

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE –
 BY DELEGATION

DATE: February 2016

BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT TEAM MANAGER

DISTRICT(S) REIGATE & BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL
 TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):
 Horley East
 Mrs Ross-Tomlin
 Lingfield
 Mr Sydney

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION

GRID REF: 530848 142733

TITLE: MINERALS/WASTE RE15/02426/CON

SUMMARY REPORT

2 Perrylands Lane, Smallfield, Horley, Surrey RH6 9PR

The continued use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders construction and demolition waste, including: the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloos, two metal containers, concrete hardstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash, and the provision of car parking and fuel storage without compliance with Conditions 2, 6 and 24 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 to provide a revised drainage strategy.

The application site (known as No.2 Perrylands Lane) is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt approximately 2km south east of Horley and 500m to the southwest of the village of Smallfield. The county boundary with West Sussex is approximately 1km to the southwest where the M23 spur road joins the M23 at Junction 9. The application site is approximately 0.82 hectares with the eastern half abutting an elevated section of the M23 motorway, which runs north / south. The M23 is on an embankment some 5m to 6m high above the site.

The application site is located to the rear (south) of the residential properties; 1, 2, 3 and 4 Perrylands Lane, Smallfield. The residential properties of Rowlands and The Peeks lie to the southwest and west of the site respectively beyond the woodland boundary. The land beyond these properties is characterised by low-density residential development and fields. Commercial activities adjoin the northern part of the eastern boundary and the eastern part of the northern

boundary. The application site is generally square and is approached via a gated access with a track which runs between numbers 1 and 2 Perrylands Lane. The site access joins Perrylands Lane, which runs east/ west, a narrow country lane classified as a D road with limited passing places.

Perrylands Lane passes under the M23 motorway approximately 50m from the application site access point and is one of only few ground level crossings of the M23 in the area. The section of Perrylands Lane from the M23 to where it joins Peeks Brook Lane to the west is registered as a Public Byway (BOAT) (No. 377). Peeks Brook Lane is also registered as a BOAT (No. 369). Footpath 368 connects with Perrylands Lane to the east of the M23 and runs southwards. Bridleway 372 connects with Peeks Brook Lane to the north of residential property Lagenhoe located to the south west of the application site.

In January 2015, the County Planning Authority (CPA) granted a new planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON for the use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders construction and demolition waste, including the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloo, two metal containers, concrete hardstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash and the provision of car parking and fuel storage.

This application is seeking to vary Conditions 2, 6, and 24 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 to provide a revised drainage strategy at the site. The applicant is seeking to vary the above conditions as since planning permission ref: RE14//02134/CON was granted, the landowner of the site who also owns the neighbouring land to the west of the application site has constructed a drainage ditch on this adjoining land which also serves the application site. The applicant submits that the newly formed ditch arrangements on the neighbouring land have sufficient capacity to the serve the application site and it is therefore unnecessary to install pipes of a higher diameter with waterflows from the application site able to connect to the newly enhanced neighbouring drainage system.

Local residents have raised concerns about flood risk and drainage impacts from the proposed drainage strategy, while Burstow Parish Council has also objected to the proposal raising concerns about the number of vehicle movements and failure to comply with other conditions. Horley Town Council raises no objection to the application.

Development Plan policies seek to protect the local environment and the amenities of local

residents from the adverse effects of development. The issues to be assessed for this particular proposal involve issues of flood risk and drainage and biodiversity and ecology. No objection has been raised by the respective consultees on these issues, subject to conditions. Officers consider that, taking into account the details of the proposal, concerns raised in letters of representation, the views of technical consultees, and controls through the relevant planning conditions, the development is unlikely to give rise to any significant adverse impact in terms of amenity or the environment.

