

Annex 4

Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD

Cabinet 18 December 2012

Schedules of representations:

- Main Modifications
- Additional Modifications
- Updated Environmental Report
- Compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework

**Surrey Minerals Plan
Surrey Waste Plan**

**Aggregates Recycling Joint Development
Plan Document**

**Schedule of representations on the Main
Modifications, Additional Modifications,
Updated Environmental Report and
Compliance with the National Planning
Policy Framework for the August 2011
Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD proposed
document for submission**

October 2012

Index

Main Modifications.....	1
Additional Modifications.....	60
Updated Environmental Report.....	80
Compliance with National Planning Policy.....	108

Representations to Main Modifications

Main Modifications

<p>4. Stanwell Liberal Party</p>	<p>MM1</p>	<p>This modification will clearly make it impossible to proceed with aggregates recycling at Stanwell Quarry, Oak Leaf Farm and Hithermoor. While the developments proposed on these sites MIGHT improve 'economic conditions' in the area (Policy AR1) they most certainly would not lead to improvement in terms of the 'social and environmental conditions' mentioned. Perhaps I can elaborate – with regard to Stanwell Quarry the nationally recognised (and locally celebrated) bio – diversity of the locality must clearly be at risk in the event of further industrial development. Despite assurances that this aspect of the area will be in safe hands for the next five years the record shows that Surrey does not enforce agreements adequately and the company in question (CEMEX) sits lightly to legal requirements.</p> <p>There has been a strong and quite justified local demand for years now for ACCESS to this beautiful 'green lung' – not just so that people can observe the wonderful Flora and Fauna there but also to take in the historically interesting remains at Stanwell Place.</p> <p>With regard to Hithermoor and Oak Leaf Farm there is a long outstanding dust problem. There are deep and justified concerns about the impact on the health and property of local people in Stanwell Moor arising from the noxious dust carried from the west (Hithermoor) or east (Oak Leaf Farm).</p> <p>It is clear then that (in the language of the modification) 'material considerations indicate otherwise (i.e. against the recycling work envisaged)'. We would endorse in this area the words: '... adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework...' (In fact the 'Specific policies' in that Framework (on biodiversity and historical interest) are directly relevant in the case of Stanwell Quarry).</p>
<p>17. Manorcroft Primary School</p>	<p>MM1</p>	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
<p>27. RAGE</p>	<p>MM1</p>	<p>We note and welcome the key word 'sustainable' in the title of Policy AR1; and also the wording to 'secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'.</p>
<p>29. Individual</p>	<p>MM1</p>	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
<p>32. Egham Residents Association</p>	<p>MM1</p>	<p>We appreciate the keyword "sustainable" in Policy AR1 & the general intent to "secure development that improves the economic, social & environmental conditions in the area"</p>
<p>33. Individual</p>	<p>MM1</p>	<p>The location of the recycling plant at Milton Park Farm will have a net adverse impact upon the local community</p>

		that is greater than the overall contribution of this plant to the minerals plan by way of increased noise and traffic proximal to a primary school and on roads where preferred pedestrian routes are defined for children to walk to school.
36. Individual	MM1	Aggregate re-cycling plant located at north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive
38. Individual	MM1	<p>I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing.</p> <p>I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons:</p> <p>Due to the removal of sites from the list too much emphasis is on the sites in Runnymede.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Milton Farm in Egham does not have pre-requisite planning permission for gravel extraction. 2) The aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm would not, contrary to policy AR1 (MM1), improve the economic social and environmental conditions in the area. 3) The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised. 4) Will increase the risk of flooding in the Milton Park Farm Area.
43. Individual	MM1	<p>An aggregate re-cycling plant located at Milton Park Farm will negatively Impact the environmental conditions in and around Manorcroft School which my daughter currently attends.</p> <p>The facility will increase the air and noise pollution considerably in the school area negatively affecting the quality of education and break-time for all pupils.</p> <p>As well as my daughter attending the school, my son will also be a pupil of Manorcroft School from September 2013. Due to the fact he has a pre-existing lung-condition I am extremely concerned about the impact on his health caused by the increased air pollution from the facility.</p>
44. Individual	MM1	<p>An aggregate re-cycling plant located at Milton Park Farm will negatively Impact the environmental conditions in and around Manorcroft School which my daughter currently attends.</p> <p>The facility will increase the air and noise pollution considerably in the school area negatively affecting the quality of education and break-time for all pupils.</p>

59. Individual	MM1	<p>In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1):</p> <p>Economically Egham is linked to education, and office based businesses: aggregate recycling, gravel extraction and also associated lorry movements are not conducive to either education or office based businesses. We should be encouraging high value information based businesses which employ numerous people to the area, not automated heavy industry. What has a greater positive impact on the area: An R&D function for a company such as P&G, or a concrete crushing plant?</p> <p>Socially the potential impact on Manorcroft nursery and school could have a severe negative impact on family life and demographics for the town if parents move pupils to less blighted schools and therefore also leave the area.</p> <p>Environmentally aggregate recycling and gravel extraction will have a considerable negative impact on Egham in terms of dust, noise, pollution (from lorries) and impact on hydrology, with potential increased flooding risk.</p>
60. Individual	MM1	<p>An aggregate recycling plant on the site in the northern portion of the Milton Park Farm, Egham, site will be detrimental to the environment of Manorcroft Primary School, Manorcroft Nursery and areas of the Manorcroft residential estate. This northern portion of the MPF site is currently earmarked by Hanson's for the industrial processes associated with gravel extraction.</p>
61. Individual	MM1	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
62. Individual	MM1	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
75. Individual	MM1	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
78. Individual	MM1	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
79. Individual	MM1	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.</p>
111. Individual	MM1	<p>Aggregate re-cycling plant located at north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive</p>
121. Belron International Limited	MM1	<p>Policy AR1 Bullet point 1 page 3 It is considered that the benefits of locating a recycling facility at Milton Park Farm demonstrably do not outweigh the likely negative impacts and the proposed development does not therefore meet the criteria which justify a presumption in favour.</p>
101. Spelthorne Borough	MM8	<p>On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in</p>

Council		particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
101.Spelthorne Borough Council	MM9	On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
102. Individual	MM1	Aggregate re-cycling plant located at north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact on the environment around Manorcroft Primary School, air and noise pollution as well as being visibly intrusive.
126. Individual	MM1	The aggregate recycling plant located at the north end of Milton Park Farm will have a negative impact around Manorcroft Nursery and Manorcroft Primary school- there will be air and noise pollution.
127. Individual	MM1	Placing the Aggregates recycling plant next to a nursery and primary school is a clear health risk which will be ignored if this plan goes ahead. The resultant pollution will either be detrimental to their health and affect their physical development if they cannot be allowed to play outside.
5. Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council	MM10	<p>I am writing on behalf of Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council in respect of the proposal to increase the amount of aggregate recycled at Salfords Depot, Salfords from 50,000 tpa to 100,000 tpa.</p> <p>Our comment is</p> <p>The only existing road access to this site is via inadequate narrow residential roads. The proposal to increase the permitted amount of aggregate recycled at Salfords Depot, Salfords from 50,000 tpa to 100,000 tpa should not be allowed until there is access from that site directly onto the A23 via Salbrook Road. Any permitted increase from the current 50,000 tpa should be conditional upon the prior provision of access directly onto the A23 via Salbrook Road.</p> <p>Reason - The existing plan accepts that the existing road access is inadequate and no increase in aggregate recycled at Salfords Depot, Salfords should be permitted until there is access from that site directly onto the A23 via Salbrook Road.</p> <p>This statement relates to Policy AR1 and AR2 for MM10 and MM12.</p> <p>We would like to be notified when the report of the inspector appointed to carry out the examination of the DPD has been publishes and when the DPD has been adopted.</p> <p>I trust this is all you need. Can you please confirm receipt.</p>
15.Oxted & Limpsfield	MM10	We note that Lambs Brickworks in South Godstone has been deleted. We very much welcome this as the site is unacceptable for aggregates recycling owing to access constraints and the environmental impact on residential

Residents Group		properties.
39. Day Group Ltd	MM10	<p>The following response is made on behalf Day Group Ltd, the site owner/operator of the Salfords Depot Site, Salfords identified within Policy AR2 as suitable for aggregates recycling. The purpose of the response is to confirm the support of the Day Group Ltd for each of the proposed Main Modifications listed above. Each of these Main Modifications relate primarily to the Salfords Depot site.</p> <p>The Main Modifications listed have arisen from confirmation provided by Day Group Ltd in respect of their commitment to bringing the site forward for development and their confirmation that the site could provide for a greater level of production than anticipated in the submission DPD (2011). This confirmation was provided both in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of Day Group Ltd to Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy of the DPD Examination [Feb 2012] and at the EIP itself.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the following information previously provided to the EiP is reconfirmed:</p> <p>Salfords Depot is currently sub-let by Network Rail to Day Group Ltd on a long lease basis. Aggregate is currently imported but in fairly limited quantities. Day Group are currently in the process of preparing redevelopment proposals for the site to provide a new, modern rail aggregate depot and related development (including an aggregate recycling facility).</p> <p>Highways issues previously identified as constraining the site have been resolved by the acquisition of additional land (the former Royal Mail site) by Days to enable access to be taken via the adjoining industrial estate.</p> <p>Depending on the kind of aggregate recycling facility provided, the Salfords site would be expected to produce up to 100,000 tpa.</p> <p>There is no question of limited land availability – the safeguarded aggregates depot area is extensive and totals some 5.1ha. As already confirmed Days Lease a substantial part of the safeguarded area and have acquired additional land to resolve highways and access issues.</p> <p>Days are a well established operator in the aggregates industry and were clear in their previous written submissions and at the EiP as to level of output which could be achieved at Salfords. As a result, the proposed Main Modifications ensure that the DPD reflects the most up to date information available. On this basis they are considered to be “sound” and particularly so in terms of being “justified”.</p>
6. Individual	MM11	Extension of period of time. Alton Road would be used, from 4 – potentially 12 years. Environmental Report. Answer in Part D.
5. Salfords and Sidlow Parish	MM12	I am writing on behalf of Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council in respect of the proposal to increase the amount of aggregate recycled at Salfords Depot, Salfords from 50,000 tpa to 100,000 tpa.

<p>Council</p>		<p>Our comment is</p> <p>The only existing road access to this site is via inadequate narrow residential roads. The proposal to increase the permitted amount of aggregate recycled at Salfords Depot, Salfords from 50,000 tpa to 100,000 tpa should not be allowed until there is access from that site directly onto the A23 via Salbrook Road. Any permitted increase from the current 50,000 tpa should be conditional upon the prior provision of access directly onto the A23 via Salbrook Road.</p> <p>Reason - The existing plan accepts that the existing road access is inadequate and no increase in aggregate recycled at Salfords Depot, Salfords should be permitted until there is access from that site directly onto the A23 via Salbrook Road.</p> <p>This statement relates to Policy AR1 and AR2 for MM10 and MM12.</p> <p>We would like to be notified when the report of the inspector appointed to carry out the examination of the DPD has been publishes and when the DPD has been adopted.</p> <p>I trust this is all you need. Can you please confirm receipt.</p>
<p>39. Day Group Ltd</p>	<p>MM12</p>	<p>The following response is made on behalf Day Group Ltd, the site owner/operator of the Salfords Depot Site, Salfords identified within Policy AR2 as suitable for aggregates recycling. The purpose of the response is to confirm the support of the Day Group Ltd for each of the proposed Main Modifications listed above. Each of these Main Modifications relate primarily to the Salfords Depot site.</p> <p>The Main Modifications listed have arisen from confirmation provided by Day Group Ltd in respect of their commitment to bringing the site forward for development and their confirmation that the site could provide for a greater level of production than anticipated in the submission DPD (2011). This confirmation was provided both in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of Day Group Ltd to Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy of the DPD Examination [Feb 2012] and at the EIP itself.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the following information previously provided to the EIP is reconfirmed:</p> <p>Salfords Depot is currently sub-let by Network Rail to Day Group Ltd on a long lease basis. Aggregate is currently imported but in fairly limited quantities. Day Group are currently in the process of preparing redevelopment proposals for the site to provide a new, modern rail aggregate depot and related development (including an aggregate recycling facility).</p>

		<p>Highways issues previously identified as constraining the site have been resolved by the acquisition of additional land (the former Royal Mail site) by Days to enable access to be taken via the adjoining industrial estate.</p> <p>Depending on the kind of aggregate recycling facility provided, the Salfords site would be expected to produce up to 100,000 tpa.</p> <p>There is no question of limited land availability – the safeguarded aggregates depot area is extensive and totals some 5.1ha. As already confirmed Days Lease a substantial part of the safeguarded area and have acquired additional land to resolve highways and access issues.</p> <p>Days are a well established operator in the aggregates industry and were clear in their previous written submissions and at the EiP as to level of output which could be achieved at Salfords.</p> <p>As a result, the proposed Main Modifications ensure that the DPD reflects the most up to date information available. On this basis they are considered to be “sound” and particularly so in terms of being “justified”.</p>
<p>39. Day Group Ltd</p>	<p>MM13</p>	<p>The following response is made on behalf Day Group Ltd, the site owner/operator of the Salfords Depot Site, Salfords identified within Policy AR2 as suitable for aggregates recycling. The purpose of the response is to confirm the support of the Day Group Ltd for each of the proposed Main Modifications listed above. Each of these Main Modifications relate primarily to the Salfords Depot site.</p> <p>The Main Modifications listed have arisen from confirmation provided by Day Group Ltd in respect of their commitment to bringing the site forward for development and their confirmation that the site could provide for a greater level of production than anticipated in the submission DPD (2011). This confirmation was provided both in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of Day Group Ltd to Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy of the DPD Examination [Feb 2012] and at the EIP itself.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the following information previously provided to the EiP is reconfirmed:</p> <p>Salfords Depot is currently sub-let by Network Rail to Day Group Ltd on a long lease basis. Aggregate is currently imported but in fairly limited quantities. Day Group are currently in the process of preparing redevelopment proposals for the site to provide a new, modern rail aggregate depot and related development (including an aggregate recycling facility).</p> <p>Highways issues previously identified as constraining the site have been resolved by the acquisition of additional land (the former Royal Mail site) by Days to enable access to be taken via the adjoining industrial estate.</p> <p>Depending on the kind of aggregate recycling facility provided, the Salfords site would be expected to produce up to 100,000 tpa.</p>

		<p>There is no question of limited land availability – the safeguarded aggregates depot area is extensive and totals some 5.1ha. As already confirmed Days Lease a substantial part of the safeguarded area and have acquired additional land to resolve highways and access issues.</p> <p>Days are a well established operator in the aggregates industry and were clear in their previous written submissions and at the EiP as to level of output which could be achieved at Salfords. As a result, the proposed Main Modifications ensure that the DPD reflects the most up to date information available. On this basis they are considered to be “sound” and particularly so in terms of being “justified”.</p>
<p>39. Day Group Ltd</p>	<p>MM14</p>	<p>The following response is made on behalf Day Group Ltd, the site owner/operator of the Salfords Depot Site, Salfords identified within Policy AR2 as suitable for aggregates recycling. The purpose of the response is to confirm the support of the Day Group Ltd for each of the proposed Main Modifications listed above. Each of these Main Modifications relate primarily to the Salfords Depot site.</p> <p>The Main Modifications listed have arisen from confirmation provided by Day Group Ltd in respect of their commitment to bringing the site forward for development and their confirmation that the site could provide for a greater level of production than anticipated in the submission DPD (2011). This confirmation was provided both in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of Day Group Ltd to Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy of the DPD Examination [Feb 2012] and at the EIP itself.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the following information previously provided to the EiP is reconfirmed:</p> <p>Salfords Depot is currently sub-let by Network Rail to Day Group Ltd on a long lease basis. Aggregate is currently imported but in fairly limited quantities. Day Group are currently in the process of preparing redevelopment proposals for the site to provide a new, modern rail aggregate depot and related development (including an aggregate recycling facility).</p> <p>Highways issues previously identified as constraining the site have been resolved by the acquisition of additional land (the former Royal Mail site) by Days to enable access to be taken via the adjoining industrial estate.</p> <p>Depending on the kind of aggregate recycling facility provided, the Salfords site would be expected to produce up to 100,000 tpa.</p> <p>There is no question of limited land availability – the safeguarded aggregates depot area is extensive and totals some 5.1ha. As already confirmed Days Lease a substantial part of the safeguarded area and have acquired additional land to resolve highways and access issues.</p> <p>Days are a well established operator in the aggregates industry and were clear in their previous written submissions and at the EiP as to level of output which could be achieved at Salfords.</p>

		Representation Text
39. Day Group Ltd	MM15	<p>As a result, the proposed Main Modifications ensure that the DPD reflects the most up to date information available. On this basis they are considered to be "sound" and particularly so in terms of being "justified".</p> <p>The following response is made on behalf Day Group Ltd, the site owner/operator of the Salfords Depot Site, Salfords identified within Policy AR2 as suitable for aggregates recycling. The purpose of the response is to confirm the support of the Day Group Ltd for each of the proposed Main Modifications listed above. Each of these Main Modifications relate primarily to the Salfords Depot site.</p> <p>The Main Modifications listed have arisen from confirmation provided by Day Group Ltd in respect of their commitment to bringing the site forward for development and their confirmation that the site could provide for a greater level of production than anticipated in the submission DPD (2011). This confirmation was provided both in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of Day Group Ltd to Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy of the DPD Examination [Feb 2012] and at the EIP itself.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the following information previously provided to the EIP is reconfirmed:</p> <p>Salfords Depot is currently sub-let by Network Rail to Day Group Ltd on a long lease basis. Aggregate is currently imported but in fairly limited quantities. Day Group are currently in the process of preparing redevelopment proposals for the site to provide a new, modern rail aggregate depot and related development (including an aggregate recycling facility).</p> <p>Highways issues previously identified as constraining the site have been resolved by the acquisition of additional land (the former Royal Mail site) by Days to enable access to be taken via the adjoining industrial estate.</p> <p>Depending on the kind of aggregate recycling facility provided, the Salfords site would be expected to produce up to 100,000 tpa.</p> <p>There is no question of limited land availability – the safeguarded aggregates depot area is extensive and totals some 5.1ha. As already confirmed Days Lease a substantial part of the safeguarded area and have acquired additional land to resolve highways and access issues.</p> <p>Days are a well established operator in the aggregates industry and were clear in their previous written submissions and at the EIP as to level of output which could be achieved at Salfords.</p> <p>As a result, the proposed Main Modifications ensure that the DPD reflects the most up to date information available. On this basis they are considered to be "sound" and particularly so in terms of being "justified".</p>
17. Manorcroft Primary School	MM16	<p>Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?</p> <p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in</p>

		<p>the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extraction and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
21. Thorpe Ward Residents Association	MM16	<p>We fail to see how locating an aggregate recycling facility at Milton Park Farm in Stroude would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions'. The very opposite would be the case and such a move would in our opinion be contrary to MM1 / policy AR1. Moreover there now appears to be an over concentration on the Runnymede area.</p>
23. Individual	MM16	<p>I am very concerned that an aggregate recycling facility at Milton Park Farm in Stroude would decrease the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and therefore contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>The extra traffic on the roads over the already congested level crossings and busy road network will cause added pollution to an area already blighted by air and motorways.</p> <p>This added pollution gives me concern as a parent of two children at Manorcroft School, where the playing fields would be next to the aggregates recycling facility. Moreover there now appears to be an over concentration on the Runnymede area.</p>
25. Individual	MM16	<p>I am concerned that any activity on the Milton Park Farm for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) I am worried about the possibility of increasing flood risk to the area. If this happens and insurers demand an increase in charges will the council re-imburse us. b) The health of local people at close proximity and the children at Manor Croft school is a major concern.
26. Individual	MM16	<p>The health and well being of residents and particularly local school children at Manorcroft Primary school would (undoubtedly to my mind) be compromised.</p> <p>In my opinion, such a recycling facility located so near to a primary school and a substantial amount of residential housing would certainly not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and so would be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p>
27. RAGE	MM16	<p>It is good to note that sites can be deleted from Policy AR3. The three remaining sites are all in the Runnymede Borough and should all be deleted too. In particular, we contend that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' – Contrary to Policy AR1. Local businesses would probably be forced out of the area; health and well – being of local school children and residents could be compromised; and the risk of flooding in Egham would be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'.</p>

28. Individual	MM16	It seems that although permission has not yet been given for gravel to be raised at Milton Park Far, aggregates might be recycled there, right behind a school which has very young children attending it. Quite how this would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' is a mystery to me and thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). Having heavy lorries driving continuously along the Stroude Road to the M25 can hardly be environmentally friendly and what possible social advantage could there be?
29. Individual	MM16	<p>Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?</p> <p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extractions and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
32. Egham Residents Association	MM16	We are very concerned that the further deletion of sites from Policy AR3 means that the 3 remaining are all in Runnymede Borough. Given the general intent quoted above, we strongly argue that an aggregates recycling facility (ARF) at Milton Park Farm in Egham would not meet this target. We in fact believe quite the opposite as local businesses would move out of the area, health of local (nearby) school children & residents would be severely impacted & the existing risk of flooding would be substantially increased.
33. Individual	MM16	The location is one of a reducing number of sites that have been deleted from the plan deletion of other sites results in the plans focus upon the borough of Runnymede to the extent that the net agglomeration would not improve the overall economic social and environmental conditions that are currently enjoyed in the area.
34. Individual	MM16	The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised.
36. Individual	MM16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns? • Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1. • The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing. • Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extraction and aggregate re-cycling.

37. Individual	MM16	<p>As a retired health and safety advisor (CMIOSH) and a Fellow of the Royal Society for Public Health as well as a Member of the Society of Biology my primary concern is for the health of children and adults in an area where there has already been a need demonstrated for monitoring of air quality as a result of pollutant levels (see also Part D page 18).</p> <p>There appears to be a preponderance of sites proposed for Runnymede, including Milton Park Farm in Egham, which I understand still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction.</p> <p>I cannot envisage how the proposed aggregates recycling facility to be located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would in any way improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>There is a potential for increase risk of flooding in Egham if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry', particularly with the continual development and "concreting over" of Egham, including the proposals by RHUL to build "villages" on their existing sports field.</p>
40. Individual	MM16	<p>I fail to understand how an aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm could in any way improve the environmental conditions in the area. (Contravention of Policy AR1 (MM1)). As a former, now retired, primary school teacher with Surrey County Council, I know that the government's Inspectors of Schools, Ofsted, require in the first instance, that every school be a place of safety for its pupils. Situating a concrete crushing facility nearby Manorcroft Primary school, in Egham, could pose a serious risk to the future health of every child who passes through that school, microscopic dust particles, lodged in the developing lungs of the young could cause damage to children who already use playgrounds and fields adjacent to the busy M25 motorway, where incidents of asthma are prevalent. I would like to know the opinion of the Chief Education Officer for Surrey on this serious matter.</p>
43. Individual	MM16	<p>As well as negatively impacting the environmental conditions in the Milton Park area an aggregate recycling site will also have a negative impact on the economic and social conditions in the area.</p> <p>Along with the increased noise and air pollution affecting Manorcroft School it would also harm local based businesses/ companies potentially forcing them to move which would then have a negative effect on economic/ employment opportunities.</p>
44. Individual	MM16	<p>As well as negatively impacting the environmental conditions in the Milton Park area an aggregate recycling site will also have a negative impact on the economic and social conditions in the area.</p> <p>Along with the increased noise and air pollution affecting Manorcroft School it would also harm local based businesses/ companies potentially forcing them to move which would then have a negative effect on economic/ employment opportunities.</p>

52. Individual	MM16	<p>I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede. ·These include Milton Park Farm in Egham, which still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction. ·In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). ·Local businesses may be forced out of the area. ·The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised. ·The risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'.
54. Individual	MM16	<p>I am worried that the dust and fumes caused by such a site will affect the health of the local school children. The number of asthma sufferers in the UK continues to steadily rise, and the UK already has one of the highest prevalence rates of asthma symptoms in children worldwide. Increasing the amount of dust in the air may be dangerous to children in the area. (Note that this also links in with Part C (Ref AM28)).</p> <p>There is also the potential issue of noise pollution from an industrial site, which may adversely affect the students education.</p>
55. Individual	MM16	<p>As a local resident of Egham town for the past 21 years I wish to record my strongest objection to the Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD.</p> <p>My primary grounds for objection are as follows:</p> <p>I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede. These include Milton Park Farm in Egham, which still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction.</p> <p>In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). My significant concerns are that: 1) local businesses may be forced out of the area; 2) the health and well-being of</p>

		<p>local school-children and residents could be compromised; 3) the risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'. In addition, the current traffic bottlenecks at the level crossings by Egham station and Pooley Green Road will result in disastrous impact on travel for businesses and families at peak times.</p>
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	MM16	<p>Great Fosters is concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations, too much focus is now on Runnymede.</p> <p>In Great Fosters' opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>Great Fosters is extremely concerned about the impact of an aggregate recycling facility on this site because it is so close to the hotel and is certain to have a seriously detrimental adverse impact on both (1) the business of the hotel (in particular our important wedding business – we currently host c. 180 weddings per annum) and (2) its condition as a Grade 1 listed building and Grade 2* listed garden (in particular, Great Fosters is concerned about the risk of flooding which we believe might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry').</p>
59. Individual	MM16	<p>I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede. These include Milton Park Farm in Egham, which still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction.</p> <p>In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1) as stated above.</p> <p>Local businesses in higher value and longer term industries such as P&G and Belron may leave the area as a result of the proximity of the proposed site.</p> <p>The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be severely compromised, particularly by the proximity of the site to Manorcroft school and nursery.</p>
60. Individual	MM16	<p>Now that a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede have been deleted, this plan lacks balance and puts too much focus on the remaining sites in Runnymede. Please demonstrate how this is not a bias by the council to put a facility in North West Surrey, rather than give full consideration to all areas.</p> <p>Milton Park Farm in Egham is still left in this document but it still does not have planning permission granted for gravel extraction. It remains highly questionable if it will be granted, not least because, if Milton Park Farm is worked dry, independent hydrology experts have advised us that it could hugely increase the flood risk for many</p>

		<p>properties in Egham due to the impermeable clay dam that would be created around each of the excavation areas. If it is not worked dry, then the aggregates recycling facility does not need to be placed as an additional burden on this area. Again, please demonstrate the justification for leaving this site in the plan.</p> <p>Please demonstrate how an aggregates recycling plant in the Green Belt at Milton Park Farm, immediately next to a primary school, nursery and housing estate that already abuts a known AQMA will 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' in line with Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>This is particularly pertinent with regards the health of local school-children and residents living and studying next to, or even in, that AQMA. I was told at the previous hearing that the aggregates recycling process takes place in an enclosed area, but I have since seen evidence of the heaps of material that exist prior (or perhaps post?) this process, and they are certainly not enclosed, have a lot of dust around them and I have no doubt in my mind that they would impact the levels of dust borne particles in the air in this sensitive area. I am already acutely aware of the particles in the air as we live on the Manorcroft Estate, my son attends Manorcroft School and he has been hospitalised with breathing difficulties on a number of occasions – the current level of dust is evident on cars, windowsills and windows. I not only expect the council to protect us from any <i>possible</i> increased risk of pollution in this recognised problem area, but I also appeal as a mother to you to please reconsider this ridiculous proposal for our community. It is a potential danger and, as such, I trust that it is the duty of care of Surrey County Council to stop this proposal from going any further.</p>
61. Individual	MM16	<p>Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?</p> <p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extractions and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
62. Individual	MM16	<p>Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?</p> <p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p>

		<p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extractions and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
63. Individual	MM16	The number of possible sites outside Runnymede has been reduced. This now renders disproportionate further attention on sites in Runnymede.
64. Individual	MM16	An aggregates recycling facility will not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and in thus contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1) The health and well-being of residents could be compromised.
67. Individual	MM16	I am concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents would be compromised. I have 2 children at Manorcroft school, one with asthma. I am also sure that an aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, as I believe it will drive out businesses and families from the area, and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).
74. Individual	MM16	<p>I am concerned that since the list of possible locations has been shortened there is too much focus on the borough of Runnymede. In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not "improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area" and would thus contradict Policy AR1 (MM1). In no small part it would affect the social amenity of the area in which improves our quality of life at the present time. It will also have adverse environmental effects in terms of increased traffic, dust and noise.</p> <p>I am concerned that the health and well-being of the local community will be compromised, a long with their safety if the Milton Park Farm site is used. The increased in traffic will add to pollution, along with dust particulates. Flooding is a real potential risk here if the site is worked 'dry'.</p>
75. Individual	MM16	<p>Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?</p> <p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extractions and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
78. Individual	MM16	Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?

