

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

BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT TEAM MANAGER

DISTRICT(S) REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL **ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**
Horley East
Mrs Ross-Tomlin

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION

GRID REF: 530848 142733

TITLE: MINERALS/WASTE RE14/02134/CON

SUMMARY REPORT

No. 2 Perrylands Lane, Smallfield, Horley, Surrey RH6 9PR

The use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders construction and demolition waste, including: the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloo, two metal containers, concrete hardstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash, and the provision of car parking and fuel storage.

The site is located on the southern side of Perrylands Lane on the outskirts of the village of Smallfield, approximately 2km to the east of Horley, within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The site is approximately 0.82ha in size and has good vegetation screening, with a 2-3m high soil screen perimeter bund and a mixture of residential properties and farmland beyond. The M23 Motorway abuts the eastern side of the site, on an embankment some 5-6m above the site. The site is approached from the north via a gated access track running between Nos.1 and 2 Perrylands Lane.

The site has historically been used as a scrap yard for over 40 years with a Certificate of Lawful Use being granted in 1994. In 2010 planning permission was granted on appeal for a change of use of the land for use as a soil processing facility. In 2013 the County Planning Authority advised the applicant, that planning permission for the soil processing facility had lapsed due to the failure to comply with time limits for the submission of details under conditions of the appeal decision. This view of the County Planning Authority has been challenged by the applicant, however in the interim the applicant has submitted a further planning application for the use of the land as a soil processing facility, mirroring that granted on appeal. Officers sought legal advice which advised that the 2010 planning permission had not been implemented due to the failure to meet the requirements of the conditions and, as such, there has been no lawful change of use. The use of the land would therefore revert to the former lawful use as a scrap yard use.

The proposed waste development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore the application falls to be considered as contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan. The main issue to be considered in this application are whether very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh any harm to the Green Belt, and whether any material changes have emerged since the appeal decision in 2010. Issues relating to visual amenity, noise, dust, flooding and traffic are also considered.

Development Plan policies seek to protect the local environment and the amenities of local residents from the adverse effects of development. There has been no objection from the Environment Agency or technical consultees in respect of the proposed development, subject to conditions and a s278 highway agreement.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council do not object, subject to the satisfactory control of impacts in respect of dust and noise. Tandridge District Council do not object to the proposed development on the basis that if the CPA are minded to grant planning permission then it should satisfy itself that very special circumstances exist, which outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. There have been no objections from Burstow Parish Council and Horley Town Council subject to conditions in respect of the highways improvements. To date, 11 letters of objection have been received, raising concerns in respect of Green Belt, traffic impacts, noise, dust, flooding and impacts on the local environment.

The Planning Inspector's decision in 2010 is an important material consideration in determining the application. Officers consider that there has been no material change in circumstances since this appeal, with a continued need for the provision of recycling facilities in the County. The impacts in respect of amenity can be adequately controlled through appropriately worded conditions. Officers consider that the development would not significantly impact on the openness of the Green Belt and very special circumstances are considered to exist to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Officers therefore conclude that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.

The recommendation is to PERMIT subject to conditions

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Blockade Services Ltd

Date application valid

1 October 2014

Period for Determination

31 December 2014

Amending Documents

None

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
Highways and Traffic	Yes	31-38
Environment & Amenity	Yes	39-58
Green Belt	No	59-66

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan

Plan 1

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1

Aerial 2

Site Photographs

Figure 1 – View N toward site entrance

Figure 2 – View W - turning area - containers - western bund

Figure 3 – View S - stockpiles and wheelwash

Figure 4 – View SW - stockpiles of inert waste

Figure 5 – View E - stockpiles and M23 in background

Figure 6 – View SE corner - inert waste soil stockpiles

BACKGROUND

Site Description

- 1 The application site (known as No.2 Perrylands Lane) is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt approximately 2km south east of Horley and 500m to the southwest of the village of Smallfield. The county boundary with West Sussex lays approximately 1km to the southwest where the M23 spur road joins the M23 at Junction 9. The application site is approximately 0.82 hectares with the eastern half abutting an elevated section of the M23 motorway, which runs north / south. The M23 is on an embankment some 5m to 6m high above the site.
- 2 The application site is located to the rear (south) of the residential properties; 1, 2, 3 and 4 Perrylands Lane, Smallfield. The residential properties of Rowlands and The Peeks lie to the southwest and west of the site respectively beyond the woodland boundary. The land beyond these properties is characterised by low-density residential development and fields. Commercial activities adjoin the northern part of the eastern boundary and the eastern part of the northern boundary. The application site is generally square and is approached via a gated access with a track which runs between numbers 1 and 2 Perrylands Lane. The site access joins Perrylands Lane, which runs east/ west, a narrow country lane classified as a D road with limited passing places.
- 3 Perrylands Lane passes under the M23 motorway approximately 50m from the application site access point and is one of only few ground level crossings of the M23 in the area. The section of Perrylands Lane from the M23 to where it joins Peeks Brook Lane to the west is registered as a Public Byway (BOAT) (No. 377). Peeks Brook Lane is also registered as a BOAT (No. 369). Footpath 368 connects with Perrylands Lane to the east of the M23 and runs southwards. Bridleway 372 connects with Peeks Brook Lane to the north of residential property Lagenhoe located to the south west of the application.