The proposed waste development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore the application falls to be considered as contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan. In relation to Green Belt policy, Officers acknowledge that the principle of this waste site has already been accepted and consider that the revised drainage strategy would not result in greater harm to the openness of the Green Belt or any other harm identified when planning permission for the use of the land as a soil processing facility was granted. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan 2008 Policy CW6, Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 Policy Co1 and Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 Policy CS3. Officers therefore consider that the proposal can be granted subject to conditions

The recommendation is to PERMIT subject to conditions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Blockade Services

Date application valid

19 October 2015

Period for Determination

26 February 2016

Amending /Amplifying Documents

- Email from WYG dated 17 December 2015
- Drawing No: TSP/BSL/P2804/001, Drainage Layout, Revision C, dated 9 February 2016

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES

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

Issue	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Surface Water & Flood Risk	Yes	35 - 42
Biodiversity and Ecology	Yes	43 - 47
Metropolitan Green Belt	No	48 - 55

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1: 2 Perrylands Lane

Site Photographs

Figure 1: Ditch Adjoining Land

Figure 2: View onto Adjoining Land

BACKGROUND

Site Description

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

Planning History

4. On 8 April 1994 a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development (CLEUD) (ref. RE93/1323) was issued in respect of a scrap yard on a site of 0.82ha for the application site. The scrap yard had been registered with the District Council since January 1968. The CLEUD area included a portacabin used as an office and a corrugated lock up storage building on the eastern boundary of the CLEUD area.
5. In 2009 a retrospective planning application (ref: RE09/1184) was submitted to the County Planning Authority for a change of use from a vehicle scrap yard to a soil processing facility. The application was refused on 16 October 2009, with a recommendation for enforcement action. The Planning and Regulatory Committee endorsed enforcement proceedings in line with the officer recommendation and on 11 January 2010 the County Council served an Enforcement Notice on the applicant and landowner. The applicant and

landowner appealed both the refusal of planning permission for the soil recycling facility and the enforcement notices. This appeal was heard in September 2010 by way of a public inquiry. The appeals (refs: APP/B3600/A/10/2122467, APP/B3600/C/10/2122563 & 2122573) were allowed, with planning permission being granted on 12 October 2010 subject to 18 conditions, which required the approval of further details.

6. In June 2011 the following details pursuant applications were approved:
 - Ref: RE10/2056 - Details of the location of stockpiles of processed and unprocessed waste pursuant to Condition 4; details of the provision of two formal passing bays on Perrylands Lane pursuant to Condition 7; and details of a scheme for the provision of 3m high bunding and fencing pursuant to Condition 13 (s278 legal agreement was required)
 - Ref: RE11/0135 - Details of specification of deliveries and removals from the site pursuant to Condition 8; details of facilities to keep the public highway clean pursuant Condition 9; details of vehicle layout for parking, loading and unloading pursuant to Condition 10; and details of landscaping pursuant to Condition 15.
7. In November 2011 planning permission (ref. RE11/1401 & TA11/1147) was granted for the provision of two formal passing bays on Perrylands Lane, revising that previously approved (ref.RE10/2056). A Section 278 legal agreement was required in respect of the works to the highway. In September 2013 a planning application (ref. RE13/01799/CON) was submitted to vary conditions 6 and 16 of the appeal decision, in order to allow the use of a concrete crusher on site in place of a screener and amended Dust Action Plan. This application was subsequently withdrawn.
8. In November 2013 the County Planning Authority (CPA) advised the applicant that the planning permission (Appeal decision ref: APP/B3600/A/10/2122467) for the soil processing facility at the site had lapsed due to the failure to comply with the time limits for the provision of passing bays as specified in Condition 7 of the appeal decision. The applicant made an application to seek to judicially review the CPA's decision, but they did not ultimately proceed as the applicant successfully applied for planning permission (ref: RE14/02134/CON) for the use of land as a soil processing facility (see full description of permission below).
9. In January 2015, the CPA granted a new planning permission ref. RE14/02134/CON for the use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders construction and demolition waste, including the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloo, two metal containers, concrete hardstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash and the provision of car parking and fuel storage.
10. On 21 July 2015, planning permission (ref: RE15/00816/CON) was granted for the use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders' construction and demolition waste, including: the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloo, two metal containers, concrete harstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash, and the provision of car parking and fuel storage without compliance with Condition 19 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 to enable a 360° excavator to operate up to 3m above ground level, subject to conditions.
11. Also on 21 July 2015, planning permission (ref: RE15/01107/CON) was granted for the use of land as a soil processing facility, utilising imported builders' construction and demolition waste, including: the siting of a screener, single storey portacabin, portaloo, two