		<p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extractions and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
79. Individual	MM16	<p>Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns?</p> <p>Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing.</p> <p>Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extractions and aggregate re-cycling.</p>
88. Individual	MM16	<p>I disagree that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'. On the contrary it would blight the entire area:</p> <p>The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised.</p> <p>The risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'</p> <p>Local businesses may be forced out of the area.</p>
91. Individual	MM16	<p>Locating an aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm (Egham) would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). Therefore please delete it. Local businesses would most likely be forced out of the area; the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be jeopardised; and the risk of flooding in residential areas of Egham would most probably be increased if Milton Park Farm were quarried dry.</p> <p>I understand that active quarrying is a pre-requisite for an aggregates recycling facility (Policy WD3, Surrey Waste Plan). The issue on the potential increase in flood risk arises primarily in regard to quarrying the site 'dry', for which an impermeable clay wall would be inserted around the perimeter of the working site and this area would be continuously pumped. This perimeter wall would however impede the natural flow of groundwater. Strong</p>

		objections to this planning application have been lodged long ago from numerous residents, from local businesses and from Runnymede Borough Council.
92. Individual	MM16	<p>I actually cannot believe that Surrey would even contemplate putting such a facility behind a pre-school & primary school. This completely immoral and defies believe. Both my daughters went to that school as do my niece & nephew and hundreds of other small citizens who have no voice of their own. This is a residential area with other children, elderly people, professional and families all contributing to a vibrant community. There is no doubt that breathing the dust from this facility will damage the health of the residents and in particular the toddlers & children who will come to school each day in this environment. We have a duty of care to these children and Surrey County Council just doesn't care. We the residents work hard & pay significant council tax to live in a good part of Surrey. In return it would appear that Surrey will repay us by poisoning our children. If Surrey does not see sense then this is clearly an issue that needs to be brought to the attention of the national press "Surrey County Council builds concrete Recycling Plant in Infant School Playing Field".</p> <p>This disruption to the area will ultimately cause a decline in local business and irreparably destroy the town. Have you ever waited at Egham Level Crossing in the morning? The infrastructure is already at breaking point! Finally the area is already in the flood pain and has a high water table. Any large scale of work at Milton Farm would increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>This is all in direct contravention to policy AR1 (MM1) as it would destroy the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p>
100. Individual	MM16	<p>An aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm would contradict Policy AR1 (MM1) ie. Would not improve the "economic social and environmental conditions in the area"</p> <p>As a parent, I am concerned about the health implications for my children and children in the local area (particularly on the proposed site back onto Manorcroft School) as a result of increased pollution from particle lorries.</p> <p>The risk of flooding may be increased due to the proposal to work the site "dry".</p>
101. Spelthorne Borough Council	MM16	On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
102. Individual	MM16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns? • Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions

		<p>in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing. • Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extraction and aggregate re-cycling.
104. Individual	MM16	<p>I disagree that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'. On the contrary it would blight the entire area:</p> <p>The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised.</p> <p>The risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'</p> <p>Local businesses may be forced out of the area.</p>
105. Individual	MM16	<p>It is looking like you are now only considering areas within Runnymede and yet this area, in particular around Egham, is already completely congested from a traffic perspective and so the impact on residents and small businesses is liable to be toxic.</p> <p>I can't believe that you can be of the opinion that any development of this type, even if temporary (if 10 plus years can be considered temporary) will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>Certainly from an environmental perspective the increased pollution from 10's of diesel powered lorries per day and the concrete laden dust that will be blown in all directions (next to a school!) will be hugely detrimental to Egham.</p>
106. Individual	MM16	<p>The focus on Runnymede sites cannot be justified, when other sites outside Runnymede have been deleted. An aggregate recycling facility at Milton Park, near a school, is an extraordinarily bad idea in terms of the effect on the children's health, not to mention the environment.</p> <p>As recent events in other parts of the country have demonstrated, the country is more susceptible to flooding. Anything that increases the risk of flooding, such as working dry the minerals in Milton Farm Park, would not be prudent. This also relates to page 9, section 10 (Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding).</p>
108. Individual	MM16	<p>I am concerned that there is too much focus on the Egham sites and that an aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm will not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). Access to and from the site will overload the already busy local A roads and railway crossings and has the potential of driving local businesses out of the area.</p>

111. Individual	MM16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting a number of sites, leaving Milton Park Farm as one of the main contenders, despite local concerns. Are commercial considerations outweighing serious local concerns? • Aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, which is contrary to Policy AR1. • The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Primary School would be compromised, where incidence of asthma and other similar conditions are already increasing. • Manorcroft Primary School suffers, in line with the rest of Egham, from flooding, which will be exacerbated with dry gravel extraction and aggregate re-cycling.
110. Individual	MM16	<p>Runnymede seems to be the focus location and I am not happy with this. We have had more than enough disruption in this area.</p> <p>I cannot see how 'economic, social and environmental conditions in the area ' will be improved by an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm. This will be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1)</p> <p>It will be disastrous for environment, health, well being. It will affect economy as people move and do not want to come to this area to live thus affecting businesses in this area. The health of the young and the elderly could be badly affected. Being trapped in an unhealthy environment can cause distress and mental illness. There is evidence that if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry' there could be the risk of flooding.</p> <p>I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.</p>
115. Individual	MM16	<p>I love my children. That is why I cannot believe that Surrey would even contemplate putting such a facility behind a pre-school & primary school. This completely immoral and defies believe. Both my daughters went to that school as do my niece & nephew and hundreds of other small citizens who have no voice of their own. This is a residential area with other children, elderly people, professional and families all contributing to a vibrant community. There is no doubt that breathing the dust from this facility will damage the health of residents and in particular the toddlers & children who will come to school each day in this environment. We have a duty of care to these children and Surrey County Council just doesn't care.</p> <p>I must therefore assume that the Council Committee have no children of their own otherwise they would not consider it. How can you consider condemning a 5 year old to breathe particles of concrete, sand and other contaminates which may be present in the recycled material such as asbestos, could possibly be ethical?</p> <p>I would challenge you to visit the school and sit down with the children, look them in the eye and explain how you</p>

		<p>are going to damage their lungs and give them cancer. If you were also to let Whitehall Farm use this facility this will be with us forever.</p> <p>We the residents work hard & pay significant council tax to live in a good part Surrey. In return it would appear that Surrey will repay us by poisoning our children. If Surrey does not see sense then this will clearly be an issue that needs to be brought to the attention of the national press "Surrey Council puts Concrete Recycling Plant in Infant School Playing Field"</p> <p>The disruption to the area will ultimately cause a decline in local business and irreparably destroy the town. Have you ever waited at Egham Level Crossing in the morning? The infrastructure is already at breaking point! Finally the area is already in the flood plain and has a high water table. Any large scale work at Milton Farm would increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>This is all indirect contravention to Policy AR1 (MM1) as it would destroy the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p>
117. Individual	MM16	<p>I disagree that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'. On the contrary it would blight the entire area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised. • The risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry' • Local businesses may be forced out of the area. <p>(Duplicate of 104)</p>
118. Individual	MM16	<p>I am extremely concerned about this plan for the proposed aggregates recycling plant.</p> <p>I am especially concerned about the following.</p> <p>It seems that although permission has not yet been given for gravel to be raised at Milton Park Farm, aggregates might be recycled there, right behind a school which has very young children attending it. Quite how this would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' is a mystery to me and thus and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). Having heavy lorries driving continuously along the Stroude Road to the M25 can hardly be environmentally friendly and what possible social advantage could there be?</p>
124. Individual	MM16	<p>An aggregate recycling plant at Milton Park Farm would not "improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area" indeed it would adversely effect these conditions. Contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). The proposed location next to housing and a school would adversely affect the health and safety of these occupants and children in an area already affected by poor air quality. An aggregates "factory" surely cannot be regarded as suitable in a "green belt" area.</p>

		<p>Whilst aggregate recycling is a welcome process to reduce the need for newly land won aggregates its location must be suitable so that it does not adversely affect the existing visual amenity in the area. The proposed location would create an unacceptable view as people approach Egham for Virginia Water and Thorpe lea. The proposed mineral extraction from Milton Park Farm will cause an unacceptable lengthy period of working and would be extended further by the aggregate recycling facility. It would be now used to re-instate the gravel pits it would be a separate stand alone concrete factory. Whilst vehicle movements may be controlled in some degree by the Gravel company – the inward delivery of demolition materials will not. The extra lorry movements would adversely affect the safety and congestion on the already overloaded road currently in the area.</p>
125. Individual	MM16	<p>It is too convenient for SCC Councillors to look to the North of the County and well away from their own leafy areas, for this new recycling site. North West Surrey already has 6 operational recycling sites, far more than elsewhere in the County. Too much focus is on sites in Runnymede.</p> <p>Egham is being destroyed, cut by cut. Originally a prosperous, busy little town and our home for several decades, it has been eyed greedily by planners, road builders and exploiters for its location and resources. This application is perhaps the final cut as I doubt the town's businesses and residential community will be able to survive this pillage. We beg you to reject these proposals and share the requirements for growing the county far more equally amongst its residents.</p>
126. Individual	MM16	<p>The health and wellbeing of pupils and staff at Manorcroft Nursery and Manorcroft School would be compromised. Aggregate recycling would not improve the economy with local businesses likely to be forced out.</p>
127. Individual	MM16	<p>As above plus the commercial impact on the local economy could be a significant problem due to congestion created by site traffic. The reduced rates and rents resulting from business closures would negatively affect the financial benefits gained from these businesses as well as jobs.</p>
128. Individual	MM16	<p>The statement that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' is in my opinion incorrect and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1):</p> <p>My child has just started at Manorcroft school. The proposal to have aggregate recycling next to a school would greatly impact environmental conditions with added dust and noise. Furthermore her walk to school would be made more dangerous by the many lorry journeys expected, and if we were force to drive her to school we would add to pollution and prevent her from essential exercise so encouraged by our government, council and schools.</p> <p>As described above, the aggregate recycling is associated with lorry movements which would in my opinion adversely impact current and new business staying/relocating to Egham. Companies such as P&G and Belron which also employ local staff, could be made to leave.</p> <p>I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too</p>

		much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede. These include Milton Park Farm in Egham, which still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction.
129. Individual	MM16	<p>As Egham residents We already live under the flight path, have a mainline railway connection are within a mile of one of the busiest motorways in Europe - with the noise and air pollution associated with these our air quality and quality of life is already compromised.As a local school governor and someone with a heart condition from birth I am very concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised and do not believe that this has been adequately factored into the proposal. There is much evidence to suggest that air borne particulates cause respiration issues in the younge old and inform.</p> <p>I do not believe that a council representing our interests can support such a gravel development.</p> <p>With I therefore object with the following specifics:</p> <p>I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede. These include Milton Park Farm in Egham, which still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction. In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). As a local school governor and someone with a heart condition from birth I am very concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised.</p>
27. RAGE	MM17	While the operator may have stated an 'interest in undertaking aggregate recycling in connection with the Milton Park Farm site', Hanson still has to comply with all environmental constraints detailed in Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD.
31. Procter & Gamble	MM17	The risk of our site flooding may be increased by the need, inherent in this proposal, to work the Milton Park Site dry.
91. Individual	MM17	The environmental constraints on Milton Park Farm are considerable. While the operator may have stated an 'interest in undertaking aggregate recycling in connection with the Milton Park Farm site, Hanson has still to comply with all ten points listed in Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan <i>Core Strategy DPD</i> . I think it worthwhile to remind ourselves of these ten points, which are prefaced by sentences including: ' <i>Mineral development will be permitted only where a need has been demonstrated and the applicant has provided information sufficient for the mineral planning authority to be satisfied that there would be no significant adverse impacts arising from the development.</i> '

		<p>1) Noise, dust, fumes, vibration, illumination, including that related to traffic, generated by the development;</p> <p>2) Flood risk, including opportunities to enhance flood storage, groundwater and surface water quality, and land drainage; and, I recall, an official change (CS/PC/20) to include dewatering and its potential impacts;</p> <p>3) The appearance, quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness;</p> <p>4) The natural environment, biodiversity and geological conservation interests;</p> <p>5) The historic landscape, sites or structures of architectural and historic interest and their settings, and sites of existing or potential archaeological interest or their settings;</p> <p>6) Public open space, the rights of way network, and outdoor recreational facilities;</p> <p>7) The use, quality and integrity of land and soil resources, land stability and the integrity of adjoining transport infrastructure;</p> <p>8)The need to manage the risk of birds striking aircraft;</p> <p>9) Cumulative impacts arising from the interactions between mineral developments, and between mineral and other forms of development;</p> <p>10) Any other matter relevant to the planning application.</p>
<p>121. Belron International Limited</p>	<p>MM17</p>	<p>At paragraph 187 (p45) the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to work proactively to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It is clear that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not accord with this requirement.</p> <p>At page 13 of the Assessment of Compliance with the NPPF the County Council confirms their unique approach in preparing a site-specific rather than criteria based plan. This however places undue reliance upon the grant of consent for mineral working at the sites concerned and also on the bringing forward of applications to recycle material there.</p> <p>A clear weakness in this approach is the lack of any certainty that consent for gravel extraction will be forthcoming and, to date, there have been only "expressions of interest" in respect of recycling at two Policy AR3 sites. It is therefore considered that it is unsafe to rely solely upon the limited number of sites identified in revised Policy AR3</p>

		<p>and that a criteria based approach would be more flexible.</p> <p>Chart 6 shows projected sales from possible recycling facilities at Milton Park Farm and the two remaining Policy AR3 sites for the period 2010–2026. This reflects the deletion of three of the original six sites identified and an expression of interest by the proposed operator at Milton Park Farm.</p> <p>The chart now shows the production of secondary aggregate starting in mid-2013, with sales from Milton Park Farm coming on stream in mid-2014. This is despite the fact that no applications for recycling facilities have been submitted for any of these sites, two of which do not presently have consent for mineral extraction.</p> <p>There is as yet no mineral consent in place at Milton Park Farm and no application has been submitted for a recycling facility here. Furthermore enquiries of the County Council have not identified any firm proposals to work mineral or to recycle inert CD & E waste at the Hamm Court Farm site. An application is before the Council in respect of an extension of the working life of Addlestone Quarry (until 31st December 2014 only) and it is currently anticipated that this application will be determined in January 2013.</p> <p>The Council officer contacted in respect of the planning status of Addlestone Quarry was unable confirm the existence of either an existing consent or application for CD & E recycling here. Clearly therefore the timescales set out in Chart 6 are over optimistic and are not based upon hard evidence.</p> <p>Whilst some confusion also arises as a result of the reference, at MM19 (p11), to Milton Park Farm, Salfords Depot, Redhill, and Penton Hook Marina as being the three sites where the operators have indicated their firm intentions to bring forward proposals, it has been assumed that the latter two sites are additional to the "<i>Remaining Policy AR3 sites</i>" referred to in Chart 6.</p>
27. RAGE	MM18	Chart 6 assumes that permission for working Milton Park Farm has already been granted, which is not the case.
32. Egham Residents Association	MM18	Chart 6 assumes that permission for initial gravel workings at Milton Park Farm has already been granted, which is clearly not the case & this inaccuracy should be rectified.
121. Belron International Limited	MM18	<p>At paragraph 187 (p45) the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities to work proactively to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It is clear that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not accord with this requirement.</p> <p>At page 13 of the Assessment of Compliance with the NPPF the County Council confirms their unique approach in preparing a site-specific rather than criteria based plan. This however places undue reliance upon the grant of consent for mineral working at the sites concerned and also on the bringing forward of applications to recycle material there.</p>

		<p>A clear weakness in this approach is the lack of any certainty that consent for gravel extraction will be forthcoming and, to date, there have been only "expressions of interest" in respect of recycling at two Policy AR3 sites. It is therefore considered that it is unsafe to rely solely upon the limited number of sites identified in revised Policy AR3 and that a criteria based approach would be more flexible.</p> <p>Chart 6 shows projected sales from possible recycling facilities at Milton Park Farm and the two remaining Policy AR3 sites for the period 2010–2026. This reflects the deletion of three of the original six sites identified and an expression of interest by the proposed operator at Milton Park Farm.</p> <p>The chart now shows the production of secondary aggregate starting in mid-2013, with sales from Milton Park Farm coming on stream in mid-2014. This is despite the fact that no applications for recycling facilities have been submitted for any of these sites, two of which do not presently have consent for mineral extraction.</p> <p>There is as yet no mineral consent in place at Milton Park Farm and no application has been submitted for a recycling facility here. Furthermore enquiries of the County Council have not identified any firm proposals to work mineral or to recycle inert CD & E waste at the Hamm Court Farm site. An application is before the Council in respect of an extension of the working life of Addlestone Quarry (until 31st December 2014 only) and it is currently anticipated that this application will be determined in January 2013.</p> <p>The Council officer contacted in respect of the planning status of Addlestone Quarry was unable confirm the existence of either an existing consent or application for CD & E recycling here. Clearly therefore the timescales set out in Chart 6 are over optimistic and are not based upon hard evidence.</p> <p>Whilst some confusion also arises as a result of the reference, at MM19 (p11), to Milton Park Farm, Salfords Depot, Redhill, and Penton Hook Marina as being the three sites where the operators have indicated their firm intentions to bring forward proposals, it has been assumed that the latter two sites are additional to the "<i>Remaining Policy AR3 sites</i>" referred to in Chart 6.</p>
33. Individual	MM19	Overall development of aggregate facilities in this area is already extensive and thus industrial activity is in conflict with the overall intent of planning and development of the Green Belt around London.
21. Thorpe Ward Residents Association	MM19	Aggregate recycling facilities and the manufacture of concrete do not seem to us to be appropriate activities for Green Belt locations.
27. RAGE	MM19	Bearing in mind the proximity of other aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside NW Surrey) it is not obvious that any further such facilities are required or justified. It would be most instructive to see the whole picture, with estimated production rates from all such facilities. The paragraph about the Green Belt is interesting. We question whether industrial operations of aggregates recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt.

28. Individual	MM19	There are already other aggregate recycling facilities in NW Surrey so surely we do not need more.
32. Egham Residents Association	MM19	As there are already several existing ARFs in the locality, several of which are operating well below capacity, why is any further facility requires or justified? We also query whether "industrial operations of aggregate recycling & concrete manufacture" are legitimate on Green Belt classified land?
34. Individual	MM19	I question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt.
37. Individual	MM19	With the existence of of several aggregates recycling facilities within a relatively close proximity, the construction of another including concrete manufacture, particularly on Green Belt (if this is even legitimate use of the land) is unacceptable.
39. Day Group Ltd	MM19	<p>The following response is made on behalf Day Group Ltd, the site owner/operator of the Salfords Depot Site, Salfords identified within Policy AR2 as suitable for aggregates recycling. The purpose of the response is to confirm the support of the Day Group Ltd for each of the proposed Main Modifications listed above. Each of these Main Modifications relate primarily to the Salfords Depot site.</p> <p>The Main Modifications listed have arisen from confirmation provided by Day Group Ltd in respect of their commitment to bringing the site forward for development and their confirmation that the site could provide for a greater level of production than anticipated in the submission DPD (2011). This confirmation was provided both in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of Day Group Ltd to Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy of the DPD Examination [Feb 2012] and at the EIP itself.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the following information previously provided to the EIP is reconfirmed:</p> <p>Salfords Depot is currently sub-let by Network Rail to Day Group Ltd on a long lease basis. Aggregate is currently imported but in fairly limited quantities. Day Group are currently in the process of preparing redevelopment proposals for the site to provide a new, modern rail aggregate depot and related development (including an aggregate recycling facility).</p> <p>Highways issues previously identified as constraining the site have been resolved by the acquisition of additional land (the former Royal Mail site) by Days to enable access to be taken via the adjoining industrial estate.</p> <p>Depending on the kind of aggregate recycling facility provided, the Salfords site would be expected to produce up to 100,000 tpa.</p> <p>There is no question of limited land availability – the safeguarded aggregates depot area is extensive and totals some 5.1ha. As already confirmed Days Lease a substantial part of the safeguarded area and have acquired additional land to resolve highways and access issues.</p>

		<p>Days are a well established operator in the aggregates industry and were clear in their previous written submissions and at the EiP as to level of output which could be achieved at Salfords.</p> <p>As a result, the proposed Main Modifications ensure that the DPD reflects the most up to date information available. On this basis they are considered to be "sound" and particularly so in terms of being "justified".</p>
40. Individual	MM19	<p>I demand to know why aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture can be permitted so close to residential areas and within Green Belt. I fear that microscopic air-borne particles of sand and cement might lodge in the lungs of children and older residents, like myself. I fear that I may be forced to leave my home of thirty years, due to respiratory problems.</p>
52. Individual	MM19	<p>I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life.</p> <p>·There are already several aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside NW Surrey) – any further such facilities are not required or justified.</p> <p>·I question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt.</p>
56. Great Foster (1931) Ltd	MM19	<p>There are already several aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside NW Surrey) – any further such facilities are not required or justified.</p> <p>As mentioned above, Great Fosters operates its business from a Grade 1 listed building and Grade 2* listed garden. We question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt, in such close proximity to a site of this historic and architectural significance. We believe that English Heritage share our concerns in this regard and trust they have been consulted.</p>
59. Individual	MM19	<p>Milton Park Farm does not yet have planning permission, the fact that "operators have indicated their firm intentions to bring forward proposals" is irrelevant until planning permission has been granted. The operator at Milton Park farm has stalled on their application for planning permission for over 3 years. Until planning is granted for the gravel extraction then the site should not even be considered for Aggregates recycling.</p> <p>I question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt.</p> <p>MM19 outlines that "with a significant proportion of land designated Green Belt might not be able to implement their full apportionment through site allocations in the development plan documents. Having tested the extent to which this applies in Surrey, it is apparent that this may be the case" - if this is the case why is Surrey progressing with the inclusion of Green Belt sites such as Milton Park Farm in their Development Plan?</p>

Rep No	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
60. Individual	MM19	<p>How robust is the justification of the business need to have yet another aggregate recycling site in (or immediately around) North West Surrey? Again, are we, the poor relations and outpost of Surrey, being used as a fall guy when other locations would be more appropriate? The distribution of sites certainly doesn't look balanced throughout the county (charts under AM33 and AM35), and if you are looking to set up more facilities in North West Surrey in order to import waste from outside the county for commercial gain, then that is certainly not in the best interests of the residents of North West Surrey and I would very strongly reject this profiteering in favour of our quality of life (I refer you to point 3). Although Surrey County Council is reportedly strapped for cash, this kind of sell-out would be completely abhorrent and unacceptable.</p> <p>How do you justify aggregates recycling, an industrial operation, in the Green Belt? This is especially pertinent for the Milton Park Farm site because the huge, industrial plant (currently proposed for the area north of Stroude Road) would be blatantly visible from the elevated approach to Egham from Thorpe. This is a totally unacceptable installment for Egham, which would be in situ for the next 15-25 years, as it turns our historical little town, backed by the National Trust Runnymede Hills on this approach, into a dirty mining town. [This also ties in with Part E and the NPPF]</p>
64. Individual	MM19	There are several aggregate recycling facilities in the local area and any further such facilities are not required nor can be justified.
74. Individual	MM19	There are definitely several aggregates recycling sites in the locality, both within and also just outside North West. More sites are neither needed or justified. I would question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in Green Belt land.
92. Individual	MM19	There are already several aggregate recycling facilities in the area and frankly you don't need anymore. These should NEVER be situated in a residential area. I would also suggest that any such activities in the Green Belt are actually illegal.
100. Individual	MM19	<p>There are already several recycling facilities in the local area – (both within and just outside NW Surrey). Anymore are not justified.</p> <p>The nature of what "Green belt" land stands for is compromised, in my opinion, through a scheme that transforms the land for such a sustained period of time.</p>
105. Individual	MM19	<p>Isn't there a aggregates recycling centre in Ashford (Middx) already, I see from the train everyday so how can you possibly need another next to Manorcroft School?</p> <p>Not to mention that the area is already considered protected from a development aspect, so you cannot possibly justify this proposal.</p>
106. Individual	MM19	It have not been satisfactorily demonstrated that a further aggregate recycling plant to the county's existing plants is necessary. It is certainly not desirable in the green belt.

Rep No	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
108. Individual	MM19	There will be a permanent loss of Green Belt amenity land along with associated ancient trees and hedges (the remnants of ancient woodland) so I would query whether industrial operations of this type and scale are justifiable within the Green Belt.
110. Individual	MM19	<p>Several aggregates recycling facilities are already operational in NW Surrey and just outside it. We believe that there is no justification or reason for more facilities of this kind. Green Belt is precious, it is protected and is it proper for industrial operations of aggregate recycling to take place on Green Belt land?</p> <p>I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.</p>
113. Individual	MM19	There are already several aggregate recycling sites in the area and it is an inappropriate thing to be placed in the Green Belt. The borough of Runnymede is in the top 10 for flood risk and these workings will exacerbate the risk. The traffic congestion is already a big problem for Milton Park Farm and surrounding roads. All main routes are crossed by rail tracks with level crossings. This causes high levels of congestion and the additional lorry traffic will compound the existing problem. The particles given off by these working are a risk to human health and the placing of such a site next to a primary school is highly inappropriate. Why is air quality not deemed to be of significance?
115. Individual	MM19	There are already several aggregate recycling facilities in the area and frankly you don't need anymore. These should NEVER be situated in a residential area. I would also suggest that any such activities in the Green Belt are actually illegal.
118. Individual	MM19	<p>I am extremely concerned about this plan for the proposed aggregates recycling plant.</p> <p>I am especially concerned about the following.</p> <p>There are already other aggregate recycling facilities in NW Surrey so surely we do not need more.</p>
124. Individual	MM19	<p>An aggregate recycling plant at Milton Park Farm would not "improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area "indeed it would adversely effect these conditions. Contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). The proposed location next to housing and a school would adversely affect the health and safety of these occupants and children in an area already affected by poor air quality. An aggregates "factory" surely cannot be regarded as suitable in a "green belt" area.</p> <p>Whilst aggregate recycling is a welcome process to reduce the need for newly land won aggregates its location</p>

		<p>must be suitable so that it does not adversely affect the existing visual amenity in the area. The proposed location would create an unacceptable view as people approach Egham for Virginia Water and Thorpe lea. The proposed mineral extraction from Milton Park Farm will cause an unacceptable lengthy period of working and would be extended further by the aggregate recycling facility. It would be now used to re-instate the gravel pits it would be a separate stand alone concrete factory. Whilst vehicle movements may be controlled in some degree by the Gravel company – the inward delivery of demolition materials will not. The extra lorry movements would adversely affect the safety and congestion on the already overloaded road currently in the area.</p>
129. Individual	MM19	<p>As Egham residents We already live under the flight path, have a mainline railway connection are within a mile of one of the busiest motorways in Europe - with the noise and air pollution associated with these our air quality and quality of life is already compromised.As a local school governor and someone with a heart condition from birth I am very concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised and do not believe that this has been adequately factored into the proposal. There is much evidence to suggest that air borne particulates cause respiration issues in the younge old and inform.</p> <p>I do not believe that a council representing our interests can support such a gravel development.</p> <p>With I therefore object with the following specifics: I question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt.</p>
101. Spelthorne Borough Council	MM23	<p>On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.</p>
133. Natural England	MM23	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 8 August 2012, and for consulting Natural England regarding the above. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Our previous letter dated 218 October 2012 regarding impacts on Ockham & Wisley Commons SSSI, part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, arising from possible increased waste recycling at Wisley Airfield still apply and should be referred to in conjunction with this letter.</p> <p>We note that there has been a reduction in sites proposed and although the Authority has consequently identified a potential substantial reduction in facilities, should recycled materials continue to be available, it may in turn increase pressure on sites such as Wisley Airfield.</p> <p>The thresholds in our previous letter will apply; Based on the information provided regarding the likely aggregates output of any such facility, the number of daily HGV loads that this would result in and the current guidance on air quality impacts it is Natural England's view that the threshold for likely significant effect will not be exceeded if the</p>

		<p>lorry movements are less than 200 Annual Average Daily Traffic Movements. It might be helpful to consider whether these movements would be likely to be exceeded regarding traffic travelling through the SSSI to access the site and whether in this case, in view of the sensitivity of the Airfield site and the potential pressures on this site, you may wish to consider whether a maximum input might be applicable at this site so as not to give rise to Likely Significant Effects. I hope these comments are helpful,</p>
2. Individual	General	<p>1. As previously stated: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Noise B. Dust and pollution C. Vibration and load / weight of truck on roads i.e. more repairs will be required, pot holes. D. Environmental issues E. Water table. F. Increased traffic flow G. A dig needs to take place to ensure no items of 'historic interest' in the land to be dug. H. Wildlife will be distributed I. We in this area have enough traffic problems and noise (Aircraft and traffic) to deal with. <p>Can you not please look at another site away from the Egham area!</p>
3. Individual	General	<p>On receiving a document from you concerning Surrey Minerals and waste development Framework etc., I would like to know if this document and all it implies is to do with the piece of land at Weybourne, also known as the Strategic gap, if so I have previously stated at a meeting some time ago that the land does <u>not</u> belong to Surrey County Council or Waverley Council as it was sold off in at least 100 plots in the late 70s / 80s to people from all over the UK as it was formerly advertised in the national newspapers, hence why people come near and far to purchase the plots.</p> <p>I also stated at the meeting that there is a public right of way across that land which is used daily by the pupils of five schools in the area.</p> <p>Another factor being the electricity pylon which dominates that area, and as I see it if the ground surrounding it is excavated and fills with water, that surely must weaken the base of the pylon to disastrous effects.</p> <p>I would think that there is enough land being excavated in and around Surrey as it is to meet the demand for aggregates as required by each county.</p>
7. Health Protection Agency	General	<p>Thank you for sharing the main and additional modifications, updated environmental report and compliance with national planning policy framework documents with the Health Protection Agency.</p> <p>We have no comments on the documents from a health protection perspective.</p>

8. Individual	General	<p>Please register my objection to the above planned development. I am unable to access your complicated information on line but wish to assure you that I am still vehemently opposed to all and every aspect of this development. I do not trust the safeguards promised.</p> <p>Why should all Surrey's rubbish be dumped on a little Thameside village, in the middle of housing and very near to a primary school.</p> <p>This development must be stopped at all costs. The plant should be sited in the middle of the countryside. We have terrible pollution here already from road and air traffic.</p> <p>I suspect this is a way of raising money totally disregarding the objections of the local people.</p>
9. Gatwick Airport limited	General	<p>Thank you for your letter/email dated 08 August 2012 regarding the above mentioned document.</p> <p>We have assessed the following documents from an Aerodrome Safeguarding Perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Modifications • Additional Modifications • Updated Environmental Report • Compliance with national Planning Policy Framework <p>We can confirm that we have no further aerodrome safeguarding comments to make with regard to the above mentioned documents. Our letter of response to the Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Documents, dated 08 September 2011 still stands.</p> <p>Please be advised that the advice given is informal and without prejudice to the consideration of any planning application which may be referred to us pursuant to Planning Circular 01/2003 in consultation under the safeguarding procedure. It cannot be assumed that any response to consultation under Planning Circular 01/2003 will necessarily coincide with the informal advice now given. We will not have any liability to you or third parties who may follow this advice.</p>
10. Runnymede Christian Fellowship	General	<p>I am very concerned regarding the lack of confident clarity that the impact on water table and surface water will be impacted, assessed and reviewed.</p>
11. London Borough of Richmond	General	<p>This is to confirm that the London Borough of Richmond do not wish to make any representations on the above consultation.</p>
12. Individual	General	<p>The only comment I have to make on this document is this. The extraction of minerals in this area will be a disaster. Meadowlands is a quiet, peaceful park (mainly retired people) like an old time country village. The traffic is already a nightmare locally without tipper lorry drivers!</p>
13. Individual	General	<p>I am writing with regard to the possibility of a concrete and aggregates crushing plant being installed in a field</p>

		<p>behind Manorcroft School, which is local to me.</p> <p>Having lived in Egham for the past 9 years, I have been closely following the issue through local interest groups, of commercial gravel extraction in the area, and share the popular concerns that such practice, for many reasons, is harmful not only to the well-being of residents in the area, but only indicates a negative impact as a whole for our community. Net, net, so far have heard no reason of any kind that this will benefit anyone who lives in the area.</p> <p>Indeed all indications so far, including the health and well-being of schoolchildren and residents (pollution leading to poor air quality), increased risk of flooding (already a concern for the future, without this adding to it), and forcing local businesses out of Egham, naturally leave us firmly against this venture. Not to mention the huge increase in heavy lorry traffic on the minor roads in Egham, substantially lowering the quality of our lives, and adding to the already significant burden of having 2 levels crossing either side of the town, causing even greater problems.</p> <p>I chose to live in Egham, for exactly the reasons I now find myself having to defend against this issue, and strongly support the Anti-Gravel Campaign to stop this happening.</p> <p>I trust this letter will serve and add to the overwhelming local concern and condemnation of this practice, for once and for all.</p>
<p>14. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I herewith very strongly object to the plans to extract minerals from the land in EGHAM and also to the waste aggregate recycling.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to do either of these on the land directly behind a school the disruption to the children through noise, air pollution and loss of facilities is not acceptable</p> <p>The traffic congestion by lorries and increased other traffic will exacerbate an already congested area because of the level crossing</p> <p>This plan is within a green belt area so is therefore not appropriate</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THESE PLANS TO DESTROY THIS AREA FURTHER</p>
<p>16. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and</p>

		<p>cement dust.</p> <p>I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard.</p> <p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.</p>
18. Individual	General	<p>I am retired, live on the Manorcraft Estate in Egham and know that my life and that of my fellow residents in Egham will be adversely affected if the proposed gravel extraction processing plant goes ahead. I would like to object to the proposal of the following grounds:-</p> <p>My comments relate to 'Surrey Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD'.</p> <p>Transport and Infrastructure. The current down time of the level crossings in Egham lead to delays, grid locks during peak hours and air pollution from the queuing traffic. The addition of heavy lorry traffic from the processing plant will make the situation intolerable.</p> <p>Noise and Air Pollution. With the proposed siting of the processing plant near the school and houses on our estate, the noise will adversely affect our quality of life and the dust and air particles resulting from the processing will add a health risk to ourselves and to the children in the school.</p> <p>Flood Risk. With Runnymede already being a flood risk area, the proposed scheme can only add to this risk – the results of which could be catastrophic.</p>
19. Individual	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The health and welfare of local school children and residents would be compromised. 2. There is a flood risk to Egham if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'. 3. Local businesses would be forced to leave the area. 4. An aggregates recycling facility in Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'. 5. There are adequate aggregate recycling facilities in the surrounding area.
20. Fisher German for Esso Petroleum Company Limited	General	<p>Our client Esso Petroleum Co Ltd do have apparatus situated near the proposed works. Esso Petroleum Co Ltd have no objections to the proposals so long as the enclosed 'Special Requirements for Safe Working' booklet and the covenants contained in the Deed of Grant are adhered to.</p> <p>(SCC Note: Three plans included showing pipeline in vicinity of Home Farm Quarry Extension, Shepperton – Queen Mary Reservoir, Sunbury – Homers Farm, Bedford.)</p>
22. Individual	General	<p>I am writing to express, in the strongest manner possible, my objections to the proposed development of a gravel extraction facility at the Milton Park Farm site in Egham, along with the proposed development on an adjacent site</p>

		<p>of an aggregate recycling function.</p> <p>It is my belief that the proposal to develop any recycling facility or gravel extraction facilities at the proposed site(s) would be logistically impractical whilst being intolerable to local residents. The proposed sites are only accessible on residential streets that pass community facilities (irrespective of the route taken), including a school, the community sports centre, the mainline train station and the local emergency services. Furthermore, the proposed sites are only accessible by crossing one of two level crossings, and any increase in traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles, would exacerbate the traffic jams that develop at peak times when the barriers remain down for periods of time. Where any such proposal involves in excess of 280 heavy goods vehicle movements per day, the site being proposed is wholly impractical.</p> <p>Secondly, the pollution that any such development would create would be detrimental to local residents: the air pollution caused by the activities on the proposed sites would release fine sand, cement and crushed concrete particles into the atmosphere, on a site directly adjacent to a school. The resulting significant increase in heavy goods vehicle movements would lead to further air pollution that the local; residents would have to endure. Aside from the air pollution, the noise pollution that the site would create during its operational hours, along with that created by the movement of a vastly increased number of heavy goods vehicles will be of detriment to the local community. We already have the persistent noise pollution from the M25 and being under the flight path for the UK's busiest airport.</p> <p>Finally, the detrimental impact on the local community will be significant: As a property owner, any such development would result in a significant loss of value to my property, whilst also increasing the risk of local properties suffering from flood waters.</p> <p>Egham is a historic town, with precious Green Belt open space that are of enormous importance to local residents, and I wish to express, as detailed earlier, my strongest objections to the proposed developments.</p>
<p>24. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I want to strongly object to the gravel extraction & concrete processing plant in Egham, at Milton Park Farm. It is too near a primary school – think of the noise, traffic risk and air pollution especially with fine cement dust in the air – on our young children!!</p> <p>Can you evidence that these fine particles cannot be a health hazard? Over several years? Why is NW Surrey always the spot for recycling – what about the rest of Surrey? Have you monitored the air quality round this school? I don't want any more traffic – lorries – on minor roads in Egham – children are injured in traffic accidents routinely these days – it is not safe! Have you really considered the impact this will make on children in the area, particularly at the school. Also – it will diminish the local environment with its unique history and character. Permanently.</p>
<p>30. Fisher German for</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>We can conform that our client's apparatus, the Government Pipelines and Storage System (GPSS), may be affected by your proposals as indicated in the attached plan(s). The plan(s) supplied are intended for general</p>

<p>Esso Petroleum Company Limited</p>	<p>guidance only and should not be relied upon for excavation or construction purposes. No guarantee is given regarding the accuracy of the information provided and in order to verify the accurate location of pipeline in conjunction with your proposals you should contact OPA Central Services, to arrange a site visit.</p> <p>When contacting OPA Central services, please quote the File Ref/Unique Number given at the top of this letter, which is specific to this enquiry. Please note that you should contact OPA Central Services within 28 days of the date of this letter in order to validate this enquiry otherwise it will become void.</p> <p>You should note that the interests of the GPSS are conserved by means of the Land Powers (Defence) Act 1958, in particular Section 16 of the Act, and other legislation such as the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996. It is, however, the Land Powers (Defence) Act 1958 that specifically prohibits any development and most intrusive activities within a GPSS Wayleaves are generally 6 metres wide and bestride the pipeline 3 metres on either side and can incorporate other associated GPSS facilities.</p> <p>OPA Central Services will be able to provide guidance on the required procedures for entering into Section 16 Consent and provide confirmation on permitted development and intrusive activities. The whole process of obtaining Section 16 Consent can take between four and six weeks depending on circumstances at the time of application.</p> <p>To reiterate, you should not undertake any work or activity without first contacting the GPSS Operator for advice and, if required, Section 16 Consent. For your additional information please visit www.linesearch.org, subheading useful information, standard requirements for working/crossing Government pipelines.</p> <p>You should also be aware that landowners and third parties have a duty of care not to carry out any works that have the potential to damage GPSS apparatus. This duty of care applies even if the works themselves are situated more than 3 metres from the pipeline. Examples of such works are mineral extraction, mining, explosives, piling and windfarms.</p> <p>Please note that implementation of any unapproved work that affects a GPSS Wayleave may result in serious consequences in terms of health and safety, expense and other attendant liabilities. In such cases it is the perpetrator of the act, together with any other promoting organisation, that shall be held fully accountable for any resulting damage.</p> <p>Should you require any further assistance regarding this letter please contact the undersigned or alternatively, you can contact the OPA Central Services using the details provided above.</p> <p>(SCC Note: Two plans included showing preferred area C: Hamm Court Farm, Chertsey and GPSS Location Plan extract of pipeline)</p>
--	--

34. Individual	General	I would like to object.
35. Individual	General	<p>It is my belief that the present proposals and the interpretation placed on them and the present implementation is based on an unlawful interpretation of planning law and government guidance with respect to three issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the extension of planning for quarry sites to enable imported aggregate and waste recycling to be carried out and associated plants to be built passed the time limitation and contrary to the original condition to return the site to agricultural use without compliance is unlawful. 2. That the continued granting by officers of land raising as part of restoration using waste not suitable for immediate recycling contrary to the original planning application conditions of restoration is unlawful. 3. That the excavations of previous land fill and land raising deposits for recycling is unlawful without new planning application for quarrying.
41. Individual	General	<p>We have lived in Manor Way for over thirty years and are convinced that the creation of an aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm will considerably reduce the value of the houses and damage the social and environmental setting, and as such be contrary to the Policy AR1. The overall effect of the gravel pits would be detrimental to social life and business. Furthermore the effect on the water table as such would be likely to increase the possibility of flooding. We have seen a reduction of the Green Belt over the last few decades, this would make the situation worse. Given the availability of aggregates recycling facilities within the adjacent areas and the concentration of such facilities in North West Surrey, I cannot see that this is necessary or appropriate for a Green Belt area.</p> <p>The health factor is also of extreme importance. There is a school nearby and the effect of the fine particles in the air produced from quarrying and crushing concrete on the health of local children, as well as the effect of noise on their education, must be taken into account, when there is already a busy railway and motorway as well as planes overhead.</p> <p>I cannot finish without drawing attention to the problem of transport. Since the last major move on gravel pits 10 years ago, we have seen an expansion of Heathrow and the M25 and the effect of that on the traffic. The railway crossings have become increasingly difficult to negotiate because of the increased usage of the line. Anyone coming here, particularly in the early morning will see the slow-moving traffic and some dangerous overtaking practices. The quality of life in this area is already deteriorating beyond the acceptable. With the movement of large and noisy lorries the overall effect on the life of the community would be terrible.</p> <p>I totally reject the plans of gravel extraction and concrete processing in Egham,</p>
42. Individual	General	I wish to strongly oppose the modified Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan.

		<p>I believe an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not improve the area and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>In particular I think that local businesses may be forced out of the area.</p> <p>More disastrous from an environmental point of view is that the risk of flooding in Egham might be increased. As Surrey County Council is the lead local flood authority, it seems to be a massive contradiction to approve a scheme that increases the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There are already enough aggregate recycling plants in the area; another one isn't needed.</p> <p>These plants are inherently dangerous to health because of the particulates they produce. Why is SCC so cavalier about the health of its residents? SCC can't sweep this under the carpet by saying it's of low significance.</p>
<p>45. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede.</p> <p>These include Milton Park Farm in Egham, which still does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction.</p> <p>In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>Local businesses may be forced out of the area.</p> <p>The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised.</p> <p>The risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'.</p>
<p>46. Central Bedfordshire Council</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Chapter 1 <u>Paragraph 4.5</u> If there are proposals for large scale gasification plants within Surrey the document could/should state this and the tonnage of bottom ash which it may be produced. <u>Paragraph 13</u> Earlier in the document it is stated that excavation waste can provide an important from of recycled aggregate, the SWP and paragraph 13 should reflect this. <u>Paragraph 15</u> Supported <u>Paragraph 18.</u> The DPD should state which objectives the DPD support. <u>Table one</u> It would be useful if a list of Permanent aggregate recycling facility located within Surrey in 2012 were</p>

		<p>provided (rather than 2010). It would also be useful if their locations were shown on a map- so a spatial approach could be taken.</p> <p><u>Graph on page 32:</u> The Shared service would like an explanation as to the difference between the "Existing" forecast "Total existing and anticipated operator". Secondly, how can a figure be existing and a future projection simultaneously? Does "Existing" actually mean zero growth?</p> <p><u>Appendix 1</u> The diagram suggests that there are two Aggregates Recycling DPDs (now LDDs), the Shared service question the accuracy of the diagram.</p> <p><u>Map: Locations of Potential Aggregate Recycling sites</u> The key is not legible.</p>
47. Individual	General	<p>I am writing to oppose the Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan.</p> <p>I believe that:</p> <p>The health of residents would suffer because of the noise, dust and particulates generated by the recycling plant.</p> <p>The proposals increase the risk of flooding in Egham and, as was shown in 2000 and 2003 in particular, this is a real and worrying threat.</p> <p>The increase in traffic would affect the quality of life in an area which already suffers more than enough motorway and aircraft noise.</p> <p>The Green Belt is not supposed to accommodate this sort of activity.</p> <p>If Surrey County Council has the remotest interest in and concern for the welfare and well-being of its residents, it will throw this plan out.</p>
48. Individual	General	<p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I am</p> <p>Sure the council are aware that there is a school nearby and that the Health & Safety Executive gave details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. This would affect all of us living nearby especially in my case as my wife suffers from COPD and already finds it difficult to breath.</p> <p>In my opinion this plant should be sited well away from residential areas.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure and traffic. I'm sure the Council are aware that the roads in this area are not suitable for large heavy lorry traffic we already have a problem due to the level crossing gates and it's very bad during rush hour, so any increase in traffic will not only affect local residents but could have an influence on local businesses and emergency services.</p> <p>So I say NO to this plan leave our lovely green fields for the enjoyment of all</p>

49. Individual	General	<p>I object to the proposals on many fronts, the most significant being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Air Quality, Health and Safety: There is already an AQMQ alongside Milton Park Farm. Pollution from the M25 and other nearby roads already impacts the area. Further aggregates re cycling would lead to dust, micro particles and further pollution. 2. Traffic Congestion / Transport Infrastructure. The roads are already very busy in the area, the level crossings slow traffic as it is. The additional heavy volumes of traffic would make the roads extremely busy, wear and tear increases on the roads, they are more dangerous for us and Egham children. Further changes to the train signalling may make the situation even worse. 3. Pollution - Noise, Dust. Having lived near and worked on a similar site growing up there would be a severe impact in terms of noise, pollution, impact on health, values of our properties. I don't see why a small local town should have this facility right in the heart of our residential area, and I would expect SCC to take requisite action to protect the residents and children. 4. Flooding - Runnymed is already a high flood risk area. It is unacceptable that we increase the risk of flooding to our properties. With the more extreme weather we have seen over recent years this risk seems higher than ever. 5. Number of similar plants in North Surrey: there are already many similar such aggregates recycling plants in north Surrey, and I don't see why we need another one in Egham. It seems this is driven by commercial greed, on behalf of the operaing company and SCC. 6. Impact on our properties. Having worked long and hard over many years to obtain our properties, and with mortgages to pay - such a development would decrease the value of our nearby properties. The current economic climate has already had an impact. <p>I object to this development in the strongest possible terms. I also view that current elected council representatives should be protecting the local community rather than bowing to commercial drivers and greed and hold them accountable for protecting Egham.</p> <p>Please take our serious concerns on board and reject these ridiculous proposals.</p>
53. Individual	General	<p>Milton Park Farm in Egham does not yet have planning permission for gravel extraction or an aggregates recycling facility. If this was changed it would have a terrible economic effect on Egham. The environmental would be devastating businesses would be likely to move out of the area which would ruin Egham which at the moment is a pleasant place to live. The health of the local school children and residents could suffer badly by a facility such as this. The dust noise and the hundreds of lorry movements are not compatible with the nature of the area which would not be able to accommodate this proposed facility.</p>
57. Individual	General	<p>With regard to the proposal for a Gravel Extraction and Concrete Processing Plant in Egham.</p> <p>I do not actually live in Egham, but both my Grandchildren attend Manorcroft School, which I understand is directly next to the proposed site.</p>

		<p>I frequently visit Egham from Ashford, and always, the worse traffic is at the roundabout that goes directly into Egham. Anyone who does this journey knows how bad it can be. Apart from the volume of traffic, the problem is compounded by two level crossings. Imagine how much worse the problem would be with heavy lorries going backwards and forwards to the site. And before you assume I am anti lorry, my husband is a lorry driver, but this proposal is extremely ill advised.</p> <p>Another point, Egham is still has a thriving high street. One of very few remaining. I visit it frequently and use many of the shops. Surely the effect on local businesses would be catastrophic.</p> <p>Finally, and obviously my main concern, is the proximity to Manorcroft School. This is a delightful little school and I am very thankful that my Grandchildren attend it. To even consider siting a gravel extraction plant next to it I find unbelievable. The effect on the childrens health cannot be anything but detrimental. My Granddaughter already has slight asthma, and surely this would be aggravated. The congestion around the school in the mornings is currently just about tolerable. The plant could only make this much worse, especially for the local residents.</p> <p>Please, PLEASE see common sense and re-think your proposal. I understand that is difficult to find suitable sites, but surely it is obvious that this site is about as unsuitable as it could possibly be.</p>
<p>58. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the various proposals for mineral extraction and aggregate recycling in our corner of Surrey. Egham does appear to be unfairly hit with unpleasant and unwanted activities. There are many reasons to object to these proposals but I am particularly incensed by the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The roads through Egham are not able to carry the extra lorry traffic that will be generated by these works. They are narrow, already busy and suffer from the fact that all north/south routes use the level crossings which already cause gridlock at peak times. In addition from past experience of aggregates workings I have found that the lorries cause a permanent film of mud on the roads in the winter and dust flying up in the summer. The surfaces of the roads are not good and this proposed increase in heavy traffic will cause even more frequent instances of potholes, which even now are not repaired from one winter to the next. 2.The pressure on the Green Belt is ever present. The proposed activities are not appropriate in a Green Belt area and the impression given is that any project big enough can ride roughshod over these regulations. 3.Flooding and the water table have long been an issue in Runnymede. The M25 has been suspected of affecting water levels, although difficult to prove conclusively. The proposed recycling plant and mineral workings can only adversely affect the flood potential problems.

		I hope you will take into consideration all my concerns.
66. Individual	General	<p>I live on the Manorcrofts Estate in Egham and am becoming increasingly dismayed at the Council's attitude to this part of Surrey. We had to fight against the Council to stop Airtrack coming in which would have divided and consequently destroyed Egham, and now we have to fight again to stop this positively harmful scheme being deployed in our area. I can only think that none of you lives in Egham or you would not for one moment countenance such a destructive scheme.</p> <p>There are many reasons why I consider it destructive and the following are simply a few of them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The increase in traffic, particularly the heavy lorries that will be required, will cause more congestion in an area that is already heavily congested at peak times. The number of level crossings in the area together with the close proximity of the M.25 will mean that there is huge potential for grid-lock. Further this increase in heavy lorries will cause damage to the roads that the Council will have to maintain, at least to their present standard, causing an additional drain on resources. As a consequence of this additional traffic air quality will become poorer. 2. It is incredible that the Council should find such a scheme acceptable when it is so close to a children's school and residential area. The Health and Safety Executive give details of the many hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust and ultra fine particles are produced when crushing concrete that would result in further risk. With regard to this it should be borne in mind that the Council would be held responsible for any ill health incurred as a direct result of this ill thought out scheme when all the negatives have been so clearly pointed out to them. Would any of the Council members send their child to this school? 3. Why this fixation on Runnymede for this site? I understand that NW Surrey takes more than half the recycling for the whole of Surrey which hardly justifies opening this additional site. Why were so many sites deleted from the list of possible locations outside Runnymede? 4. With regard to climate change Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most likely to flood. So why propose aggregates recycling in Runnymede?
68. K&L Gates LLP for New Zealand Golf Club (NZGC)	General	<p>The Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD (the "DPD") proposes that the Martyrs Lane site (the "Site") is a preferred site for aggregates recycling.</p> <p>In December 2009 we submitted a response form to the first consultation on behalf of the NZGC, which explained why the Site would not be an appropriate site for such a development, and requested its removal as an preferred site in the DPD.</p>

		<p>In October 2011 we submitted further representations at the publication stage. In these representations, we explained how the inclusion of the Site as a preferred site rendered the DPD both unsound and not legally compliant.</p> <p>We also attended the public examination hearing on 22 March 2012 and made further representations, in particular in regard to a new application by McLaren to build a technology centre in the vicinity of the Site.</p> <p>We would like to re-state the representations we have made on behalf of NZGC in the 2009 and 2011 consultations, as well as the representations made during the hearing. We do not consider that Surrey County Council has properly taken them into account, and that for the reasons given, the DPD is not sound.</p>
69. Individual	General	Please can you note my opposition?
70. Individual	General	<p>Regarding the above, I am concerned that having deleted a number of sites from the list of possible locations outside of Runnymede, too much focus is now on the sites remaining in Runnymede.</p> <p>I have a raft of serious concerns, the main ones being those listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are already several aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside NW Surrey) – any further such facilities are not required or justified. 2. Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard. 3. I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.
71. Individual	General	<p>Please note that I wish to object to the plans for Milton Park Farm Egham</p> <p>In my opinion an aggregate recycling facility located on the farm would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and would be contrary to policy AR1 (MM1)</p> <p>I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads would have highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and compound the current problems residents around the area already have.</p>

		The education of the children at Manorcroft School will be risk by the working of the recycling plant due to dust and noise in such close proximity
73. Individual	General	<p>I am contacting you regarding the above proposals. There are a number of reasons why I believe they are totally inappropriate and, indeed, I would go so far as to say that I am staggered that such proposals would even be considered.</p> <p>For example, how on earth can it be thought a good idea to place such a facility right next to a Manorcroft School? If I tried my utmost, I could not think of a more inappropriate place. Surely the health and well-being of children should trump all other considerations, and the potential adverse effects of dust and fine particles etc on the health of the children should be enough on its own to stop these plans from even being considered.</p> <p>I am also worried about the effects on local traffic. Traffic in Egham is already a nightmare, particularly during rush hour and particularly on roads close to our level-crossings. As someone who lives close to one of these level-crossings, I can testify as to how many difficulties traffic issues cause. We are already in a situation where encountering almost total gridlock is not unknown. Adding heavy lorries to this congestion can only make these problems significantly worse, and the implications for those of us who have to use these roads, and on local businesses who rely on them, are enormous.</p> <p>I would also mention the issue of flooding. I am told that Runnymede is an area that is classed as being prone to flooding (indeed, several insurers have turned me down for home insurance based on my post code). Please explain to me why it is thought to be a good idea to introduce in an area at risk of flooding an activity which increases the risk of flooding.</p> <p>I have every confidence that when the time comes for a decision to be made, those responsible will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the proposal to site this plant in the fields behind Manorcroft school are misguided and wholly inappropriate, and I look forward to such plans being dismissed.</p>
77. Parish Council of East Clandon	General	With reference to this document, the Parish Council of East Clandon had no comments to make.
80. Individual	General	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms regarding the modified Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document.</p> <p>I am struggling to understand how anyone could possibly consider this beautiful, historic area suitable for such a purpose. How can such a site be justified when there are already several other facilities in the locality?</p> <p>My main concerns are:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The residents living near Milton Park Farm • The school children attending both Manorcroft Primary School and Manorcroft Nursery. • The increase in volume of traffic in the area <p>Already during the day, there are often considerable queues in Egham due to the length of and number of times the level crossing gates are lowered. This is not just during the rush hour or school run but throughout the day. The proposed facility would obviously need a number of lorry movements throughout the day, thereby adding to the congestion in the area. Enormous lorries thundering around/stuck in traffic in Egham would also contribute to the decrease in air quality, pose safety hazard for the children not to mention the noise and pollution.</p> <p>I feel it unreasonable, inappropriate and unfair that both the local residents and four hundred plus children at Manorcroft School and Nursey would be subjected to further noise, dirt, dust and pollution on top of that already generated by the M25 motorway and Heathrow air traffic. The health and welfare of these people would surely be compromised.</p> <p>Please do not allow this application to go ahead as it would ruin this area. It would be to the detriment of the landscape, wildlife, residents, road users and children of Egham. We already suffer noise and pollution of the M25 on our doorstep, please do not add to this.</p>
<p>81. English Heritage</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>You will be aware that English Heritage has consistently expressed its concerns at the allocation of Milton Park Farm and the adjacent Whitehall Farm for mineral extraction (and subsequently aggregate recycling) because of the significant adverse effect on the setting of Great Fosters, a Grade I listed building sitting within a Grade II* registered garden, and other nationally significant heritage assets including the Grade II listed Luddington House and its Grade II listed walled garden.</p> <p>The Proposed Modification MM16 is the deletion of three sites proposed for aggregate recycling in the Submission DPD, including Whitehall Farm. However, it is my understanding that this deletion is not a change of policy but rather more of a clarification reflecting Hanson Aggregates' intention to use the proposed plant at Milton Park Farm for recycling, should their current planning application be approved, rather than establish a recycling operation at Whitehall Farm.</p> <p>Therefore, although this clarification is welcome as indicating that there would not be any additional impacts on Luddington House and its walled garden from aggregate recycling activities at Whitehall Farm, English Heritage's fundamental objections remain.</p> <p>In this respect and given the Council's consultation on the compliance of the DPD with the National Planning Policy Framework, it is worth noting the confirmation of the Framework that the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is a fundamental part of sustainable development, and that mineral operations should not</p>

		<p>have unacceptable adverse impacts on the historic environment.</p> <p>English Heritage would appreciate being notified when the Inspector's report has been published and when the DPD has been adopted.</p>
82. Individual	General	<p>Im am writing to express concerns over the proposed development as laid out in the 'Surrey Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD'.</p> <p>II feel there are quite a number of issues which mean that the suggested location of Egham, near Manorcroft school, is not suitable and I shall try and out,line several of them below.</p> <p>Referring to the main modifications of the document, (MM16) I do not feel that the location of agreagtes recycling at the Milton Park Farm site would have a beneficial effect on the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1) and I feel this links in closeley to page 21 of the updated environmental report such that increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.</p> <p>Looking at the proposal in relation to health, I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard (Additional modification 28) and the proposed proximity to Manorcroft primary school would mean that the children's education and/or helath at Manorcroft could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm (Page 21, updated environmental report)</p> <p>AS for the location of the proposal in relation to the county as a whole, I question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt and wonder of the justification of having more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey located within the area of NW surrey (Additional modifications 33 and 35).</p>
83. Individual	General	<p>In my opinion, an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm, Egham would not 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and would thus be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).</p> <p>Local businesses will be forced out of the area as stated by Proctor & Gamble. Belron and many others who moved here for the rural aspect.</p> <p>House prices in the area will tumble</p>

		<p>The increased lorry movements on Vicarage Road will become unbearable as we have a big industrial estate at Thorpe who use this residential road for access to Thorpe.</p> <p>The health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised.</p> <p>The risk of flooding in Egham might be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry'.</p> <p>There are already several aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside NW Surrey) – any further facilities are not required or justified.</p> <p>I question whether industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are legitimate activities in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site. I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school- children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust.</p> <p>I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard.</p> <p>If in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.</p> <p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.</p> <p>We have had the health hazards of the M25, Terminal 5 and Thorpe Trading Estate. For God's sake, give Egham a break and go somewhere else otherwise you will be hit will billions in compensation claims.</p> <p>Please listen to the voice of the people of Egham. We are supposed to be living in a democracy.</p>
<p>84. Highways Agency</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>The HA is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.</p> <p>The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p>

		We have reviewed the modifications consultation and do not have any comment at this time.
85. Individual	General	<p>I live about 100m away from where you are proposing the excavation of enormous gravel pit, which I understand will take approximately 10 years. I cannot believe this site, which is one of the last green fields in Egham and is surrounded by residential roads and properties, is even being considered.</p> <p>I have two young sons which attend Manor Croft School next to where you are proposing the construction of concrete processing plant. Not only will they have to endure living next to an enormous excavation, but a concrete processing plant during their schooling.</p> <p>I have huge concerns for my sons' health due to the environmental impact of hazardous dust they will be exposed to 24 hours a day 7 days a week. If these sites are approved I will be taking my sons for continuous health monitoring examinations including lung function testing. If there is any deterioration in my sons' health I will seek legal advice.</p> <p>I do not believe the current road infrastructure can sustain the estimated 500 lorry movements throughout Egham each day. These vehicles will have to pass through residential roads and schools, through Egham High Street and over level crossings which currently are down 40 minutes in each hour. The congestion that will be created will have a huge impact on pollution and the well being of Egham residents. I previously lived in Wraysbury next to a Gravel Excavation site and have experienced how these lorry drivers operate. They were paid by load and drive to excessive speed on the shortest route will little regard for local residence or property. The narrow residential roads can only increase the risk of fatalities to pedestrians from these lorry movements.</p> <p>I have been advised by a Local Estate Agent's that the value of my property will be significantly reduced if these proposals are approved. I would then not be in a position to sell my house, obviously I would seek legal advice regarding compensating for any loss in value of my property.</p> <p>Finally I would like to state that I and my family are very happy in our home, which we believed to be very safe and secure environment to live in. If these sites are approved the happiness and wellbeing of my family would be seriously harmed.</p>
86. Individual	General	<p>This email is to express my concerns in relation to the above named mineral and waste plans and specifically, the possibility of a concrete and aggregates crushing plant from being installed in the field directly behind Manorcroft School in Egham.</p> <p>My concerns relate to the health and wellbeing of children attending Manorcroft School and local residents being as:</p>

		<p>(i) Fine dust particles would go into the atmosphere as a result of the works which could well be detrimental to health, (ii) There would be noise pollution caused by both the works themselves and increased HGV traffic volumes to and from the site, (iii) The roads around the immediate area are already regularly congested when the level crossings are down and this would become much worse with HGV's going to and from the site, (iv) The roads in the immediate vicinity are far from suitable for HGV traffic.</p> <p>It doesn't seem fair or reasonable for the very young children attending Manorcroft School to be burdened with the noise and dust pollution that would undoubtedly result from them having a plant situated right next door to them.</p> <p>I am struggling to comprehend how the placing of a concrete and aggregate crushing plant right next to a school can possibly be advantageous, when there are other alternatives. I would therefore ask the planners concerned to think ever more carefully about the validity of the Egham site.</p>
87. Individual	General	<p>I wish to formally notify you of my objection to the <u>Surrey Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD</u> as planned for Egham. For clarity, the concrete and aggregates crushing plant in the field directly behind MANORCROFT Primary School.</p> <p>It is ridiculous to believe that such a concrete crushing facility will not have any impact on the health and well-being of local school-children and residents, that our children's well being will not be compromised. The necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has NOT been given proper consideration and it has not been shown to be beyond reasonable doubt that there are no hazards associated with the ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) produced when crushing concrete, fine sand and cement dust.</p> <p>This alone should present enough of a risk to not allow the creation of this plant in Egham.</p> <p>Without doubt, an aggregates recycling facility would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Remember there are already several aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside NW Surrey) – any further such facilities are not required or justified. There is simply no need for it!</p> <p>Besides which, industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture are not legitimate activities in the Green Belt.</p> <p>If these were not enough reasons to reject the plan, then it is also clear that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes</p>

		<p>through town. It will be chaos with an accident waiting to happen!.</p> <p>Given the recent weather conditions, it may be prudent to also note that there is a very real and present risk of flooding in Egham if this crushing plant were worked 'dry'.</p> <p>Bottom line, there is NOT ONE justifiable reason to allow this development in Egham.</p> <p>As such I implore you to <u>please reject this development plan.</u></p>
89. Individual	General	<p>With regards to siting a recycling plant at Milton Park Farm. We strongly object to any recycling plant, be it aggregates or other, with the close proximity of a SCC School, Manorcroft. The area already has the M25 Motorway next to it and planes from Heathrow Airport overhead. This whole area does not need more pollution.</p> <p>Regarding traffic the whole road network is unsuitable for a vast increase in vehicle movement. The queues at the railway crossing in Egham are already a cause for concern.</p> <p>With other recycling plants in this area, not all in Surrey, why leave Milton Park Farm on the list for a plant, close to a school and houses.</p>
90. Individual	General	<p>I am writing to object to the Surrey Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD. On a day when the news is full of stories of flooding, it is depressing to consider that Runnymede Borough, which is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood, is subject to a proposal that is extremely likely to make it more liable to flooding. Everyone knows that when you take gravel out the result is a quagmire. Whitehall Farm is always a quagmire once heavy rain sets in. So I object to any proposal to take gravel out near Whitehall Farm that will increase its quagmire condition. If you want to create a quagmire you should do it away from people's homes. Similarly the risk of flooding in Egham could well be increased if Milton Park Farm were worked 'dry' (what an inappropriate expression given the state the land would be left in). In addition I cannot see how the industrial operations of aggregate recycling and concrete manufacture can be legitimate activities in the Green Belt.</p> <p>I also believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham and the surrounding areas would have an extremely significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.</p> <p>I am appalled that it should be considered appropriate to site quarrying or recycling aggregates next to Manorcroft Primary School. This shows no concern for the development or the health of these young children. There are considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust which would inevitably impact on the pupils at Manorcroft.</p>

		I object to these proposals in the strongest possible terms
93. Individual	General	An aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm will not improve the economic, social and environmental condition in the area and would be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1) local businesses may well suffer, there is also a considerable risk to school children being located so close to Manorcroft School. This is a green belt site, there are alternative sites within and outside NW Surrey.
94. Individual	General	As you will see, I live in Whiteland, Egham, and this is approximately half a mile from the proposed Recycling Site in Stroude Road, Egham. Despite any proposed modifications the fundamental problem remains that the proposed site is so close to, if not the Green Belt; it backs onto a School (Manorcroft School); and apart from the noise and dust, the roads in Egham simply cannot cope with additional lorries. If anyone has any doubt as to the volume of traffic in Egham, I would urge them most sincerely to drive through Egham (during the rush hour) starting at the A30 By-Pass and proceeding along The Avenue, followed by the High Street, Church Road and Station Road, and proceeding over the level-crossing into Manorcroft Road. For these, and all of the reasons that have been set out on earlier occasions, I would ask that the application be rejected.
95. Individual	General	In response of the deletion of Waterspalsh farm from Policy AR3 as the operators are not proposing to extract aggregate. Please keep me informed of any further development.
96. Individual	General	In response of the deletion of Waterspalsh farm from Policy AR3 as the operators are not proposing to extract aggregate. Please keep me informed of any further development.
97. Individual	General	AR3 Site proposal to use land on the South side of Egham, close to Manorcroft school, past Proctor & Gamble and beyond Great Foster Hotel towards Virginia water for gravel extraction, a concrete processing plant and aggregates recycling is completely unacceptable the road system in the area is totally unacceptable to carry the additional traffic that would result from such operations and there would be severe environmental implications for residents in the area, which is already stated 'standard in terms of E.U limits.
98. Individual	General	I would like to voice my concern regarding the above facility being considered at Milton Park Farm, Egham. My main concern is the closeness to Manorcroft School which is attended by my grandson at the present time, and will be attended by my second grandson when he comes of school age. I cannot understand how the health and well being of the children will not be affected by such a construction, as well as jeopardising their journey to school with the additional traffic, which is hazardous enough as it is. From the health point of view I understand that ultra-fine particles are produced when crushing concrete, and I would like to ask whether necessary care towards

		<p>the school children has been given proper consideration. I am sure there are considerable hazards associated with these dust particles.</p> <p>Egham and Thorpe are still relatively unscathed areas, apart from the eyesore of the M25 and to have something like the above thrown on our doorstep is just a further insult with even more traffic noise and pollution, not to mention congestion. We already have enough congestion with having to negotiate level crossings in the area, one very close to Milton Park Farm. Therefore in my opinion a recycling facility located at Milton Park Farm would not improve anything economic, social or environmental in the area. It would also further depreciate properties already depreciated by the M25.</p> <p>I understand there are already several recycling facilities in the area so I cannot understand why any further such facilities could be justified. I also question whether this is legitimate in a Green Belt area.</p> <p>Nothing about the location of this site makes sense from any point of view be it Air Quality, Historic Environment, Transport, Education, Green Belt, Climate change, etc. etc.</p> <p>I hope my comments will be taken seriously and hope to receive news that fair consideration has been given to this proposal and that any decisions made will be in Egham residents favour and Milton Park Farm will not be allowed to become a blight on the landscape and a health hazard to our residents and our gorgeous future generation children.</p>
<p>99. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I would like to voice my concern regarding the above facility being considered at Milton Park Farm, Egham.</p> <p>My main concern is the closeness to Manorcroft Primary School where my 6 year old son attends and will also be attended by my other son once he reaches school age. I cannot understand how the health and well being of the children will not be affected by such a construction. Also the traffic build up to school is heavy enough with the train gates at Egham Station and the general volume of cars on the road during rush hour and school pick up and drop off, this will only add to the weight of traffic which is hazardous for many reasons to the children alone; including air pollution. I don't feel as though the health of the children, staff and local residents to the area has been given any consideration. How can minute dust particles in the atmosphere be non hazardous to a human beings health? Not to mention anybody who suffers with any kind of respiratory problems already, eg Asthma.</p> <p>I understand there are already several recycling facilities in the area so I cannot understand why any further such facilities could be justified. I also question whether this is legitimate in a Green Belt area.</p> <p>I do hope mine and all other local residents, parents of children attending and staff of Manorcroft Primary School's comments will be read and taken into consideration and the seriousness of all the points and worries given to this</p>

		situation are put first. It is a tremendous worry that such a good school can be under such jeopardy. Egham at present is a lovely area to live in, a monstrosity like this would be detrimental to the area and upbringing of our children.
103. Slough Borough Council	General	No specific response
107. Individual	General	I'm writing to say I believe that this should not be allowed to go ahead in an area so close to a busy town and a school. The dust and the particles within the dust are a potential health hazard for locals and particularly for the children.
109. Individual	General	<p>I am writing to express my concern and objection to the plans for gravel extraction and for an aggregates recycling plant at the Milton Park Farm in my home town of Egham.</p> <p>Firstly, I understand that the site at Milton Park Farm does not have the pre-requisite planning permission granted for gravel extraction. Can you please confirm this? Also, I challenge the assertion that an aggregates recycling facility located at Milton Park would 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area' and it would, therefore be contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1). Indeed, I would argue that such a development would compromise the health and well-being of Egham residents and, in particular, local school children.</p> <p>There are already several aggregates recycling facilities in the locality (both within and just outside of north west Surrey) and so no further facilities are requires or justified. In any case, I would question whether industrial operations such as concrete manufacture or aggregate recycling are legitimate activities in a Green Belt area such as this.</p> <p>As mentioned above, I believe that a development such as this would have a detrimental affect on the health of local school children due to proximity of the site to Manorcroft School and the ultra-fine particles (approximately 0.1 micrometres) produced when crushing concrete. Contrary to the updated environmental report, the subject of air quality is not of 'low significance' and hazards to health must be taken seriously, particularly when very young children are concerned. There is no current data available for the Air Quality Management Area alongside Milton Park Farm and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for the data to be relevant.</p> <p>Finally, I believe that the proposal would have an adverse affect on the local traffic and infrastructure and object to the proposal on this basis too. I currently turn right out of Rusham Road, across the railway at the Egham Station level crossing and then along Manorcrofts and Stroude Road to Virginia Water and beyond every working day and this route is already difficult because of delays at the level crossing. I believe that an increase in heavy traffic which would be inevitable if the development were to proceed- would have a highly significant adverse impact on</p>

		<p>all residents that – like me –use routes through Egham.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe that the proposal is hazardous to residents (especially school children) detrimental to the infrastructure and life style of residents and – in any case- unnecessary, unjustified and should not go ahead.</p>
112. Hershams Resident Association	General	In the aggregates recycling joint development plan document for minerals and waste plans as amended page 10 para 33 (formerly 32) the table of permanent aggregate recycling facilities still shows Weylands Treatment works as in Hershams, where as it is in fact in Walton-on-Thames. This should be corrected.
114. Individual	General	<p>I live about 100m away from where you are proposing the excavation of enormous gravel pit, which I understand will take approximately 10 years. I cannot believe this site, which is one of the last green fields in Egham and is surrounded by residential roads and properties, is even being considered.</p> <p>I have two young sons which attend Manor Croft School next year to where you are proposing the construction of concrete processing plant. Not only will they have to endure living next to an enormous excavation, but a concrete processing plant during their schooling.</p> <p>I have huge concerns for my son's health due to the environmental impact of hazardous dust they will be exposed to 24 hours a day 7 days a week. If these sites are approved I will be taking my sons for continuous health monitoring examination including lung function testing. If there is any deterioration in my sons' health I will seek legal advice.</p> <p>I do not believe the current road infrastructure can sustain the estimated 500 lorry movements throughout Egham each day. These vehicles will have to pass through residential roads and schools, through Egham High Street and over level crossings which currently are down 40 minutes in each hour. The congestion that will be created will have a huge impact on pollution and the well being of Egham residents. I previously lived in Wraysbury next to Gravel Excavation site and have experienced how these lorry drivers operate. They were paid by load and drive to excessive speed on the shortest route will little regard for local residence or property. The narrow residential roads can only increase the risk of fatalities to pedestrians from these lorry movements.</p> <p>I have been advised by a Local Estate Agent's that the value of my property will be significantly reduced if these proposals are approved. I would then not be in a position to sell my house, obviously I would seek legal advice regarding compensating for any loss in value of my property.</p> <p>Finally I would like to state that I and my family are very happy in our home, which we believed to be very safe and secure environment to live in. If these sites are approved the happiness and wellbeing of my family would be seriously harmed. (Duplicate of 85)</p>
116. Tandridge	General	It is noted that as regards AM2 Lambs Brickwork has been deleted which is welcome. The decision by Surrey

<p>District Council</p>		<p>County Council not to include this site in the Development Plan Document was supported. The District Council agreed with Surrey County Council in excluding the site in its Background Document of November 2009, assessing the potential aggregates recycling short listed sites. This assessment concluded that the "issues of development of permanent facility in the Green Belt, view that the site is unacceptable for aggregates recycling." Tandridge District Council agreed with County Council that the site was unacceptable for aggregates recycling.</p>
<p>119. Campaign to Protect Rural England</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Duty to Cooperate Test I appreciate that this first comment we are making you may not be able to take into account as it is not raised in the modifications. However CPRE Surrey made the point at the Hearing that a large amount of recycling waste was being imported into Surrey, mostly from London, and there was clearly a duty to cooperate with the adjoining London Boroughs, particularly as they do not appear to be making any additional provision in their own areas. The County Council officers said they had tried to liaise but had a poor response. There was no evidence to support their claim. Since the Hearing a 15 year waste strategy drawn up by 7 North London Boroughs has failed because of the duty to cooperate test. (Duty under the Localism Act).. The Inspector stated 'there has not been constructive, active and ongoing engagement during the North London Waste Plan's preparation between the North London councils and the planning authorities to which significant quantities of waste are exported.' We suggest that this matter needs to be reinvestigated. Lambs Brickworks We support the deletion of this site. We have no comments on the other amendments.</p>
<p>120. Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting the Royal Borough to respond to the above consultation. The Council does not wish to comment on the proposed changes.</p>
<p>122. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I write with regard to the proposed aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park Farm, Egham which I feel is a thoroughly unsuitable site for a number of reasons. As a parent of two children attending Manorcroft Primary School and the nursery on the same site, I am highly concerned at the health risks to young children who are at such a vulnerable stage in their development by the ultra fine particles (approximately 0.1 micrometres) produced by crushing concrete and also the additional considerable health hazards from the increased pollution levels due to increased heavy goods vehicle traffic required to service the proposed facility. I believe this contradicts the duty of care that the council has towards local school children and the residents. I feel strongly that the health impacts of this proposal be given further consideration and that the proposed aggregates facility rejected. The level crossings in Egham currently cause considerable traffic problems in the local area which would only be exacerbated by an increase in heavy good vehicle traffic which would also further worsen air pollution levels as despite signs requesting drivers to switch engines off, vehicles are usually left running thus adversely affecting the quality of life for local residents. I believe the increase in traffic would also adversely affect businesses in the local</p>

		<p>area, wait times at the level crossings can already be extensive, any increase in these due to greater traffic volume will have a negative impact on people travelling in to use businesses in Egham and the local area thus having a knock on effect on the local labour market.</p> <p>In addition to the above, I feel that aggregate recycling and concrete production are not appropriate Green Belt activities and that an aggregates recycling facility is not a legitimate proposal for the area.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that the proposed facility directly contravenes Policy AR1 (MM1) as not only does not improve the economic, environmental and social conditions in the are, it has a sever adverse affect on the same.</p> <p>I hope that common sense and a duty to protect the residents and children of Egham and Runnymede prevails and that the proposed facility is rejected out of hand.</p>
125. Individual	General	<p>I wrote to you a year ago expressing my outrage at the proposals for an aggregate recycling site on the site of Milton Park Farm and had hoped common sense would prevail and this totally inappropriate scheme would be stopped dead in its tracks. But the threat of it is still with us, with some revisions, and I write again to register my strong opposition to the proposals.</p> <p>There are numerous reasons to object to this scheme but I shall limit mine to the four areas that concern me most:</p> <p><u>Impact on the local area.</u></p> <p>I do not consider an aggregates recycling facility at Milton Park farm will 'improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area', and is thus contrary to Policy AR1 (MM1).In fact I believe such a facility will make life intolerable for Egham residents – living and working in the area I know the town is already unable to cope with the existing traffic volume and into this will come fleets of heavy lorries exacerbating an already serious problem.</p>
130. Individual	General	<p>I am writing to you with reference to the above and to express my displeasure on the possibility of a concrete and aggregates crushing plant being installed in the field directly behind Manacroft School in Egham.</p> <p>My family and I have lived happily in Egham since April 1985. It makes us very sad and extremely concerned to learn the serious consequences we will be faced with, should this project become a reality.</p> <p>One of our main concerns is the adverse impact of the significant increase in traffic such as a large number of heavy lorries on minor roads in Egham. We already suffer long delays caused by the barrier-down-time at the 3</p>

		<p>level crossings. As a church warden at St John’s Egham Parish Church I am in and out of the town centre several times a week. Each day I travel through Egham to and from my work place in Colnbrook. It is painful to imagine the extra time my journeys will take if this project goes ahead. It will also affect over 500 other worshipers at our Church as well as a several hundred families who use our Church Centre and the pre-school nursery.</p> <p>Should this project go ahead, the recycling plants will be with us for many years to come. Local businesses will move out and new businesses will not come to Egham due to its adverse effects. That will make Egham an unpopular place.</p> <p>We are very much afraid of the negative effect this would have on the air quality in our area. It is a known fact the North West Surrey already houses several aggregates recycling facilities and therefore any more facilities of this nature cannot be justified in the same locality.</p> <p>These are only a few of the concerns we have on this issue. I hope you would think of the people of Egham sympathetically and give serious consideration to the adverse effect it will have on our home town where we wish to live safely and healthily in the years to come.</p>
<p>134. Crawley Borough Council</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting Crawley Borough Council to comment on the proposed amendments to the Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document. I am able to confirm that Crawley Borough Council do not wish to make any comments at this stage, though would ask to receive written notification as appropriate in terms of the document’s progression.</p> <p>I would like to take this opportunity to wish you all the best for the future progression of the document.</p>

Representations to Additional Modifications

Additional Modifications

101.Spelthorne Borough Council	AM1	On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
27. RAGE	AM3	We observe from the new Contents that Appendix 2 (formerly on page 43) has now been deleted and we expressly request that it be re-instated. This gave a list of aggregates recycling facilities (ARFs) in and adjoining Surrey; and it therefore supplied useful information against which the locations of proposed sites could be compared. (Sere comment on MM19 above.) It would seem sensible to have all relevant information in one place: i.e. in the Aggregates Recycling Document. We have found core document CDSCC60 https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/ data/assets/file/0003/264954/Aggregate-Recycling-Sites-in-and-proximate-to-Surrey_v3.pdf This gives a map from which one can see that there are six ARFs within 3 ½ miles of Milton Park Farm and a seventh 5 ½ miles away. (These sites are numbered 7, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21; and number 1; respectively) We understand that these facilities are not running at full potential and therefore there is already spare capacity. Why do we need another ARF in the area?
32.Egham Residents Association	AM3	We spotted that the previous Appendix 2 has been deleted & feel that it should be re-instated as it gave a list of existing ARFs & shows the concentration of these plants in & around NWSurrey (with 6 existing ARPs within 5 miles of Milton Park Farm – which emphasises our point under MM19 above.
91. Individual	AM3	I understand that there are already six aggregates recycling facilities within a four-mile radius of the proposed site, which I believe are not all working at full capacity; and North-West Surrey appears to recycle more than half the total aggregates for the entire County. I question why another one would be needed here. Please delete it.
101.Spelthorne Borough Council	AM12	On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
1.Runnymede Borough Council	AM15	The insertion of the wording " <i>The proposed recycling in connection with the Penton Hook Marina site is expected to involve the processing of in-situ material already present on the site</i> " is welcomed. However, objection is made to the wording that follows, i.e. " <i>together with a small amount of river dredgings imported by barge</i> ". As set out in the Council's submission (ref. AP240) to the hearing on 23 March, the Council's view is that there is no justification for land importation of aggregate to the site. The Council therefore requests that this wording be deleted. If the County Council is resolved on retaining reference to imported material at Penton Hook, it is requested that the wording should be amended to make clear the actual quantity of import that would be acceptable, along with the date by which importation would be required to have finished.
101.Spelthorne	AM16	On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the

Borough Council		changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
101. Spelthorne Borough Council	AM20	On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.
1. Runnymede Borough Council	AM27	<p>The insertion of the wording "<i>The development of an aggregate recycling facility would only be considered where mineral extraction has been permitted as indicated in Policy WD3 in the Surrey Waste Plan</i>" is welcomed. However, objection is made to the absence of any reference to the requirement for any such planning permission to have been implemented, at least in part. The Council therefore requests that the wording "<i>and is being implemented</i>" be added to the end of para 69; this would accord with the Council's submission (ref. AP240) to the hearing on 21 March.</p> <p>In the same submission to the hearing, the Council requested the following additions to policy AR3: "<i>... that any temporary planning permission for aggregates recycling shall terminate once the site has been restored following mineral extraction</i>" and "<i>... the cumulative environmental impact, especially in relation to transport, air quality, flow of groundwater, noise and dust, in combination with other developments, as assessed by formal Environmental Impact Assessment, will not compromise either the regulatory or locally set environmentally acceptable levels of the particular receptors</i>".</p> <p>The Council notes that these points have not been included in the submission document; a justification for their not having been taken into account would be welcomed.</p>
27. RAGE	AM27	We agree with the statement: ' <i>The development of an aggregate recycling facility would only be considered where mineral extraction has been permitted as indicated in Policy WD3 in the Surrey Waste Plan</i> '.
17. Manorcroft Primary School	AM28	<p>Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA.</p> <p>If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft pupils.</p>
23. Individual	AM28	As above I am concerned that the ultra fine particles produced by crushing concrete would have a detrimental effect on the health of the children at Manorcroft School for many years to come, as this facility would be with us for a long time. Has the health effects of this site been given due consideration? I question this.
26. Individual	AM28	Again, I would cite duty of care towards residents and local school children and their parents / carers has been given

		proper consideration. I understand that studies have shown considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust (Particles of approx 0.1 micrometres I am reliably informed) a
27. RAGE	AM28	Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, we question whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with silica (sand) and cement dust; and furthermore, ultra-fine particles (approx 0.1 micrometers) are produced when crushing concrete. And if, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is to use this 'facility', then recycling could be with us, with the potential to affect our health, for decade.
29. Individual	AM28	Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA. If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft Pupils.
32. Egham Residents Association	AM28	The proposed location of the ARF in the northern park of the Milton Park Farm site raises an issue of the necessary duty of care towards the health of nearby school children & residents? The Health & Safety Executive has given details of the considerable hazards associated with silica sand & cement dust & indeed ultra-fine particles which are produced when crushing concrete. The long-term nature of any such ARF could thus impact on local health for decades & we query how this proposal stacks up on health grounds?
33. Individual	AM28	The statutory duty of care placed by the health and safety at work Act 1974 requires employees to ensure safe systems and a safe place of work that so far as is reasonably practical considers the risks and controls harm to others. It is reasonably practical to prevent such harm to children at the school and local residents may face regarding increased total respirable dust inhaleable from concrete with set limits in EH40.
34. Individual	AM28	Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard. We already live in an area of high incidents of asthma, dust is very likely going to increase this disease in local children.
36. Individual	AM28	• Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of

		<p>Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft pupils.
37. Individual	AM28	<p>With reference to my own areas of expertise, the siting of the aggregates recycling facility with the potential for production of hazardous inhalable dust particles in relatively close proximity to a school at the Milton Park Farm site concerns me that the requisite duty of care has not been fully appreciated.</p>
38. Individual	AM28	<p>I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing.</p> <p>I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons:</p> <p>Has the committee involved fully and scientifically evaluated the hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust? This hazard would surely affect the nearby school children and residents. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete which would present an additional health hazard If this is so this recycling would be with us for many years to come and so would the hazard.</p>
40. Individual	AM28	<p>I request evidence from an independent scientific and medical study into the extent of health hazards to school children and residents, resulting from microscopic air-borne cement dust particles, before any aggregate recycling and concrete crushing is undertaken so close to Manorcroft School and residents near Milton Park Farm.</p>
43. Individual	AM28	<p>As the local LEA SCC provide an excellent educational facility in Manorcroft School. If permission is granted to the aggregate re-cycling facility in Milton Park Farm SCC fail in their duty of care in regards to the pupils as a result harm the facility would cause to pupils now and in many years to come</p>
44. Individual	AM28	<p>As the local LEA SCC provide an excellent educational facility in Manorcroft School. If permission is granted to the aggregate re-cycling facility in Milton Park Farm SCC fail in their duty of care in regards to the pupils as a result harm the facility would cause to pupils now and in many years to come.</p>
52. Individual	AM28	<p>I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life.</p> <p>·Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper</p>

		<p>consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust.</p> <p>·I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard.</p> <p>·If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.</p>
54. Individual	AM28	<p>I am worried that the dust and fumes caused by such a site will affect the health of the local school children. The number of asthma sufferers in the UK continues to steadily rise, and the UK already has one of the highest prevalence rates of asthma symptoms in children worldwide. Increasing the amount of dust in the air may be dangerous to children in the area. (Note that this also links in with Part C (Ref AM28)).</p> <p>There is also the potential issue of noise pollution from an industrial site, which may adversely affect the students education.</p>
55. Individual	AM28	<p>As a local resident of Egham town for the past 21 years I wish to record my strongest objection to the Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD.</p> <p>My primary grounds for objection are as follows:</p> <p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I question whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children, pre-school children, elderly people and elderly care homes, and local residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust, especially for vulnerable groups such as the very young and very old. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard. If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come. This means that the full impact of health damage caused may not be apparent for many years but represents ongoing deterioration in the population.</p>
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	AM28	<p>Great Fosters is concerned that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard to our staff and many guests.</p> <p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.</p>
59. Individual	AM28	<p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I</p>

		<p>ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration? The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard. In my opinion it is completely inappropriate for this sort of facility to be located so close to a school – not only would the plans impact the health of the school’s and nursery’s pupils, but perhaps could threaten the long-term viability of the school as parents could send their children to other schools less blighted by development.</p> <p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then the disruption to the area would be with us for many years to come which would negatively impact school pupils and residents for a pro-longed period.</p>
60. Individual	AM28	<p>As I already mentioned in point 4, I am very concerned about the dust particles that could affect our community, and especially the vulnerable. I believe that the need for Surrey County Council to exercise a responsible duty of care (especially when its role as LEA is taken into consideration) is even greater when the particles we are talking about could quite feasibly include silica and cement dust (the latter was the subject of the lawsuit in the Erin Brockovich film).</p>
61. Individual	AM28	<p>Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA.</p> <p>If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft Pupils.</p>
62. Individual	AM28	<p>Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA.</p> <p>If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft Pupils.</p>
63. Individual	AM28	<p>An aggregates recycling facility generating fine particles and dust positioned close to the close houses and school, would be a source of serious health problems.</p>
67. Individual	AM28	<p>The proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility within the Milton Park Farm site, does not seem to have taken proper consideration of the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents. I believe the Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust.</p>
74. Individual	AM28	<p>With regard to the Milton Park Farm site I would like to ask which hand of consideration has been given towards school children and residents vis a vis Health & Safety in relation to dust which arises from sand and cement dust. My understanding is that particles of approx 0.1 micrometres are produced in the process of crushing cement. If Whitehall</p>

		Farm is to be used in addition to Milton Park Farm then recycling will make a problem for us in environmental terms for many years to come.
79. Individual	AM28	<p>Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA.</p> <p>If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft Pupils.</p>
88. Individual	AM28	<p>I am concerned about the health and welfare of school children and residents in the area due to the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard.</p> <p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.</p>
91. Individual	AM28	<p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I question whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive gives details of the considerable hazards associated with silica (sand) and cement dust; and furthermore, ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete.</p> <p>The latest research coming from the University of Surrey (not my university) shows that, in addition to relatively large particles (of several micrometres in diameter), ultra-fine particles (UFPs) are also released when crushing concrete blocks, demolishing old concrete slabs and recycling concrete debris: see reference (1) below. UFPs have diameters less than 0.1 micrometres (that is, 100 nanometres) and are thus 100 times smaller than the Particulate Matter of 10 micrometres (PM₁₀). The latter is more widely known (2) and it comes from both vehicle exhausts and building operations. If it comes from building activities, it brings its own particular health hazards, carrying biological debris (fungal spores, moulds, bird droppings, etc.) and affecting respiratory function. During demolition of concrete, UFPs have the potential to carry airborne pathogens or viruses into the surrounding environment; but their health hazards are not yet fully understood and the production of UFPs needs regulation (3). The 'Precautionary Principle' should be invoked: if one doesn't understand the hazard, then don't do it! At the very least, a risk assessment needs to be done.</p> <p><i>References</i> P Kumar, M Mulheron and C. Som, Release of ultrafine particles from three simulated building processes, <i>Journal of Nanoparticle Research</i>, (2012) 14:771 (14 pages). V Kukadia, S Upton and C Grimwood, Controlling particles, vapour and noise pollution from construction sites: <i>Building Research Establishment Pollution Guide</i>, (2003) pages 1-8. P Kumar, M Mulheron, B Fisher and R Harrison, Airborne ultrafine particle dust from building activities – A source in need of quantification, <i>Atmospheric Environment</i>, vol.56 (2012) pages 262-264.</p>

92. Individual	AM28	As per my comments for Part B putting such a facility in a residential area behind a pre-school & primary school is completely immoral. I assume therefore that the Council Committee have no children of their own otherwise they would not consider it. How can you consider condemning a 5 year old to breathe particles of concrete, sand and other containments which may be present in the recycled material such as asbestos, could possibly be ethical? I would challenge you to visit the school and sit down with the children, look them in the eye and explain how you are going to damage their lungs and give them cancer. If you were also to let Whitehall Farm use this facility this will be with us forever.
100. Individual	AM28	Locality the ARF so close to Manorcrofts School has the necessary due care and attention been taken and sufficient studied to categorically conclude that the health and safety of the children from particles and dust produced is not compromised (especially considering the already high level pollution from the M25). If in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also used for the facility, then recycling would be with Egham for an inordinate amount of time (10's of years).
102. Individual	AM28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA. • If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft pupils.
104. Individual	AM28	I am concerned about the health and welfare of school children and residents in the area due to the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard. If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.
105. Individual	AM28	I think I have already covered this above but again, very fine potentially toxic particles of airborne pollution being released next to a junior school suggest you would not be taking seriously you duty of care to children.
106. Individual	AM28	The known particulate pollution, near a school, that would be caused by aggregate recycling would be a neglect, by the council, of the duty of care towards the schoolchildren. This negligence would also affect the people who work at the school and the local residents.
108. Individual	AM28	The proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site borders Manorcroft Primary School and I would ask whether the necessary duty of care towards the school-children and residents has been given due consideration. The Health & Safety Executive have given details of the considerable hazards

		associated with fine sand and cement dust.
110. Individual	AM28	<p>The proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility (north prt of Milton Park Farm site) is too close to Manorcroft school children and a densely populated residential area . Is there duty of care shown to their health and wellbeing?</p> <p>We have heard about research recently which details the great hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust which cannot be expelled from the lungs. Ultra fine particles (apprx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete - extremely dangerous. Has this been taken into consideration?</p> <p>If Whitehall Farm is also going to be involved in recycling as well as Milton Park Farm there is potential that we shall all in this area, suffer environmental strain, health issues, distress for much longer.</p> <p>I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.</p>
111. Individual	AM28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating an aggregate re-cycling facility at the north end of Milton Park Farm, so close to Manorcroft Primary School, does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils of Manorcroft Primary School by SCC, particularly in their role as the LEA. • If approved, aggregate re-cycling at Milton Park Farm will continue for many years, affecting many generations of Manorcroft pupils.
115. Individual	AM28	<p>As per my comments for Part B putting such a facility in a residential area behind a pre-school & primary school is completely immoral. I assume therefore that the council Committee have no children of their own otherwise they would not consider it. How can you consider condemning a 5 year old to breathe particles of concrete, sand and other contaminants which may be present in the recycled material such as asbestos, could possibly be ethical?</p> <p>Again, I would challenge you to visit the school and sit down with the children, look them in the eye and explain how you are going to damage their lungs and give them cancer.</p> <p>If you were also to let Whitehall Farm use this facility this will be with us forever.</p>
117. Individual	AM28	<p>I am concerned about the health and welfare of school children and residents in the area due to the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazards.</p> <p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come.</p>

Rep No	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
		(Duplicate of 104)
118. Individual	AM28	<p>I am extremely concerned about this plan for the proposed aggregates recycling plant.</p> <p>I am especially concerned about the following.</p> <p>I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, and therefore there are very real health risks involving respiratory problems caused by chronic irritation of the lungs and mucus membranes. How can you contemplate risking the health of the local children, particularly as the problem would be toxicologically compounded by similarly sized Diesel particles released by the associated heavy aggregates lorries on the Stroude Road, vehicles on the adjacent M25 motorway as well as particulate and hydrocarbon pollution from airliners flying overhead?</p> <p>Please do not allow this aggregate recycling plant to be built.</p>
121. Belron International Limited	AM28	<p>At Annex 3 (p21) of the Environmental Report Update (August 2012), in discussing transport infrastructure & traffic, the Council stresses the need to take into account the environmental impacts of traffic, and particularly the resulting noise, dust, fumes and vibration, which it regards as key considerations.</p> <p>AM28 however indicates support for the location of a recycling facility at Milton Park Farm and its retention for the operational lifetime of the succeeding Whitehall Farm site.</p> <p>It is considered that the resulting increase in HGV traffic on minor roads in the vicinity of Egham would give rise to significant additional adverse impacts over a considerable period of time and that those impacts have not been fully take into account in accord with the principles set out in the updated Environmental Report.</p>
124. Individual	AM28	<p>The proposed location for aggregates recycling fails to take into account the location of local schools and housing and fails to address the respect of detrimental air quality due to fine dust associated with cement dust and particles.</p>
125. Individual	AM28	<p>Equally worrying is the impact of such a site within a stone's throw of the local school, recreational facilities and residential properties. Can the County really demonstrate it has exercised a 'duty of care' to these citizens, young and old? I understand the area is already an Air Quality Management area (AQMA) and some time ago had already exceeded EU limits with its levels of particulates – into this already toxic mix you will be adding ultra-fine particles of dust, without even having up- to- date data. I strongly disagree this to be a matter of 'low significance' as it will have a great significance to the growing number of children and adults with asthmatic and chest conditions.</p>
126. Individual	AM28	<p>Location of the site at the north end of Milton Park Farm so close to Manorcroft school and Nursery does not demonstrate the necessary duty of care towards the pupils and staff and establishments by SCC. This will affect many generations of pupils.</p>
128. Individual	AM28	<p>Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration? The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and</p>

		<p>cement dust. I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard. In my opinion it is completely inappropriate for this sort of facility to be located so close to a school – not only would the plans impact the health of the school’s and nursery’s pupils, but perhaps could threaten the long-term viability of the school as parents could send their children to other schools less blighted by development.</p> <p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then the disruption to the area would be with us for many years to come which would negatively impact school pupils and residents for a pro-longed period.</p>
129. Individual	AM28	<p>As Egham residents We already live under the flight path, have a mainline railway connection are within a mile of one of the busiest motorways in Europe - with the noise and air pollution associated with these our air quality and quality of life is already compromised.As a local school governor and someone with a heart condition from birth I am very concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised and do not believe that this has been adequately factored into the proposal. There is much evidence to suggest that air borne particulates cause respiration issues in the younge old and inform.</p> <p>I do not believe that a council representing our interests can support such a gravel development.</p> <p>With I therefore object with the following specifics: Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling facility in the northern part of the Milton Park Farm site, I ask whether the necessary duty of care towards nearby school-children and residents has been given proper consideration. The Health & Safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust.</p> <p>I believe that ultra-fine particles (approx. 0.1 micrometres) are produced when crushing concrete, which would present an additional health hazard.</p>
16. Individual	AM33	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further <u>aggregates recycling facilities</u> are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.</p>
17. Manorcroft Primary School	AM33	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?</p>
21. Thorpe Ward Residents Association	AM33	<p>Tables here indicate that the NW Surrey area would accommodate over half the total Surrey recycling – no further aggregate recycling facilities are therefore required in this area.</p>

25. Individual	AM33	<p>a) Which route will lorries take. I suspect they will further exacerbate the problems we have with level crossings and will also be a major problem on minor roads.</p> <p>b) the education of our young children will be affected by noise and health problems.</p> <p>c) The living conditions for the whole area will be diminished and make Egham a second rate area to live in.</p>
27. RAGE	AM33	<p>These two charts (for 25% and 75% production) appear to be incompatible with one another. Please explain. And furthermore, as an example, taking figures read off the 75% chart for 2016, why is NW Surrey taking 60% of the total for all of Surrey? Does not this clearly demonstrate that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed in NW Surrey?</p>
29. Individual	AM33	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?</p>
36. Individual	AM33	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?</p>
38. Individual	AM33	<p>I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing.</p> <p>I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons:</p> <p>Charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. How can this be right? Surely it should be distributed fairly within Surrey as a whole.</p>
40. Individual	AM33	<p>I require an explanation as to why N.W. Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling of Surrey as a whole.</p>
52. Individual	AM33	<p>I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life.</p> <p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.</p>
55. Individual	AM33	<p>As a local resident of Egham town for the past 21 years I wish to record my strongest objection to the Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD.</p> <p>My primary grounds for objection are as follows:</p> <p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. Unless NW Surrey generates a similar proportion of the waste then this clearly indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.</p>

60. Individual	AM33	As mentioned in point 5, these charts show that North West Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in North West Surrey and it is unfair to expect this area of the county to take any further burden on behalf of the rest of the county. What these charts don't show is that there are already six aggregate recycling facilities within four miles of the proposed site at Milton Park Farm, Egham, and not all are working at full capacity. Again, I have to question if this is a commercial decision in the interests of profiteering rather than preserving or improving the quality of life of Surrey residents.
61. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
62. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
67. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total aggregates recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.
74. Individual	AM33	These charts show me that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. This indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed in NW Surrey if your information is correct.
75. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
78. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
79. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
92. Individual	AM33	Your own charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of all the recycling for Surrey which means this just isn't necessary.
102. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
110. Individual	AM33	More aggregates recycling facilities are not needed in NW Surrey because these charts demonstrate that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
111. Individual	AM33	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
115. Individual	AM33	Your own charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of all the recycling for Surrey which means this just isn't necessary.
121. Belron	AM33	During the examination in public of the Aggregates Recycling DPD there was considerable discussion on the location of

<p>International Limited</p>		<p>existing recycling sites and their degree of fit with market requirements.</p> <p>The Council confirmed that all areas of the County were currently well served and that the present distribution, with approximately 35% of existing sites located within north west Surrey, both reflected and met existing needs. It was also stated that, since the major sources and markets were located in urban areas, the preference was that recycling facilities should be located in such areas.</p> <p>In subsequent discussions on the location of possible future sites, including Milton Park Farm, it was apparent that a number of these sites were not located in urban areas and indeed that several lay in Green Belt.</p> <p>It was also noted that the projected future distribution of sites showed a very marked skewing towards north west Surrey with approximately 50% of sites located here, in direct conflict with the Council's evidence that the present distribution met present and projected future needs.</p> <p>In considering locations for recycling facilities it is clearly self-evident that sites should be easily accessible from the strategic road network. It is considered that the proposed site at Milton Park Farm does not meet this test.</p> <p>During the hearings it also became apparent that the location of proposed future recycling sites does not accord with with national, regional and local guidance and that, in selecting sites, the County Council had not adhered to its own locational criteria. Furthermore it was apparent that Milton Park Farm presently falls outside any of the County's own preferred locational criteria and, even if consent were to be granted, it would rank only fifth in the preferred categories of locations.</p> <p>The charts set out in AM33 and AM35 confirm that the Council has failed to address the shortcomings described above and that north west Surrey is therefore scheduled to handle a much greater proportion of future inert waste arisings within the County. This is in direct contradiction to the Council's assertion that the existing distribution meets present and projected future needs.</p>
<p>124. Individual</p>	<p>AM33</p>	<p>The proposals indicates NW Surrey would take too large a proportion of recycling for the whole of Surrey – this is unacceptable in and area of high population and schools. Crushing of concrete should be carried out close to source to eliminate unnecessary vehicle journeys delivering demolitions waste and concrete away from the facility.</p>
<p>126. Individual</p>	<p>AM33</p>	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation – is this commercially driven?</p>
<p>127. Individual</p>	<p>AM33</p>	<p>Directing more than half of the total recycling for Surrey to this site is intolerable. How so much disruption and pollution can be concentrated next to a primary school and nursery defies a sense of logic or decency.</p>
<p>16. Individual</p>	<p>AM35</p>	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.</p>
<p>17. Manorcroft</p>	<p>AM35</p>	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not</p>

Rep No	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
Primary School		seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
21. Thorpe Ward Residents Association	AM35	Tables here indicate that the NW Surrey area would accommodate over half the total Surrey recycling – no further aggregate recycling facilities are therefore required in this area.
25. Individual	AM35	a) Which route will lorries take. I suspect they will further exacerbate the problems we have with level crossings and will also be a major problem on minor roads. b) the education of our young children will be affected by noise and health problems. c) The living conditions for the whole area will be diminished and make Egham a second rate area to live in.
29. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
36. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
38. Individual	AM35	I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing. I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons: Charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. How can this be right? Surely it should be distributed fairly within Surrey as a whole.
40. Individual	AM35	I require an explanation as to why N.W. Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling of Surrey as a whole.
52. Individual	AM35	I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life. These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.
55. Individual	AM35	As a local resident of Egham town for the past 21 years I wish to record my strongest objection to the Minerals Plan and Surrey Waste Plan, Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD. My primary grounds for objection are as follows: These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. Unless NW

		Surrey generates a similar proportion of the waste then this clearly indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.
60. Individual	AM35	As mentioned in point 5, these charts show that North West Surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in North West Surrey and it is unfair to expect this area of the county to take any further burden on behalf of the rest of the county. What these charts don't show is that there are already six aggregate recycling facilities within four miles of the proposed site at Milton Park Farm, Egham, and not all are working at full capacity. Again, I have to question if this is a commercial decision in the interests of profiteering rather than preserving or improving the quality of life of Surrey residents.
61. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
62. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
67. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total aggregates recycling for all of Surrey, which indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed or justified in NW Surrey.
74. Individual	AM35	These charts show me that NW Surrey would be taking more then half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. This indicates that further aggregates recycling facilities are not needed in NW Surrey if your information is correct.
75. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
78. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
79. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
92. Individual	AM35	Your own charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of all the recycling for Surrey which means this just isn't necessary.
102. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
110. Individual	AM35	More aggregates recycling facilities are not needed in NW Surrey because these charts demonstrate that NW surrey would be taking more than half of the total recycling for all of Surrey. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
111. Individual	AM35	These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation across the county. Again, is this commercially driven?
115. Individual	AM35	Your own charts show that NW Surrey would be taking more than half of all the recycling for Surrey which means this just isn't necessary.

Rep No Organisation Name	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
121. Belron International Limited	AM35	<p>During the examination in public of the Aggregates Recycling DPD there was considerable discussion on the location of existing recycling sites and their degree of fit with market requirements.</p> <p>The Council confirmed that all areas of the County were currently well served and that the present distribution, with approximately 35% of existing sites located within north west Surrey, both reflected and met existing needs. It was also stated that, since the major sources and markets were located in urban areas, the preference was that recycling facilities should be located in such areas.</p> <p>In subsequent discussions on the location of possible future sites, including Milton Park Farm, it was apparent that a number of these sites were not located in urban areas and indeed that several lay in Green Belt.</p> <p>It was also noted that the projected future distribution of sites showed a very marked skewing towards north west Surrey with approximately 50% of sites located here, in direct conflict with the Council's evidence that the present distribution met present and projected future needs.</p> <p>In considering locations for recycling facilities it is clearly self-evident that sites should be easily accessible from the strategic road network. It is considered that the proposed site at Milton Park Farm does not meet this test.</p> <p>During the hearings it also became apparent that the location of proposed future recycling sites does not accord with with national, regional and local guidance and that, in selecting sites, the County Council had not adhered to its own locational criteria. Furthermore it was apparent that Milton Park Farm presently falls outside any of the County's own preferred locational criteria and, even if consent were to be granted, it would rank only fifth in the preferred categories of locations.</p> <p>The charts set out in AM33 and AM35 confirm that the Council has failed to address the shortcomings described above and that north west Surrey is therefore scheduled to handle a much greater proportion of future inert waste arisings within the County. This is in direct contradiction to the Council's assertion that the existing distribution meets present and projected future needs.</p>
126. Individual	AM35	<p>These charts show that NW Surrey would be taking on more than half of the total recycling for Surrey. This does not seem to indicate a fair allocation – is this commercially driven?</p>
127. Individual	AM35	<p>Directing more than half of the total recycling for Surrey to this site is intolerable. How so much disruption and pollution can be concentrated next to a primary school and nursery defies a sense of logic or decency.</p>
101. Spelthorne Borough Council	AM53	<p>On 25 September Cabinet resolved that Surrey County Council be informed that this Council welcomes and supports the changes which have been proposed in the Main Modifications and the Additional Modifications, in particular the deletion of references to Charlton Lane and Homers Farm, having regard to the Council's original representations, and confirms that it has no further comments to make on any of the proposed changes.</p>

15. Oxted & Limpsfield Residents Group	General	<p>In the Schedule of Additional Modifications and the document entitled "Assessment of compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework" some of the references to policies are incorrect owing to the reordering caused by the introduction of a new policy AR1, which reflects the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, and what was agreed between SCC and OLRG (i.e. the original AR3 windfall policy to come before the original AR2 policy).</p> <p>For example in paragraph 7 of the NPPF assessment document, the first sentence should read "Policy AR2 (to be renumbered <u>AR4</u>)". Therefore, OLRG requests that SCC should review the documents and make such further Additional Modifications as necessary to ensure that the ARDPD reflects the following order of policies:</p> <p>AR1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development AR2 - Aggregates recycling facilities AR3 - Aggregates recycling at mineral sites AR4 - Aggregates recycling outside preferred areas AR5 - High value recovery.</p>
19. Individual	General	The ultra fine particles produced when crushing concrete are hazardous to local school children, residents and wildlife.
46. Central Bedfordshire Council	General	<p><u>Policy AR1</u> – The shared service supports this policy – though Surrey should be careful not to repeat National Policy. <u>Paragraph 40</u> – Temporary recycling facilities should be included in the calculations. <u>Paragraph 82</u> – States that "<i>authorities with a significant proportion of land designated Green Belt might not be able to implement their full apportionment through site allocations in development plan documents</i>". The Shared service questions whether this approach is deliverable, and whether it will lead to the under-provision of mineral in the South East.</p>
64. Individual	General	<p>If, in addition to Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm is also to use this facility, then recycling would be with us for many years to come. Regarding the proposed location of the aggregates recycling in the northern section of Milton Park site has necessary duty of care towards residents been given proper consideration? The health & safety Executive give details of the considerable hazards associated with fine sand & cement dust.</p>
93. Individual	General	I am very concerned regarding the hazards associated with fine sand and cement dust the crushing of materials would present an additional health hazard.
95. Individual	General	The deletion of Watersplash farm from Policy AR3. Please keep me informed of any further development.
96. Individual	General	The deletion of Watersplash farm from Policy AR3. Please keep me informed of any further development.
97. Individual	General	AR3 There should be no addition to the six aggregates recycling plants already sited in N.W. Surrey. There are alternative location which have not yet been explored. The plans breach the national planning policy framework.
103. Slough Borough	General	No specific response

Rep No **Modification No / Paragraph**
Organisation Name

Representation Text

Council		
---------	--	--

Representations to Updated Environmental Report

Updated Environmental Report

27. RAGE	Page 3	On page 3, first paragraph, we quote the following: The strategic nature of the policy meant that it also had the capacity to present risks to key aspects of the environment, including the natural and historic environments, landscape, particularly in terms of local visual amenity, the water environment, including impacts on flood risk, the climate as a consequence of energy use, and local air quality due to dust. The main impacts in respect of communities would be the effects of traffic on local roads, and the scope for developments to give rise to nuisance (e.g. noise, dust, etc.). This neatly summarises our grave concerns regarding development at Milton Park Farm.
32.Egham Residents Association	Page 3, para 1	States that "the strategic nature of the policy (AR1) means that it also has the capacity to present risks to key aspects of the environment, including the natural & historic environments, landscape, particularly in terms of local visual amenity, the water environment, including impacts on flood risk, the climate as a consequence of energy use and local air quality due to dust. The main impacts in respect of communities would be the effect of traffic on local roads and the scope for developments to give rise to nuisance (e.g. noise, dust etc)". These reasons pretty much some up our objections to an ARF at Milton Park Farm!
91. Individual	Page 3, para 1	On page 3, first paragraph, I quote the following: The strategic nature of the policy [AR1] meant that it also had the capacity to present risks to key aspects of the environment, including the natural and historic environments, landscape, particularly in terms of local visual amenity, the water environment, including impacts on flood risk, the climate as a consequence of energy use, and local air quality due to dust. The main impacts in respect of communities would be the effects of traffic on local roads, and the scope for developments to give rise to nuisance (e.g. noise, dust, etc.). This neatly summarises my grave concerns regarding development at Milton Park Farm.
4. Stanwell Liberal Party	Page 18 – Air Quality	You say- correctly- here, that air quality impacts will need to be addressed. They surely will given the huge dust problem already existing in Stanwell Moor (the subject of course of a different enquiry). This matter, contrary to your estimate, is not of 'low significance.'
16. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.
17.Manorcroft Primary School	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
21.Thorpe Ward Residents Association	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? In our area of Runnymede, under the LHR flight paths and with the Borough being quartered by the M25 and M3, air quality is of paramount importance. Indeed, there is Air Quality Management Area adjacent to the Milton Park Farm site in Stroude.

19. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I do not agree this is of 'low significance'.
26. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	This cannot be regarded as a matter of low significance: there is already an AQMA alongside it. Additional air pollution cannot be tolerated in this area as it puts health (and lives) at risk.
27. RAGE	Page 18 Paragraph A3.4 Air quality	SCC recognises the 'impacts on local air quality through emissions of dust and emissions <i>from vehicles</i> . <i>Such potential impacts will need to be addressed, in the case of any proposals for new facilities (whether permanent or temporary), as part of any EIA undertaken in relation to any planning applications made.</i> ' We agree with this statement, and with it being categorised as 'Adverse, but we strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously and are of 'high significance'. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it.
29. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
32. Egham Residents Association	Page 18 – Air Quality	We strongly disagree that this issue is of "low significance" – indeed hazards to health have to be taken very seriously & should be of "high significance". It should be noted that Milton Park Farm already has an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it.
33. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I disagree that impact will be of low significance and question the quantitative evaluation that supports this statement.
34. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant. Most large lorries are diesel and if there is an increase in the number of them in the area, there will be an increase of their exhaust in this area and thus more pollution to affect local people. It has been clearly proven that Diesel exhaust particles are harmful.
36. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
37. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	The use of the phrase 'low significance' in conjunction with the potential for increased air pollution by both the activities of recycling, cement production and increased vehicle traffic actually appears unbelievably naive (particularly taken in the context of all the other proposals for development in the area). As previously observed this area is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).
38. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for

		<p>many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing.</p> <p>I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons:</p> <p>This topic is of "high importance" not "low importance. There is no current data available and advice from experts is that Milton Park Farm should have consistent and ongoing monitoring by an Air Quality Management Area. This should include relevant points on the site and along transport routes.</p>
40. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I repeat request for an independent scientific air quality study.
52. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	<p>I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.</p>
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	Page 18 – Air Quality	Great Fosters disagrees with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it.
59. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. The impact on the health of pupils at Manorcroft school and nursery should be considered highly significant. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.
60. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	It is offensive that the issue of our air quality has been dismissed as having 'low significance'. This is clearly an attempt to bury what is actually a very important issue that would take time and money to resolve (and probably not in favour of the installation at that). I expect a much greater duty of care by Surrey County Council with regards to something that could have long term health implications for generations. This report needs to recognise that the proposed site overlaps an area already classified as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and both will be abutting Manorcroft School and housing estate. Surrey County Council also has a duty to recognise that there is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant. I have a trail of email communications with the Runnymede Borough Council experts about this over the

		last few years (although their post no longer exists as funding was cut), which I would be happy to release to you for due consideration.
61. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
62. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
64. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered 'of low significance'.
74. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being of 'low significance'. It is of my great concern to local residents who are subject to increased pollution from the M25. Sanely hazards to health should be taken seriously before any decisions are made that will impact the population. At Milton Park Farm forum there is an Air Quality Management area alongside it which suggests there is already an issue about it.
75. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
76. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	My second ground for objecting to the proposal is the effect on air quality, particularly with regarding the proximity of the proposed plant to Manorcrofts school. It is no surprise to me to learn that the occurrence of diseases such as asthma is increasing (particularly among children) given that ever increasing amount of air pollution. The proximity of the M25 and Heathrow Airport mean that air quality in Egham is already poor. To site an aggregate re-cycling plant in the area adjacent to the school would indicate a total disregard for the health and well being of children at school and therefore this proposal must be seen as a complete non-starter.
78. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
79. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
88. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.
92. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	The comments of "low significance" are ridiculous. We already suffer from high levels of asthma due to pollutions from the M25 & Heathrow. This is final "nail in the coffin". Would you let your toddler go to school or live on top of a concrete processing plant! I believe that Surrey has not acted on the advice of experts regarding the monitoring of the existing air quality and there is already AQMA by it.
100. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	Air quality should be given extremely high priority, especially given the already high level of pollution posed by the M25.

102. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
104. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.
105. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	Again, increased airborne dust particles from both the recycling and also the vehicles delivering and removing aggregates from the site.
108. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'.
110. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I cannot understand at all how a topic such as air quality can be considered to be of 'low significance.' Health hazards are to be regarded properly. WE have an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside Milton Farm. We already have to deal with pollution from the M25 and aircraft. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
111. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can Air Quality be of 'low significance'? Air quality and its effect on health is a very serious issue. The area around Milton Park Farm is already an Air Quality Management Area.
115. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	The comments of "low significance" are ridiculous. We already suffer from high levels of asthma due to pollution from the M25 & Heathrow. This is the final "nail in the coffin". Would you let your toddler go to school or live on top of a concrete processing plant! I believe that Surrey has not acted on the advice of experts regarding the monitoring of the existing air quality and there is already an AQMA by it. The effect of air quality & other environmental issues will have a massive effect on all the local community. This area is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The area next to the M25 is designated as an AQMA as it had levels of pollutants and particles that exceeded the EU limits the last time they were measured but levels of have not been recorded recently due to budget cuts. The additional processing and transportation will certainly have a negative effect on the area. Again this is next to a primary school and nursery, housing estate, residential properties and Council leisure facilities. These pollutants can cause deep lung tissue damage and even enter the brain through the bloodstream so they need to be closely monitored and reduced where necessary. Both my daughter and nephew (who either went or go to this school have suffered from asthma and my father suffers from breathing problems. Therefore I am very concerned as to the effect of the additional pollutants on the health of our community.
117. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance' . Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all

		relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year to be relevant. (Duplicate of 104)
124. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	How can air quality be regarded as low significance when the close area already failed to comply with the EU ref.
126. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	This should not be considered 'low significance' This is already an AQMA area and the effect on health is serious.
127. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	Classifying air quality as 'low significance' is interesting and I would like to know how it fits into the Runnymede 'local air quality action plan'.
128. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. The impact on the health of pupils at Manorcroft school and nursery should be considered highly significant. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.
129. Individual	Page 18 – Air Quality	As Egham residents We already live under the flight path, have a mainline railway connection are within a mile of one of the busiest motorways in Europe - with the noise and air pollution associated with these our air quality and quality of life is already compromised. As a local school governor and someone with a heart condition from birth I am very concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised and do not believe that this has been adequately factored into the proposal. There is much evidence to suggest that air borne particulates cause respiration issues in the young old and inform. I do not believe that a council representing our interests can support such a gravel development. With I therefore object with the following specifics: I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance'. Hazards to health have to be taken seriously. In the case of Milton Park Farm, there is already an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) alongside it. There is no current data available for this AQMA and advice from experts is that this should be monitored at all relevant points on the site and along affected transport routes for at least a year for it to be relevant.
27. RAGE	Page 19 – Water resources & quality.	We note that aggregate recycling facilities ' <i>may create demand for water as part of the recycling process</i> '. I We would like to know how much demand and whether, at individual sites such as Milton Park Farm, this demand would be sustainable.
4. Stanwell Liberal	Page 20 – Historic	You totally ignore the fact that SQ falls COMPLETELY within the protection parameters spelled out by the Govt in the NPF where there are entire and highly relevant chapters on the need to safeguard these.

Party	environment & archaeology	
16. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	In the case of Milton Park Farm, the settings of local listed buildings appear to have been overlooked.
19. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	Historic environment & archaeology – the settings of local listed buildings has been overlooked.
27. RAGE	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	In the case of Milton Park Far, we take issue with the statement: ' <i>The proposed locations of the recycled aggregate production facilities do not, based on existing information, coincide with any areas of national importance for heritage and archaeology...</i> ' in that the settings of local listed buildings appear to have been overlooked.
40. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	Milton Park Farm's proximity to Great Fosters: Patrons of this hotel would fail to be attracted to a setting where a clanking conveyor belt crossed the approach road and where heavy lorries thundered past the historic building!
52. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life. In the case of Milton Park Farm, the settings of local listed buildings appear to have been overlooked.
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	In the case of Milton Park Farm, the setting of Great Fosters as a local listed building appears to have been overlooked.
74. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	In the case of Milton Park Farm, the settings of local lived buildings such as Great Fosters appear to have been overlooked.
110. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	The setting of local listed buildings do not appear to have been taken into consideration with regard to Milton Park Farm. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.

Rep No	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
121. Belron International Limited	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	In considering the historic environment & archaeology, the MPA identifies heritage and the setting of historic landscapes, sites and structures as being a key considerations. Notwithstanding this, in the case of the proposed Milton Park Farm site, the potential impacts on both local historic parkland and nationally important listed buildings and their settings do not appear to have been fully assessed and taken into account.
124. Individual	Page 20 – Historic environment & archaeology	The proposed facility would adversely affect the existing approach to "Great Fosters" a short drive up the road.
4. Stanwell Liberal Party	Page 20 – Natural environment & biodiversity	You totally ignore the fact that SQ falls COMPLETELY within the protection parameters spelled out by the Govt in the NPF where there are entire and highly relevant chapters on the need to safeguard these.
59. Individual	Page 20 – Natural environment & biodiversity	The site at Milton Park Farm, and Egham in general are very important for Stag Beetles which could be impacted by the Aggregate Recycling in conjunction with the gravel works
59. Individual	Page 20 – Economic Performance & Diversity	I would consider the plans for Milton Park Farm to be of potentially disastrous economic consequence for Egham - Economically Egham is linked to education, and office based businesses: aggregate recycling, gravel extraction and also associated lorry movements are not conducive to either education or office based businesses. We should be encouraging high value information based businesses which employ numerous people to the area, not automated heavy industry. What has a greater positive impact on the area: An R&D function for a company such as P&G, or a concrete crushing plant?
128. Individual	Page 20 – Economic Performance & Diversity	I would consider the plans for Milton Park Farm to be of potentially disastrous economic consequence for Egham - Economically Egham is linked to education, and office based businesses: aggregate recycling, gravel extraction and also associated lorry movements are not conducive to either education or office based businesses. We should be encouraging high value information based businesses which employ numerous people to the area, not automated heavy industry. What has a greater positive impact on the area: An R&D function for a company such as P&G, or a concrete crushing plant?
40. Individual	Page 21	Protector & Gamble's Research Laboratories are located adjacent to Milton Park Farm. This company's largesse and charitable generosity to Runnymede Borough's young people has been outstanding for decades. What a reward for them – to be driven out of their peaceful premises by a gravel company.
97. Individual	Page 21	AR3. Issues of traffic congestion, raised accident rates, environmental damage and impacts on air quality have not been adequately addressed.

19. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	Local businesses would leave the area.
27. RAGE	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	While the operation of an aggregates recycling facility would create a few jobs, if this is at the expense of hundreds of highly skilled employees being lost from local businesses, then the overall effect is not 'Beneficial & Low significance' but 'Adverse & High significance'. The local economy of Egham could be wrecked by the imposition of an aggregates recycling facility for Milton Park Farm.
51. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	If local businesses had to move out due to the effects of this kind of industry on their business processes and logistics, the local economy of Egham (and local projects supported by generous corporate social responsibility contributions) would be severely blighted by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm. People already avoid the town at certain times of the day due to the issues with the level crossings in the town and increases in the volume of traffic will add to this. Egham may well be reduced to a ghost town.
52. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life. If local businesses had to move out due to the effects of this kind of industry on their business processes and logistics, the local economy of Egham (and local projects supported by generous corporate social responsibility contributions) would be severely blighted by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm.
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	If, as we are concerned will be the case, Great Fosters' business was adversely affected by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm, this would have a detrimental effect on the local economy as we are a local employer.
59. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	If local businesses had to move out due to the effects of this kind of industry on their business processes and logistics, the local economy of Egham (and local projects supported by generous corporate social responsibility contributions) would be severely blighted by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm. See comment on Economic performance & diversity.
60. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	P&G and Belron are now incredibly significant employers in Egham, especially with the loss of other businesses in this harsh economic climate. Due to their geographic proximity to the site workings (for P&G, this is more about the gravel extraction – a proviso for the aggregates recycling proposal) both have objected to this development. Both have expressed concerns that, if this did go ahead, the negative effects on their commercial interests would mean that they might have to leave the area. I am incredibly loathed to see that happen. P&G especially invests heavily in the local community as a sponsor of many local Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives, school buses, the Egham Royal Show and they have kindly provided funding for Christmas lights this year. If P&G were

		to pull out of Egham, we would be bereft of our main community benefactor. I appreciate that Surrey County Council cannot make a decision based on the commercial interests of a third party, but I would expect a projected loss of investment in the community, residential tenants, their associated retail spending and the retail spending of commuters should at least be part of the equation if Surrey's pledge to residents is to be believed.
74. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	An aggregates recycling plant and operations resulting from it will decrease the potential attractiveness of the area for drawing business businesses. No one will want to work nearby if it compromises health and well being. This is especially true of the Milton Park farm site.
88. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	If local businesses had to move out due to the effects of this kind of industry on their business processes and logistics, the local economy of Egham (and local projects supported by generous corporate social responsibility contributions) would be severely blighted by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm.
91. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	While the operation of an aggregates recycling facility would create a few new jobs, if this is at the expense of hundreds of highly skilled employees being lost from local businesses, then the overall effect is not 'Beneficial & Low significance' but 'Adverse & High significance'. The local economy of Egham could be wrecked by the imposition of an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm.
92. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	The blight that this will cause on the area will unquestionably badly affect local businesses & the local economy. Just 2 months ago thousands of people lined the streets of Egham to celebrate the Olympic Torch as it made its way to Proctor and Gamble. These plans will destroy all that (ref: Page 21).
104. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	If local businesses had to move out due to the effects of this kind of industry on their business processes and logistics, the local economy of Egham (and local projects supported by generous corporate social responsibility contributions) would be severely blighted by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm.
115. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	The blight that this will cause on the area will unquestionably badly affect local businesses & the local economy. Just 2 months ago thousands of people lined the streets of Egham to celebrate the Olympic Torch as it made its way to Proctor and Gamble. These plans will destroy all that (ref: Page 21).
117. Individual	Page 21 - Labour market & employment.	If local businesses had to move out due to the effects of this kind of industry on their business processes and logistics, the local economy of Egham (and local projects supported by generous corporate social responsibility contributions) would be severely blighted by an aggregates recycling facility on Milton Park Farm. (Duplicate of 104)
110. Individual	Page 21 - Labour	This proposal of recycling aggregates could have a very damaging effect on local businesses. If the disruption, the

	market & employment.	pollution, the health risks lead them to move out of Egham this could have a very serious effect on the economy of the town and availability of work. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
40. Individual	Page 21	Protector & Gamble's Research Laboratories are located adjacent to Milton Park Farm. This company's largesse and charitable generosity to Runnymede Borough's young people has been outstanding for decades. What a reward for them – to be driven out of their peaceful premises by a gravel company.
17. Manorcroft Primary School	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
19. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Increase in heavy traffic which have a huge adverse impact on the quality of life of residents.
23. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The extra traffic on the roads will cause added problems on already congested roads> I am especially concerned with walking children to school along narrow pavements with large lorries gong past.
26. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	There are already considerable problems crossing the level crossings in the town: additional heavy lorry traffic will have a highly significant adverse impact on residents quality of life.
27. RAGE	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	We believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads intersected by railway level crossings in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents, young and old.
29. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
31. Procter & Gamble	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The increase in heavy lorry traffic on local minor roads could have a serious adverse impact on local quality of life as well as the operation of local businesses.

32.Egham Residents Association	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	We believe that heavy lorry traffic on minor roads intersected by a level crossing & the M25 would have serious impacts on the local quality of life.
33. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Heavy goods vehicle movements will increase the roads will be adversely impacted with particular conflict with pedestrians and cyclists along these prefaced routes.
34. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.
36. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
37. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Access and egress around Egham is already significantly challenged with existing traffic loads leading to gridlocks at the traffic lights on Station Road. Additional heavy lorry traffic on the roads around Egham can only aggravate this issue leading to stress for both those using the roads, businesses dependant on goods movement and residents. There is also a greater risk of traffic accidents, including those involving school children.
40. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Heavy rush hour traffic, with the additional recycling lorries could block the busy level crossings in Egham town. Emergency vehicles could be denied access as a consequence.
43. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The additional traffic associated with the siting of re-cycling and gravel extraction facility at Milton Park Farm will negatively impact pupils getting to and from school, local residents in their commutes to work as well as staff of major employees in the area such as Belron, Proctor & Gamble, Royal Holloway University and BMC Software.
44. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The additional traffic associated with the siting of re-cycling and gravel extraction facility at Milton Park Farm will negatively impact pupils getting to and from school, local residents in their commutes to work as well as staff of major employees in the area such as Belron, Proctor & Gamble, Royal Holloway University and BMC Software.
51. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure	I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town. The roads are narrow (particularly Stroude Road

	& traffic	<p>which is an accident blackspot) as well as the routes around Egham station and large lorries place pedestrians at increased risk. My two small children walk to school each day and I am deeply concerned about the increased risks that such a large increase in heavy goods vehicles will raise.</p>
52. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>I would like to object to the Aggregates Recycling Proposal for Egham. Such project would have a considerable negative effect of the local community as well as a detrimental effect on my quality of life.</p> <p>I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.</p> <p>Only a few months after the ill-thought Airtrack project and the strong opposition it gathered in Egham, it's simply unacceptable that SCC is seeking to worsen the congestion problems by significantly increasing traffic in Egham without any solution to the issue of level crossings.</p> <p>Egham already has a train line running through the middle of the town, with 4 level crossings, no bridges and no tunnels the result being that daily lives of the residents are already negatively effected even with the current level of train traffic. The AR proposal will increase the wait time, pollution, frustration further isolate the most vulnerable residents as well as impact bus services which are already badly affected by the level crossings and the resulting congestion.</p> <p>Nothing is being done to address this issue and I strongly object to any project that could make this bad situation worse. I already suffer on a daily basis of the congestion, difficulties in commuting right from the start of my journey because of the stationary traffic in Egham (and that frequently includes weekends and off peak periods when multiple trains extend the wait time significantly). I object to the project as it would affect my capacity to go to work in a timely manner, increased expense in petrol due to the wait time at the crossing and no alternative route is possible.</p> <p>The town is already severely congested with rush hour waits at the level crossings of 15 to 25 minutes. It is already normal for people waiting for the crossing to see the barriers go up and down 3 or 4 times before they reach the front of the queue. This already causes serious traffic congestion affecting me and the entire town.</p> <p>I am concerned that gridlock will contribute to a risk of ghettoisation for Egham Hythe. This part of town where I live is not very affluent. Already affected by anti-social behaviours, but if the South part of Egham is seen as a "virtual island" this will impact on the value of my property which located South of the railway line and others. People who can move out will, others will be left behind with properties harder to sell or at a loss.</p> <p>The existing wait time and congestion are already infuriating and vehicles and pedestrians still attempt to cross when the barriers are going down. Without condoning such practices, it is very likely that increased congestion</p>

		<p>will only increase the temptation or risk taking and with schools in the area, the most at risk could be the youngest members of our community.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned that the additional traffic and resulting congestion will have a negative effect on air quality in an area that is already an air management area. The area next to the M25 is designated as an AQMA as it had levels of pollutants and particles that exceeded EU limits the last time they were measured. I appreciate that it's not in SCC power to reduce traffic on the M25 or aircrafts movements but knowing the existing issue again, I find it acceptable that SCC is putting forward a project that will make it worse.</p>
54. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>I believe that the increase of traffic caused by a whole load more lorries will grind Egham to a near stand still. In particular there are significant issues already caused by the amount of time the two level crossings are down for. Traffic at peak times already causes backed up traffic to block many other road junctions in Egham. Additional lorries will significantly hinder commuters, shoppers and emergency vehicles from Egham's police and fire stations.</p>
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>Great Fosters believes that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in and around Great Fosters would have a highly significant adverse impact upon its business.</p>
59. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.</p>
61. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.</p>
62. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.</p>
63. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>Increased numbers of heavy lorries in and around Egham would seriously affect the movement of all traffic here because of the gridlock that would be caused at the well known black spots of the level crossings and roundabouts, etc.</p>

64. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	I believe that an increase in heavy goods traffic on minor roads in Egham will have a highly significant negative impact on the quality of life of residents.
67. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the current problems residents have in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town (inclusive of journeys from school to the town).
72. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	I believe that an increase in heavy goods lorries on minor roads around Egham would have an adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents in terms of increased noise, lowering of ease of movement and increased feelings of exposed to danger and risk.
75. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
76. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	<p>I am writing to register my objections to the proposals to allow aggregate recycling at Milton Park Farm in Egham. I object to the proposals on the grounds of the unsuitability of the local road network and the effect on local air quality.</p> <p>As I am led to believe that there would be no access from the proposed plant directly onto the M25; I can only assume that vehicles to and from the site would have to use the existing road network. The traffic would have to use a route from the A30 and M25 either along The Avenue, Vicarage Road, New Wickham Lane and Manorcrofts Road, or The Avenue, Church Road, Station Road, and Manorcrofts Road.</p> <p>The first of these routes is rather a long way round to get to and from the site from the Runnymede roundabout and I doubt whether the traffic would stick to it for too long before taking a shortcut through the town. Even if the traffic did keep to this route it is entirely unsuitable for large numbers of rigid 8 wheeled trucks that would be associated with the operation of the recycling plant.</p> <p>The Avenue is a residential road which included at least one sheltered housing complex for old people. Residents from this complex need to cross The Avenue to access the town and additional heavy goods vehicle movements along this road would increase the likelihood of an old person being killed or injured. It is also habitually parked-up on the south-east side adjacent to the roundabout which reduced the useable width of the road. The vehicles would have to effect a left turn at the mini-roundabout outside the police station. This is an extremely tight turn and the vehicles would need to be on the wrong side of the carriageway as they turn into Vicarage Road – this dramatically increases the likelihood of an accident. At the other end of this route the section of Manorcrofts Road</p>

		<p>from the junction of the New Wickham Lane and Stroude Road to the site is narrow and totally unsuitable for the size and weight of vehicle under consideration.</p> <p>The alternative route would take the traffic along the Avenue (with the associated problems outlined above), and along Church Road to the traffic lights at the junction with Station Road. At this point the vehicles would turn left and proceed along Station Road. Station Road is narrow, and the pavement on one side is particularly narrow. The vehicles would have to cross the railway line at the level crossing next to Egham station. I am aware that during the morning and evening peak periods these roads are already congested and the barrier downtime at Egham station crossing can cause the traffic to back up to the traffic lights. It should also be borne in mind that at peak periods there are large numbers of children moving to and from Manorcroft school, and also large numbers of Strode's College Students arriving at Egham station who walk up Station Road to the college. The noise, exhaust fumes and general danger of mixing heavy goods vehicles with children and teenagers tells me that there is great potential for a serious if not fatal accident to occur, and also there are long term health effects on young people to consider.</p> <p>Once over the crossing traffic would have to negotiate the mini-roundabout just outside Manorcroft school, and then the double bend in Manorcrofts Road itself.</p> <p>Vehicles leaving the site would have to negotiate this double bend in the opposite direction. Currently the Armco barrier outside the house on the corner of Manorcrofts Road and Braywood Avenue is regularly damaged by vehicles which fail to take the corner; which illustrates just how unsuitable this road is for HGVs. The second bend is also narrow, the pavement is narrow and the view of the way ahead is quite restricting.</p> <p>In summary therefore, the road network available to service the proposed site is totally unsuitable.</p>
78. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
74. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The increase in traffic that this proposed use of land would create will raise questions about health and safety. Pavements are already unacceptably narrow in places. It will not be possible to control the number of lorries arriving and departing from the site. The area is already grid-locked at peak hours.
79. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
88. Individual	Page 21 –	I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse

	Transport infrastructure & traffic	impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the severe problems that residents already suffer in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.
92. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The traffic through Egham is already at breaking point. Any increase in lorry traffic will have a massive impact on the quality of life of all the people who work and live here. Try traveling through Egham at rush hour and you will see we are already near breaking point (ref: Page 21).
100. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	An increase in heavy lorry traffic in an already highly grid-locked area (caused by the train level crossings) would impact the roads materially further.
102. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
104. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the severe problems that residents already suffer in crossing the level crossings on all the north-south routes through town.
105. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Egham already struggles to keep traffic moving due to the number of level crossings and train schedules. 100's of additional heavy lorries per week will put undue strain on traffic flow and also the road and level crossing surfaces. The potential increased disruption due to more frequent road repairs in addition to the overall traffic increase will probably cause an even higher level of air pollution increase.
108. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	As mentioned above, access to and from the site will overload the already busy local A roads and railway crossings. Hundreds of additional HGV movements each week will put undue strain on traffic flow and also the road and level crossing surfaces.
110. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Local residents will suffer an extreme lack of life quality when battling against heavy lorry traffic on minor roads not built to deal with this kind of traffic . Rat runs will be created which could lead to accidents. Congestion will lead to increased pollution. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
111. Individual	Page 21 – Transport	Additional traffic associated with aggregate re-cycling, combined with gravel extraction, would impact negatively on the safety of our pupils in an area that is already very busy. This may also impact on the timely arrival into

	infrastructure & traffic	Manorcroft Primary School of both pupils and staff.
115. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	The traffic through Egham is already at breaking point. Any increase in lorry traffic will have a massive impact on quality of life of all the people who work and live here. Try traveling through Egham at rush hour and you will see we are already near breaking point (ref: Page 21).
117. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	I believe that an increase in heavy lorry traffic on minor roads in Egham would have a highly significant adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents and only compound the severe problems that residents already suffer in crossing level crossings on all the north-south routes through town. (Duplicate of 104)
124. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	Extra traffic caused by heavy lorries would congest the local roads and make it less attractive for businesses and move into the area and make the lives of residents less pleasant.
126. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	An increase in heavy lorry traffic in Egham will have an adverse effect and compound level crossing issues and cause problems for children walking to local schools and not encourage people to use Egham Town Centre.
127. Individual	Page 21 – Transport infrastructure & traffic	With access for emergency services already affected by level crossings, extra congestion could seriously impact homes and businesses in the event of an emergency.
17. Manorcroft Primary School	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
29. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
33. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	Educational impact re use of outdoor classrooms and sporting activities has not been fully assessed.
34. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The children's education at Manorcroft Primary School could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm.

36. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
40. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	Outdoor curricular activities at the Manorcroft Primary School may be called into question if concrete-crushing is undertaken so close by the field/playgrounds.
51. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The children's education at Manorcroft Primary School and nearby Thorpe Lea and The Hythe Community schools could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm. Outdoor recreation may be affected and transport to and from local sports events and facilities may be hampered by the increased traffic in the locality. Parents are likely to encounter far more difficulty in getting their children safely to school.
52. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The children's education at Manorcroft Primary School could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm.
59. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The children's education at Manorcroft Primary School and nursery could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm. As stated above the long term viability of a high performing school could be threatened if parents choose schools less blighted by industry.
61. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
62. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
19. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	Local school children outside activities would be compromised.
23. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	At present Manorcroft School is a place parents fight for their children to attend. Will this still be the case with the recycling site next door. The school will not able to continue at the level currently attained.

27. RAGE	Page 21 – Skills and education	While the generally dismissive statement: <i>'No significant risks or opportunities are anticipated during the lifetime of the plan – the policy is not expected to have significant adverse or beneficial effects on the provision of skills and education.'</i> may apply to some sites, in the case of the proximity of Manorcroft Primary School to Milton Park Farm, it does not. The children's education could be placed at risk, especially if the outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates.
38. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	<p>I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing.</p> <p>I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons:</p> <p>Already the children at Manorcroft School have to deal with motor pollution from the M25. Pollution will be greatly increased and our children will be at risk. This will affect their outside activities. With the current focus now on physical exercise I see this as a barrier to health and wellbeing of our Egham children.</p>
60. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	<p>A development of this nature so close to the school boundary will limit the outdoor activities of children. This is not London and a lot of my Egham friends chose to leave London to avoid just this kind of polluted environment in the interests of the health and well being of our children. The school playing fields have the M25 to one side, but the open expanse and vista of Milton Park Farm to the other side to provide balance. It appears the plan of SCC is to pen the school children in with grassed mounds, leaving the M25 pollution on one side and dust from aggregates mounds along with associated heavy plant traffic noise on the other. My son currently plays football after school on a Friday in addition to his usual school activities, but I would not let him play anymore if this development were to go ahead as I couldn't risk him getting ANY more fine particles in his lungs as (as I have mentioned) he has been hospitalised in the past with breathing difficulties. He will not be the only child in this position and I challenge that this proposed development would curtail the quality of life and activities for local children.</p> <p>Due to the possible effects on his health, I would also give full consideration to withdrawing him from Manorcroft School and, again, I'm sure this would be a consideration for others too. Manorcroft School is a grade 2 improving school with some grade 1 features and it would be such a shame to see the profile of its pupils change, leaving this 'good' performing school with unnecessary challenges. This is made more likely as other primary schools</p>

		<p>slightly outside our existing catchment area are expanding to a two-form entry and another local infants' school is expanding to include juniors too. It is not responsible to create this potential problem for Manorcroft School or its existing pupils.</p> <p>In addition, consideration needs to be given to ecological data. The ecological report accompanying the original 2009 application by Hanson's to extract gravel was written in 2008. The surveys on which it was based took place in the period 2002-2006 and were updated in 2008. They are therefore well out of date and thus the surveys are no longer an acceptable source of information on which to base any rulings or decisions with regards development. Also, the planning policies which are referred to in Hanson's ecological report, including Planning Policy Statement 9, which sets out overall Government stance on wildlife conservation, have now been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework and so the ecological report should be revised to take account of this.</p>
74. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of children at Manscroft Primary School could be placed at risk, especially of outside amenities have to be curtailed as a result of concerns about quarry's or recycling aggregates and their accompanying health hazards.
75. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
78. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
88. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The children's education at Manorcroft Primary School could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm.
91. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	'No significant risks or opportunities are anticipated during the lifetime of the plan – the policy is not expected to have significant adverse or beneficial effects on the provision of skills and education' may apply to some sites, in the case of the proximity of Manorcroft Primary School and Pre-School to Milton Park Farm, it does not. The children's education could be placed at serious risk, especially if the outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates.
92. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	As well as poisoning our children you will damage their education and their "right to play" outside and learn.
100.	Page 21 –	Children of Manorcroft will have their quality of education compromised as a result of noise and pollution

Rep No Organisation Name	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
	Individual Skills and education	(Outdoor activities).
102. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
104. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The children's education at Manorcroft Primary School could be placed at risk, especially if the extensive outside activities had to be curtailed as a result of quarrying or recycling aggregates at Milton Park Farm.
110. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The proposed recycling facility would severely affect the life and education of the children at Manorcroft Primary School, curtailing their outside work, which is well developed at the school teaching them life skills. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
111. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
115. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	As well as poisoning our children you will damage their education and their "right to play" outside and learn.
126. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education at Manorcroft school and Nursery will be out at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of extraction – a currently valuable resource.
9. Individual	Page 21 – Skills and education	The education of Manorcroft Primary School pupils will be put at risk if outside activities have to be halted as a result of aggregate re-cycling and gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm. Our outside environment is used extensively for both 'outdoor classroom' and sporting activities. Curtailment of the latter is certainly against the legacy of the recent Olympic and Paralympic games.
27. RAGE	Page 21 – Welfare, health & well-being.	See our comments concerning air quality above.
121. Belron International Limited	Page 21 – Welfare, health & well-	At page 21 the Environmental Report identifies the importance of addressing "perceived" risks to the welfare, health and well-being of local communities arising from noise, dust and traffic.

	being.	Such risks must be regarded as being real rather than perceived and it is considered that the current proposals to locate a recycling facility in the northern part of the proposed Milton Park Farm site fail properly to address the cumulative impacts of the mineral extraction and recycling proposals upon the welfare and well-being of the community, particularly in respect of the effects of from noise, dust and traffic.
50.Riding and Paddock Way Residents Association.	Page 35 – Transport Infrastructure and Traffic	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the Riding and Paddock Way Residents Association. We want to comment on the Updated Environmental Plan page 35 last paragraph titled Receptor : Transport Infrastructure and Traffic. (The commentary provided in this paragraph refers to a recycling site at Alton)</p> <p><i>Description of risks: The site has the estimated potential to produce up to 0.60 million tonnes of recycled and secondary aggregate over a 12 year period of temporary operations. Based on the assumptions that material would be transported in loads of 20 tonnes, that production would occur for 250 days of the year, and that imports and exports of waste associated with the recycling operations would be 150,000 tonnes and 50,000 tonnes per year respectively, it is estimated that the aggregate recycling operations would give rise to up to 80 HGV movements per day (Source: Strategic Transportation Assessment, August 2011, Appendix 2)</i></p> <p>In this paragraph reference is made to the StrategicTransport Assessment, August 2011. I cannot find this document on the Surrey CC website. However I have found the Environmental Report for the Aggregates Recycling DPD - Chapter 14 Transport Infrastructure and Traffic dated August 2011 (i.e. the same date as the Strategic Transport Assessment). Given the same date and issuing authority, it is reasonable to assume that the data in Chapter 14 is the same as in the Strategic Assessment.</p> <p>I have extracted the second paragraph of page 183.</p> <p><i>Alton Road, Farnham: The site has the estimated potential to produce up to 0.25 million tonnes of recycled and secondary aggregate over a 5 year period of temporary operations. Based on the assumptions that material would be transported in loads of 15 tonnes, and that production would occur for 278 days of the year, it is estimated that the aggregate recycling operations would give rise to up to 12 loads per day.</i></p> <p>Please compare this with the current version taken from page 35 of the Updated Environmental Plan of 2012. A change in the forecast from 12 to 80 trips a day is material. If a similar change is applied to the Martyr’s Lane Site, the attitude of our Resident’s association would change from opposition to the proposed facility at Martyr’s Lane to implacable opposition. Unfortunately I believe that even the latest estimates of truck trips are too low.</p> <p>Proposed Adjustments to the Basis for Calculating Truck Trips.</p> <p>The most recent basis for calculating the number of truck trips implies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 250 working days a year (I believe this to be reasonable).

2. An average load of 20 tons. (I believe this to be too large, 15 t per load is more realistic as there will certainly be times when part loads or smaller than 20t trucks are used.
3. 30 per day inward and 30 outward truck trips to cater for an estimated 150 000 t/year of waste. (The 2011 basis seems to have omitted this load).
4. 10 per day inward and 10 per day outward truck trips to remove 50 000 t/year of recycled aggregate.
5. The total truck trips from items 3 and 4 are 80 per day i.e. 1 every 6 minutes. You will recall this figure of 80 truck trips per day is reflected in the proposed modifications to the DPD.

I have 2 major concerns with the latest basis.

1. No provision is made for the removal of unrecyclable waste i.e. the difference between 150 000 t/year waste in and 50 000 t/year recycled aggregate. In the case of Alton, this would require another 40 trips per day.
2. The implied yield of recycled aggregate is 50 000/150 000 i.e. 33%. This might be correct. However the Babbie report estimates 1.92 million t per year of CDE waste (see paragraph 22 of the Aggregates Recycling DPD). Old chart 8 on page 35 of the Aggregates Recycling DPD shows approximately 390 000 t/year of sales of recycled aggregate. This implies an average yield of 20% for the yield of recycled aggregate. As the whole focus of the report is to achieve an imposed target for recycled material, it would appear that the 150 000 t/year of CDE waste feeds an understatement. The CDE waste required to produce 50 000 t/year of recyclable aggregate could be as much as 250 000 t/year.

Recalculation of Martyr's Lane Traffic Load

Unfortunately the Martyr's Lane Traffic Load is not shown in any of the documents published on the SRCC website for comment in this consultation. I have calculated the Traffic Load using what I believe to be appropriate parameters. The results are shown in the table below.

	August 2011	August 2012	Modified Basis 1	Modified Basis 2
Truck Size t	15	20	15	15
Working days/y	278	250	250	250
Aggregate yield % on CDE waste	33	33	33	20
Recycled sales kt/year	80	80	80	80

CDE waste kt/year	180	180	180	300
Truck Trips/day	19	128	171	256
Mins per truck	24	4	3	2

The Resident's Association cannot accept a development of these dimensions at Martyr's Lane.

Proposals

1. The DPD should be revised to incorporate a representative transport model. I would suggest the Modified Basis 2 as shown in the table above.
2. Martyr's Lane should be removed from the list of proposed new sites.
3. The other 4 proposed new sites (see paragraph 51 of the DPD) should be reviewed in the context of higher transport loads. It is possible that some might be excluded from the DPD
4. Forecasts of Recycled Aggregate sales in various sections of the DPD should be revised in accordance with the revised list of new sites.

I intend to contact our Surrey County Councillor to raise these matters.

4. Stanwell Liberal Party	General	In the tables which follow these items you make no mention of Stanwell, Stanwell Moor and Spelthorne generally where an environmental assessment is badly needed before further work goes on.
6. Individual	General	<p>Extending the period of time that Alton Road could be used up to 12 years is hardly a minor change – it should be listed in main modifications. The noise, disruption and potential pollution would go on twice as long! It is too close to too many ecologically sensitive areas to be used for even four years. How can none of the 'receptors' have been downgraded to worse than before when the work would last more than twice as long?</p> <p>I feel we are not being given the full truth here, and it is vital we are, for the people who live close by as well as for the <u>environment</u>!</p>
39. Day Group Ltd	General	<p>Annex 4 – Revised environmental assessment for the Salfords Depot Site.</p> <p>The environmental assessment for the Salfords Depot site has been revised on the basis of MM12 which makes provision for a greater level of production at Salfords Depot - increased from maximum of 50,000 to 100,000 tpa. The owners/operators of the site, Day Group Ltd, support the conclusions reached in the revised environmental statement that: <i>"For the proposed increase in the level of production for the Salfords Depot site the assessment anticipated little change in the range of adverse impacts and beneficial effects that could reasonably be expected to arise from the development when compared with the assessment set out in the Environmental Report for the</i></p>

Rep No	Modification No / Paragraph	Representation Text
		<i>submission version of the DPD in August 2011."</i>
51. Individual	General	<p>I am very concerned about the increase in air pollution caused by particulate matter from the concrete processing plant. The dust and dirt that this process will cause in an area already blighted by traffic pollution from the M25 and Heathrow, is entirely unacceptable. I am astonished that any credence can be given to proposals for such a plant in this area.</p> <p>I wish to object to an oppose the proposal for the Gravel Extraction processing plant in the strongest possible manner. There is absolutely no benefit for our local community or the surrounding areas.</p>
53. Individual	General	To say a facility like this will only produce a little effect on the local air quality I strongly disagree with we already have an air quality issue in the area we also have quite a few beautiful listed buildings in the area and these could possibly suffer from a facility like the one proposed. The heavy lorry traffic which would occur will have a significant effect on the quality of life of the local residents and compound the problem of the level crossings.
65. Environment Agency	General	<p>We have no major concerns in relation to the proposed changes. We would highlight that a Flood Risk Assessment is required whenever a site lies in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and whenever a site is greater than 1 hectare. In addition, if there is evidence of historic flooding, this should also be investigated through a Flood Risk Assessment. This should be reflected in the Key Development Criteria for those sites where it applies, particularly Penton Hook, Salfords Rail Depot and Alton Road.</p> <p>Other than the above, we have no additional comments to make from those previously.</p>
93. Individual	General	I strongly disagree with this subject being considered to be of 'low significance' hazards to health have to be taken seriously. The increase in heavy lorry traffic on main roads in Egham would have an adverse impact upon the quality of life of residents.
103. Slough Borough Council	General	No specific response
106. Individual	General	A particular concern that I have is with the traffic. The increase in heavy vehicle traffic along minor roads in Stroude and Egham will make them considerably more dangerous. There is a history of fatalities on Stroude Road. This will not be helped by the increase in traffic. Furthermore, the environment will be seriously compromised for the residents. This is a green belt area, and therefore it is not suitable for large aggregate recycling plants
112. Hershams Residents Association	General	Although Policy MC14 para (i) in the Environmental report offers to the problem created by heavy goods vehicles traveling to and from aggregate recycling sites, we submit that this factor has been given insufficient weight in relation to sensitive built up areas such as Hershams and the desirability of traffic to and from Weylands Treatment works being routed from and to the North towards the River Thames and NOT South through

		Hersham.
131. Individual	General	<p>Annex 3, page 24 Milton Park Farm, Egham (AR3)</p> <p>I maintain that siting of an Aggregates Recycling Plant at Milton Park Farm, Egham would incontrovertibly adversely harm the environment in extremely close proximity to the Manorcroft Nursery and Primary School both in terms of air quality and physical hazard safety.</p> <p>A) Air Quality: Placing the recycling plant at Milton Park Farm would unacceptably increase the risk to the health of young children whilst at critical stage of their development. The incidence rate of respiratory illness in children attending these facilities will be monitored closely for a statistically significant increase in the years to come if it is decided to site the plant here. If this plan does turn out to have an adverse health effect on children, the NHS and taxpayers would bear the burden of poor respiratory health of the future generation. Given the above, clear risk of harm to the environment in the form of childrens' respiratory health and subsequent physical development can reasonably be seen to supercede the presumption that the recycling plant development should proceed.</p> <p>B) Physical Hazard Safety: I understand that the plant would include slurry type waste pools of some depth, which would be enclosed by an appropriate fence to prevent people or large animals from straying into the area and falling into the pools. I am concerned that even with such precaution, the placement of such pools on land adjacent to the Primary School, would not eventually result in the tragedy of a child drowning in the pools. Children are by nature very curious and prone to exploration, and even when fences are in place and warning signs posted, they cannot be expected to fully understand such danger. Younger children would not even be capable of reading the warning signs. Fencing can be breached, due to natural damage (wind, fallen tree branches, etc) or vandalism. It is not unreasonable to expect that, over time, the fencing could become damaged and a child could get through and come to harm, possibly resulting in death. Therefore placing a waste pool or pools so close to a Nursery and Primary School seems inherently risky, and in my view presents an unacceptably high risk to the physical hazard safety of children. On this basis the clear risk of harm to the environment in the form of childrens' physical hazard safety can reasonably be seen to supercede the presumption that the recycling plant development should proceed.</p> <p>Annex 3, page 24 of the Updated Environment Report states, "The policy provides a means of applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the context of the Aggregates Recycling DPD, but also takes account of other provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework that allow for that presumption to be superseded in circumstances where the harm to the environment would outweigh the other benefits that would be achieved if the development were to proceed.</p>

Representations to Compliance with National Planning Policy Framework

Compliance with National Planning Policy Framework

19. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
21.Thorpe Ward Residents Association	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	As we have already stated in Part B of this form, we do not believe aggregate recycling facilities and the manufacture of concrete are appropriate activities in the Green Belt.
26. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate use of Green Belt land.
27. RAGE	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Reference is made to MC3 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD. I believe that the wording of this, amended at the Examination, is as follows: <i>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. Proposals in the Green Belt for mineral development other than extraction and primary treatment will only be permitted where the applicant has demonstrated that very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm by reason of its inappropriateness and any other harm.</i> Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and therefore not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
32.Egham Residents Association	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	We do not see how recycling aggregates is a "primary activity" & thus appropriate in the Green Belt?
34. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
33. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting	Recycling of aggregates is not a primary treatment activity within the minerals plan and its contrary to development within the Green Belt.

	Green Belt Land	
37. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	The use of Green Belt Land for recycling aggregates is unacceptable as it is not a primary activity.
40. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	I question whether aggregates recycling should be allowed in the Green Belt. It is not solely 'mineral extraction' but an industrial activity, by definition.
56. Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
59. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Protecting Green Belt land (third column). Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
63. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	It cannot be right to recycle aggregates in the Green Belt.
67. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Also section 9 of the Compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework would indicate that Recycling aggregates is not an appropriate Green Belt activity as it is not a primary treatment.
74. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and I believe that it is not an appropriate activity on Green Belt Land.

88. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
91. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Reference is made to MC3 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy DPD. I believe that the wording of this, amended at the Examination, is as follows: <i>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. Proposals in the Green Belt for mineral development other than extraction and primary treatment will only be permitted where the applicant has demonstrated that very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm by reason of its inappropriateness and any other harm.</i> Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and therefore not an appropriate Green Belt activity. Please delete Milton Park Farm from the list of potential sites for recycling aggregates.
92. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	This is not in keeping with activities associated with Green Belt.
100. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Green Belt land should be protected. Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and should not go ahead on this land.
104. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
105. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	All this in the green belt, this proposal is not protecting it but destroying it.
108. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting	Recycling aggregates is not an appropriate Green Belt activity.

	Green Belt Land	
110. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	How can recycling aggregates be appropriate in a Green Belt area? Such activity is not a primary treatment. I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
115. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	This is not in keeping with activities associated with Green Belt.
117. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt Activity. (Duplicate of 104)
123.Nutfield Conservation Society	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	<p>We note the phrase "<i>LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt</i>". (Assessment of Compliance with NPPF Page 6). We note also that SCC considers this may be a material consideration should a planning application come forward for Copyhold Works, Redhill.</p> <p>We suggest that it is inadequate to leave consideration of "<i>planning positively to enhance</i>" to the point at which a planning application is being determined. Surrey County Council wishes to include a Green Belt site in its list of possible permanent aggregate recycling sites. Does this constitute an enhancement of the beneficial use of the Green Belt? If Surrey County Council wishes the Plan to be NPPF compliant, the time to answer that question is now.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that allocating Copyhold Works as a site for aggregate recycling does not correspond with the LPA's duty "<i>to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity</i>", nor with the duty "<i>to improve damaged and derelict land</i>", (NPPF Para 81).</p> <p>In so far as the Plan is required to be NPPF compliant to be considered truly sound, we have to suggest that the Plan is unsound until our question above is satisfactorily answered.</p>
124. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	The proposal would destroy Green Belt and this factory is not a suitable activity which is allowed under Green Belt Policy.

125. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	This is a totally inappropriate development in a Green Belt area as recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment. It is in fact a most beautiful and historic area providing a fitting backdrop to such ancient listed buildings as Great Fosters.
128. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.
129. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	<p>As Egham residents We already live under the flight path, have a mainline railway connection are within a mile of one of the busiest motorways in Europe - with the noise and air pollution associated with these our air quality and quality of life is already compromised. As a local school governor and someone with a heart condition from birth I am very concerned that the health and well-being of local school-children and residents could be compromised and do not believe that this has been adequately factored into the proposal. There is much evidence to suggest that air borne particulates cause respiration issues in the young old and infirm.</p> <p>I do not believe that a council representing our interests can support such a gravel development.</p> <p>With I therefore object with the following specifics: Recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity.</p>
132. Individual	Page 5 Section 9 protecting Green Belt Land	<p>Compliance with NPPF (Green Belt)</p> <p>Whilst "<i>LPA's should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt</i>" (Assessment of Compliance with NPPF Page 6), I note also that SCC considers this may be a material consideration should a planning application come forward for Copyhold Works, Redhill.</p> <p>Surely it would be unreasonable and inadequate to leave consideration of "<i>planning positively to enhance</i>" to the point at which a planning application is being determined. Surrey County Council wishes to include a Green Belt site in its list of possible permanent aggregate recycling sites. Does this constitute an enhancement of the beneficial use of the Green Belt to the detriment of its inherent qualities and nature? If Surrey County Council wishes the Plan to be NPPF compliant, the time to answer that question is now and fully.</p> <p>Surely, allocating Copyhold Works as a site for aggregate recycling is contrary to the LPA's duty "<i>to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity</i>", and the duty "<i>to improve damaged and derelict land</i>" (NPPF Para 81). It would be equally disingenuous to hold the Copyhold Works as a site for aggregate recycling as complying with, and maintaining the essential characteristic of, "<i>permanence</i>" (NPPF Para. 79) and "<i>sustainability</i>" (NPPF Para.</p>

		<p>84) of the Green Belt. Undoubtedly, the proposed activities would very much undermine the preservation of inherent nature of the Green Belt <i>per se</i> and would represent an irreparable harm incapable of being mitigated.</p> <p>I have serious doubts that allocating Copyhold Works as a site for aggregate recycling will not have an ever-lasting detrimental impact and accelerate the ever-increasing risk of longer term flood risk, water supply and changes to the biodiversity and landscape (NPPF Para. 99) of the area, certainly of equal importance in "<i>the beneficial use of the Green Belt</i>" for those living in it.</p> <p>Consequently, and in so far as the Plan is required to be NPPF compliant to be considered truly sound, it would appear that the Plan is unsound until all the above concerns are reasonably and satisfactorily answered for now and future generations.</p>
19. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 Meeting the challenge	The borough is in the top ten areas of the country likely to flood. Why add to the risk?
17. Manorcroft Primary School	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
23. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	We are already at risk of flooding in Egham. Working the aggregates site at Milton Park Farm 'dry' would increase this. With extra flooding already an increased risk with climate change is it right to increase this further?
26. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the	Runnymede borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood, these activities will only compound the risk.

	challenge of climate change flooding	
27. RAGE	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	<i>The Plan seeks to identify sites for aggregates recycling away from the most vulnerable areas of flood risk and environmental importance and close to the sources of waste, so limiting the need to transport material over long distances.</i> Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood; and also the borough at greatest flood risk within the County of Surrey. So why propose aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede? Regarding Milton Park Farm, the existing hydrostatic flood risk can be seen from Core Document CDSCC22 Map 5.4a (dated 28 May 2009). Map 5.4b shows the climate change scenario. To these risks must be added the hydrodynamic risks associated with sudden or prolonged severe storms, flash flooding and artesian effects.
29. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
32. Egham Residents Association	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As Runnymede is in the top ten areas in the U.K. most liable to flood, we don't see why any ARF is proposed in the Borough?
33. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Hydrology and climate change impact and due to this development the adverse impact on ground water flows and water table levels that will impact upon the existing landscape is not properly evaluated.
36. Individual	Page 9	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry

	Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
37. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Further concreting over in area with high potential for flooding as is Runnymede Borough, the whole issue of aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede is questionable.
38. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	<p>I am a local resident living in the area for >28 years. Our family have grown up in the area, our children have attended the local schools (hopefully grandchildren will be) and we would like to continue to live in the area for many years. However we do need this area to be healthy and fit for wellbeing.</p> <p>I write to you today to object to the above schemes for the following reasons:</p> <p>Runnymede is in the top ten areas of the country likely to flood. It is ridiculous to propose aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede.</p>
40. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	I am aware that Runnymede Borough is the top ten areas of flood-risk in the country. Ground water disturbance, resulting from mineral extraction, is a threat to Egham town.
54. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge	Our area is already at serious risk of flooding. Flood protection at other parts of the Thames (e.g. Windsor), means that Egham, being downstream, has a much higher risk of flooding. I am concerned that the removal of plants from this area, and the additional man made ground (tarmac/concrete/etc.) will increase the risk of serious flooding in the area. I don't believe that enough has been done to address this issue.

	of climate change flooding	
56.Great Fosters (1931) Ltd	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. Great Fosters cannot understand why it is therefore proposed that there should be an aggregates recycling site in Runnymede where working 'dry' will increase the risk of flooding.
59. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding (third column). Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. So why propose aggregates recycling and gravel extraction sites in Runnymede which will negatively impact Egham's likelihood of flooding?
60. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Flooding is a very real threat to Egham and already affects residents in some roads e.g. Boshers Gardens and Clarence Street. I sincerely hope that the County Council will see sense and reject the possibility of a gravel extraction plan with clay-lined pits, which would exacerbate this situation. In which case the aggregates recycling would not be necessary.
61. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
62. Individual	Page 9 Section 10	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.

	- meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	
64. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 - meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede is in the top ten areas of the county most liable to flood so why propose aggregate recycling sites here?
74. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 - meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. I would therefore ask, why a proposal to recycle aggregates, with its accompanying risks of flooding has been or is being seriously considered for this area?
75. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 - meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
78. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 - meeting the challenge of climate change	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.

	flooding	
79. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
88. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. So why propose aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede?
91. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	The Plan seeks to identify sites for aggregates recycling away from the most vulnerable areas of flood risk and environmental importance and close to the sources of waste, so limiting the need to transport material over long distances. Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood; and also the borough at greatest flood risk within the County of Surrey. So why propose aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede? Regarding Milton Park Farm, the existing hydrostatic flood risk can be seen from Core Document CDSCC22 Map 5.4a (dated 28 May 2009). Map 5.4b shows the climate change scenario. To these risks must be added the hydrodynamic risks associated with sudden or prolonged severe storms, flash flooding and artesian effects. In the opinion of experts, these have not been adequately addressed in Hanson’s Environmental Statement.
92. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede is in the top ten of areas liable to flood. Therefore it makes no sense for our Council who are supposed to be supposed to be acting in the interests of the people to propose something which may damage our homes and livelihood.
100. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting	Flood risk in Egham is very high and as much anything that may increase this risk should not go ahead.

	the challenge of climate change flooding	
102. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
104. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. So why propose aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede?
105. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	There is already a high risk of flooding in this area. Any proposal to dry work any future extraction could have you rescuing people from their homes should we experience a repeat of the very heavy rains of the last few years and therefore destroying livelihoods and devaluing the entire area making it impossible for people to ensure homes so trapping us in our homes. Not a very sound political strategy this!
108. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	The borough is in the top ten areas of the country most at risk of flooding. The bulk of the area under consideration is a mere 18" above the water table and there is an inevitable risk of flooding and contamination to the water supply - both during and after extraction. With the terrible flooding that we have seen throughout the country this week why on earth would you even consider increasing that risk?

110. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As it is known that the Borough of Runnymede is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flooding, how can aggregates recycling sites be proposed for Runnymede? I do hope that all these points will be carefully considered. We, local residents, have a right to live peacefully, healthily and without distress battling against noise, pollution, lorry movements. We want people to come to live in this area helping our economy and not be turned away because of what is being proposed.
111. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	As already stated, Manorcroft Primary School is affected by flooding as is Egham. The aggregate recycling and dry gravel extraction at Milton Park Farm will make a bad situation worse.
115. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede is in the top ten areas liable to flood. Therefore makes no sense for our Council who are supposed to be acting in the interests of the people to propose something which may damage our homes and livelihood.
117. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. So why propose aggregates recycling sites in Runnymede? (Duplicate of 104)
124. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge	This area is already subject to extensive areas where ground is waterlogged any proposals which affect water levels or the permeability of the underlying gravel should be restricted.

	of climate change flooding	
126. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	This area is affected by flooding and the aggregate recycling and 'dry' gravel extraction will make things worse.
127. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	We have areas at risk of extreme flooding. This included the area covered by this site and also the school and nursery. This extraction may well have a bad impact on an already big problem.
128. Individual	Page 9 Section 10 – meeting the challenge of climate change flooding	Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood. So why propose aggregates recycling and gravel extraction sites in Runnymede which will negatively impact Egham's likelihood of flooding?
32.Egham Residents Association	Page 10	In addition to serious flooding issues, the Milton Park Farm site raises concerns over poor quality & the impacts on open space & landscape in the area.
15. Oxted & Limpsfield Residents Group	General	In the Schedule of Additional Modifications and the document entitled "Assessment of compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework" some of the references to policies are incorrect owing to the reordering caused by the introduction of a new policy AR1, which reflects the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, and what was agreed between SCC and OLRG (i.e. the original AR3 windfall policy to come before the original AR2 policy). For example in paragraph 7 of the NPPF assessment document, the first sentence should read "Policy AR2 (to be renumbered AR4)". Therefore, OLRG requests that SCC should review the documents and make such further

		<p>Additional Modifications as necessary to ensure that the ARDPD reflects the following order of policies:</p> <p>AR1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development AR2 - Aggregates recycling facilities AR3 - Aggregates recycling at mineral sites AR4 - Aggregates recycling outside preferred areas AR5 - High value recovery.</p>
25. Individual	General	This area is already affected by aircraft noise, road noise from the M25, now noise and pollution from implementation of this DPD. Implementation is a definite NO from me.
27. RAGE	General	We take some comfort from the statement: <i>The policy framework of the Surrey Minerals and Waste Plans requires the impacts of development on biodiversity, open space and landscape, flood risk and air quality to be addressed in detail at the project level stage.</i> In addition to serious flooding issues, at Milton Park Farm we are also concerned about the potential for deteriorating air quality if aggregates were ever recycled at this site. The open space and landscape are also important in this area of Green Belt, respecting the setting of dwellings and listed buildings.
46. Central Bedfordshire Council	General	<p><u>Title</u> The document should not be referred to as Development Plan Document, but a Local Development Document as reflected in Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 1:</u> The Core Strategy is now a LDD (Local Development Document), not a DPD. The text should reflect this.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 36</u> It would be useful if 2012 data provided rather than 2010 data. Surrey is reminded of the NPPF (paragraph 158) which states: "Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, <u>up-to-date</u> and relevant evidence about the economic and social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.</p> <p>Appendix 2: Aggregate recycling facilities in and adjoining Surrey should not be deleted. Reason – for conformity with the NPPF.</p>
53. Individual	General	Runnymede is in the top ten areas in the country most liable to flood following an aggregates recycling site in the area would almost certainly affect the water table which could cause local flooding. The Green Belt not a place to put a facility like this please do not allow this pleasant area to be ruined.
93. Individual	General	I feel that recycling aggregates is not a primary treatment and not an appropriate Green Belt activity. Also Runnymede Borough is in the top ten areas of the country most liable to flood.
97. Individual	General	There would seem to be an assumption that quarrying and extraction is a foregone conclusion this is not the case.
103. Slough Borough Council	General	No specific response
123. Nutfield Conservation Society	General	We note that the NPPF introduces a Duty to Cooperate with local businesses (amongst others), but that it applies only from 15 November 2011 and is not retrospective. In the context of Aggregate Recycling the most important local businesses with which Surrey County Council would wish to cooperate are, we suggest, the operators of the existing permanent and temporary sites. Although reliance on consultations and discussions prior to 15 November 2011 would not make the Plan unsound, we suggest that applying the Duty to Cooperate now in its fullest sense would make the

		<p>Plan sounder and less vulnerable to challenge.</p> <p>Although it is evident from the August 2012 Modifications Document that there has been discussion and correspondence with some site owners and operators providing valuable update data, it is not evident that there has been a proactive, systematic and comprehensive approach to all site owners and operators, exploring as far as possible their commercial intentions and refining as far as possible their future plans and predictions for AR sales. Obviously some or all of the information gathered may have to be withheld from public circulation at the request of the operators for reasons of commercial confidentiality, though we favour a policy of maximum transparency where commercial confidentiality is not an issue.</p> <p>While the data provided in the Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 on sales of recycled aggregates, based on actual and estimated figures, is useful background material, we suggest it is not as valuable -for the purposes of constructing a sound Plan with robust site allocations - as forward sales predictions gathered systematically and regularly. We acknowledge that the Duty to Cooperate does not apply to site owners and operators and those council officers will sometimes be frustrated in their efforts to collect useful data. Nevertheless, a schedule showing when and how such data will be systematically sought in the future will, we suggest, add to the soundness of the Plan. It may not always be necessary to rely on direct responses from site operators. Correspondence with the Environment Agency and annual returns to Companies House may provide useful data, along with other information put in the public domain by site operators, on websites for instance.</p> <p>The website of Britaniacrest, operator of Little Orchard Farm in Hookwood, indicates that they receive up to their permitted limit of 250,000 tpa of waste, of which 4,000 tonnes is green waste and the remainder is mainly C&D waste, a significant proportion of which must surely be converted to recycled aggregate. It is not readily apparent how this raw data can be linked to the Aggregate Sales figures in the 2010-2011 Annual Monitoring Report, or the revised projected sales from existing permanent sites 2010 - 2026 as shown in Chart 1 in the August 2012 Modifications. It may well be that accurate sales figures and usable future sales predictions have been provided to SCC officers by Britaniacrest but cannot be divulged because of commercial confidentiality. If so, it would be helpful for that to be documented even if the detail information cannot be revealed, so as to provide reassurance that the projected sales figures in Chart 1 are reasonably soundly based.</p> <p>Because of the uncertainty over whether full account has been taken of the present and future capacity of the Hookwood site, we must reaffirm our suggestion that the inclusion of Copyhold Works in the Plan is still unjustified, since Little Orchard Farm, Hookwood, may be a more than adequate alternative, with far better access routes.</p>
<p>132. Individual</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>I wish to make the following comments in response to the consultation on the above modifications.</p> <p>Compliance with NPPF (Duty to Cooperate)</p> <p>I note that the NPPF introduces a Duty to Cooperate with local businesses (amongst others), but that it applies only from 15 November 2011 and is not retrospective. In the context of Aggregate Recycling the most important local</p>

businesses with which Surrey County Council would wish to cooperate are, it appears, the operators of the existing permanent and temporary sites. Although reliance on consultations and discussions prior to 15 November 2011 would not make the Plan unsound, I suggest that applying the Duty to Cooperate now in its fullest sense would make the Plan sounder and less vulnerable to challenge.

Although it is evident from the August 2012 Modifications Document that there has been discussion and correspondence with some site owners and operators providing valuable update data, it is not evident that there has been a proactive, systematic and comprehensive approach to all site owners and operators, exploring as far as possible their commercial intentions and refining as far as possible their future plans and predictions for AR sales. Whilst I appreciate that some or all of the information gathered may have to be withheld from public circulation at the request of the operators for reasons of commercial confidentiality, I favour a policy of maximum transparency where commercial confidentiality is not an issue withholding vital information upon which a public decision ought to be made. I beg to differ that pure private commercial interests are above public interest.

While the data provided in the Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011 on sales of recycled aggregates, based on actual and estimated figures, is useful background material, it would not appear as valuable -for the purposes of constructing a sound Plan with robust site allocations - as forward sales predictions gathered, in a transparent and equal manner, systematically and regularly. I acknowledge that the Duty to Cooperate does not apply to site owners and operators and those council officers will sometimes be frustrated in their efforts to collect useful data. Nevertheless, a schedule showing when and how such data will be systematically sought and audited in the future, following the same standard procedure, will surely add to the soundness of the Plan. It may not always be necessary to rely on direct responses from site operators. Correspondence with the Environment Agency and annual returns to Companies House may provide useful data, along with other information put in the public domain by site operators, on websites for instance.

The website of Britaniacrest, operator of Little Orchard Farm in Hookwood, indicates that they receive up to their permitted limit of 250,000 tpa of waste, of which 4,000 tonnes is green waste and the remainder is mainly C&D waste, a significant proportion of which must surely be converted to recycled aggregate. It is not readily apparent how this raw data can be linked to the Aggregate Sales figures in the 2010-2011 Annual Monitoring Report, or the revised projected sales from existing permanent sites 2010 - 2026 as shown in Chart 1 in the August 2012 Modifications. It may well be that accurate sales figures and usable future sales predictions have been provided to SCC officers by Britaniacrest but cannot be divulged because of commercial confidentiality. If so, it would be helpful for that to be documented even if the detail information cannot be revealed, so as to provide reassurance that the projected sales figures in Chart 1 are reasonably soundly based.

Because of the uncertainty over whether full account has been taken (and given) of the present and future capacity of the Hookwood site, I must reaffirm my suggestion, shared by many other local residents, that the inclusion of Copyhold Works in the Plan is still unjustified and unreasonable, since Little Orchard Farm, Hookwood, may be a more than adequate alternative, with far better access routes for example.

Rep No **Modification No / Paragraph**
Organisation Name

Representation Text