Planning History

- 4 On 8 April 1994 a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development (CLEUD) (ref. RE93/1323) was issued in respect of a scrap yard on a site of 0.82ha for the application site. The scrap yard had been registered with the District Council since January 1968. The CLEUD area included a portacabin used as an office and a corrugated lock up storage building on the eastern boundary of the CLEUD area.
- 5 In 2009 a retrospective planning application (ref: RE09/1184) was submitted to the County Planning Authority for a change of use from a vehicle scrap yard to a soil processing facility. The application was refused on 16 October 2009, with a recommendation for enforcement action. The Planning and Regulatory Committee endorsed enforcement proceedings in line with the officer recommendation and on 11 January 2010 the County Council served an Enforcement Notice on the applicant and landowner. The applicant and landowner appealed both the refusal of planning permission for the soil recycling facility and the enforcement notices. This appeal was heard in September 2010 by way of a public inquiry. The appeals (refs: APP/B3600/A/10/2122467, APP/B3600/C/10/2122563 & 2122573) were allowed, with planning permission being granted on 12 October 2010 subject to 18 conditions, which required the approval of further details.
- 6 In June 2011 the following details pursuant applications were approved:
- Ref: RE10/2056 - Details of the location of stockpiles of processed and unprocessed waste pursuant to Condition 4; details of the provision of two formal passing bays on Perrylands Lane pursuant to Condition 7; and details of a scheme for the provision of 3m high bunding and fencing pursuant to Condition 13 (s278 legal agreement was required)
 - Ref: RE11/0135 - Details of specification of deliveries and removed from the site pursuant to Condition 8; details of facilities to keep the public highway clean pursuant Condition 9; details of vehicle layout for parking, loading and unloading pursuant to Condition 10; and details of landscaping pursuant to Condition 15.
- 7 In November 2011 planning permission (ref. RE11/1401 & TA11/1147) was granted for the provision of two formal passing bays on Perrylands Lane, revising that previously approved (ref.RE10/2056). A Section 278 legal agreement was required in respect of the works to the highway. The passing bays have not yet been provided and the s278 has not been completed. In September 2013 a planning application (ref. RE13/01799) was submitted to vary the appeal decision, in order to allow the use of a concrete crusher on site (undetermined due to lapse of the Appeal decision).
- 8 In November 2013 the County Planning Authority (CPA) advised the applicant that the planning permission (Appeal decision ref: APP/B3600/A/10/2122467) for the soil processing facility at the site had lapsed due to the failure to comply with the time limits for the provision passing bays as specified in Condition 7 of the appeal decision. The applicant made an application to seek to judicially review the CPA's decision, which was allowed to proceed by the Court on 5 February 2014, but is currently in abeyance awaiting a hearing date from the Court. In the interim the applicant is also pursuing negotiations over the s278 highways agreement and has submitted this planning application for a new planning permission for the soil processing facility at the site.
-

THE PROPOSAL

- 9 The applicant is seeking planning permission for the use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders construction and demolition waste, including: the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloos, two metal containers, concrete hardstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash, and the provision of car parking and fuel storage.
- 10 The proposed operating hours are between 0800 – 1700 Monday to Friday and 0900 - 1330 on Saturdays. There will be no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays or Public Holidays. The applicant runs nine 20 tonne HGVs from the site with movements during the busier periods (Spring to Summer) reaching a maximum of 30 movements per day. The proposed maximum throughput of the site is 12,000 tonnes per annum.
- 11 The applicant is intending to use the proposed passing bays on Broadbridge Lane, as permitted under planning permission RE11/1401 & TA11/1147, which will be secured by means of a s278 legal agreement with the County Highway Authority.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

- 12 Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
'Whilst the planning history and grant of planning permission on appeal is noted in 2010 concern is raised about the potential effects of the development and the intensification of the use of the site. This concern relates to the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties through dust contamination and noise disturbance. However subject to the consideration of these matters and if they can be satisfactorily controlled by condition or would not have a materially harmful effect no objection is raised in principle.'
- 13 Tandridge District Council
'Although the District Council considers that this is not an appropriate use in the Green Belt, it is recognised that in allowing the Appeals on 12 October 2010, the Inspector found that the application met the tests set out in Policy CW6 in the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 that must be considered before finding that "very special circumstances" justify granting planning permission. The District would ask that if the County Council is minded to grant planning permission that it first satisfies itself that the "very special circumstances" which outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt have been demonstrated in this current application.'

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

- 14 **Environment Agency**
No objection
(Advice – The site is covered by an Environmental Permit and the operator must comply with the permit)
- 15 **County Highways Authority – Transportation Development Management**
No objection, subject to conditions
- 16 **Countryside Management Officer - Landscape**
No objection, subject to conditions
- 17 **County Air Quality/Dust Consultant**
No objection, subject to conditions

18 **County Noise Consultant**
No objection, subject to conditions

19 **Countryside Access Officer – Rights of Way**
No comments received

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

20 **Horley Town Council**
No objection, but raise concerns about impact on Green Belt and local neighbourhood. Expect consideration of new Government policy on waste.

21 **Burstow Parish Council**
No objection, but commented '*would like the District Council to obtain a contribution to the cost of changing the profile of the road humps along Broadbridge Lane to the junction with Perrylands Lane so that there is a reduction in the noise created by HGVs when they pass over them. We would also like the original conditions to be incorporated within any consent given*'

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

22 The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices and an advert was placed in the local newspaper. A total of 146 of owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. To date 11 letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposed development, raising the following issues:

- Inappropriate use in Green Belt and unnecessary use of site, in view of existing sites in area
- Additional HGV impact on road network – increase in traffic and damage to the roads (potholes)
- Access road unsuitable for size and volume of HGV traffic – dangerous to users of lane, which includes use as bridleway
- HGV movements usually clash with 'school run' – danger to children, especially with children's playground and playing field on corner of Broadbridge Lane and Weatherill Road
- Operator not cleaning the road
- Noise impact from operations
- Noise from HGVs passing over speed bumps on Broadbridge Lane
- More appropriate on an industrial estate
- Dust impacts on health of those living near to site
- Impact on environment and wildlife
- Operator has been working outside their approved operating hours (early starts, late finishes and Saturday pm working) in breach of previous planning permission – who is monitoring the site and logging these vehicles
- No passing places have been put in place in accordance with previous planning permission
- Site not constructed in accordance with approved plans – drainage and bunding
- Screener equipment not located in designated position on site
- Stockpiles have exceeded their limits of 4 metres
- Machinery operating on top of stockpiles
- Danger of fuel storage close to M23 and homes

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 23 The County Council as Waste Planning Authority (for clarity, Officers refer to the County Council as the County Planning Authority – ‘CPA’ elsewhere in this report) has a duty under Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to determine this application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. At present in relation to this application the Development Plan consists of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2008 (as amended) and the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005 (saved policies) and Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014.

National Planning Policy

- 24 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted in March 2012, and together with the National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG), provides guidance to local planning authorities in producing local plans and in making decisions on planning applications. The National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) was recently adopted in October 2014, which replaces Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) as the national planning policy for waste in England, and should be read in conjunction with the NPPF and the Waste Management Plan for England 2013. The Waste Management Plan for England 2013 sets out the Government’s aim of working toward a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management.
- 25 The NPPG states that the planning system controls the development and use of land in the public interest, which includes consideration of the impacts on the local environment and amenity taking into account the criteria set out in Appendix B to the NPPW. The new policy document aims to streamline previous waste planning policy, making it more accessible to local authorities, waste developers and local communities alike. It aims to provide a clear framework to enable waste planning authorities to work collaboratively with their communities and consider, through their Local Plans, what sort of waste facilities are needed and where they should go, while also protecting the local environment and local amenity by preventing waste facilities being placed in inappropriate locations.
- 26 The above national planning policies are a material consideration and planning authorities should have regard to them to the extent that they are appropriate. Planning applications which comply with an up to date Development Plan should be approved. Refusal should only be on the basis of conflict with the Development Plan and other material considerations.
- 27 The NPPF states that policies in Local Plans should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to publication of the framework. However, the policies in the NPPF are material considerations which planning authorities should take into account. Due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies are to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight they may be given). The County Planning Policy team have reviewed the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 with regard to its conformity with the NPPF and have concluded that the document conforms with the policies and approach set out in the NPPF.

EIA Screening

- 28 The proposed development was evaluated by the CPA in accordance with the EIA Regulations (2011) and the advice set out in the NPPG on EIA. The Screening Opinion (dated 4 August 2014) under Regulation 5 of the EIA Regulations concluded that the proposed soil processing facility, alone and in combination with other waste uses located in the surrounding area, does not constitute EIA development.

- 29 As already mentioned above, the site had historically been used as a scrap yard for waste vehicles for a period of over 40 years, and was granted a lawful use certificate in 1994. In 2010 planning permission was granted on appeal for the change of use to a soil processing facility, and was subject to several conditions requiring the approval of detailed schemes. The conditions also stated that the use as a soil processing facility would cease if the application failed to meet the requirements of these conditions. Whilst the applicant submitted details to satisfy Condition 7 in respect of a scheme of highway improvements, the applicant failed to provide the highway improvements within a specific timescale. Condition 7 stated that the *'use hereby permitted shall cease..'* if the applicant failed to meet one of the requirements, one of which was *'the approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable'*. The CPA is of the view that the use of the site for soil processing has ceased, in accordance with the wording of Condition 7. The applicant has challenged this view and is currently the subject of Judicial Review proceedings.
- 30 In light of recent legal advice and case law, the lawful implementation of the change of use of the site to a soil processing facility was dependent on compliance with conditions. As the applicant failed to comply with the conditions, the change of use had not occurred and therefore the lawful use of the site remains a scrap yard. The site owner would be entitled to cease soil processing and revert to scrap yard.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

Surrey Waste Plan 2008

Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005

Policy Mo4 – Development Related Funding for Highway Schemes

Policy Mo5 – Design and Roads within New Development

Policy Mo7 – Car Parking Strategy and Standards

Policy Mo12 – Public Rights of Way Network

Policy Mo13 – Provision for Cyclists

- 31 Surrey Waste Plan 2008 Policy DC3 requires information to be provided by applicants to enable the impact of proposals to be assessed. The policy states planning permission for waste related development will be granted provided it can be demonstrated that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. In relation to traffic the policy requires assessment of the impact of traffic generation, access and suitability of the highway network in the vicinity, including access to and from the motorway and primary road network. The policy also requires assessment of the impact of transport on neighbouring amenity.
- 32 Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005 Policy Mo5 (Design of Roads within New Development) states that the council will seek to ensure that arrangements for access and circulation are appropriate to the type of development proposed and the area in which it is located and do not aggravate traffic congestion, accident potential or create environmental disturbance in the vicinity. Policy Mo12 (Public Rights of Way Network) of the plan seeks to improve and extend the bridleway and footpath networks, with Policy Mo13 (Provision for Cyclists) aiming to improve conditions for cyclists and meeting their needs in highway and traffic management schemes.
- 33 The applicant has stated that the site has been operating as a soil processing facility since 2008, with the site operator running nine 20 tonne HGVs from the site. Historically the number of vehicle movements, have varied day to day, up to a maximum of 30 movements per day, with a tonnage throughput of 12,000 tonnes per annum. Prior to this activity, the scrap yard use had no restrictions in terms of vehicle numbers. The applicant has submitted the original submissions (dated September 2009) in support of

the application, in addition a transportation addendum (July 2014) has considered the changes since that earlier submission. The applicant has referred to the 2010 Appeal decision, which considered the transport implications of the development, with the Appeal Decision (Inspector Report) dated 12 October 2010 stating that '*with road improvements to provide passing places, there would be no detriment to highway safety*'.

- 34 As part of the 2010 Appeal Inquiry a Statement of Common Ground was prepared, which agreed the following highways matters:
- Access arrangements to and from the appeal site are acceptable and the site access is provided with adequate visibility splays.
 - Sufficient turning and manoeuvring space, to accommodate the turning of a large tipper lorry, is provided within the appeal site.
 - Two passing places can be provided by the Appellant along Perrylands Lane, which will enable two large tipper lorries, as used by the Appellant, to pass each other safely along Perrylands Lane.
 - The passing places would also ensure that there is sufficient space for such vehicles to comfortably pass equestrians or cyclists.
 - The passing places can be created within land that is classified as highway maintainable at public expense.
 - All highways improvements can be secured by a suitably worded condition or agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.
 - A lorry routing agreement, which will restrict the number of lorries using local roads and their route can be secured by a unilateral undertaking or a S106 Legal Agreement.
- 35 In November 2011 the detail design of two passing bays on Perrylands Lane was granted planning permission (ref. RE11/1401 & TA11/1147), subject to a Section 278 legal agreement for completion of the works to the highway. The s278 remains outstanding and as such the bays have not yet been provided.
- 36 The County Highway Authority (Transport Development Planning) Officers have assessed the above application and raise no objection, subject to conditions in respect of: a) the passing bays; b) wheel wash facilities and maintaining highway; c) a limit on HGV numbers up to 30 HGV movements Monday to Friday, and 16 movements on Saturdays; d) routing of HGVs avoiding Broadbridge Lane to the south; and e) parking/loading/unloading space on site in accordance with the approved plans. These conditions reflect some of the agreed measures above and are required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.
- 37 The issues raised by objectors in respect of highway safety, traffic impact and impacts on the local amenity are issues that were raised during the public inquiry in 2010, and are addressed in the above agreed measures and the Appeal Decision Report dated 12 October 2010. The Inspector was mindful of the impacts on the amenities of local residents from HGV traffic, concluding that the imposition of conditions could mitigate the matters raised by local residents.
- 38 The current application is not proposing a change in vehicle numbers, or mitigation measures. Subject to imposition of the conditions relating to access, traffic and protection of the public highway, Officers therefore conclude on highways and traffic matters that the proposal is acceptable as it is consistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and development plan policies relating to such matters.

ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP)

Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014 (RBCS)

Policy CS10: Sustainable Development

- 39 The NPPW states that *‘when determining waste planning applications, waste planning authorities should only:*
- *consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B and the locational implications of any advice on health from the relevant health bodies. Waste planning authorities should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessment of epidemiological and other health studies;*
 - *ensure that waste management facilities in themselves are well-designed, so that they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located;*
 - *concern themselves with implementing the planning strategy in the Local Plan and not with the control of processes which are a matter for the pollution control authorities. Waste planning authorities should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced’;*
- 40 Surrey Waste Plan 2008 Policy DC3 requires application proposals to provide appropriate information and assessments to demonstrate that impacts of the development *“can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources.”* The policy goes on to identify a range of matters, which must where relevant to a proposal be addressed and for proposals to demonstrate that there would not be an adverse effect from such matters on local amenity and the local environment. Matters relevant to this application include:
- visual impact and impact on landscape;
 - flood risk and effect on the flow and quality of groundwater, surface water, land drainage (of the site and adjoining land);
 - adverse effects on neighbouring amenity including noise, dust and transport impacts;
- 41 Policy CS10 of the RBCS 2014 states that development will: respect the ecological and cultural heritage; minimise the use of natural resources and contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions by re-using existing resource; minimise pollution, including air, noise and light, and to safeguard water quality.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 42 The site is not covered by any landscape designation and is located in low lying land adjacent to the M23, to the rear (south) of properties off Perrylands Lane. The site is fairly well screened and is surrounded by a mature tree and hedge line boundary. Residential properties of Rowlands and The Peeks lie to the south west and west of the site respectively beyond the woodland boundary. There is good screening provided from mature vegetation along the boundaries of the site with the operations only really visible when standing directly in front of the site entrance on Perrylands Lane. Due to the close proximity of residential dwellings to the site to the west and southwest of the site, stockpiles and the screener, as well as the bunds are visible from these dwellings.

- 43 The applicant has referred to an approved scheme of landscaping (ref. RE11/0135), which included planting of the bunds, submitted pursuant to Condition 15 of the appeal decision. This information has been submitted in support of the application. The Inspector placed conditions on the location and height of the inert waste stockpiles, so as to prevent any adverse impact on the visual character of the surrounding area. In addition, further control was placed on the type of waste brought onto the site and to secure the removal of remaining scrap, to ensure that the operation does not cause any adverse impact on the landscape character of the area. Permitted development rights were also removed in respect of any additional plant/equipment so as to protect the character of the surrounding area.
- 44 The County Landscape Officer (CLO) assessed the proposed development and submitted documents, and considered that there would be no additional adverse impact in the landscape as a result of the proposals, as such raised no objection in respect of landscape impact subject to conditions in respect of the plans. However, as the site benefits from mitigation provided by tree lines, as well as the trees being important elements in the local landscape, they should be protected from any adverse impact. As such, the CLO has recommended a condition ensuring the protection and future maintenance of the trees.
- 45 The CLO also considered the impact of lighting on the landscape, noting that the type of lighting is an important consideration in landscape mitigation, and that all lighting should comply with the guidance notes on obtrusive light produced by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) in order to control light pollution. All lighting should be fitted with cowls or baffles to ensure no upward spillage of light. The applicant has stated that two directional lights are erected on 1m poles on the portacabin roof and an additional directional light erected on the telegraph pole in the NE corner of the site. The applicant goes on to state that the lights are used in winter months only during operational hours and point away from neighbouring properties. The CLO recommended that the type and use of lighting should be controlled by condition to control any light pollution.
- 46 Condition 15 of the appeal decision required a scheme for landscaping, together with future maintenance of the planting and fencing, including replacement of trees or shrubs for a period of 10 years. Whilst Drawing Nos. 5253/003 and 5253/004 have provided the detail of the landscape scheme, there are no details of a scheme of maintenance. As such the CLO recommends that a scheme of maintenance of the above planting and fencing, including replacement planting would need to be submitted for approval.
- 47 The site has had a waste use with the established scrap car yard for over 40 years. Given the extant waste use and subject to the imposition of conditions Officers consider that there should be no significant adverse impact on visual amenity and landscape character of this area.

Air Quality (Dust)

- 48 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. In determining planning applications the NPPW states (Para. 7) that planning authorities should consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity, and should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessment of epidemiological and other health studies.

- 49 Policy DC3 of the SWP 2008 states that planning permission for waste related development will be granted provided that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. Matters such as the release of polluting substances to the atmosphere, and adverse effects on neighbouring amenity including fumes and dust, should be assessed and where necessary, appropriate mitigation should be identified so as to minimise or avoid any material adverse impact and compensate for any loss.
- 50 The applicant has acknowledged that the main sources of dust from this site are likely to come from vehicles entering and leaving the site, loading and unloading, screening operations and stockpiled materials. It was agreed between the applicant and the CPA at the 2010 public inquiry that noise and dust from the site could be kept to an acceptable level by the construction of earth bunds and fencing and the installation of a sprinkler system. The applicant has stated that the bunds and perimeter planting serve as a dust barrier, however, dust control measures are provided, including the operation of a water bowser and the erection of water mist sprinklers to be mounted on 6m high poles at the centre of the stockpiles. The sprinklers have not been installed, and will need to be in place prior to commencement of development. A Dust Action Plan (DAP) was submitted in support of the application (Ref. R1390-R02-v3 dated August 2010), which was the subject of conditions on the appeal decision, to ensure the implementation and control of the DAP. The applicant has suggested that these conditions are included in any future planning permission.
- 51 The County Air Quality Consultant (CAQC) has provided advice in respect of the dust impact, raising no objection providing that the conditions placed on the appeal decision are carried forward on any planning permission granted. This includes the need for the mitigation measures as outlined within the Dust Action Plan dated August 2010 R1390-R02-v3 to be undertaken and adhered to at all times during the implementation of the use of the site as a soil processing facility. If activities generate dust nuisance beyond the site, then those activities should cease until the dust generation stops. Officers consider that subject to the above controls, soil processing can take place on the site without causing adverse nuisance or unacceptable dust impacts on neighbouring amenity.

Noise

- 52 The applicant has stated that the site abuts an elevated section of the M23 motorway and is under the flight path into Gatwick airport which collectively dominate the local noise environment. The applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment Report which was prepared in support of the 2010 appeal, in addition an Addendum (dated July 2014) was submitted, which shows that there has been no change in circumstances that could lead to a different decision. The assessment concludes that the '*screening operations can take place within the site area, without the current daytime noise level being significantly exceeded*'. The applicant has stated that the proposed activities at the site are the same as assessed in 2010 and involve use of a McCloskey screener and mobile plant (EX135 and a loader). The soil screener is located closest to the M23 boundary and operates for up to 6 hours per day, and the process is seasonal (spring and summer months only), as material needs to be dry.
- 53 It was agreed between the main parties at the 2010 public inquiry that noise from the site could be kept to an acceptable level by the construction of earth bunds and fencing. Local residents have objected to the proposed development with regard to noise impact from the site and HGVs accessing the site. The Appeal Decision (Inspectors Report) states that '*the local residents object to the noise of the lorries but, given that the noise climate is already affected by the M23 and the proximity to the Gatwick airport flight path, it would not be equitable to prevent the use of a public road by the number of vehicles proposed in this case. I therefore consider that the imposition of conditions could mitigate the matters raised by local residents.*'

54 The County Noise Consultant has reviewed the planning application and supporting information with regard to the potential for adverse noise effects. Based upon the premise that there is no alteration to the operations/activities proposed for the site and that the relevant conditions relating to and controlling noise effects are current, applied and being complied with, then this application should not result in any change to noise effects from that allowed at appeal. The fundamental acceptability of the application was decided at appeal in 2010. Officers therefore consider that providing the noise conditions associated with the appeal decision are carried forward to any planning permission granted then the application should be acceptable in relation to noise, as it accords with the development plan.

Flooding

55 The majority of the site is located just beyond a tributary of the River Mole. As such the site predominately lies within an area classified by the Environment Agency as Flood Zone 1 (a 1 in 100 flood event zone), with a strip along the western boundary (20m) of the site within Flood zone 2 (a 1 in 1000 year flood event zone).

56 The applicant submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) with the 2010 application and has produced an addendum to the FRA dated August 2014, which confirms that there is no adverse impact in relation to flood risk and the proposals are therefore, acceptable. Flooding was not an issue raised by the Inspector in her decision in 2010. A 'Drainage Strategy Plan' dated April 2011 was approved (ref. RE10/2056) by the CPA in June 2011. Residents have raised issues about whether the site's drainage is in accordance with the approved drainage plan. It has been noted by Officers that the 'french drain' has not been provided, however this can be addressed and enforced by an appropriately worded condition.

57 The Environment Agency raised no objection to the proposed development advising that the site benefits from an environmental permit, as such the operator must ensure compliance with the permit is met at all times. If any controlled waste is to be removed off site, then the site operator must ensure a registered waste carrier is used to convey the waste material off site to a suitably permitted facility.

58 In conclusion Officers consider the proposal remains acceptable on flood risk grounds and accords with national policy and development plan policy flood risk.

GREEN BELT

Surrey Waste Plan 2008

Policy CW6 – Development in the Green Belt

Policy WD2 - Recycling, Storage, Transfer, Materials Recovery and Processing Facilities (Excluding thermal Treatment)

Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014

Policy CS3 - Green Belt

59 The NPPF states at paragraph 79 that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open with the essential characteristics of the Green Belt being their openness and permanence. Paragraph 80 sets out the five key purposes of the Green Belt. The relevant criteria for this application are to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to safeguard encroachment of the countryside. The Inspector in the 2010 appeal decision concluded that the bunds and stockpiles, which form an integral part of the soil processing facility represent a negative impact on openness and the development is therefore inappropriate in Green Belt terms. However, whilst the site is in the countryside and Green Belt, the land affected would be no larger than the lawful use of the land as a scrap yard.

- 60 Paragraph 87 goes on to state that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 advises that in the consideration of proposals, that local planning authorities should ensure 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*”.
- 61 Policy CW6 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP2008) states that there will be a presumption against waste related development in the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. This policy echoes the requirements of the NPPF that very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development of waste management facilities in the Green Belt will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The policy sets out considerations that may contribute to very special circumstances. These being the lack of suitable non-Green Belt sites, the need to find locations well related to the source of waste arisings, the characteristics of the site; and the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management.
- 62 Policy CS3 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Core Strategy 2013 seeks to maintain the Green Belt within the Borough and states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt.
- 63 Policy WD2 of the SWP 2008 identifies the locations where planning permission for development involving bulking up of waste and facilities for recycling, recovery and processing of waste will be granted. Waste sites also have to be assessed against SWP 2008 development control Policy DC3 (General Considerations), which requires that the County Council be satisfied that the impact of a proposed so that it does not significantly affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. It also requires planning applicants to show that they have assessed particular environment and amenity issues.
- 64 Policy CW5 of the SWP 2008 deals with unallocated site and notes that priority should be given to previously developed, contaminated, derelict or disturbed land as potentially appropriate locations for waste management activities. The Inspector noted this in her report stating that whilst the site has previously been in a waste use, it is in a rural area and the location is not particularly well sited from a strategic road access viewpoint. However, the Inspector addressed the four considerations that may contribute to very special circumstances under Policy CW6, and stated that there is an acknowledged shortage of waste recycling sites in the county and the site contributes to an established need. In addition the Inspector added that the site ‘*is previously developed land with a lawfully established waste related use and is recycling a higher than average percentage of materials brought onto it*’. In conclusion the Inspector stated: ‘*with mitigation measures in place, there are no other factors weighing against the proposal and I consider that the considerations set out above are significant enough to indicate that the harm caused by inappropriateness is clearly outweighed, to the extent that very special circumstances exist, indicating that planning permission should be granted.*’
- 65 The applicant referred to the Inspectors Report and the above conclusion on Green Belt, however, submitted what they considered the very special circumstances of this case (as originally submitted for the appeal), which included; an alternative site assessment demonstrating the lack of suitable non-green belt sites, the characteristics of the site being previously developed with a long history of scrap use and the established need for additional recycling site in Surrey sites.

66 Officers have to take into account the Inspector’s decision and conclusion on Green Belt, and have to consider whether very special circumstances still exist that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The appeal decision is an important material consideration in favour of granting the application. In view of the conclusions in the above sections on traffic and environment and amenity, Officers do not consider that the amenities of the Green Belt would be harmed to such degree that planning permission should be refused, weighing up the harm, which would result as ‘any other harm’ in the context of Green Belt planning policy. With regard to inappropriateness and the loss of openness the site is previously developed land and there is still an accepted need for the County to increase recycling and recovery capacity and divert waste from landfill to contribute to agreed targets for Surrey and there have been no material changes since the appeal decision in 2010. As such Officers consider that very special circumstances still exist that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness and justify the grant of planning permission.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

67 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.

68 It is acknowledged that there would be an impact on the Green Belt caused by inappropriateness of the development and harm to openness, in addition impacts in respect of traffic, dust, noise and landscape are acknowledged and have been assessed in the body of the report and mitigation provided; however the scale of such impacts is not considered sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1 and, if planning permission were to be granted, such impacts are capable of being mitigated by the measures incorporated into the application proposal and by planning condition and the mitigation measures and controls available through the Environmental Permitting regime. As such, this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right.

CONCLUSION

69 The proposal needs to be assessed and considered as a new waste proposal within the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Key issues in determining this application include the history of the site for waste uses, including the Inspector’s decision and report. However, there still needs to be consideration of the following: compliance with the Development Plan, the protection of the Metropolitan Green Belt, the suitability of the site for waste development, traffic impact, and the potential impact on local residential, environmental and amenity interests.

70 Waste development of this type is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore planning permission may only be granted where factors that amount to very special circumstances are demonstrated to justify inappropriate development and clearly outweigh the harm in terms of inappropriateness and any other harm. The soil processing operations and associated infrastructure would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and this has been acknowledged by the Inspector.

71 There have been no objections from technical consultees in respect of the proposed development. Residents have objected on Green Belt and amenity grounds. In view of the planning permission being granted on appeal for the same development, Tandridge District Council required that the CPA be satisfied that very special circumstances still exist. These issues have been addressed in the above sections of the report, and Officers consider that whilst there are acknowledged impacts, the characteristics of the site and history are key points for consideration, and along with the proposed mitigation measures are sufficient to overcome these objections and concerns.

- 72 The suitability of the application site for waste development and potential impact of the proposal in terms of waste management has already been accepted by a Planning Inspector on appeal. Officers consider that through the imposition of suitable planning conditions relating to site management and other control measures undertaken at the site, the proposed soil processing facility can be permitted in the Green Belt, and would not result in a materially adverse impact on the environment. Officers do not consider that there has been any material change in the factors which the Inspector considered amounted to a demonstration of very special circumstances in this case and therefore the proposal accords with the SWP 2008 Policy WD2 of the SWP 2008.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is to PERMIT subject to conditions

CONDITIONS

Commencement

- 1 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.

Approved Plans

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

Drawing No	Title	Dated
5253/0001	Site Location Plan	(date stamped 22.08.14)
5253/002	Site Layout	July 2014
5253/003	Bund Details	July 2014
5253/004	Scheme for Bund Planting	July 2014
5253/005	Route to be used by HGVs entering and leaving the Blockade Services site at Perrylands Lane	July 2014
5253/006	Layout of Vehicle Parking, Loading and Unloading Area, and Turning Area	July 2014
5253/007	Extent of Landscaping on site at 2 Perrylands Lane	July 2014
5253/008	Position of Wheel Washing Equipment	July 2014
06 J7/01043	Details of Jakoustic Fencing System	(date stamped 22.08.14)
TSP/BSL/P2129/01	Drainage Strategy Plan	April 2011
90627-TK02 rev A	Swept Path of Large Tipper Turning within Site	(date stamped 22.08.14)
90627-01	Visibility Splays	(date stamped 22.08.14)
Figure 1	Location of Noise Mitigation Features	(date stamped 22.08.14)

Pre-commencement Conditions

- 3 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted 2 formal passing bays shall be constructed by the applicant along Perrylands Lane (between the motorway bridge and Ontario Close) which will be sufficient for a 20 tonne capacity lorry (and thus an equestrian or cyclist) to comfortably give way to another 20 tonne capacity lorry, in general accordance with the approved plans contained within Appendix 14 of the August 2014 Planning Statement and planning permission ref.RE11/1401 & TA11/1147.
- 4 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the proposed wheel wash facilities and their operation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The approved wheel wash facilities shall be installed, retained and used whenever the operations hereby permitted involve the movement of HGVs to or from the site.
- 5 Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted the approved sprinkler system shall be installed and used thereafter whenever the proposed use is in operation in order that the operator can minimise dust generated from the site.
- 6 Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted the culvert proposed on the western boundary of the site under the field entrance gate and any culverts under the bunds shall be installed and have a minimum diameter of 450mm.

Limitations

- 7 No machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out, no servicing, maintenance or testing of plant shall be undertaken, no lights shall be illuminated and no deliveries taken at or despatched from the site outside the following times:

0800 – 1700 Mondays to Fridays,
0900 – 1330 on Saturdays
nor at any time on Sundays, Bank, National or Public Holidays.

This shall not prevent the carrying out of emergency operations but these are to be notified to the County Planning Authority.
- 8 Only inert construction and demolition waste shall be imported onto the application site. All incidental waste, to include rubbish and scrap, shall be removed from the site and disposed of at a suitably licensed landfill.
- 9 There shall be no crushing of construction and demolition waste.
- 10 Site operations shall be carried out in accordance with the Working Scheme (Appendix 3 of the August 2014 Planning Statement) and 'Site Layout' Drawing No.5253/002 dated July 2014, with stockpiles of processed and unprocessed waste to be no more than 4 metres in height.
- 11 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no plant, building or machinery, whether fixed or moveable, other than that specifically authorised by inclusion in the following list shall be erected or brought onto the application site without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority.

Items authorised by this permission: 1 office portacabin, 2 metal containers, one of which contains fuel storage, 1 portable toilet, 1 screener, 1 360° excavator, 1 road sweeper, 1 mini digger, 1 loading shovel, 2 skips, 1 wheelwash.

All these items shall be removed from the site upon the cessation of the use hereby permitted.

Traffic and Access

- 12 All lorries used for carrying loads to and from the application site are to be sheeted.
- 13 There shall be no more than 30 HGV movements per day (15 in and 15 out) on Monday to Fridays and no more than 16 HGV movements (8 in and 8 out) on Saturdays. HGV movements should not exceed 20 tonnes capacity.
- 14 Any movements associated with the development hereby permitted shall be required to use the route as indicated on Drawing No.5253/005 so as to avoid the use of Broadbridge Lane to the south. Records of HGV movement to and from the site must be maintained and made available to the Planning Authority on request.
- 15 Space shall be laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked, for the 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.

Noise

- 16 Except for temporary uses, the level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 3.6 metres from the façade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 60LAeq during any 30 minute period.
- 17 For the temporary operation of bund formation, the level of noise arising from this activity when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 3.6 metres from the façade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 70LAeq during any 30 minute period.
- 18 The bunds and acoustic fence as shown on Drawing Nos. 5253/002 'Site Layout', 5253/003 'Bund Details' and 06 J7/01043 entitled 'Detail of Jakoustic Fencing System' shall be maintained in a good condition through treatment and replacement where necessary, to ensure its acoustic performance.
- 19 All plant and machinery are to work only from ground level, except within the hatched area of Figure 1 of Appendix 5 of the August 2014 Planning Statement, where a single 360° excavator may operate up to 2m above ground level for the purpose of loading the hopper of the screener.

Lighting

- 20 In order to avoid any upward glare of light from the site lighting and to minimise light spill outside the boundary of the site, lights are to face into the site operational area and be directed downward with appropriate reflectors/cowls to minimise light pollution.

Dust

- 21 The mitigation measures outlined within the Dust Action Plan dated August 2010 R1390-R02-v3 shall be undertaken and adhered to at all times during the implementation of the use hereby authorised.

- 22 The Dust Action Plan shall be periodically reviewed and amended if required at no greater than two year intervals in the first six years, with five year reviews thereafter for the duration of the use of the site.
- 23 Having regard to the Dust Action Plan no activity hereby permitted shall cause dust to be emitted from the site. Should such emissions occur, the relevant activity shall be suspended until it can be resumed without causing any such emissions.

Drainage

- 24 The drainage ditch on the north and west boundaries of the site and the french drain within the site, shall be provided in conjunction with the repositioning and construction of the bunds in accordance with the 'Site Layout' and 'Drainage Strategy Plan', and the drainage system shall be maintained and kept clear of debris at all times throughout the duration of the development.

Landscaping

- 25 All trees on and immediately adjoining the site shall be protected from damage as a result of operations on site, to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority in accordance with the guidance in British Standard BS5837:2012. Any trees or parts of trees removed without the County Planning Authority's consent or die or become in the opinion of the County Planning Authority seriously diseased or otherwise damaged within 5 years following completion of the planting shall be replaced not later than the end of the first available planting season.
- 26 The proposed hedgerow shall not exceed 4m in height when measured from the base of the hedgerow.
- 27 The landscaping of the site shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing Nos.5253/003 and 5253/004.
- 28 Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme of maintenance of the landscaping for both planting and fencing shall be submitted for the approval in writing by the County Planning Authority.

REASONS FOR IMPOSING CONDITIONS:

- 1 To accord with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to enable the County Planning Authority to control the development and monitor the site to ensure compliance with the planning permission.
- 2 For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3-4 In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
- 5 To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of dust on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3.
- 6 In order to ensure that the surface water drainage system within the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.

- 7-11 To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
- 12-15 In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
- 16-19 To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality to comply with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
- 20 To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of lighting on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008
- 21-23 To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of dust on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3.
- 24 In order to prevent the increased risk of flooding and to ensure that the drainage system within the site is provided and surface water drainage of the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
- 25 In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
- 26 In order to ensure the hedgerow remains stable in the long term in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
- 27-28 To comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of biodiversity and conservation to comply with policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 The applicant's attention is drawn to the need to complete a Section 278 Legal Agreement with regard to the construction of the two passing bays on Perrylands Lane. Should this Legal Agreement result in the amendment of any plans subject of this planning permission, the applicant's attention is drawn to the need to have such plans approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.
- 2 The applicant is advised that any culvert, diversion, weir, dam or like obstruction to the flow of a watercourse requires the separate consent of the Environment Agency and/or Internal Drainage Board, under the Land Drainage Act 1991.
- 3 The applicant is advised that if *Thuja plicata* is not available that suitable alternatives would be Laurel, *Caragana arborescens*, *Buxus sempervirens* or *Ceanothus*.
- 4 The applicant is advised that it would be beneficial if a backward sloping step could be formed in the bank profile along the tree planting line as this will help retain water moving down the bank face.
- 5 Because of the high ambient noise from non-site related sources, it may be necessary to measure noise from site operations closer to the source and use noise modelling techniques or calculations based on the provisions of BS 5228 – 1:2009.

CONTACT

Stephen Jenkins

TEL. NO.

020 8541 9424

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014
Waste Management Plan for England 2013
National Planning Policy for Waste 2014

The Development Plan

Surrey Waste Plan 2008
Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005
Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014

Other Documents

Appeal Decision (APP/B3600/A/10/2122467, APP/B3600/C/10/2122563 & 2122573) –
Inspectors Report dated 12 October 2010

This page is intentionally left blank