metal containers, concrete harstanding, stockpiles of soils and rubble, perimeter soil bunds, lighting, water mist sprinklers, access gates, wheelwash, and the provision of car parking and fuel storage without compliance with Condition 2 – approved plans and Condition 27 – landscaping plans of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015, in order to allow for an amended bund design and landscaping scheme, subject to conditions. On 26 August 2015, details of wheel washing facilities (ref: RE15/01408/CON) submitted pursuant to Condition 4 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 were approved.

12. On 27 January 2016, the County Highway Authority wrote to the applicant (Blockade Services Limited) in accordance with the S278 Agreement dated 24 August 2015 stating that the applicant may consider the County Highway Authority's letter as the Provisional Certificate, following the recent completion of the passing bays on Perrylands Lane. The works are now subject to a 12 month maintenance period.

THE PROPOSAL

13. This application is submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Section 73 allows planning permission to be given for development of the same description as development already permitted but subject to different conditions. As such, the development which this Section 73 application seeks to amend will have been judged to be acceptable in principle at an earlier date at the time that the planning permission was granted.
14. Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) makes clear that in considering a Section 73 planning application, the Local Planning Authority shall consider only the question of the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted. Therefore the key issues to consider are whether the proposed variations to Conditions 2, 6 and 24 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 would result in an adverse impact on amenity or the environment.
15. Each condition that the applicant is seeking to vary is listed below [**Officer Note:** only the plans which the applicant is seeking to vary are included under Condition 2 below]:

***Condition 2:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings: Drawing No. TSP/BSL/P2129/01, Drainage Strategy Plan, dated April 2011.*

***Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

***Condition 6:** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the culvert proposed on the western boundary of the site under the field entrance gate and any culverts under the bunds shall be installed and have a minimum diameter of 450mm.*

***Reason:** In order to ensure that the surface water drainage system within the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.*

***Condition 24:** The drainage ditch on the north and west boundaries of the site and the french*

drain within the site, shall be provided in conjunction with the repositioning and construction of the bunds in accordance with the 'Site Layout' and 'Drainage Strategy Plan', and the drainage system shall be maintained and kept clear of debris at all times throughout the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: *In order to prevent the increased risk of flooding and to ensure that the drainage system within the site is provided and surface water drainage of the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008."*

16. The applicant is seeking to vary the above conditions as since planning permission ref: RE14//02134/CON was granted the landowner of the site, who also owns the neighbouring land to the west of the application site, has constructed a drainage ditch which also serves the application site. The applicant submits that the newly formed ditch arrangements on the neighbouring land have sufficient capacity to serve the application site and it is therefore unnecessary to install pipes of a higher diameter with waterflows from the application site able to connect to the newly enhanced neighbouring drainage system.
17. The newly formed ditch on adjoining land is shown on submitted plans. The applicant's drainage engineers have been to the adjoining land and undertaken a levels survey to measure the sections of the drainage ditches to see whether the ditches could cope with the discharge from the application site. It is stated that the drainage ditch on the adjoining land is generally 450mm deep by 350mm wide at the bottom of the ditch widening to 600mm, giving a cross section of 0.214m². A 450mm diameter pipe has a cross section area of 0.16m². The gradient of the ditch is approximately 1 in 260.
18. By connecting to the ditch system on adjoining land, the applicant would no longer need to provide a drainage ditch in the north western corner of the application site as the proposed connection to the adjoining ditch system would direct water westwards along the adjoining drainage ditch system and then northwards to Perrylands Lane. By directing flow into the ditch on adjoining land, the applicant would no longer need to construct a culvert under the field entrance gate in the northwest corner of the site. Any surface water in the ditch located on the northern boundary of the site would enter the ditch system adjoining No.3 Perrylands Lane and enter the ditch system along Perrylands Lane.
19. In seeking to vary Conditions 2, 6, and 24 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015, the applicant has proposed that the conditions should be amended as follows:
 - **Condition 2:** *"The list of approved plans should be amended to include reference to the Plan of revised Drainage Flows, September 2015."*

The applicant submits that the Ditch Survey Plan, ref: TSP/BSL/P2804/03 Rev A, demonstrates that the improved drainage on the adjacent land, which is outside of the site.

 - **Condition 6:** *"Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the drainage system as shown on the approved 'Drainage Strategy Plan' be connected to the*

adjoining drainage network as shown on plan: TSP/BSL/P2804 (Title: Ditch Survey) to utilise the newly formed ditch.”

- **Condition 24:** *“The French drain within the site, shall be provided in conjunction with the repositioning of the bunds in accordance with the ‘Drainage Strategy Plan’ and the drainage system shall be maintained and kept clear of debris at all times throughout the duration of the development hereby permitted.”*

The applicant submits that the revised wording of Condition 24 removes reference to the drainage ditch on the north and west boundaries of the site, reflecting the revised use of the newly formed ditch, which runs east to west, across the neighbouring land (labelled ‘Newly formed ditch’) as shown on Plan TSP/BSL/P2804/03 Rev B.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

20. **Reigate & Banstead Borough Council**
No comments received

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

21. **Tandridge District Council (adjoining authority)**
No comments received
22. **Countryside Management and Biodiversity Manager**
No objection
23. **Natural England**
No comments to make
24. **The Environment Agency**
No comments to make: *“This application falls outside our remit as a statutory planning consultee and we do not wish to be consulted on it.”*
25. **Lead Local Flood Authority**
No objection, subject to conditions

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

26. **Horley Town Council**
No objection
27. **Burstow Parish Council**
Object: raising concerns about the number of vehicle movements and failure to comply with other planning conditions (including the passing bays, hours of operation, number of vehicle movements).

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

28. The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices and an advert was placed in the local newspaper. A total of 154 of owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties and those who had previously commented on planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 were directly notified by letter. In response to this notification, at the time of writing this report, a total of 5 written representations objecting to the planning application have been received. Relevant matters raised in these letters are as follows:

- The surrounding area and roads have seen a massive increase in flooding over the past two years. The County Council should ensure that the impact of the drainage proposals is fully assessed to ensure that flooding in the area will not be increased.

[**Officer's Note:** a number of matters raised in written representations are in relation to traffic movements, noise and air pollution and the condition and upkeep of the surrounding road network. These matters are not relevant to this planning application which is seeking to vary conditions: 2, 6 and 24 to provide a revised drainage strategy. As stated in paragraph 13 above, the original planning permission which this application is seeking to vary (ref: RE/14/02134/CON) considered a number of potential impacts, including noise, air quality and highways/transportation.]

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

29. The County Council as County Planning Authority has a duty under Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to determine this application in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (1990 Act) requires local planning authorities when determining planning applications to "have regard to (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and (c) any other material considerations". At present in relation to this application the Development Plan consists of The Surrey Waste Plan 2008, the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 and the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 (saved policies 2014).
30. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted in March 2012. This document provides guidance to local planning authorities in producing local plans and in making decisions on planning applications. The NPPF is intended to make the planning system less complex and more accessible by summarising national guidance, which replaces numerous planning policy statements and guidance notes, circulars and various letters to Chief Planning Officers. The document is based on the principle of the planning system making an important contribution to sustainable development, which is seen as achieving positive growth that strikes a balance between economic, social and environmental factors. The Development Plan remains the cornerstone of the planning system. Planning applications, which comply with an up to date Development Plan should be approved. Refusal should only be on the basis of conflict with the Development Plan and other material considerations.

31. The NPPF states that policies in Local Plans should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to publication of the framework. However, the policies in the NPPF are material considerations which planning authorities should take into account. Due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies are to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight they may be given).
32. The National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) 2014 was published in October 2014 replacing with immediate effect Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management. The NPPW sets out detailed waste planning policies to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management. The NPPW should be read in conjunction with the NPPF, the Waste Management Plan for England, National Policy Statements for Waste Water and Hazardous Waste or any successor documents. All local planning authorities should have regard to its policies when discharging their responsibilities to the extent that they are appropriate to waste management.
33. The Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP2008) sets out the planning framework for the development of waste management facilities in Surrey. The plan is divided into four sections. The Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision for the area over the plan period together with key spatial objectives and strategic policies. The Waste Development section contains site specific proposals for the development of waste management facilities. The Waste Development Control Policies section contains a set of development control policies that apply across the whole County and apply to all waste development. The Proposals Map illustrates the areas of designation identified in the core strategy policy and the location of identified sites.
34. The Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted in July 2014 (RBCS2014) provides the spatial strategy for Reigate & Banstead for the next 15 years. It covers a wide range of spatial planning issues. The RBCS2014 forms part of the Development Plan that guides land-use planning in the borough. Until the Development Management Plan is adopted, policies in the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 (saved policies 2014) which have been formally saved also form part of the development plan. A list of Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 (RBLP2005) saved policies are included in Appendix 3 of the RBCS2014.

FLOOD RISK

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP2008)

Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 (RBCS2014)

Policy CS10 – Sustainable Development

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 (saved policies 2014) (RBLP2005)

35. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF sets out that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
36. Policy DC3 of the SWP2008 states that planning permission for waste related development will be granted provided that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. Matters such as flooding (among others) should be assessed

and where necessary, appropriate mitigation should be identified so as to minimise or avoid any material adverse impact and compensate for any loss.

37. Policy CS10 of the RBCS2014 sets out that development will need to take account of all sources of flooding and manage flood risk through the use of SuDS and flood resistant/resilient design features.

Officer's Assessment

38. The applicant is seeking to vary the above conditions as since planning permission ref: RE14//02134/CON was granted a drainage system on adjoining land to the west of the application site has been improved. The landowner of the application site also owns this neighbouring land to the west. The applicant submits that the newly formed ditch arrangements on the neighbouring land have sufficient capacity to serve the application site and it is therefore unnecessary to install pipes of a higher diameter with waterflows able to connect to the newly enhanced neighbouring drainage system.
39. The Environment Agency (EA) have responded that they have no comments to make on this application as it falls outside their remit as a statutory planning consultee. Officers note that as of 15 April 2015, Surrey County Council in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is now a statutory consultee on surface water management drainage issues for all new major developments.
40. Having been consulted on the proposals, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have reviewed the surface water drainage strategy for the site and have assessed it against the requirements under the NPPF, its accompanying NPPG and Technical Standards. The LLFA have raised no objection to the proposed changes to the surface water drainage strategy to incorporate a different drainage design at the site, subject to conditions. However they recommend that the reference to culverts being installed on site needing to be at least 450mm, to allow the free passage of water, is retained.
41. Concerns have been raised in a written representation that the surrounding area and roads have seen an increase in flooding over the past two years and that the County Council should ensure that the impact of the drainage proposals is fully assessed to ensure that flooding in the area would not be increased. Officers can confirm that the LLFA have assessed the drainage proposals raising no objection the proposed drainage strategy.

Conclusion

42. The LLFA have raised no objection to the proposed changes to the surface water drainage strategy at the site. Having reviewed the submitted details, written representations and responses from consultees, Officers consider that the proposals for a revised drainage strategy at the site would not increase flood risk or cause an adverse impact in terms of surface water drainage in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policy CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014, subject to conditions.

BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGY

Development Plan Policies

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP2008)

Policy DC3 – General Considerations

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 (RBCS2014)

Policy CS10 – Sustainable Development

43. Policy DC3 of the SWP2008 states that planning permission for waste related development will be granted provided that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. Matters such as the loss or damage to flora and fauna and their respective habitats at the site or on adjoining land should be assessed and where necessary, appropriate mitigation should be identified so as to minimise or avoid any material adverse impact and compensate for any loss.
44. Policy CS10 of the RBCS2014 sets out that development should be designed to ensure that adverse impacts on landscape, wildlife and amenity are addressed.

Officer's Assessment

45. A narrow strip of land to the west of the application site which borders Peeks Brook Lane has been identified as Priority Inventory Habitat (PIH) – Deciduous Woodland. The drainage ditch on adjoining land which this application proposes to connect to would divert water flows from the site within close proximity to this PIH. The ditch along Peeks Brook Lane adjacent to PIH falls outside of the application site.
46. In response to consultation on the proposal, the Countryside Management and Biodiversity Manager (CMBM) responded that they have no ecological objections or observation to make on this application. In response to consultation on the development proposal, Natural England have advised that they have no comments to make.

Conclusion

47. The CMBM and Natural England have raised no objection to the proposed changes to the surface water drainage strategy at the site. The revised surface water drainage strategy proposes to divert surface water flow via the newly formed ditch on adjoining land northwards to Perrylands Lane. Having reviewed the submitted details, written representations and responses from consultees, Officers consider that the proposals for a revised drainage strategy at the site would not have a significant adverse impact on flora and fauna on this adjoining land in accordance with Policy DC3 of the SWP2008 and Policy CS10 of the RBCS2014.

GREEN BELT

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP2008)

Policy CW6 – Development in the Green Belt

Policy WD2 – Recycling, Storage, Transfer, Materials recovery and Processing Facilities (Excluding Thermal Treatment)

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 (RBCS2014)

Policy CS3 – Green Belt

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 (saved policies 2014) (RBLP2005)

Policy Co 1 – Green Belt

48. The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The NPPF states at paragraph 79 that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open with the essential characteristics of the Green Belt being their openness and permanence. Paragraph 80 sets out the five key purposes of the Green Belt. The relevant criteria for this application are to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to safeguard encroachment of the countryside. The Inspector in the 2010 appeal decision concluded that the bunds and stockpiles, which form an integral part of the soil processing facility represent a negative impact on openness and the development is therefore inappropriate in Green Belt terms. However, whilst the site is in the countryside and Green Belt, the land affected would be no larger than the lawful use of the land as a scrap yard.
49. Paragraph 87 goes on to state that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 advises that in the consideration of proposals, that local planning authorities should ensure substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and that very special circumstances will not exist *“unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”*.
50. Policy CW6 of the SWP2008 states that there will be a presumption against waste related development in the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. This policy echoes the requirements of the NPPF that very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development of waste management facilities in the Green Belt will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The policy sets out considerations that may contribute to very special circumstances. These being the lack of suitable non-Green Belt sites, the need to find locations well related to the source of waste arisings, the characteristics of the site; and the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management. Policy CW5 of the SWP 2008 deals with unallocated site and notes that priority should be given to previously developed, contaminated, derelict or disturbed land as potentially appropriate locations for waste management activities.
51. Policy CS3 of the RBCS2014 seeks to maintain the Green Belt within the Borough and states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt. Policy Co1 states that in order to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for development that is inappropriate in the Green Belt unless justified by very special circumstances

52. Policy WD2 (iii) of the SWP 2008 identifies the locations where planning permission for development involving bulking up of waste and facilities for recycling, recovery and processing of waste will be granted. Waste sites also have to be assessed against SWP2008 development control Policy DC3 (General Considerations), which requires that the County Council be satisfied that the impact of a proposed development is such that it does not significantly affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. It also requires planning applicants to show that they have assessed particular environment and amenity issues.

Officer's Assessment and Conclusion

53. As set out above in paragraph 13, this application is submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Section 73 allows planning permission to be given for development of the same description as development already permitted but subject to different conditions. As such, the development which this Section 73 application seeks to amend will have been judged to be acceptable in principle at an earlier date at the time that the planning permission was granted.
54. In the determination of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 for the use of the land as a soil processing facility utilising imported builders construction and demolition waste, harm to the Green Belt was considered by Officers. Officers concluded that very special circumstances exist that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness to justify the granting of planning permission. The principle of the development was granted by Inspector (Appeal decision ref: APP/B3600/A/10/2122467).
55. This application is seeking to vary conditions 2, 6 and 24 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015. Taking into account existing planning permissions at the site, Officers do not consider that the proposed variations to the drainage strategy represent a material change which would increase harm to the Green Belt, by reason of its inappropriateness, impact on openness or any other harm. As discussed in previous sections of this report, the proposed variations to the drainage strategy at the site would not cause a significant adverse impact in terms of flood risk, drainage or biodiversity/ecology. Officers otherwise do not consider there have been any other material changes in the circumstances underlying the grant of the original planning permission. Therefore, Officers consider that very special circumstances still exist that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, loss of openness, and any other harm in accordance with Policies CW6, WD2 and DC3 of the SWP 2008, Policy CS3 of the RBCS2014 and Policy Co 1 of the RBLP2005.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

56. The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, contained in the Preamble to the Agenda is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.
57. It is acknowledged that there would be an impact on the Green Belt caused by inappropriateness of the development and harm to openness. Additionally, impacts in respect of flood risk/drainage

and biodiversity and ecology have been assessed in the body of the report. The scale of the impacts is not considered to be sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1 and, if planning permission were to be granted, such impacts are capable of being mitigated by the measures incorporated into the application proposal and by planning condition and the mitigation measures and controls available through the Environmental Permitting regime. As such, this proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention right.

CONCLUSION

58. The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. Key issues in determining this application include the history of the site for waste uses, including the Inspector's decision and report and planning permissions granted by the County Planning Authority. However, there still needs to be consideration of the following: compliance with the Development Plan, the protection of the Metropolitan Green Belt, flood risk and drainage impact and the potential impact on local residential, environmental and amenity interests (including biodiversity and ecology).
59. Waste development of this type is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore planning permission may only be granted where factors that amount to very special circumstances are demonstrated to justify inappropriate development and clearly outweigh the harm in terms of inappropriateness and any other harm. This application is seeking to vary Conditions 2, 6 and 24 of planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015 which granted planning permission for the use of the land as a soil processing facility. In assessing the application, Officers considered that very special circumstances exist that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness to justify the granting of planning permission. In assessing this proposal, Officers do not consider that the proposed changes to the drainage strategy at the site materially alter the very special circumstances which have previously been identified and the development which has previously been permitted. Therefore, Officers consider that the proposal accords with Policy CW6 and WD2 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, and Policy CS3 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014.
60. There have been no objections from technical consultees with respect to the proposed development. Residents have objected to the proposal raising concerns that the surrounding area and roads have seen an increase in flooding over the past two years and that the proposal should be assessed to ensure that the flooding in the area would not be increased by the proposal. The Lead Local Flood Authority has assessed the proposal and has raised no objection subject to conditions. Other concerns raised by residents relate to traffic movements, noise and air pollution and the condition and upkeep of the surrounding road network. As has been set out in paragraph 28 above, these concerns are not relevant to this planning application.
61. Having considered the submitted details, concerns raised in written representations and consultation responses from consultees, Officers consider that the proposals for a revised drainage strategy at the site would not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity or

10

the environment or cause an increased risk of flooding in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policy CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is to **PERMIT** subject to conditions:

Conditions:

Commencement

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

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:
 - Drawing No. 5253/0001, Site Location Plan (date stamped 22.08.14)
 - Drawing No. 5596/001/H, Proposed Site Plan (date stamped 11.06.15)
 - Drawing No. 5596/002/REV-A, Proposed Section Drawing, dated 04/03/15
 - