measures to reduce noise to acceptable levels and ensuring provision of appropriate noise attenuation measures.

272 As summarised in the Consultation and Publicity Section above, CLAG2, Manor Farm Residents' Association and local residents have raised concerns and objected to the proposal on noise grounds. These queries and grounds of objection relate to the potential impact from noise and vibration and disturbance to residents, Buckland and Laleham schools and impact on the learning environment, users of local footpaths and neighbouring recreation and sports grounds from proposed activities on both the Manor Farm and QMQ parts of the application site. Issues raised include the proximity of mineral extraction to residential properties, days of the week operations would be undertaken and hours of operation, noise from the mineral conveyor, traffic, reversing bleepers, the disturbance already cause by noise from activity at the existing QMQ site and concern this would be made worse, damage to property from traffic noise and vibration, and adequacy of the applicant's noise assessment for assessing the impact in the local area.

273 Spelthorne Borough Council object on the grounds insufficient information has been provided on noise as given the concerns expressed by local residents the borough council feel information that would normally be required by planning condition should be submitted prior to determination of the application to give residents more confidence that noise will not be an issue.

274 The noise implications of the proposed development have been assessed and submitted as part of the ES. The detailed assessment work and modelling is in two parts (to be referred to in this report as the mineral extraction and plant site assessments). For the extraction operations at Manor Farm the mineral extraction assessment covered the proposed mineral extraction and restoration operations at Manor Farm and the transport of mineral by conveyor to the QMQ processing plant. The mineral processing activity at QMQ and transport of mineral by road from the QMQ was not included in this assessment as these activities are ongoing at the QMQ site and no changes are proposed in the application in terms of traffic numbers generated by the QMQ site, access to and from the public highway or use of the local highway network to access the site. The plant site part of

the detailed assessment work addressed the proposed concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant at the QMQ mineral processing plant site. The plant site assessment included assessing the cumulative noise impacts of these new elements with the ongoing permitted mineral processing and recycling activities.

275 The mineral extraction noise assessment was undertaken in accordance with national guidance (at the time the March 2012 NPPF Technical Guidance) in consultation with the County Noise Consultant (CNC). The assessment involved undertaking noise surveys at locations in the area surrounding the application site (both the Manor Farm and QMQ parts) picked to be representative of residential properties and Buckland School. The noise surveys were undertaken to establish background noise levels in the locality.

276 The assessment identified the sources of noise, including levels and characteristics, associated with the different activities and phases of development, and plant and equipment that would be involved in the mineral extraction, transport of mineral by conveyor to the QMQ processing plant, restoration, and production of concrete and aggregate bagging operations at the QMQ site. This together with the background noise level information was used to calculate noise levels at each of the representative locations used in the noise survey.

277 For the Manor Farm part of the site the stages of development assessed were initial soil stripping and bund construction, mineral extraction and transfer of mineral onto the conveyor and operation of the conveyor and conveyor switch/transfer points adjacent to properties on Ashford Road (numbers 131, 151 and 155). The proposed development would involve phased working and progressive restoration so activity would be taking place on different parts of the Manor Farm site, for example mineral extraction on phase 2 at the same time as restoration on Phase1. To obtain levels representative of the highest noise levels that could result at the noise sensitive locations the worst case scenario of all three activities and pieces of plant and equipment being undertaken and operating simultaneously.

278 Predicted noise levels were then calculated for the different phases and assessed against the background noise levels to determine the noise impact on the neighbourhood and any mitigation measures necessary to enable noise guideline limits to be met. Mitigation measures identified were use of acoustic screens (soil bunds formed using soil stripped in advance of mineral extraction) and localised enclosure using straw/hay bales around the conveyor change point sited to the west of Numbers 131, 151 and 155 Ashford Road, with the final details relating to height and location to be agreed, which could be secured by planning condition.

279 The application is proposing to work and progressively restore the land at Manor Farm in four phases. The applicant has designed the scheme for the site so that margins of at least 100 metres would remain unworked between the limit of extraction and residential properties. There would be activity within this 100 metre unworked zone associated with the construction and removal of screen bunds using soils stripped in advance of extraction, and works associated with restoration and landscaping following extraction. The extraction of mineral, transport by conveyor to the QMQ processing plant and restoration would be undertaken between 7.30am and 1800 Monday to Friday only. Mineral processing operations at QMQ would take place Monday to Friday and on Saturday mornings. The minimum amount of machinery would be used at any one time and all plant and vehicles used would be serviced regularly, maintained in good working order and fitted with effective silencers. White noise or other approved device would be use on wheeled plant operating at the site instead of audible reversing bleepers.

7

280 The mineral extraction noise impact assessment concluded that the proposed phased working and restoration of the land at Manor Farm and conveying the mineral to the processing plant together with the identified mitigation measures would not lead to noise levels at noise sensitive receptors (residential properties and Buckland School) in excess of the NPPG 70dB(A) LA_{eq}, 1h (freefield) level for short term activities, nor background plus 10dB for normal operations during normal day time working hours.

281 As set out in the Flood risk, land drainage, groundwater and water quality section of the report the design of the proposed soil bunds has been amended since the application was submitted. The change involved placing gaps in bunds A, B and C and had regard to the need to maintain the noise attenuation and visual screening properties of the bunds. The CNC is satisfied adequate noise attenuation would still be provided by the bunding.

282 The plant site noise assessment work related to the use of the QMQ processing plant and proposed new concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant. The plant site assessment had been initially been undertaken in support of the proposals for a concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant at QMQ referred to in paragraph 14 above. An update to the original plant site assessment was submitted in November 2012.

283 The update arose out of complaints made in October 2012 about noise from the site and recycling facility from a local resident living opposite QMQ on the Ashford Road (between Gloucester Crescent and Charles Road). Following the complaints noise monitoring was undertaken by the operator, Brett Aggregates Ltd and used to update the plant site noise assessment. The County Council's Noise Consultant (CNC) investigated the complaint and undertook monitoring. The applicant's updated assessment included monitoring at two new monitoring locations, both on the Ashford Road, one outside 317 near the junction with Gloucester Crescent (opposite the current mineral processing plant site) and the other outside 281 near the junction with Shaftesbury Crescent (opposite the location of the recycling facility which is currently sited in the south western part of plant site). Noise levels were also measured at the two previous monitoring points west of the site (Bingham Drive and Charles Road) used in the original assessment.

284 Cumulative noise generated by the existing permitted mineral and waste developments at QMQ is limited by planning condition as follow:

"Except for temporary operations, the level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2m at least 3.6m from the façade of a residential property or other a noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed: 55 LAeq for any 0.5 hour period during 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0730 to 1300 hours Saturdays."

285 The applicant's monitoring identified that whilst noise from the QMQ site could be heard at properties on the Ashford Road during lulls in traffic, the noise generated was within the limits set by planning condition. The CNC informed planning officers that he did not think there was a problem with noise from the site and concluded that the site was operating in compliance with the noise limit set for the site.

286 Having regard to the existing site noise limits, the plant site assessment followed the approach set out in national guidance as referred to above with noise measurements taken at locations west of the existing mineral processing plant site and recycling facility processing plant site to establish background noise limits. The noise impact assessment identified that with the existing mineral and waste development plus the proposed concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant operating at the QMQ site, the 55 LAeq for any 0.5 hour period noise limit would be slightly exceeded at the two monitoring locations (outside No 281 Ashford Road near the junction with Shaftesbury Crescent and on Bingham Road) further south opposite the recycling facility.

287 To mitigate this impact a four (4) metre high bund erected on the western boundary of the existing recycling plant site would be necessary to ensure noise from the existing and proposed plant operations would be within the 55 LAeq for any 0.5 hour period noise limit for the site. Work commenced constructing the bund in late 2012 and the bund would need to be retained and maintained at 4m high. This could be secured by planning condition.

288 The Manor Farm Residents' Association made enquiries in February 2014 about monitoring of the QMQ site and stated that a number of their residents had indicated high levels of noise and dust problems during the summer of 2013. Although objections to this planning application have been received from local residents on the grounds that noise can be heard from the QMQ site, the only complaint received by the county council about noise since the current permitted development at the QMQ site permitted under SP07/1269, SP07/1273 and SP07/1275 have been operational was in late 2012. As reported above when this was investigated the site was not found to be operating in breach of the noise limit set by planning condition. The fact noise from activity and operations being undertaken on the QMQ site is noticeable outside the site boundary does not mean the site is operating in breach of the noise limit.

289 With regard to the effects from traffic this proposal does not involve a change to the access and traffic that would be associated with the QMQ site. When granting planning permission for the existing developments at QMQ in 2009 and in connection with the three applications reported to the June 2011 meeting, the environmental impact of and suitability of the local road network for the type and volume of traffic that would be generated was assessed and not considered an overriding constraint.

290 The applicant has undertaken a noise impact assessment in line with Government policy and guidance in the NPPF and NPPG and Surrey Noise Guidelines. Incorporated into the proposed extraction and restoration at Manor Farm and mineral processing operations at QMQ are a number of best practice measures which would remove or reduce noise emissions at source. In addition mitigation measures are proposed, including erection of noise bunds around working areas, to ensure the proposals would be undertaken within national and Surrey Noise Guideline limits for mineral development on noise sensitive receptors (residential properties and Buckland School). The measures would reduce noise impacts on other receptors using the public rights of way at Manor Farm, the Greenfield Recreation Ground and SALSA L facility. No further information is required prior to determination of the application to assess the noise implications of the proposed development.

291 Noise has the potential to adversely affect the amenity of users of FP 29 and FP30, particularly during extraction and restoration within Phase 1. Officers consider the impact on users of FP29 would be mitigated appropriately by the measures incorporated into the proposal and use of soil bunding. For users of FP30 adequate mitigation would be possible during working in Phases 2, 3 and 4 to the west of the footpath as soil bunding would be erected between the operational area and FP30. However, noise during operations on Phase 1 would be noticeable and intrusive or potentially disruptive to some users adversely impacting on the amenity of users of the path. The degree of disturbance would vary depending on where within Phase 1 relative to the footpath operations were being undertaken and this harm is acknowledged. However, as the extraction and restoration operations within Phase 1 would be of limited duration (10 months extraction), the harm has to be balanced against the need for the mineral.

292 The County Noise Consultant has assessed the proposal and the applicant's noise assessment. He is satisfied the assessment of the noise impact of the proposed development has been undertaken correctly, that the proposed development has been designed with appropriate mitigation measures proposed and incorporated into the proposal such that it can be carried out within the provision of the Surrey Noise Guidelines.

Conclusion on noise

293 In conclusion on noise matters Officers consider that noise can be adequately controlled and the proposal is acceptable and subject to securing controls through planning conditions the proposal is consistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF, NPPG and relevant development plan policies.

7

Air Quality (Dust)

294 The whole of Spelthorne Borough is designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to levels of nitrogen dioxide, mainly attributable to road traffic and Heathrow Airport. The AQMA does not apply to PM_{10} particulate matter. Air quality from existing mineral workings and landfill sites in the borough are not identified as a source of emissions and concern in terms of air quality.

295 This section of the report addresses dust. In consultation with the County Air Quality Consultant consideration of air quality impacts arising from traffic was scoped out of the matters to be assessed in connection with the proposal as mineral would be taken to the QMQ for processing and the HGV traffic generated by the export of mineral extracted at Manor Farm (in bulk, as concrete or bagged aggregates) would be replacing HGV traffic exporting mineral excavated from within the reservoir and all HGV movements would remain within the limit set by the extant planning permissions at the site. Therefore there is no need for an air quality assessment of particulates from traffic from the proposal.

296 Dust is a generic term used to describe particulate matter of different sizes, shapes and compositions in the size range 1–75 µm (micrometres) in diameter. Small particles that are less than or equal to (≤) 10 µm in diameter are commonly referred as PM_{10}. There are two issues concerning airborne dust from surface mineral workings: the impact upon residential amenity by causing a nuisance; and the impact upon health.

297 Small particles (PM_{10}) are associated with effects on human health and only make up a small proportion of the dust emitted from most mineral workings. These are deposited slowly and may travel 1000m or more from the source but their concentration will decrease rapidly on moving away from the source due to dispersion and dilution. Larger particles (greater than 30µm (µ = microgram)) make up the greatest proportion of dust emitted from mineral workings, including sand and gravel sites, and will largely deposit within 100m of sources, with intermediate particles (10 - 30µm) being likely to travel up to 200-500m. Large and intermediate particles are often referred to as *nuisance dust*.

298 Dust impacts from mineral workings are a source of concern to surrounding communities and SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD Policy MC14 requires sufficient information to be submitted to enable the authority to be satisfied that there would be no significant adverse dust impacts. Included in the key development requirements for the Manor Farm preferred area is the need to assess the impact on air quality and objectives of the Spelthorne Borough Council Air Quality Management Plan.

299 As summarised in the Consultation and Publicity Section above, CLAG2, Manor Farm Residents' Association and local residents have raised concerns and objected to the proposal on air quality grounds. The concerns and grounds of objection relate to the potential impact from nuisance dust, additional impact on air quality which is already an issue and cause of ill health in the local area, proximity to housing and local schools, health impacts in particular on children, the elderly and those with pre existing health conditions, impact on growing fruit and vegetables.

300 Spelthorne Borough Council object on the grounds insufficient information has been provided on air quality as given the concerns expressed by local residents the borough council feel information that would normally be required by planning condition (e.g. potential for nuisance arising from wind-blown dust) should be submitted prior to determination of the application to give residents more confidence that air quality will not be an issue.

301 The NPPF and guidance in the NPPG expect mineral planning authorities, through policies in plans and in determining planning applications, to ensure that mineral proposals do not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the natural environment or human health by "*preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution*" (paragraph 109). To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution planning decisions should ensure new development is appropriate for its location and that the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and take account of the potential sensitivity of the area to adverse effects from pollution (paragraph 120). In relation to dust emissions from mineral development policy in the NPPF is that unavoidable dust emissions should be controlled, mitigated or removed at source (paragraph 144).

302 The March 2014 NPPG (and previous Technical Guidance to the NPPF) provides guidance and advice on how to assess and manage the dust impact of new development, with specific guidance for assessing dust emissions from minerals extraction (part ID 27 Paragraphs 023 to 032). The NPPG states that where dust emissions are likely to arise, applicants should prepare a dust assessment study which should be undertaken by a competent person/organisation with acknowledged experience for undertaking such assessments. Under the previous guidance residential areas, glasshouses and (plant) nurseries and horticultural land are viewed as being medium sensitivity in relation to dust emissions and their sensitivity to nuisance dust.

303 The guidance advises that additional dust controls relating to suspended fine particulates (PM_{10}) might be necessary if a dust source at the proposed site is in close proximity to any residential property, or other sensitive use. Where residential properties or other sensitive receptors are within 1000 metres of the dust source, assessment of the likelihood of the additional PM_{10} contribution from the development leading to PM_{10} levels likely to exceed national Air Quality Objectives should be undertaken (ID 27 Paragraphs 30 and 32). If not then good practice mitigation and control measures would be appropriate.

304 Dust can be generated at mineral sites from a range of activities and processes including site preparation (soil stripping and bund construction), excavation, stockpiling, loading and transport of excavated mineral to the processing plant, minerals processing and restoration. Other factors such as weather conditions, including wind, precipitation and temperature will also influence dust generation and movement. Dust emissions can impact on adjoining land uses and the natural environment.

305 The ES submitted with the application contains an assessment of the health and nuisance dust implications of the proposal on air quality standards and dust sensitive receptors (residential properties and Buckland and Laleham Schools) within 1000 metres/1 km of the site. The assessment followed guidance in Technical Guidance to the NPPF which was current at the time.

306 The ES concluded that although there were large numbers of dust sensitive properties within 1km of the site, based on the prevailing PM_{10} Air Quality in Spelthorne borough, there was no real likelihood of the current PM_{10} Air Quality Objective being exceeded in which case further assessment work was not required in relation to PM_{10}. The assessment concluded there would be no adverse health impacts on health from any increases in PM_{10}

arising from the development. The ES identified the main potential sources of airborne dust associated with the proposed development to include:

- soil stripping and bund formation
- overburden excavation
- sand and gravel extraction
- site haulage – e.g. at Manor Farm the movement of vehicles and plant on internal haul routes and use of loading shovel at the extraction working area to load mineral into the conveyor hopper and at QMQ internal movement within the mineral processing plant site area
- transport of extracted sand and gravel by field conveyor system
- mineral processing
- bund removal and soil replacement

307 A 100 metre stand-off would be maintained between the limit of extraction and residential properties and the Buckland School, though there would be activity associated with construction and removal of soil bunds and restoration works within the 100 metres standoff. The ES assessed the risk of dust impacts at the identified dust sensitive receptors and concluded that with implementation of dust control and mitigation measures appropriate for the potential sources of airborne dust there would be insignificant dust impacts on properties and local schools. The application proposes adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures.

308 The County Air Quality Consultant reviewed the applicant's dust assessment study and considers it had covered all of the areas recommended in the NPPF Technical Guidance and they are in broad agreement with the findings of the assessment. In line with the NPPF which states that any unavoidable dust and particle emissions should be controlled, mitigated or removed at source, the consultant advises that, if implemented, the proposed control and mitigation measures (by means of design/layout, management, equipment and other controls) are likely to give a good level of control and avoid significant adverse impacts. These can be secured by planning condition.

309 The consultant recommends imposition of condition(s) requiring the implementation of a Dust Action Plan (DAP) which is a documented site specific operational plan to prevent or minimise the release of dust from the site; and a Dust Monitoring Plan (DMP) providing for a programme of ongoing dust monitoring to validate the outcome of the dust assessment study and check on the continuing effectiveness of the proposed control and mitigation measures. Details of both the DAP and DMP should be submitted to the CPA for approval.

310 The Manor Farm Residents' Association made enquiries in February 2014 about monitoring of the QMQ site, and stated that a number of their residents had indicated high levels of noise and dust problems during the summer of 2013. Although objections to this planning application have been received from local residents about potential dust impact from the proposal, with some referring to dust from the QMQ site, no complaints about dust from the site have been received by the Planning Enforcement Team since the planning permissions for the current mineral extraction, mineral processing and waste recycling operations permitted in 2009 commenced.

Conclusion on air quality (dust)

311 The concerns of local residents are acknowledged. Officers are satisfied that an appropriate dust assessment study has been undertaken and sufficient information provided at this stage to assess the dust implications of the proposed development, and nothing further information is required prior to determination of the application. A phased programme of working and restoration is proposed with at least a 100m standoff/unworked margin between the extraction residential properties and Buckland School. This distance, together with the dust control and mitigation measures proposed, should ensure there would be no significant adverse impact from nuisance dust on nearby sensitive receptors,

or health from suspended dust. As such Officers consider the proposal is consistent with the aims and objective of national policy and guidance and relevant development plan policy relating to dust.

Rights of way, leisure and recreation

312 As shown on Plan 1 Public Right of Way Footpath 30 (FP 30) crosses the application site at Manor Farm from the Ashford Road in the south to link up with FP 28 and FP29, both of which lie outside the application site. The route of FP 30 is lined with vegetation, a mature belt of trees on the west and a mature hedge and tree belt on the east. FP28 runs in a north south direction between the Buckland School and properties on Brightside Avenue to connect up to Berryscroft Road to the north adjacent to the entrance to Buckland School. FP29 runs along the northern boundary of proposed Phase 1 working area then runs south eastwards crossing the Greenfield Recreation Ground to link up to the Ashford Road. There are no public rights of way crossing the QMQ part of the application site.

313 As well as the Greenfield Recreation Ground, which in the part to the east includes an enclosed children's play area, other leisure and recreation areas adjoining the site are the Buckland School playing fields to the north of Phase 1 and the Staines and Laleham Sports and Leisure (SALSAL) Ground which lies to the west of the proposed Phase 2 working area and site compound. The SALSAL facility is home to a number of different sport and leisure clubs for all ages. External facilities used for different sports all year round include archery targets and grass playing fields, cricket pitches and floodlit all weather multi use pitches.

314 The public rights of way are well used and form access links between residential areas in Laleham and Staines upon Thames and to Buckland School. Although secured around the perimeter by fencing, gates and hedgerows the majority of the land at Manor Farm forms one large field with tree belts and hedgerows within it crossed north to south by FP30, which is lined on both sides by mixed tree and hedgerow vegetation and parts of the path are on an embankment raised above the surrounding land. Gaps through the trees and hedgerow at various points along FP30 enable access across to the fields either side of the path.

315 Unauthorised use is made of the fields at Manor Farm by dog walkers and others. There is a history of problems caused by people using the land for unsocial activity including riding motorbikes. This is understood to have reduced since cattle have been grazing the land.

316 Objections have been raised by CLAG2 and residents about the impact of the proposal on the public rights of way and users. The issues raised by objectors include concerns about closure of FP30, the adverse impact on amenity and use of the right of way that would result from various activities associated with the proposed development obstructing the footpath and impacting from noise, dust, visual intrusion, health and safety risks (from proximity to the excavation and water areas) resulting in the path becoming unusable and leading to a negative impact on recreational and leisure activities of the local population and its use as a means access on foot and bicycle to Buckland School. In view of the potential impact on the footpath CLAG2 question how the path could remain open.

317 The County Rights of Way Officer raises no objection to the application subject to a number of requirements to protect the right of way and its use: public access along FP30 being maintained throughout the period of extraction and restoration. If this is not possible an official temporary closure order is required. No obstruction of the public right of way at any time, including on a temporary basis by placing of plant or machinery. Any damage to rights of way surfaces must be repaired. Warning signs must be erected where site operations involve the route of the public right of way to be used or crossed, and such signs must not discourage public use.

7

318 National policy in the NPPF identifies the planning system as playing an important role in promoting healthy communities. The NPPF looks for planning decisions to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities with access to opportunities for sport and recreation identified as important in contributing to the health and well-being of communities. SMP 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 seeks to protect public open space, the rights of way network and outdoor recreational facilities from significant adverse impacts arising from proposed mineral development. Included in the key development considerations for the Manor Farm preferred area is retention of FP30 and making provision for suitable unworked margins to protect users.

319 SB Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 identifies recreation as a significant land use in the borough. Sport and recreation facilities are recognised as having an important part to play in people's well being and quality of life with continued and increased participation in sport and recreation recognised as contributing towards the Government's aim of improving the general health of the nation. Protection of existing facilities is seen as important and through Policy EN4 the borough council seeks to ensure there is sufficient, well sited and suitable open space to meet a wide range of outdoor, recreation and open space needs.

320 The route of FP30 would remain open during the life of mineral extraction and restoration. Working is proposed either site of the path. Mineral extracted from Phases 2, 3 and 4 would be transported by conveyor to the processing plant and the conveyor would cross over the route of the footpath. Rather than constructing a bridge over the path the conveyor would pass under the path in a tunnel. Plant and machinery would need to cross the path to gain access to the different parts of the site, for example during soil stripping from Phase 1 to transport soils to the storage bund (Bund B) which would run parallel on the western side of the footpath between it and Phases 2 and 3 and the northern part of Phase 4.

321 The application proposes to construct the conveyor tunnel under the path in sections so the path could remain open. Apart from removal of some trees on either side of the path where the conveyor tunnel would be constructed and to enable access for vehicles and plant and machinery, the existing vegetation along the remainder of the length of FP30 would be unaffected. The routes of FP28 and FP29 lie outside the application site boundary so would not be affected by the proposed development.

322 Granting planning permission for development does not allow the stopping up/closure or diversion of a public right of way whether on a short term temporary basis whilst works adjacent to or on the line of the public right of way, or for longer periods whilst the development is carried out. Stopping up (closure) or diversion of a public right of way to enable the development to take place (for example if the land beneath a footpath was being worked, or a building or other development constructed along or across it), even if the right of way was only impacted for a temporary period, would require an official stopping up or diversion order.

323 In this case, a public right of way, FP30, runs through the proposed mineral site, and is to remain open during the life of extraction and restoration operations. The route would be crossed over by plant and machinery and vehicles to enable access to the different parts of the site. Crossing the route of the footpath to enable access between different parts of the application site would be possible, and lawful, without the need for the footpath to be closed; in the same way that vehicles and equipment involved in the agricultural use of the land can at present and as happens across the country where public rights of way run across agricultural land, or across developed land and premises where different landuses uses are being undertaken. The same would apply to works to vegetation or fencing along the route of the footpath.

324 Subject to imposition of conditions as recommended by the County Rights of Way Officer, there is no need for FP30 to be closed or diverted whilst the site is operational. The route of the footpath and surface would need to be protected and users have right of way over site traffic. Should it be necessary for the footpath to be temporarily closed, for example to construct the conveyor tunnel, a stopping up or diversion order would be required.

325 Whilst the proposed development would not lead to loss of public open space, or existing facilities used for sport or leisure, it has the potential to impact on use of the facilities adjoining the site, including external areas at Buckland School, and the public rights of way network. It would impact on the unauthorised use of the fields at Manor Farm by local people and dog walkers.

326 As is clear from the objections received there is great concern locally about impact on local amenity, loss of the area at Manor Farm for recreational activity and the impact on potential use for recreation and sport of the external areas at Buckland School, inside and outside uses at the SALSAL facility and public open space areas at the Greenfield Recreation Ground.

327 The local landscape, amenity and recreational value of the land and public rights of way at Manor Farm is acknowledged, and the impact on these interests during the operational life of the mineral site was included in the reasons for refusal of a proposal for mineral extraction in 1978. The proposal subject of this application has the potential to impact during the operational life of the mineral extraction and post restoration at the Manor Farm part of the site on these interests. There would be no impact from the aspects of the proposed development at QMQ.

328 Dealing first with potential long term impacts, the proposed restoration scheme would change the character of the land at Manor Farm from the existing open agricultural land to an area of lakes with landscaped wooded edges and a nature conservation after-use.

329 The 2010 planning application by Shepperton Aggregates included proposals to open the restored site up to the public by creating additional footpaths to link with existing ones and roads to the west. In response to local residents concerns about security (raised in objections to the 2010 application and during the pre application community consultation undertaken by the applicant, Brett Aggregates in connection with this application), and for reasons relating to aerodrome safeguarding to address concerns about increased bird strike hazard, the restoration scheme does not now proposed to increase public access to the site.

330 Post restoration the nature and character of the land in the local landscape would be changed. The public rights of way network would be unaffected. The impact of the restoration proposals on landscape and amenity interests has been assessed in the Landscape and visual impact section of the report. This identified there would be no significant adverse long term impact to landscape interests and the amenity value of the land at Manor Farm and in the surrounding area. The proposed restoration and after-use would not impact on the use or availability of public rights of way at Manor Farm, land at Buckland School, or existing areas of public open space and sport and leisure facilities adjoining the site, and opportunity they provide for sport and recreation in the local community.

331 For the duration of the phased mineral extraction removal of extracted mineral by conveyor and restoration, the development has the potential to result in short term impact from changes in the nature and character of the land, noise and visual intrusion impacting on amenity and use of the public right of way network and adjoining areas of public open space and facilities used for sport and recreation. Measures designed to reduce or mitigate the impact of the proposed development include phased working and restoration, working

Monday to Fridays only between 0730 and 1800, use of soil bunds for noise and visual screening purposes, removing excavated mineral by conveyor.

7

332 These impacts have been assessed in the landscape and visual impact and noise sections of the report. In the wider landscape setting impacts would be small due to the enclosed nature of the site. Impact would be greater in the local landscape setting where there are unrestricted and partially limited views of the site, these and noise impacts are capable of being adequately controlled and mitigated such that, apart from the impact on FP30, the proposed development would not adversely impact on amenity at or the enjoyment and use of external space at residential properties and Buckland School, the FP28 and FP29, or existing areas of public open space and sport and leisure facilities adjoining the site and opportunity they provide for sport and recreation in the local community.

333 There would however be adverse impact on FP30 during extraction and restoration operations, and transport of mineral by conveyor to QMQ, with the harm greatest during operations on Phase 1 to the east where operations would be visible through the gaps in the existing vegetation, and from noise emissions. The proposed development has the potential to affect users enjoyment and amenity of users and undermine the value of FP30, which links to the local public footpath network (FP28 and FP29), in providing the opportunity for people to access the open countryside at Manor Farm and as a means of access between the developed areas of Laleham and Staines upon Thames.

334 However, as concluded in the sections on these matters any adverse impact and harm would be short term and limited in duration, and has to be balanced against the need for the mineral and environmental benefit of mitigation measures such as soil bunds on the western side of the path, and transporting mineral by conveyor to the processing plant. Officers do not consider the scale of the impacts and harm on FP30, for the duration of the proposed phased extraction and restoration at Manor Farm, is so great as to justify refusing the application on grounds of impact on the amenity of users of the footpath.

335 In conclusion, Officers are satisfied that whilst there would be temporary impact on users of FP30, this would be limited both in the duration and scale of impact and not an overriding constraint to the development. Taken as a whole, and with the measures proposed to avoid, reduce and mitigate any adverse effects on local amenity, Officers consider no significant adverse impact would be caused in terms of to the enjoyment and use of external space at residential properties and Buckland School, the FP28 and FP29, or existing areas of public open space and sport and leisure facilities adjoining the site and opportunity they provide for sport and recreation in the local community. Officers are satisfied the proposal is in accordance with relevant national and development plan planning policy on such matters.

Biodiversity and ecology (species and designated areas)

336 The requirement for planning to contribute to "*conserving and enhancing the natural environment*" is included in the 12 core planning principles set out in the NPPF, with specific policy with regard to the protection of protected species and habitats set out within part 11 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment' (paragraphs 109 to 125). Guidance is provided in the NPPG with further guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation as it applies in England contained in Circular 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and their impact within the planning system (Circular 06/2005).

337 The NPPF looks to the planning system to "*minimise impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressure.*" Plans should aim to minimise adverse effects on the natural environment and set criteria based policies against

which development proposals on or affecting protected wildlife sites will be judged, with policies distinguishing between the hierarchy of designations and protection commensurate with their status giving appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution made to wider ecological networks.

338 The NPPF sets out principles to apply in determining planning applications including: refusing planning permission where significant harm resulting from the proposed development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for; development likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI should not normally be permitted, where an adverse effect is likely an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the impact on the SSSI and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSI sites; and encourage opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in or around developments.

339 SMP 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 requires proposals for mineral working to provide sufficient information on and assess the impact on the natural environment and biodiversity, and where necessary the impact to be minimised, mitigated and any loss compensated for. The key development requirements for the Manor Farm preferred area require sufficient information to enable an Appropriate Assessment in respect of the South West London Waterbodies to be undertaken, if required; and sufficient information provided to identify baseline ecology and protected species and species of principal importance, assess impact and mitigate potential impacts.

340 Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD Policies SP6 Maintaining and Improving the Environment and EN8 Protecting and Improving the Landscape and Biodiversity seek to protect and improve the landscape and biodiversity of the Borough through safeguarding sites of international and national importance; working with others to develop and secure the implementation of projects to enhance the landscape and create or improve habitats of nature conservation value; wherever possible ensure that new development contributes to an improvement in landscape and biodiversity and also avoids harm to features of conservation interests; and states planning permission will be refused where development would have a significant harmful impact on the landscape or features of nature conservation value. Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 saved policy RU11 gives protection to SNCIs.

341 As set out in the Consultation and Publicity Section above CLAG2 and local residents have raised objections on biodiversity grounds. In summary the grounds of objection relate to loss of the existing habitat at Manor Farm and impact on existing wildlife at the site and surrounding area, querying the need for additional waterbodies and wetland habitat in the area at the expense of the existing habitat; impact on bats and birds (species already present and those returning to the area) from loss of pasture habitat; adequacy of the bat survey work and mitigation, dust impact on trees at QMQ which act as a good screen to the industrial development at the site and loss of a variety of established trees and habitat they provide.

342 The ES accompanying the application included an assessment of the potential impact on biodiversity and nature conservation interests at the site (land at Manor Farm and QMQ) and surrounding area, including statutory (e.g. SPA and SSSI) and non statutory nature conservation sites e.eg SNCIs) designated sites. An addendum to the ES was submitted in June 2013 and provides further information relating to the potential impact of the conveyor route and operation of the conveyor on the land West of Queen Mary SNCI. The ES describes the baseline ecological conditions at both parts of the application site in terms of designated sites, types of habitat and plant and animal species present on the site. An extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken (now referred to as Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) which was used to determine what further plant and species survey work was required. Botanical surveys for the area within the application site and

breeding bird, bat, amphibian and reptile surveys were carried out, and existing habitats at the site and in the surrounding area evaluated.

7

343 The potential impact from the different elements of the proposed development (extraction at Manor Farm, transport of mineral by conveyor from Manor Farm to QMQ, mineral processing at QMQ and restoration of the land at Manor Farm to waterbodies) on habitats and species was assessed, and mitigation or compensation measures identified. With the mitigation/compensation the overall residual impacts on habitats and species were assessed as negligible and not significant, with the new habitat at Manor Farm assessed as positive and significant at the local level in the longer term.

344 The assessment identified that the vast majority of the land at Manor Farm comprises improved grassland of negligible ecological value, currently used for cattle grazing. The field system at Manor Farm is delineated by fences and defunct hedgerows, crossed by a public footpath (FP30) running approximately north to south delineated by a relatively species rich hedgerow and tree belt. In the western part of the land are a strip of woodland, lines of trees and several scattered trees and standing wood. The land within QMQ (land and water areas) comprises a range (mosaic) of habitat types with the main ecological value attributed to the areas around the waterbodies which have been designated as a SNCI principally for its breeding bird assemblage. The assessment identified the key ecological receptors as: the mosaic of habitats at QMQ, mature trees, hedgerows, breeding birds and bats.

345 The trees and hedgerows at Manor Farm were identified as providing foraging and breeding habitat for birds as well as offering biological connectivity to the wider area. The hedgerows also provide foraging habitat for bats. The bat survey identified common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle bats using the hedgerow/tree belt alongside the footpath and field to the east for foraging, and common pipistrelle bats identified foraging along the boundary hedgerow along the western (SALSAL facility, garden centre and Northfield Road) boundary of the site, and defunct hedgerow on land west of FP30. 19 trees and standing deadwood were identified as having potential to support bat roosts, and further investigation was undertaken (tree climbing survey) where possible.

346 The QMQ bird survey identified 39 bird species (associated with different habitat types within the wider site), along the route of the proposed conveyor. The bird species included species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, species, National Biodiversity Action Plan species, Species of Principal Importance (further to section 41 of the National Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) and Red/Amber list species.

347 The assessment concluded that, subject to the identified mitigation measures being taken, the proposed extraction, transport of mineral by conveyor, mineral processing and restoration would not have a significant adverse impact on designated sites or protected species and habitats. Mitigation measures proposed, which form part of the application proposals, include: construction of new habitats through the restoration at Manor Farm site with an emphasis on nature conservation; retention of hedgerows and features of ecological value where possible; careful routing of the conveyor with QMQ; clearance of vegetation for the construction of the conveyor outside the bird breeding season; retention of deadwood on site, replanted where possible, installation of species specific bird and bat boxes; working practices to minimise disturbance outside operational areas including implementation of dust control and mitigation measures and pollution control measures.

348 No objection has been raised by Natural England in relation to protected species or designated sites (the South West London Waterbodies Special Proteciton Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site or the seven Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which are entirely within or part of the SPA/RAMSAR site). They welcome the inclusion of bat boxes which are known to be used by pipistrelle bats known to be using the site. As bats use the site for foraging commuting lines should be maintained e.g. via boundary hedges to alternative local foraging areas.

349 The Surrey Wildlife Trust raise no objection but have concerns about the potential impact from the construction of the conveyor route on the SNCI. The County Ecologist and Biodiversity Manager raises no objection and considers there would be no significant adverse effect on ecology and the restoration scheme should provide a biodiversity enhancement through the creation of new habitats.

350 The proposal would result in permanent loss of the existing grassland habitat on the area of land excavated for mineral and adjoining areas. Restoration would be to a nature conservation end use involving creation of new habitats comprised of three new waterbodies planted with reed beds and other marginal planting, and adjacent land areas planted with willow and native scrub, woodland belts and hedgerows. Subject to agreement with the school a conservation study area would be provided on land adjacent to the Buckland School. The restoration scheme would deliver biodiversity enhancement.

351 The potential impact on bats and birds has been assessed and mitigation proposed. This includes retention of hedgerows and features of ecological value where possible and provision of bat and bird breeding boxes. Retention of hedgerows together with the existing tree and hedgerow vegetation around the Manor Farm boundary, together with the hedgerow along the route of FP30 would continue to provide foraging commuting lines for use by bats known to use the site. In addition in the longer term the new habitats created would offer additional foraging opportunities for bats. Additional survey work would be required in advance of vegetation clearance, or works to remove or lop of trees and standing wood, to check for breeding birds and bat roosts; and if necessary measures taken to protect any bats identified and roots and breeding birds. This can be secured by planning condition.

Conclusion on biodiversity and ecology (species and designated areas)matters

352 The proposal has the potential to impact on biodiversity interests including habitats and species at both the Manor Farm and QMQ parts of the site and in the surrounding area. Apart from the loss of the grassland habitat at Manor Farm these impacts are temporary. Subject to implementation of the mitigation and protection measures outlined in the ES during extraction and processing operations, and the land restored, landscaped and managed in accordance with the Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan, and long term management of the restored site, which could be secured through a legal agreement, Officers consider no material adverse impact would result on biodiversity and nature conservation interests. In the longer term the new habitats created and nature conservation after-use at the restored site offer the opportunity for biodiversity enhancement on the site and surrounding area. Accordingly, Officers consider the aims, objectives and requirements of national policy in relation to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and, relevant development plan policies have been met.

Historic environment and archaeology

353 One of the core land-use planning principles in the NPPF to underpin planning decisions is to "*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*". National policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment, including archaeology is set out set out within part 12 (paragraphs 126 to 141) of the NPPF, including information and assessment requirements, and matters local planning authorities should take account of in determining planning applications, with further guidance provided in the NPPG.

354 Applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, providing information proportionate to the asset's importance sufficient to enable the potential impact of the proposal on their significance to be understood. For heritage assets with archaeological interest an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation should be submitted.

355 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC14 requires the impacts in relation to the historic landscape, sites or structure of architectural and historic interest and their settings, and sites of existing or potential archaeological interest or their settings to be considered. The policy requires sufficient information and assessment to be submitted on the loss or damage to archaeological resources such that appropriate mitigation measures can be identified so as to minimise or avoid any material adverse impact and compensate for loss. Key development requirements for the Manor Farm preferred area require proposals to demonstrate no unacceptable impacts on the character and setting of Laleham Conservation Area and prior archaeological assessment and evaluation as the site is within an area of high archaeological potential.

356 Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009 Strategic Policy SP6 Maintaining and Improving the Environment and Policy EN5: Buildings of Architectural and Historic Interest seek to preserve and protect the borough's cultural heritage architectural and historic heritage including historic buildings and Conservation Areas. Spelthorne Borough Council Local Plan 2001 Policy BE24 states there is a presumption against development which would affect a scheduled or any other nationally important ancient monument or its setting and that development adversely affecting a site or monument of County importance will not be permitted. Policy BE25 that for development proposals in areas of high archaeological potential a field evaluation should be carried out where an initial assessment has shown that important archaeological remains may exist, and that conditions should be imposed to ensure that damage to any remains is minimal or avoided.

357 The area in which the application site at Manor Farm and QMQ is situated is rich in archaeological and cultural heritage terms. The part of the application site at QMQ has been previously disturbed by mineral working, so destroyed in archaeological terms and excluded from the need for assessment. Therefore, in the remainder of this section of the report any reference to the site is the land at Manor Farm.

360 The ES submitted with the application has assessed the potential impact of the proposal on archaeology and cultural heritage interests at the site and surrounding area, taken as an area approximately 1 kilometre (km) radius from the site boundary (search area). The ES identified that there are 74 heritage assets recorded within the search area. Whilst there are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Listed Buildings within the application site, there is one Scheduled Ancient Monument and 25 Listed Buildings (one Grade 2 *, the rest Grade 2) within the search area. The Laleham Conservation Area lies some 400 metres to the south. Within the site is one non-designated Historic Environment Record (HER) asset, with another immediately adjacent to the site which may contain remains extending into the site, designated as Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP).

361 On the basis of the HER and analysis of information from the search area the ES established that there was a moderate to high potential for the site to contain archaeological remains. As a result trial trenching was undertaken within the boundary of the site in 2008 involving a total of 149 trenches representing 5% of the proposed mineral extraction area. This identified a high density of archaeological features and deposits, evidence for settlement activity, dating from the early Neolithic and Middle Bronze Age onwards.

362 English Heritage advised as part of the scoping that the proposed mineral extraction at Manor Farm would have no implications for the setting or archaeological integrity of any designated heritage asset. The applicant's assessment identified there would be no physical impact on the SAM, Laleham Conservation Area or Listed Buildings from the proposed development (mineral extraction and transport by conveyor) at Manor Farm. Nor would the proposed development affect the village setting of the Listed Buildings. As the application site and Laleham Village are not inter visible there would be no visual impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and no noise or traffic effect. No mitigation was required.

363 Information from the assessment undertaken and trial trenching work, indicate there is the potential that further associated archaeological remains would be present within the application site at Manor Farm (areas to be excavated and other areas which would experience disturbance as part of the proposed development). The ES concluded the proposed extraction had the potential to have an impact of moderate adverse significance on buried archaeological remains and would require some form of mitigation. The scope and extent of the mitigation would need to be agreed with the Surrey County Council Archaeological Officer but may comprise strip, map and record exercises across all areas where disturbance is proposed.

364 As set out in the Consultation and Publicity Section of the report local residents have objected to the proposal on grounds that the proposal would lead to loss of the heritage of Laleham (loss of the fields and wildlife which form the historic setting of the village, and destruction of the archaeology in the site) and adverse impact from traffic travelling through the village and extraction activity on the site and conveyor belt, on historic interests in Laleham (Conservation Area and Listed Buildings).

365 Based on the results of the archaeological evaluation undertaken and reported in the ES, the County Archaeological Officer is of the view that heritage assets with archaeological significance, revealed and suspected to be present across those parts of the site at threat from destruction by the proposed development, are not of significance as to warrant their preservation *in situ*.

366 The County Archaeological Officer considers the mitigation proposed to undertake programme of archaeological work comprising a Strip, Map and Sample exercise is appropriate mitigation in this case. This would need to encompass an archaeologically controlled strip with contingent excavation and recording of any assets present and would preserve by record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset that would be lost as a result of the proposed development.

367 The strip, map and search archaeological work would have to be undertaken across all areas of the Manor Farm part of the application site where extraction and groundworks (construction of bunds, site compound, conveyor belt etc) are proposed which have the potential to impact on archaeological assets. As preservation by record would be appropriate mitigation the necessary programme of archaeological work does not need to be carried out prior to determination of the planning permission, and could be secured by imposition of a planning condition should planning permission be granted.

Conclusion on historic environment and archaeology

368 In conclusion Officers consider an appropriate assessment has been undertaken of the potential impact on heritage assets and where necessary mitigation measures identified which can be secured by planning condition such that the proposal is consistent with the aims and objectives of national and development plan policy relating to the historic environment and archaeology.

7

Restoration and aftercare

369 CLAG2, Buckland School and local residents object/raise concerns about the restoration and after-use proposals. Issues:

- Creation of waterbodies isn't restoration as the site would not be returned to land
- Water and nature conservation is not a beneficial after-use so application does not comply with Policy MC3.
- Duration
- Creation of additional waterbodies (issues: enough already in Spelthorne, safety concerns, nuisance from swarms of insects, flood risk)
- Who will manage in the long term?
- Public access (some support, some opposed to)
- Have put forward what they consider is a feasible and acceptable method of importation of material to backfill the site which would enable an alternative restoration option to be considered
- Object to loss of high quality agricultural land; agricultural land needs to be retained to food security
- The small areas of agricultural land left at Manor Farm won't be viable, so will fall out of agricultural use, difficulties with access

370 The existing mineral processing plant site at QMQ has planning permission for use in connection with the import and processing of as raised minerals and the waste recycling facility until 2033. The application is seeking planning permission for the proposed concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant for the same duration. The processing plant site would remain in place after the proposed working and processing of mineral from Manor Farm has been completed. The restoration of the application site at QMQ is addressed through the restoration scheme and after-use approved under reference SP07/1276 referred to in paragraph 13 above.

371 The approved after-use of QMQ is nature conservation. The application proposes to work and progressively restore the land at Manor Farm site in phases to a nature conservation after-use. Nature conservation uses are appropriate to the designation and objectives for the use of land in the Green Belt. Green Belt issues are assessed in more detail later in the report.

372 The NPPG guidance on Minerals (ID 27 Paragraph 221) defines restoration as "*the return of land following mineral extraction to an acceptable condition, whether for resumption of the former land use or for a new use*". The SMP 2011 Core Strategy Glossary defines restoration as the "*process of returning a site or area to its former or future use following mineral extraction. It includes processes that take place before and during mineral extraction (stripping and protection of soils) and operations after extraction up until the after-use is established on the site*".

373 Government policy relating to restoration of mineral workings looks to planning authorities to put in place policies in plans to ensure land where mineral working has taken place is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare takes place for a range of after-uses, which include agriculture and biodiversity. (NPPF Section 13 paragraph 143). In determining planning applications authorities should provide, through application of conditions as appropriate, for restoration

and aftercare to high environmental standards at the earliest opportunity (NPPF Section 13 paragraph 144).

374 The NPPG (ID 27 paragraphs 036 to 049) provides more detailed guidance on restoration and aftercare of mineral workings. Paragraph 40 advises on the level of detail required and states that for proposals involving "*the best and most versatile land the outline strategy should show, where practicable, how the methods used in the restoration and aftercare enable the land to retain its longer term capability, though the proposed after-use need not always be for agriculture*".

375 Restoration schemes should indicate how restoration and aftercare is to be integrated with the working scheme and demonstrate the suitability of the proposals to the proposed after-use. For short term working detailed conditions relating to restoration and aftercare requirements are appropriate. In relation to financial guarantees the guidance states that the responsibility for the restoration and aftercare of mineral sites lies with the operator. Applicants should demonstrate how they propose to make provision for restoration etc during the operational life of mineral working sites and demonstrate with their applications what the likely financial and material budgets for restoration, aftercare and after-use will be.

376 Minerals can only be worked where they are found. In Surrey exploitable sand and gravel resources are concentrated in north west Surrey, impacting on communities and the landscape in Spelthorne Borough. Proximity to residential areas and need to protect local communities from adverse effects of working, airport safeguarding, flood risk, water supply and biodiversity constraints has influenced restoration and aftercare proposals at current and former mineral extraction sites. These matters also affect the allocation of land in the minerals plan and sequencing of when land identified as suitable for working is worked.

377 The SMP 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC17 states that mineral working will only be permitted where the county council is satisfied that the site can be restored and managed to a high standard, for sites to be restored progressively where appropriate, and restoration completed at the earliest opportunity. Applicants are expected to agree a scheme for restoration detailing how the land will be restored and managed before, during and after working. Restoration should be sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area and capable of sustaining an appropriate after-use.

378 To facilitate the objective of achieving a high standard of restoration and land is brought back into use, the Minerals Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2011 provides best practice advice and indicative restoration schemes for the preferred areas identified in the minerals plan. In addition to restoration, a key objective of the minerals plan is environmental enhancement. This involves looking for opportunities to secure a range of different environmental enhancements before, during, and after restoration such as enhancing the setting of heritage assets or public access, or meeting biodiversity targets.

379 To assist in delivery of enhancement SMP 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC18 provides for the county council to work with mineral operators and others to identify and deliver benefits. Where appropriate account should be taken of relevant guidance and strategies and a wider area enhancement approach developed, for example, by linking restoration proposals for mineral sites. North west Surrey is identified as an area in Surrey where the restoration and enhancement of land can contribute to wider strategic projects.

380 The restoration key development requirement for the Manor Farm preferred area identifies that restoration opportunities are restricted by the lack of suitable access for HGVs for the importation of inert fill material so, unless a feasible and acceptable method of importation of fill can be found enabling an alternative restoration option to be considered, restoration will involve creating of areas of open space and open water. Other factors identified in the indicative restoration for the site and key development requirements which influence

restoration proposals at Manor Farm include: flood risk, aerodrome safeguarding (birdstrike), public access, agricultural grade of the land and biodiversity.

7

381 The applicant's proposed restoration to a nature conservation end use, comprising a mix of waterbodies, reedbed and woodland is in line with the key development requirement for restoration, and the Minerals Site Restoration SPD indicative restoration scheme. To address aerodrome safeguarding issues the physical design of the waterbodies (lake edges, size and dimensions of areas of open water), proposed marginal planting and tree planting around the lake edges has taken account of the need to minimise attractiveness of the site and its subsequent use by birds, and no provision made for public access to the waterbodies.

382 The reference to alternative methods of importing fill was retained in the key development considerations to enable an alternative restoration option to be considered, if proposed in a future application proposal.

383 CLAG2 have put forward what they consider to be a feasible and acceptable method of importing fill and so enabling restoration to agriculture. This would involve fill material being delivered to QMQ, treated in the existing concrete crusher on site (which operates at the recycling facility) so it would be a suitable shape and size to enable transport by conveyor to the Manor Farm site.

384 This the action group consider now possible given the shorter distance involved in conveying material between Manor Farm and the mineral processing plant at QMQ, than the previous Shepperton Aggregate proposal which involved transporting to mineral for processing at Shepperton Quarry.

385 The option of transporting waste of the type, and quantities required, which would be suitable for use in backfilling the excavated void at Manor Farm was discussed at the Examination in Public (EIP) into the Primary Aggregates DPD in 2010/2011. At the EIP the applicant informed the Inspector technical means of satisfactorily bringing fill material in this way to sites did not exist.

386 Although transport of materials by conveyor, and over long distances, is a well established practice used by the minerals industry, and in other industries, it is not widely used in connection with transport of waste for use in backfilling mineral voids. There have been no examples of use of conveyors in this way in Surrey, or to the best of Officers' knowledge, anywhere else in the country. Use of conveyors was proposed to transport spoil waste the Crossrail project from the landing point on Wallasea Island, Essex to the disposal site on the island (transported by barge to Wallasea Island). The project encountered technical difficulties due to the varying nature of the material.

387 The county council has to determine the current application, involving restoration to landscaped lakes and a nature conservation after-use, based on the merits of the proposal as submitted, not an alternative hypothetical proposal.

Agriculture and soils

388 There is no key development consideration relating to agriculture and soils. The published Agricultural Land Classification map for the area shows the land at Manor Farm as a mix of non-agricultural, urban and grade 2. (Land within grades 1, 2 and 3a are referred to as best and most versatile (bmv) land.) Information held by the county council used to inform the SMP2011 identified the land as half grade 2 (southern half) with the remainder grade 3a.

389 In connection with the planning application a detailed assessment of the 33.4ha area of land within Manor Farm was undertaken to establish the Agricultural Land Classification, and submitted as part of the ES. The applicant's assessment of the agricultural land quality within the application area showed that application site is predominantly graded 3a (19.7ha), with a smaller area of 3b (11ha) and a very small area of grade 2 (1.6ha). The small area of grade 2 land is in the south west of site, and lies outside the area to be worked.

390 Of the remaining land some 16.4 ha would be affected by the mineral extraction of which some 9.5ha is grade 3a and 6.9ha grade 3b. The rest of the application area would comprise unworked margins used for soil storage, the conveyor route and access.

391 Soils stripped from the areas where mineral would be worked, and become waterbodies, would be retained on site, and used in restoration of the land and placed above the water, around the waterbodies. Although the after-use of the site affected by mineral extraction would not be agriculture, and the restoration proposals involve loss of best and most versatile land, using the soils above water would conserve the soils. All soils would be retained on site.

392 The importance of protecting land capable of supporting agricultural and forestry uses in order to meet current and future needs, in particular the best and most versatile land classified as grades 1, 2 and 3a, is acknowledged in the SMP 2011 Core Strategy (paragraph 6.29). The plan looks for proposals to work mineral on higher grade land to return land to a state suitable for agriculture even when not possible for land to be restored to its original agricultural classification.

393 This proposal would involve permanent loss of an area of best and most versatile land. Due to constraints associated with importation of fill material, the principle of the nature conservation after use and loss of the best and most versatile land at Manor Farm was accepted when the minerals plan was adopted. Outside of the land restored to landscaped lakes, the remaining areas within the application site together with the rest of the land within the applicant's landholding at Manor Farm would still be available for agricultural use. Though, as objectors have identified, the size and degree of connectivity between the remaining land parcels may impact on the way the land is used compared to the current use for grazing. The applicant's farm manager has confirmed the areas would be viable for cattle grazing with stock transported by road vehicle as and when necessary.

394 No objection has been raised by Natural England, the statutory consultee on agriculture and soils. Natural England, have confirmed that due to the inaccessibility of the site for HGVs it would be extremely difficult to either import inert fill to restore to agricultural use, or export topsoil, the most appropriate after-use for the site would be the proposed landscaped lakes for nature conservation purposes.

Duration and aftercare/long term management

395 Concerns have been raised about the timescale to complete extraction and restoration. The application proposes to work and restore the land at Manor Farm progressively in four phases with extraction commencing after extraction of mineral from beneath the baffle in QMQ is complete. Working and restoration is anticipated to take five years to complete. The rate of extraction would be dependent on market conditions, and could be quicker or slower than the anticipated average annual extraction rate and five year extraction period stated in the application.

396 In this case as a wet restoration is proposed, restoration progress would not be dependent on availability of suitable fill material, so would be able to follow on closely after extraction. Details of restoration and a Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan has been provided designed to ensure short term (years 1 to 5) and longer term (6 to 25 year) establishment, protection and management of the landscape features identified within the restoration plan.

7

397 The applicant is experienced in working and restoring sand and gravel sites in the county and elsewhere in the country, to nature conservation and other after-uses, and achieving high standards of restoration. Information on likely financial and material budgets for restoration, aftercare and after-use and how provision will be made for such matters during the operational life of the proposed extraction has been provided.

398 Officers have no reason to doubt the application site would not be restored to a high standard and subsequently managed.

Conclusion on restoration and aftercare

399 Some of the land within the application site at Manor Farm is Grade 2 and Grade 3a land (referred to as “best and most versatile” (bmv) agricultural land). The proposed restoration to a nature conservation use meets the key development requirements for the Manor Farm preferred area. The application would involve extraction on 9.5 ha of Grade 3a land, the remaining 6.9ha area to be extracted is Grade 3b. The proposal would therefore involve permanent loss of some 9.5ha of Grade 3a land to lakes and marginal areas. The application proposal includes details for soil stripping, handling, storage and replacement of soils stripped from the areas affected by extraction, thereby conserving the soils.

400 The proposal involves a relatively short term working and restoration timescale. Officers consider restoration to a nature conservation after-use is appropriate.

401 Subject to implementation of the mitigation and protection measures outlined in the ES during extraction and processing operations and the land restored, landscaped and managed in accordance with the Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan which provides for the long term management of the restored site and could be secured by planning condition and through a legal agreement, Officers consider adequate information has been provided in the application to show how the site would be progressively restored and managed such that the site would be capable of being returned to an acceptable after-use at the earliest practicable date. In the longer term the new habitats created and nature conservation after-use at the restored site offer the opportunity for biodiversity enhancement on the site and surrounding area. The proposal is considered to accord with national minerals planning policy and development plan policy regarding restoration and aftercare following mineral extraction.

.

Airport safeguarding/power transmission equipment

402 The site lies within the 13km identified birdstrike safeguarding zone for Heathrow Airport. National Grid and Esso Petroleum gas pipelines and National Grid electricity overhead lines transmission equipment run through the QMQ site.

403 Matters of concern raised by objectors include: risk of birdstrike from the proposed afteruse, dangers and increased risk of drowning from the presence of the extraction site and waterbodies post restoration in proximity to schools, public footpaths and residential properties, proximity of the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant to electricity power lines at QMQ.

404 The NPPF requires planning authorities when determining planning applications for mineral working to ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on aviation safety. Government Circular 01/03 “Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas” sets out the importance of safeguarding certain civil aerodromes to ensure their operation and development are not inhibited or placed at risk. The Circular states that the primary aim is to guard against new or increased hazards caused by development.

405 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC14 states that proposals for mineral working will only be permitted where a need has been demonstrated and sufficient information has been submitted to enable the authority to be satisfied that there would be no significant adverse impacts arising from the development. Potential impacts to be considered include the need to manage the risk of birds striking aircraft, and the key development requirements for the site include the need to assess the potential hazard to birdstrike from birds attracted to the site during extraction, restoration and from the proposed afteruse.

406 As referred to in the section on restoration the proposed restoration scheme and afteruse has been designed to take account of this issue. The statutory consultee, Heathrow Airport Safeguarding, has raised no objection subject to a Bird Hazard Management Plan (BHMP), secured by planning condition, to minimise the attractiveness of the restored site and its subsequent use to birds. This would need to apply in perpetuity.

407 Esso Petroleum Co Ltd (Fisher German) and National Grid have been consulted. No objection has been raised, so long as the operators follow their respective requirements and advice relating to safe working when planning and undertaking the development is adhered to. Information will be provided to the applicant and dealt with by way of informative. National Grid confirmed they have considered all aspects of the proposed development including the location and dimensions of the proposed aggregate bagging plant building at QMQ in relation to their overhead transmission line.

Lighting

408 Residents living in the vicinity of the proposed site compound at Manor Farm have raised concerns about lighting and potential nuisance at night from the lighting shining into bedrooms affecting sleep, and being triggered by animals. The only lighting would be downward directed, sensor activated, lighting for security purposes at the site compound, which would be on the boundary with the SALSAL facility

409 Vegetation along the boundary and the SALSAL site in between would screen views from residential properties some 200 metres to the west on Worple Road. Properties to the north (Pavilion Gardens) and on Brightside Avenue to north east and east would be some 160, 230 and 130 metres away from the compound. From these locations there are uninterrupted views across the fields. The proposed soil screen bund to the north and east of the compound would screen views from the north during phases 2 to 4, and from the north east and east during Phase 2 and 3. Given the purpose of the lighting and distances between the site compound and residential properties, Officers consider disturbance due to light spillage outside the site impacting on properties would be unlikely. The lighting would be visible and it is acknowledged triggering of the security lighting could be a source of annoyance and concern to residents. The presence of screen bunds (when in place) around Phase 2 would help mitigate any impact. Further information about the security lighting, including siting would be appropriate, which could be secured by planning condition.

Cumulative impact

410 Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states that in granting planning permission for mineral development mineral planning authorities should "*take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality*". Paragraph 6.35 of the SMP 2011Core Strategy DPD identifies the cumulative effects of working quarries and the way they relate to existing developments as important issues, particularly so in areas which are already under significant development pressure, or have concentrations of several existing and potential mineral workings.

411 The paragraph goes on to state that cumulative impacts may, for example, arise where mineral sites that are in close proximity to each other would be worked at the same time, or where working has taken place over a long period of time. Measures to avoid or mitigate cumulative impacts include phasing of working and restoration, imposing planning conditions and controlling the number and timing of permissions.

412 The application site at Manor Farm and QMQ is located in an area of Surrey with a long history of mineral working, with current operational sites at Hengrove Farm and Hengrove Park (access onto the A30) and Home Farm Extension/Shepperton Quarry (access onto Shepperton Road) within 2km of the site. Potential future areas for mineral extraction from preferred areas identified in the SMP 2011 Primary Aggregates DPD within 5km of the QMQ site include Homers Farm (access onto the A30) and Watersplash Farm (access onto the A244 Gaston Bridge Road).

413 The key development criteria (KDC) for the Manor Farm preferred area identifies the need for phased working of the preferred area with the Home Farm Extension to minimise cumulative traffic impacts on the communities of Laleham and Shepperton Green. The KDC criteria for the Home Farm Extension site, also a preferred area in the plan, referred to the phased working with the Manor Farm preferred area. There are currently undetermined planning applications for mineral extraction from the Homers Farm and Watersplash Farm preferred areas, which subject to planning permission being granted, could be worked concurrently with the Manor Farm site and ongoing mineral and waste developments at QMQ.

414 The potential impact of the proposed development has been assessed in the ES, and in consultation with statutory and non statutory consultees, during the consideration of the planning application. Issues assessed include transport, flood risk, hydrology and hydrogeology, noise, dust and air quality and biodiversity. These are issues which in combination with impacts from other mineral development in the area could result in "*the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality*".

415 None of the impacts assessed are considered on their own likely to lead to significant adverse impact. No issues of concern were identified by Technical Consultees relating to potential cumulative effect. Given the nature of the existing mineral developments and preferred areas referred to above, relative locations of the sites and distance separating them from the Manor Farm/QMQ site, Officers conclude there would be no cumulative effect of multiple impacts from the Manor Farm proposal.

OTHER MATTERS

Public safety

416 The concerns raised about public safety and risk of drowning or accidents are noted. Health and safety issues associated with unauthorised access to the site during operations, and post restoration are matters the applicant would need to address under their responsibilities as landowner and operating the site. The applicant has stated they would fence the working area at Manor Farm to prevent access. The restoration scheme and after-use excludes public access. Measures incorporated into the design of the site to restrict access to the waterbodies include fencing, tree and scrub planting, and planting up existing gaps in hedgerows.

417 Provision and maintenance of barriers to secure an operational mineral site, or parts of a site, with suitable barriers such as fencing or hedgerows (and maintaining them) to discourage unauthorised access to an operational site, is addressed through other legislation relating to health and safety and quarrying operations, and related regulations such as the Quarries Regulations 1999.

GREEN BELT

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Development Plan Document (SMP 2011 Core Strategy DPD)
Policy MC3 – Spatial Strategy – mineral development in the Green Belt
Policy MC17 – Restoring mineral workings
Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 (saved policies) (SBLP 2011)
Policy GB1 Development proposals in the Green Belt

418 Objections raised by CLAG2 and local residents relating to Green Belt include: the amenity and recreational value of the land at Manor Farm, adjoining school and leisure and recreation areas and use made of these areas by the local community; the important Green Belt function served by the site by separating Staines upon Thames and Laleham and value of the land in providing a sense of being on the urban fringe (as referred to in the reasons for refusal for mineral working at the site in 1978); loss of Green Belt land as not being returned to agriculture; nature conservation not an appropriate afteruse/beneficial afteruse; contrary to Surrey Minerals Plan Policy MC3; impact of mineral working in the area and amount of water; concerns about the ability of applicant to restore the site; lack of agreed timescale for completion; and environmental standards (noise, dust, traffic) not being of the highest level.

419 The application site at Manor Farm and QMQ lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt where policies of restraint apply. Government policy on Green Belt is set out in part 9 'Protecting Green Belt land' (paragraphs 79 to 92) of the NPPF. Government policy and guidance in relation to minerals planning is set out part 13 'Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals' (paragraphs 142 to 149) and the minerals section of the NPPG.

420 Protecting Green Belts around main urban areas is included in the core planning principles of the NPPF. Paragraph 79 states that the "*fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence*". The Green Belt is seen as serving five purposes including to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

7

421 The NPPF states at paragraph 87 that "*inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances*" and paragraph 88 goes on to state that when considering "*any planning application*" authorities should ensure that "*substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt*" and that "*very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."*

422 Minerals can only be worked where they are found and mineral working is a temporary use of land. Mineral extraction is included in the forms of development listed in paragraph 90 that are not inappropriate in Green Belt "*provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt'*. When determining planning applications paragraph 144 of the NPPF states local planning authorities should "*provide for restoration and aftercare of mineral workings at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions, where necessary*".

423 Except for a limited range of circumstances, set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF, the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development. Buildings associated with packaging of mineral for sale, or industrial processes (which would include secondary processing of mineral such as production of concrete or mortar) are not specifically referred to.

424 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC3 states that *'Mineral extraction in the Green Belt will only be permitted where the highest environmental standards of operation are maintained and the land restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with Green Belt objectives within agreed time limits'.* This would apply to both the extraction and initial processing (primary treatment) of excavated mineral.

425 The policy goes on to state that proposals for other forms of mineral development (secondary processing or treatment of processed mineral) in the Green Belt, will only be permitted where an applicant has demonstrated very special circumstances to outweigh the harm by inappropriateness and any other harm. Other forms of mineral development would include concrete batching plant, industrial development involving secondary processing of mineral, and aggregate bagging plant (packaging mineral for sale).

426 The supporting text at paragraph 3.47 refers to how land in the Green Belt can make a positive contribution to providing opportunities for, amongst other matters, securing nature conservation interests and how restoration of mineral workings should have regard to these objectives; and give particular attention to any priorities in the area in which a site is situated.

427 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC17 requires mineral working proposals to provide for restoration which is sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area in (which it is situated), and capable of sustaining an appropriate afteruse. Mineral working will only be permitted where the mineral planning authority is satisfied that the site can be restored and subsequently managed to a high standard. The final part of the policy states that restoration should be completed at the earliest opportunity, and where appropriate progressively restored, with applicants expected to agree a scheme with the mineral planning authority detailing how the land will be restored and managed before, during and after working.

428 The supporting text at paragraph 8.6 refers to the majority of mineral workings in Surrey being in the Green Belt, and that mineral sites can be appropriately restored to a range of after-uses including nature conservation. Paragraph 8.7 refers to the need for applicants to show they have both technical and financial competence to undertake the proposed restoration scheme. For some types of after-use, such as nature conservation, periods of management longer than the five year period advocated in national policy is appropriate, and should be secured by use of legal agreements.

429 Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 Saved Policy GB1 Green Belt advises that development located within the Green Belt which would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and maintaining its openness will not be permitted.

430 Given the Green Belt location it is necessary to assess whether the proposed development would cause harm to the Green Belt; consider whether high standards of operation would be maintained during operations (SMP 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC3), and provisions for restoration and afteruse.

431 The application is for phased extraction of sand and gravel from land at Manor Farm and restoration to a nature conservation after-use; transporting the extracted mineral by conveyor to the existing QMQ mineral processing plant for processing, use of site infrastructure (site offices, weighbridge, wheel cleaning facilities, access etc.) at QMQ, and for the siting and use of a concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant, housed in a building at QMQ.

432 The applicant proposes that the concrete batching and aggregate bagging plants would remain after extraction at Manor Farm had been completed to be used in association with the importation and processing of as raised sand and gravel and recycling facility together with the existing QMQ mineral processing plant, until replaced by low level mobile plant (see paragraph 15), and site infrastructure which have planning permission to the end of 2033. The plant would use sand and gravel from these operations, primarily derived from the processing of as raised sand and gravel/excavation waste. (Recycled aggregate derived from the recycling facility could be used as a raw material provided it is produced to the specification and quality suitable for use.) The SMP2011 refers at paragraph 3.23 to the importance of transportation of materials both before and after processing in developing a spatial strategy for the location of aggregates recycling facilities. The strategy is driven by the need to reduce haulage distances and associated vehicle emissions.

433 After 2033 the applicant intends that the batching and bagging plant would be removed with the mobile processing plant, buildings etc. and that the area would be restored as the last phase of restoration at QMQ. The approved restoration is to a nature conservation afteruse in accordance with details approved under reference SP07/1276 for the restoration of QMQ site.

434 The previous sections of the report have assessed the potential impacts on the environment and local amenity including landscape and visual impact, noise and dust, and provision for restoration and aftercare. These confirm that subject to the control and mitigation measures identified being implemented the proposal, including the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant at QMQ, would be capable being undertaken at the highest environmental standards.

Mineral extraction (at Manor Farm) and primary processing (at QMQ)

435 For the duration of operations the mineral extraction and restoration works and associated perimeter soil screen bunds, site facilities (access road and site compound) at the Manor Farm site, conveyor system and existing mineral processing plant and site infrastructure at QMQ would impact on openness. In addition there would be some harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt during working and restoration from (on the Manor Farm part of the site) the presence of the screen bunding which would interrupt views during working and restoration; and the limited and glimpsed views from public rights of way and surrounding land and properties of the access and site compound, extraction and restoration operations and the conveyor system.

436 The land at Manor Farm would be progressively worked and restored to a nature conservation after-use, and subsequently managed in accordance with details provided. This could be secured by planning condition and a S106 relating to the long term management of the site. Provisions are already in place relating to cessation of the use of the mineral processing plant and site infrastructure at QMQ, and subsequent restoration to a nature conservation afteruse and aftercare. Nature conservation is an appropriate after-use for land within the Green Belt. Officers have no reason to doubt the application site would not be restored to a high standard and subsequently managed.

437 The proposed development at Manor Farm, and use of the processing plant and site infrastructure at QMQ, are temporary uses of the land, and would therefore preserve the openness of the Green Belt in the long term. Any harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt from the mineral extraction at Manor Farm would be limited in extent and duration.

Concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant

438 Historically, as an exception to Green Belt policy, Surrey County Council has accepted the siting of concrete batching plant at operational mineral sites and granted temporary planning permission or approved details, tied to the life of the mineral extraction permission provided:

- the plant uses indigeneous material,
- is capable of being operated without harm to environmental or amenity considerations, and
- serves a local need.

439 In 2008 temporary planning permission was granted in the Green Belt for concrete production and an aggregate bagging plant at Hithermoor Quarry as part of a package of proposals. In that case the raw materials for the plant would come from indigenous mineral extracted at Hithermoor, as raised mineral imported to Hithermoor for processing and recycled aggregate from the onsite recycling facility. The indigenous mineral at Hithermoor would supply the plant for less than half of the 11 year life of the development.

440 Officers consider the plant proposed at QMQ as part of the current application comprise other mineral development and constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which, under SMP2011 Policy MC3 and national policy in the NPPF, requires demonstration by the applicant that very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm. In order for planning permission to be granted for this element of the development the Authority must be satisifed that there are factors which amount to very special circumstances, which clearly outweigh the harm to Green Belt and any other harm.

Applicant's very special circumstances

441 The applicant's consideration of very special circumstances for siting the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant are:

i) they are conditionally permitted development (PD) by virtue of Class B of Part 19 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (GDPO). When publishing the GDPO no caveat was added by Government to the effect that such development is not permitted in the Green Belt.

The conditional permission granted under PD rights requires prior written approval of detailed proposals for the siting, design and external appearance of the building, plant or machinery. Such approval should

"*not be refused or granted subject to conditions unless the authority are satisfied it is expedient to do so because:*

(a) the proposed development would injure the amenity of the neighbourhood and modifications can reasonably be made or conditions reasonably imposed in order to avoid or reduce that injury, or

(b) the proposed development ought to be, and could reasonably be, sited elsewhere."

PD rights at QMQ have not been withdrawn under an Article 4 Direction, nor has the county council withdrawn permitted development rights on the planning permissions granted for mineral extraction at QMQ, though conditions imposed on the planning permissions for extraction of mineral from beneath the baffle in QMQ ref SP07/1269, and the importation of as raised mineral for processing at QMQ ref SP07/1275 require details of siting, detailed design, specifications, and appearance of the plant, buildings or machinery to be submitted and approved in writing before plant, buildings or machinery (fixed or mobile) are erected on site.

The reasons for imposing the conditions read:

"To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Structure Plan 2004 Policy SE1 and Surrey Minerals Local Plan 1993 Policy 1."

The applicant considers that as no reference has been made to the potential impact on the Green Belt, the county council clearly accepts that development "ancillary" to mineral extraction in the Green Belt is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

ii) The plant would be sited in a location within the exisiting QMQ plant site which makes best use of space available in relation to the backdrop of the reservoir embankment and the storage of processed mineral it would need as raw material. It would be completely screened from view from outside the QMQ site and the submitted noise assessment demonstrates noise generated would be within Government noise criteria.

iii) Locating the plant within the existing and long established processing plant area at QMQ obviates the need for an alternative location for the concrete production and aggregate bagging (probably within industrial development) and eliminates the need for additional haulage (of raw material) to such a location and the attendant financial and environmental implications.

7

442 In recognition of location constraints on extraction and the primary processing of mineral, which can only take place where the mineral is found, SMP2011 Core Strategy Policy MC3 makes a distinction between this and other mineral development.

443 By locating concrete batching and bagging plant at QMQ the plant would have a ready supply of mineral from Manor Farm, and sand and gravel mineral which had been imported and processed under the existing planning permissions (and subject to correct specification, recycled aggegate material from the recycling facility).

444 In relation to openness the plant would be sited within the QMQ processing plant site on existing hardstanding and within a site on which large structures and pieces of equipment and buildings are already located. As such it would not lead to further encroachment into the countryside, though there would be an impact on openness.

445 The impact on openness would come from the presence of the aggregate bagging and associated stockpiles and the concrete batching and aggregate bagging plant and associated parking on the existing hardstanding. Although this would be limited in the context of the rest of the development at the processing plant site, it would involve additional development, industrial in nature, within the Green Belt. Whilst the impact on openness from the processing plant site would be reduced when the existing mineral processing plant site is removed and replaced with mobile plant under the existing planning permissions at QMQ, Officers consider the proposed concrete batching and aggregate bagging plant would have a moderate impact on openness for the duration of the development to the end of 2033.

446 The moderate harm to openness would be temporary following which the plant, along with the remainder of the existing development at the processing plant site would be removed and the land restored. The timetable for restoration of the processing plant site would not be affected. Under the approved scheme the restoration of the processing plant site is final phase of the restoration and landscaping of the QMQ site and due to be completed by the end of 2038. There is adequate provision through the restoration and landscaping scheme approved under ref SP07/1276 for the restoration to a nature conservation use and aftercare of the QMQ plant site, a use appropriate in the Green Belt.

447 Despite the proposed duration of the siting and operation of the plant at QMQ to the end of 2033, the openness of the Green Belt would be preserved in the long term and the plant would not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt and fundamental aim of Green Belt policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.

448 In relation to very special circumstances the applicant has put forward three reasons. The first relates to PD rights. Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (GDPO) sets out PD for a range of development categories and uses. None are caveated by Government to the effect that such development is not permitted in the Green Belt. The county council does not, as a matter of practice, refer to Green Belt in the reasons for imposing conditions restricting permitted development rights. Factors such as Green Belt can not be considered under the procedures for prior written approval.

449 The production of concrete production and aggregate bagging are not directly related to extraction or primary processing of mineral which would be extracted at Manor Farm. In addition they would remain in place after completion of extraction, and not be removed after completion of extraction at Manor Farm which would be required by condition B3 Class B of Part 19 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted

Development) Order 1995 (GDPO) if the plant were located at QMQ under PD rights associated with extraction at Manor Farm.

450 Class 19 Part B provides for development such as concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant, provided they are used in connection with mineral "won" at the mine. QMQ qualifies as a relevant mineral site/mine, in connection with extraction from beneath the baffle in the reservoir under permission ref SP07/1269 (and SP13/01236 if granted, see paragraph 15 above), to end of 2016 if SP07/01236 is granted, but not in connection with the importation and processing of as raised mineral, as the mineral would not be being won or brought to the surface at QMQ. Once extraction from beneath the baffle has ceased mineral would no longer be being "won" from the QMQ site.

451 To benefit from PD rights planning permission for mineral extraction has to have been granted. In this case the applicant is applying for planning permission to extract mineral from Manor Farm and has included the plant in the application proposals. Therefore, the PD argument is premature in connection with Manor Farm. Officers do not consider it relevant anyway at QMQ as the application proposes commencing extraction at Manor Farm after completion of extraction from within the reservoir has been completed.

452 Officers do not accept that the GPDO rights referred to by the applicant have any locus in the consideration of very special circumstances in connection with this planning application. In order for planning permission to be granted for this element of the development the Authority must be satisifed that there are factors which amount to very special circumstances, which clearly outweigh the harm to GB and any other harm.

453 The applicant's second factor concerns the siting of the plant within existing QMQ plant site, which is one of the considerations in assessing prior approval submissions made relating to Class B Part 19, and the condition imposed on the QMQ baffle extraction permission (SP07/1269 (SP13/01236)). The justifiction focuses more on the benefit of where within the plant site it is located relative to the reservoir embankment and other features and to the processed mineral stockpiles which would be the prime raw material, rather than any environmental benefits from being co located at QMQ. Reference is made to the lack of visual impact and noise impact.

454 The impact of the siting and operation of the concrete batching and aggregate bagging plant has been assessed in the ES and planning application in respect of noise, dust, landscape and visual impact. These issues are considered in earlier sections of the report. In relation to landscape and visual impact the QMQ processing plant site is well screened due to screening provided by the existing vegetation within the QMQ site, the reservoir embankment and intervening development, and no harm would result to the visual amenities of the Green Belt from siting the plant within the processing plant site.

455 No objections have been received from technical consultees, and as concluded earlier in the report no material adverse impact would arise and the siting and operation of the plant at QMQ would be acceptable and comply with the NPPF and relevant development plan policy in relation to these matters.

456 However, the lack of harm from visual impact, noise or some other harm does not overcome harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. No further detail has been provided on benefits of siting the plant at QMQ.

457 The third factor concerns the financial, operational and environmental benefits from using land within an established processing plant site located at the source of the raw material.

458 Officers consider that there is a need in the locality for faciities of the type proposed which adapt the mineral for sale. Minerals extraction sites in north west Surrey have supported such facilities and there are advantages in locating plant at the mineral source in terms of sustainable distribution. While there may be alternatives in terms of site location, siting the plant at QMQ would assist in reducing haulage distances.

7

459 The local area as a whole is subject to Green Belt constraint and accordingly Officers agree with the substance of the applicant's third factor and consider that there are good reasons to accept further processing of the mineral won locally at Manor Farm, and imported to the QMQ site under the existing planning permissions which have planning permission to the end of 2033. It is acknowledged the latter would involve importation for use of the all the raw materials for production of concrete or to be packaged in the bagging plant. In the case of the bagging plant the kit is simply used to package the product for the market place. Minerals per se can only be worked where they occur and therefore to an extent the location of plant to assist in the adaptation for sale is restricted.

460 There would be environmental benefits due to reduction in transport of aggregate to a location, such as on an industrial estate. Siting the plant at the QMQ site would reduce overall vehicle movements, and vehicle emissions, compared to the plant being located elsewhere. Plant located elsewhere would generate traffic associated with transporting the raw material to the plant and transporting the product to the customers. Financial implications and commercial benefits to an operator do not amount to very special planning circumstances.

Conclusion on Green Belt

461 In respect of these aspects of the proposed development Officers conclude the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The presence of the plant on the existing processing plant site would cause moderate harm to openness when considered in the context of the other development. However, no permanent harm to openness would result following removal of the plant and restoration of the land for which an approved restoration and aftercare scheme is in place. No other harm has been identified.

462 While Officers do not accept two of the factors put forward by the applicant, they nevertheless consider that factors which amount to very special circumstances exist in the form of need and the sustainable location of associated activities making use of the mineral reserve extracted at Manor Farm, and suitable waste materials imported to the QMQ under the permissions for importation and processing of as raised sand and gravel and construction and demolition waste facility.

463 Subject to imposition of planning conditions to ensure relevant standards of working, restoration and management of the land, and entering into a legal agreement to secure the long term management of the restored site, Officers are satisfied that the proposed extraction and primary processing of minerals is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and complies with national policy in the NPPF and relevant development plan policies.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

464 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.

465 The proposal involves extraction of mineral at Manor Farm and restoration to landscaped lakes for nature conservation afteruse, transporting the mineral by conveyor to QMQ for processing and a concrete batching and aggregate bagging plant. It is recognised the development has the potential to impact on the local environment and local amenity in terms of traffic, flood risk, local landscape and visual amenity, noise, dust, rights of way and people's enjoyment of the countryside at Manor Farm and lighting. Issues and concerns have been raised by objectors on these matters concerned about the impact on residents, Buckland School and users of the public rights of way at Manor Farm and adjacent leisure and recreation facilities.

466 These issues are acknowledged and have been assessed and discussed in the body of the report. It is recognised that there would be some short term impact in terms of visual impact and noise on the local landscape and the amenity and recreational value of the land and public rights of way, in particular users of FP30. The scale of the impacts is not considered sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1 and, if planning permission were to be granted any impact is capable of being controlled or mitigated by the measures incorporated in the planning application proposal, planning conditions, and secured through a S106, and controls available through other regulatory regimes. As such this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right.

467 In considering this planning application and framing the recommendation Officers have considered both individual interests of objectors and those in the wider community. Having taken account of all the facts Officers consider that the wider community needs and benefits that would result from extraction of mineral at Manor Farm and supply of aggregates for which a need exists outweighs any impact on individuals.

CONCLUSION

468 The proposal involves extraction of mineral at Manor Farm and restoration to landscaped lakes for nature conservation afteruse, transporting the mineral by conveyor to QMQ for processing and a concrete batching and aggregate bagging plant. Related to this application, application ref SP13/01003 proposes a partial realignment of the route and siting of the conveyor belt within the QMQ site. The two developments are interdependent and, if permitted, would be implemented as one. An environmental assessment has been undertaken and an overarching ES submitted with the applications.

469 The application site lies within the Green Belt where policies of restraint to development apply. Minerals can only be worked where they are found. The NPPF indicates that development involving mineral extraction (and processing) in the Green Belt is not inappropriate provided openness is maintained and the development does not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. Mineral working should provide for restoration and aftercare to be carried out to high environmental standards at the earliest opportunity. Other mineral development such as concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and require very special circumstances to be demonstrated, which outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, before planning permission can be granted.

470 The land at Manor Farm is identified in the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 as a preferred area for the extraction of sand and gravel. Aggregate minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and quality of life which includes maintaining and repairing existing development and infrastructure such as houses, schools and roads. Assessment of the current landbank position has demonstrated a strong case of need for additional reserves of primary land won sand and gravel to be permitted in order to help towards maintaining security of supply.

7

471 The development has been assessed in terms of Green Belt. The proposed development at Manor Farm, and use of the processing plant and site infrastructure at QMQ, are temporary uses of the land, and would therefore preserve the openness of the Green Belt in the long term. Any harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt from the mineral extraction at Manor Farm would be limited in extent and duration and so are not considered significant by Officers. The proposed restoration is to a nature conservation use, a use appropriate to the designation and objectives for the use land in the Green Belt.

472 Officers are satisfied that subject to the imposition of conditions and securing by a legal agreement the long term management of the site, restoration and aftercare of the can be carried out to a high environmental standard. The proposed extraction and primary processing of minerals is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and complies with national policy in the NPPF and relevant development plan policies. The concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and for the duration on site and operational would result in a moderate impact on openness. There would be no permanent harm to openness and adequte provision exists through the approved restoration scheme for the QMQ site for restoration of the land to an appropriate afteruse. No other harm has been identified. Officers consider very special circumstances exist to justify the grant of temporary planning permission for siting and use of the plant at QMQ for the duration of mineral extraction at Manor Farm and thereafter in connection with the exisiting planning permissions for imporataion and processing of as raised sand and gravel and recycling of construction and demolition waste at QMQ.

473 The implications of the proposed development have been assessed in terms of impacts on the local environment and amenity. Issues assessed include highways, traffic and access; flood risk, water quality, groundwater and land drainage; landscape and visual impact; noise; air quality and dust; rights of way; biodiversity and ecology (species and designated areas); historic environment and archaeology, restoration and after-use, airport safeguarding/safety/infrastructure; and lighting. Issues raised on these matters by objectors have been taken into consideration. No objections have been received from technical consultees.

474 In summary the proposal to extract minerals is in accordance with a DPD allocation and otherwise satisfies a clear need with regard to a national policy requirement to maintain a landbank and so maintain a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. The Manor Farm site can be worked and restored in a manner which does not conflict with Green Belt policy or lead to any other harm. The concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant may be permitted as an exception to policy given the very special circumstances which exist and the lack of any other harm to residential amenity and the purposes of the Green Belt in the long term.

475 Having had regard to the environmental information contained in the Environmental Statement, national and development plan policy, consultee views and concerns raised by local residents objecting to the proposal, Officers consider, subject to imposition of conditions, and a section 106 legal agreement to secure the long term management of the restored site and limit HGV vehicles numbers in combination with all planning permissions at QMQ to a maximum of 150 per day (300 movements), for which draft heads of terms are set out in the Annex, together with controls through other regulatory regimes, the development would not give rise to unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts and the development is consistent with the NPPF and the development plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is that, subject to the prior completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure the long term aftercare management, (including bird management) of the land at Manor Farm and to limit the number of HGV movements in combination with planning permission refs SP07/1273 and SP07/1275 to no more than 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day for which draft Heads of Terms are set out in the Annex, to PERMIT subject to conditions and informatives.

Conditions:

1 From the date of this decision until the cessation of the development to which it refers, a copy of this decision including all documents hereby approved and any documents subsequently approved in accordance with this decision, shall be displayed at the offices on the site, and shall be made known to any person(s) given the responsibility for the management or control of operations.

2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:

Drawing No.	Drawing Title	Date
PA1	Location Plan	March 2012
PA2	1000m Location Plan	March 2012
PA3	Existing Use Plan	March 2012
PA4	Borehole Location Plan	March 2012
PA5	Phasing Plan	March 2012
PA6	Phase 1 with Cross Sections – Rev F	24/04/14
PA7	Phase 2 with Cross Sections – Rev D	24/04/14
PA8	Phase 3 with Cross Sections – Rev C	24/04/14
PA9	Phase 4 with Cross Sections – Rev C	24/04/14
PA10	Conveyor Tunnel General Arrangement – Rev B	12/02/13
PA11	Queen Mary Quarry Batching Plant	March 2012
PA12	Queen Mary Quarry Aggregate Bagging Plant	March 2012
PA13	Restoration Detail Plan	March 2012
PA14	Restoration Elevations	March 2012
PA15	Approved Restoration Plan for QMQ Site	March 2012
PA16	Proposed Worple Road Access – Rev C	12/02/13
PA17	Proposed Ashford Road Access – Rev C	12/02/13
PA18	Queen Mary Quarry Proposed Site Layout – Rev B	20/07/12
EIA 6.2	Public Rights of Way Plan	20/07/12
EIA 8.1	Heritage Assets and Potential Disturbance	March 2012
EIA 8.2	Historic Maps	March 2012
ST12377-SK1	Floodplain compensation and Causeway Drainage Proposal	04/11/13
QMQ/016	Overhead Power Cables above Proposed Conveyor	19/11/2013
ST13443-PA2	Application Area (proposed conveyor route)	09/04/13
EIA 9.3	Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation - Phase 1 Rev E	13/01/14
EIA 9.4	Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation Phase 2 Rev C	23/04/2014
EIA 9.5	Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation Phase 3 Rev B	23/04/2014
EIA 9.6	Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation Phase 4 Rev B	23/04/2014
EIA 9.8	Conveyor Route Details Rev B	March 2012
EIA 9.8	Conveyor Route Details (Annotated copy with pipe	March 2012

Drawing No.	Drawing Title	Date
	details and spacings)	(received with letter dated 1 November 2013)
EIA 9.9	Existing Surface Water Features Prior to Sand & Gravel Extraction at Manor Farm	March 2012

7

Commencement

3 The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. The applicant shall notify the County Planning Authority in writing within seven working days of the commencement of development.

Time Limits

4 Extraction of mineral from Manor Farm shall not commence until the mineral extraction from Queen Mary Quarry 'baffle' permission (ref. SP07/1269 dated 15 January 2009) has finished. The applicant shall notify the County Planning Authority in writing within seven working days of the commencement of extraction.

5 Extraction of mineral from Manor Farm, transportation by conveyor to Queen Mary Quarry and processing of extracted mineral shall be for a period of 5 years from the date of commencement of extraction. On completion of extraction the conveyor belt shall be removed from land at Manor Farm and Queen Mary Quarry, and the land at Manor Farm shall be restored within 6 years of the commencement of extraction, by which date all buildings, fixed plant or machinery, internal access roads and hardstandings, together with their foundations and bases and conveyor tunnels shall be removed from the land and the site shall be restored in accordance with the approved restoration plans.

6 The use of the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant hereby permitted on land at Queen Mary Quarry shall cease either upon cessation of the developments permitted under planning permission refs SP07/1273 and SP07/1275 dated 15 January 2009 or otherwise no later than 31 December 2033 following which all buildings, fixed plant or machinery, internal access roads and hardstandings, together with their foundations and bases shall be removed and the land restored in accordance with the details and timescales approved under SP07/1276 dated 15 January 2009, and any approved variations to the detail and timing.

Restriction of Permitted Development Rights

7 Notwithstanding the provisions of parts 4 and 19 of Schedule 2 of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any Order amending, replacing or re-enacting that Order):

no plant, buildings or machinery whether fixed or moveable, shall be erected on the site, without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority in respect of the siting, detailed design, specifications and appearance of the plant, buildings or machinery.

Access, Traffic and Protection of the Public Highway

8 a) Before any other operations are commenced, the temporary access to Ashford Road as shown on Drawing PA17 Proposed Ashford Road Access – Rev C dated 12/02/2013 shall be designed, constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The Ashford Road access shall be used in connection with extraction and restoration operations within Phase 1 as shown on Drawing PA5 Phasing Plan dated March 2012 for transport of plant and equipment and maintenance of the conveyor system only and thereafter during extraction operations on Phases 2 to 4 in connection with maintenance of the conveyor system only. On completion of extraction the access shall be permanently closed and any kerbs, verge, footway fully reinstated by the applicant, and hedgerow replanted in a manner to be agreed in writing with the County Planning Authority, upon the completion of Phase 1.

b) (i) Before any other operations are commenced details of the current design of the Worple Road agricultural access (width, surface and gates) and proposed design of the Worple Road access as shown on Drawing PA16 Proposed Worple Road Access – Rev C dated 12/02/2013, including visibility splays and trees and hedgerow to be lopped/cut back or removed, protection measures for trees affected, and details of tree and hedgerow replanting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

b) (ii) Prior to commencement of extraction in Phase 2 the construction of the modified Worple Road access shall be completed and provided with visibility splays in accordance with the approved details.

b) (iii) The Worple Road access shall be used in connection with extraction and restoration operations within Phases 2 to 4 as shown on Drawing PA5 Phasing Plan dated March 2012 for transport of plant and equipment and maintenance of the conveyor system, and access to the site compound only.

b) (iv) Within six years of commencement of extraction any kerbs, verge, footway shall be removed and the Worple Road access shall be reinstated to its previous design (width, surface and gates) and hedgerow and trees replanted in accordance with the details approved under part a) of this condition.

9 Prior to commencement of the development a Section 278 agreement shall be entered into with the County Highway Authority for the construction of the tunnels and the placing of the conveyor under FP30 and Ashford Road, their removal on completion of extraction, and reinstatement of the highway and public footpath.

a) Before extraction is commenced in Phase 1, construction of the conveyor tunnel under Ashford Road shall be completed. The conveyor tunnel shall be constructed generally in accordance with the approved plans Drawing numbers EIA9.8 Conveyor Route Details Rev B dated March 2012, PA10 Conveyor Tunnel General Arrangement Rev B dated 12/02/2013 and ST12377-SK1 Flood Plain compensation and Causeway Drainage Proposal dated 04/11/13, as modified through details to be provided and agreed in connection with the Section 278 agreement to be completed relating to works to the highway.

b) Before extraction is commenced in Phase 2, construction of the conveyor tunnel under Footpath 30 shall be completed. The conveyor tunnel shall constructed generally in accordance with the approved plans Drawing numbers EIA9.8 Conveyor Route Details Rev B dated March 2012 and PA10 Conveyor Tunnel General Arrangement Rev B dated 12/02/2013, as modified through details to be provided and agreed in connection with the Section 278 agreement to be completed relating to works to the highway.

c) The conveyor tunnels shall be permanently removed once sand and gravel extraction at Manor Farm has ceased, and the highway/footway and public footpath shall be fully and permanently reinstated in accordance with details provided to, and agreed by, the County Planning Authority.

7

10 The means of access for vehicles to the development shall be via the Ashford Road and Worple Road accesses only as set out Condition 8 a) and 8b) above. There shall be no other vehicular means of access to the site.

11 a) Prior to commencement of extraction in Phase 1 east of Footpath 30 the conveyor route shall be provided to Phase 1, and between Manor Farm and the Queen Mary Quarry processing plant along the route shown on Drawing numbers EIA9.8 Conveyor Route Details Rev B dated March 2012 and PA6 Phase 1 with Cross Sections Rev F dated 24/04/14, as modified by the conveyor route permitted under planning permission ref SP3/01003 dated [insert date] and shown on Drawing ST13443-PA2 Application Area (proposed conveyor route) dated 9/4/13.

b) Prior to commencement of extraction in Phase 2 the conveyor route shall be extended to provide access to the land west of Footpath 30 as shown on Drawing numbers EIA9.8 Conveyor Route Details Rev B dated March 2012 and PA7 Phase 2 with Cross Sections Rev D dated 24/04/14. The conveyor route shall be modified in accordance with the details shown on Drawing numbers PA8 Phase 3 with Cross Sections Rev C dated 24/04/14 and PA9 Phase 4 with Cross Sections Rev C dated 24/04/14 prior to commencement of extraction in Phases 3 and 4. The conveyor route shall be maintained for the duration of extraction in each phase along the route shown on the approved drawings and used for transport of extracted mineral to the processing plant site at Queen Mary Quarry. All sand and gravel extracted at Manor Farm shall be exported to the Queen Mary Quarry processing plant site via conveyor. There shall be no export of material from Manor Farm by HGV. All sand and gravel extracted at Manor Farm shall be exported from the Queen Mary Quarry site via the existing access onto the A308.

12 a) Before any operations in respect of the development Manor Farm are commenced details shall be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority of measures to be taken and facilities provided 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 associated with the use of the Ashford Road and Worple Road accesses. The agreed measures shall thereafter be retained and used in connection with site preparation, extraction and restoration operations at Manor Farm.

b) The existing approved wheel cleaning facilities and method for keeping the public highway clean in operation at Queen Mary Quarry shall be maintained and used in connection with the export of mineral extracted at Manor Farm, and thereafter following completion of extraction at Manor Farm in connection with the operation of the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant hereby permitted.

13 Neither extraction of minerals from Phase 2, nor use of the site compound shown on drawings PA6 Phase 1 with Cross Sections – Rev F dated 24/04/14 and PA16 Proposed Worple Road Access – Rev C dated 12/02/13, shall commence until space has been laid out within the site compound in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority for the parking and loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. The parking/turning area shall be used and retained exclusively for its designated purpose.

14 When measured in combination with all planning permissions for Queen Mary Quarry, the development hereby permitted shall give rise to no more than 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day. The site operator shall maintain accurate records of the number of HGV vehicles accessing and egressing the site daily and shall make these available to the County Planning Authority on request.

Construction Management Plan

15 Prior to the commencement of development a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall set out procedures for managing the construction of the buildings, plant, equipment and conveyor and the preparation of land to ensure that movements and deliveries are adequately controlled during this phase of the development. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented as approved.

Hours of Operation

16 In connection with Manor Farm operations and operation of the conveyor between Manor Farm and the processing plant in Queen Mary Quarry:

No lights shall be illuminated nor shall any operations or activities authorised or required by this permission be carried out except between the following times:

0730 - 1800 Mondays to Fridays
There shall be no working on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank Holiday or National Holidays. Neither shall any servicing, maintenance or testing of plant be carried out between 1800 - 0730 Monday to Fridays.

This condition shall not prevent the following activities:
a) emergency repairs to plant and machinery
b) lighting for security purposes

17 In connection with Queen Mary Quarry operations:

No lights shall be illuminated nor shall any operations or activities authorised or required by this permission be carried out except between the following times:

0730 - 1800 Mondays to Fridays
0730 - 1300 Saturdays
There shall be no working on Sundays, Bank Holiday or National Holidays. Neither shall any servicing, maintenance or testing of plant be carried out between:

1800 - 0730 Monday to Fridays, 1300 Saturdays - 0730 Mondays.

This condition shall not prevent the following activities:
a) emergency repairs to plant and
b) lighting for security purposes

Noise Control

18 All vehicles plant and machinery operated within the site shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' specification at all times and where necessary shall be fitted and used with effective silencers and/or noise insulation.

7

19 Other than vehicles involved in exporting aggregate product from the Queen Mary Quarry or delivery of consumables to the site compound at Manor Farm, all other vehicles and mobile plant operating at the Manor Farm and Queen Mary Quarry site under the control of the operator (which shall include plant and equipment hired by the operator or used by contractors), must be fitted with, and use, a white noise type vehicle alarm or switchable system.

20 Except for temporary operations, the level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2m at least 3.6m from the façade of a residential property or other a noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 55 LAeq for any 0.5 hour period during 0730 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0730 to 1300 hours Saturdays.

21 For temporary operations such as site preparation, soil and overburden stripping, bund formation and final restoration, the level of noise arising when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 3.6 metres from the facade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 70LAeq, during any 1 hour period. Such activities shall not take place for a total period greater than eight weeks in any twelve month period.

22 Prior to the extraction of minerals and use of the conveyor, details of the location and height of the noise barriers for the conveyor switch points as specified in Planning Supporting Statement paragraph 7.149 and Table 7.12, Wardell Armstrong dated 13/11/2012 (not 2013 as on letter), Environmental Statement paragraphs 11.6.16 and 11.7.3, paragraphs 2.13 to 2.18 of the June 2013 Addendum to the Environmental Statement and plan ST13443-PA2 Application Area (proposed conveyor route) dated 09/04/13, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The noise barriers are to be constructed in accordance with the approved details and maintained in good condition until completion of extraction and use of the conveyor system to transport mineral to the Queen Mary Quarry processing plant, with the monitoring and maintenance of the barriers to be included within the site integrated management system.

23 The 4 metre high bund erected on the site boundary of the recycling facility within the Queen Mary Quarry as described in the W A Hines & Partners Report dated 2.11.12 and shown on the Aerial in that report shall be retained and maintained at 4m high at all times until cessation of the use of the concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant in accordance with condition 6.

Dust

24 a) Prior to the commencement of development a Dust Action Plan (documented site-specific operational plan to prevent or minimise the release of dust from the site) (DAP) ; and a programme of ongoing dust monitoring to validate the outcome of the assessment and to check on the continuing effectiveness of control/mitigation measures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

b) The dust control and mitigation measures set out in the planning application (including paragraphs 7.23, 7.149 and Table 7.12 and Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement) shall be implemented and the Dust Action Plan and monitoring scheme approved pursuant to Condition 23 (a) shall be implemented as approved throughout the duration of the development.

Water environment and pollution controls

25 The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the planning application (including paragraph 7.149 and Table 7.12) and approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (July 2012) (Chapter 9 and Appendix 9.1 of the Environmental Statement), as modified by the June 2013 Addendum to the Environmental Statement and subsequent letters and emails), and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

There is no increase in impermeable area on the site and no increase in surface water run-off volume.

26 Full level for level compensation for all elements being built within each phase will be provided at the start of each phase prior to any bunding or overburden storage in the floodplain in accordance with the following plans and documents:

Drawing EIA 9.3 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation - Phase 1 Rev E revision E dated 13/01/14 and point 1 of letter dated 3 December 2013 from Wardell Armstrong, reference JG/ST12377/016,
Drawing EIA 9.4 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation Phase 2 Rev C dated 23/04/2014,
Drawing EIA 9.5 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation Phase 3 Rev B dated 23/04/2014,
Drawing EIA 9.6 Summary of proposed level for level flood compensation Phase 4 Rev B dated 23/04/2014.

27 All bunds shall be constructed in accordance with the following:

Drawing PA6 Phase 1 with Cross Sections – Rev F dated 24/04/14,
Drawing PA7 Phase 2 with Cross Sections – Rev D dated 24/04/2014,
Drawing PA8 Phase 3 with Cross Sections – Rev C dated 24/04/2014,
Drawing PA9 Phase 4 with Cross Sections – Rev C dated 24/04/2014.

28 Prior to commencement of development a scheme to ensure that the causeway does not form a barrier across the floodplain shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

a) detailed drawings of the proposed pipes within the causeway,
b) calculations demonstrating that the size, location and number of pipes are sufficient to allow flood waters to pass through the causeway unhindered for all flood events up to the 1 in 100 plus climate change flood event,
c) measures to ensure that the pipes will be maintained as open within the causeway for the lifetime of the causeway,
d) measures for removal of the causeway to at least normal water level at the end of the development.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

29 The bunds and causeway shall be removed in accordance with the restoration plans; Drawing PA13 Restoration Detail Plan dated March 2012 and Drawing PA14 Restoration Elevations dated March 2012.

7

30 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing No.ST12377 SK1 Floodplain compensation and Causeway Drainage Proposal dated 04/11/13 and the following measures as detailed:

a) provision of level for level floodplain compensation for the causeway up to the 1 in 100 plus climate change flood level
b) compensation to be provided before the causeway is put in place and maintained as open for the life of the causeway.

31 Any facilities for the storage of oil, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The size of the bunded compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank plus 10%. All filling points, vents and sight glasses must be located within the bund. There must be no drain through the bund floor or walls.

32 Prior to the commencement of development a groundwater monitoring plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The groundwater monitoring plan shall include:

a) additional monitoring boreholes to the north, east and west of the extraction area, and existing off-site wells to the east and south should be included,
b) water level monitoring and groundwater chemistry should be undertaken, with annual data reviews,
c) contingency mitigation measures

The groundwater monitoring plan shall be implemented as approved.

Programme of Working

33 The working of minerals from Manor Farm shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing drawing PA5, with the bund construction in accordance with drawing nos. PA6, PA7, PA8 and PA9 as listed above under Condition 2.

Rights of Way

34 Public access must be maintained throughout the period of mineral extraction and restoration. If this is not possible whilst work is in progress then an official temporary closure order will be necessary, the cost of which is to be borne by the applicant. The operator must ensure that:

a) There are no obstructions to the public rights of way at any time, including on a temporary basis by the placing of plant or vehicles,
b) Any damage to the rights of way surfaces must be reinstated to the satisfaction of the County Council's Countryside Access Officer,
c) Warning signs must be erected where contractors' vehicles are using or crossing the right of way, the wording of such signs not to discourage public use.

Archaeology

35 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 County Planning Authority.

Bird Management Plan

36 Development shall not commence until a Bird Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The submitted plan shall include details of:

a) monitoring of any standing water or wetland within the site temporary or permanent

The Bird Management Plan shall be implemented as approved, on commencement of the extraction and shall remain in force for the operational life of the site, including the restoration and thereafter in perpetuity.

Ecology

37 Prior to the construction of any buildings and erection of plant and equipment, or removal of vegetation the site at (Manor Farm and Queen Mary Quarry) in advance of operations or during restoration shall be inspected by a suitably qualified ecologist to check for breeding birds. No trees shall be felled or vegetation removed during the bird nesting season (1 March – 31 August) unless they have been inspected by a suitably qualified ecologist who has certified that there are no active nests which might be disturbed or destroyed by those activities. If an active nest is identified as being so affected by the development, no further works shall take place in that area until all nesting activity has concluded.

38 Prior to the commencement of development, a biodiversity mitigation scheme to include the type and number of bat and bird boxes proposed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, and thereafter implemented as approved.

Soil Movement and Placement

39 Soils shall only be moved when in a dry and friable condition; and handling, movement and replacement of soils shall not be carried out between the months of November to March inclusive, or during the bird breeding season unless the area concerned has been shown to be free of nesting birds, following an inspection by a suitably qualified ecologist, immediately prior to such works commencing. Soils should be handled in accordance with Defra's 'Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils'.

40 Bunds for the storage of soils shall be in accordance with the following criteria:

a) Topsoils, subsoils and subsoil substitutes should be stored separately.
b) Where continuous bunds are used dissimilar soils should be separated by a third material, previously agreed with the County Planning Authority.
c) Topsoil and subsoil (or subsoil substitute) bunds should not exceed 3 m in height.
d) Materials shall be stored like upon like, so that topsoil shall be stripped from beneath subsoil bunds and subsoil from beneath overburden bunds.

Landscaping and Restoration

41 The height of stockpiles within the Queen Mary Quarry processing plant shall not exceed 16 metres.

42 The restoration of the Manor Farm site shall be carried out in stages, progressively as the extraction proceeds in accordance with the approved Quarry Phasing Plans (Drawings PA5 – PA9, as detailed in Condition 2 above) and the approved Drawing PA13 Restoration Detail Plan for Manor Farm dated March 2012.

43 The restoration of the Queen Mary Quarry site shall be in accordance with the restoration and landscaping scheme for the site approved under reference SP07/1276 dated 15 January 2009, as reproduced on Drawing No. PA15 – 'Approved Restoration Plan for QMQ Site' dated March 2012.

7

44 Prior to the extraction of each of the phases of working within Manor Farm, detailed landform and planting design proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

45 Prior to commencement of development a vegetation survey of the Manor Farm site following the guidance and recommendations in BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations) shall be undertaken and a tree and hedgerow protection plan submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The tree protection plan shall include details of:

a) identification and assessment of the trees and hedgerows that are required to be removed,
b) measures for the protection of the trees and hedgerows that are to be retained during the construction and operation of the site.

The tree and hedgerow protection plan shall be implemented as approved and all existing hedges, trees, saplings, shrubs along the boundaries and such vegetation within the site shown as being retained in the tree protection plan submitted pursuant to this condition shall be retained and protected from damage during the process of extraction and subsequent restoration.

46 The management and maintenance of the restoration plan for Manor Farm shall be for a period of 25 years in accordance with the 'Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan' dated March 2012 (Appendix 7.1 RevA Planning Statement).

Reasons:

1 To ensure that the management and staff responsible for the day-to-day operation of the site are fully acquainted with the approved schemes and conditions in the interests of proper planning and to assist the County Planning Authority exercise control over the development hereby permitted and minimise the impact of the development in accordance with all the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

2 For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4 To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development hereby permitted at a mineral working site in an area of Metropolitan Green Belt and to minimise the impact on local amenity in accordance with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC3.

5 To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development hereby permitted at a mineral working site in an area of Metropolitan Green Belt and enable restoration of the land in accordance with the approved restoration scheme to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to minimise the impact on local amenity in accordance with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policies MC3 and MC17.

6 To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development hereby permitted at a mineral working site in an area of Metropolitan Green Belt and enable restoration of the land in accordance with the approved restoration scheme to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to minimise the impact on local amenity in accordance with Policies MC3 and MC17 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy.

7

7 To safeguard the Metropolitan Green Belt and protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with the terms of Policies MC3 and MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

8-15 In the interests of safeguarding the local environment and to ensure the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policies MC14 and MC15 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

16-17 To comply with the terms of the application and ensure minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality in accordance with Policy EN11 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009, and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

18-23 To ensure minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality in accordance with: Policy EN11 of the 'Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document' February 2009 and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

24 To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with: Strategic Policy SP6 and Policy EN3 of the 'Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document' February 2009 and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

25-32 To reduce the impact of flooding both on and off site, ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site, minimising the risk of pollution of watercourses and groundwater in accordance with: Strategic Policy SP6 of the 'Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document' February 2009, and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

33 To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Strategic Policy SP6 of the 'Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document' February 2009, and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

34 To protect the route of the public footpaths and the amenities of the users and comply with Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

35 To afford the County Planning Authority a reasonable opportunity to examine any remains of archaeological interest which are unearthed and decide upon a course of action required for the preservation or recording of such remains in accordance with the Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

36 It is necessary to manage the site in order to minimise its attractiveness to birds which could endanger the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Heathrow Airport in accordance with Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

37-40 To comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of biodiversity and wildlife conservation to comply with Policy EN8 of the 'Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document' February 2009, and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

41 To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Strategic Policy SP6 and Policy EN8 of the 'Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document' February 2009.

7

42-46 In order to achieve a high standard of restoration, and protect the local environment and amenity, in accordance with Policies MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

Informatives:

1 Details of the highway requirements necessary for inclusion in any application seeking approval of reserved matters may be obtained from the Transport Development Planning Team of Surrey County Council.

2 When a temporary access is approved or an access is to be closed as a condition of planning permission an agreement with, or licence issued by, the Highway Authority Local Highway Service Group will require that the redundant dropped kerb be raised and any verge or footway crossing be reinstated to conform with the existing adjoining surfaces at the developers expense.

3 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).

4 A pedestrian inter-visibility splay of 2m by 2m shall be provided on each side of the access, the depth measured from the back of the footway and the widths outwards from the edges of the access. No fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of such splays.

5 The applicant is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

6 A S278 Agreement is required in respect of the works (conveyor tunnel, site entrances onto Ashford Road and Worple Road, public footpath) under this decision. A bond will be required from the commencement of the development for the duration of the works and will only be released on the satisfactory reinstatement of the highway.

7 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments and requirements of National Grid within their letters of 2 October 2012, 30 July 2013 (Part 1) and 30 July 2013 (Part 2), 12 December 2013, 27 December 2013, and 10 February 2014, copies of which have been provided to the applicant or can be obtained from the County Planning Authority.

8 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments and requirements of Esso Petroleum Co Ltd set out within the Fisher German letter dated 17 October 2013 and enclosed Special Requirements for Safe Working booklet and the covenants referred to in the Deed of Grant, copies of which have been provided to the applicant or can be obtained from the County Planning Authority.

9 The applicant's attention is drawn to the following requirement of Thames Water in relation to public sewers and sewerage infrastructure in the B377 Ashford Road:

"There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.

There is a foul water sewer and manhole in Ashford Road (B377) in the location where the conveyance tunnel is proposed. The manhole is at a depth of approximately 11.6m AOD. The developer needs to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 regarding asset protection of this sewer during and after the construction."

10 Attention is drawn to the requirements of Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and to the Code of Practice for Access of the Disabled to Buildings (British Standards Institution Code of Practice BS 5810: 1979) or any prescribed document replacing that code.

11 The Applicant's attention is drawn to the potential need to modify the existing Pollution Prevention Control (PPC) Permit for the site prior to the commencement of any works.

12 The Applicant's attention is drawn to the potential need to obtain a Local Authority Pollution Prevention Control (LAPPC) Permit for the site prior to the commencement of any works.

13 The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or is being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.

Birds are known to nest on the ground within the site, on buildings and items of the mineral processing plant and these and trees and scrub present on the application site are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity during this period and shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present, the site is assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates.

14 Environment Agency - Advice to applicant: **"**There is currently an abstraction licence issued to Brett Aggregates at the adjacent site. The licence number is TH/039/0031/008. This licence allows water to be abstracted for the purpose of mineral washing. The maximum abstraction volumes associated with this licence are –

573m^3/hour
5,730m^3/day
1,760,000m^3/year

It is mentioned in the planning application that water would be needed for concrete production, dust suppression (including vehicle washing) and potentially for landscape irrigation. If you intend to use your existing abstraction licence for any purpose other than mineral washing, you will need to contact us to discuss the possibility of varying your licence. You would also need to contact us if you intend to drill a new borehole or seek to take water from a surface water source (e.g. lake/river).

If you have any questions regarding the above points then please email Alastair Wilson at thames.northeast@environment-agency.gov.uk or call on 03708 506 506."

7

15 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.

CONTACT

Susan Waters
TEL. NO.
020 8541 9227

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 March 2012 (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 (NPPG)
Circular 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation- Statutory Obligations
Government Circular 01/03 Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas
The Development Plan
Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents)
Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document for the Minerals and Waste Plans 2013 (Aggregates Recycling DPD 2013)
Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001
Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009
Other documents
Primary Aggregates Land Assessment Report 2009
Report to Spelthorne Local Committee 16 January 2012 (Item 8) on Surrey's Drive SMART Road Safety and Anti Social Driving Strategy, and Spelthorne's Local Speed Management Plan.
Spelthorne Borough Council 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Spelthorne Borough Council, August 2013
The Recent Storms and Floods in the UK February 2014 report published by the Met Office and Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (CEH)
Surrey County Council Guidelines for Noise Control Minerals and Waste Disposal 1994 (Surrey Noise Guidelines)
Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2012/2013
Surrey County Council Aggregates Monitoring Update August 2013
Surrey County Council Local Aggregate Assessment (Surrey LAA) October 2013
Surrey County Council Aggregates Monitoring Update: May 2014
The deposited application documents and plans and Environmental Statement 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 for the related conveyor application ref SP13/01003.
Department of the Environment letter dated 24 January 1978 to Greenham Sand & Ballast Co. Ltd. (Secretary of State decision on appeal against non determination of planning application SP76/60 (appeal ref: APP/5300/A/76/2931)

Annex

Draft Heads of Agreement

These Draft Heads of Agreement relate to the following planning application which is being reported to the 07 January 2015 Planning and Regulatory Committee:

Application ref SP12/01132: for the extraction of sand and gravel and restoration to landscaped lakes for nature conservation afteruse at Manor Farm, Laleham and provision of a dedicated area on land at Manor Farm adjacent to Buckland School for nature conservation study; processing of the sand and gravel in the existing Queen Mary Quarry (QMQ) processing plant and retention of the processing plant for the duration of operations; erection of a concrete batching plant and an aggregate bagging plant within the existing QMQ aggregate processing and stockpiling areas; installation of a field conveyor for the transportation of mineral and use for the transportation of mineral from Manor Farm to the QMQ processing plant; and construction of a tunnel beneath the Ashford Road to accommodate a conveyor link between Manor Farm and QMQ for the transportation of mineral.

Site: Land at Manor Farm, Ashford Road and Worple Road, Laleham and land at Queen Mary Quarry, west of Queen Mary Reservoir, Ashford Road, Laleham, Staines, Surrey.

Set out below are the broad heads of agreement, subject to the grant of planning permission for the above planning application, to be included in a legal agreement between Brett Aggregates (Applicant and Landowner) and Surrey County Council (County Planning Authority) to secure:

i) the long term (25 year) landscape and ecological management, maintenance and aftercare of the land at Manor Farm including for the control of birds; and

ii) control over vehicle numbers so the number of HGV movements in combination with other planning permissions at QMQ does not exceed more than 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day.

i) Outline of Basic Management Plan Agreement

1. Within twelve (12) months of the grant of planning permission for the above planning application the applicant shall submit to the County Planning Authority for approval a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) based on the March 2012 Restoration Management and Maintenance Plan in Appendix 7.1 of the July 2012 Planning Supporting Statement pursuant to the application describing how the land at Manor Farm will be managed, making provision for landscape and ecological interests, including for the control of birds, for a period of 20 years (and providing for 5 yearly reviews) following completion of the five year aftercare as prescribed by Condition [insert number] of planning permission SP12/01132.

2. All management shall only take place in accordance with the approved Landscape and Ecological Management Plan unless otherwise agreed with the County Planning Authority.

3. The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan shall address the following:
   (i) Habitat management which shall address how best to enhance the continuing establishment and long term health of the areas of grassland, grassland and willow scrub areas, hedgerows, trees, island tree planting, reed beds, marginal planting, conservation study area, formed by the Applicant as shown on Restoration Detail Plan PA13 Rev B pursuant to the application.
   (ii) The framework (including resources) in place to implement the Management Plan.
   (iii) The control of birds on the land at Manor Farm in the form of the bird hazard management plan approved pursuant to Condition [insert number] of planning permission SP12/01132.

4. The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan shall include details of arrangements to monitor the effectiveness of tasks undertaken pursuant to point 3 above.

5. The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan shall provide for the:
   (i) establishment of a Management Group comprised of the Applicant, the County Planning Authority, and any other persons who in the opinion of the County Planning Authority are appropriate to include, and
   (ii) the establishment and format of annual meetings of the Management Group to discuss the progress of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, to review the tasks undertaken in the previous year and to agree those to be undertaken in the following year; and to provide for reviews of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval on no less than a five yearly basis following approval of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.

ii) Vehicle numbers

The Developer covenants with the Council that they will limit the number of HGV movements generated by the Manor Farm proposal including concrete batching plant and aggregate bagging plant, in combination with other planning permissions at QMQ to no more than 300 HGV movements (150 two way HGV movements) on any working day.
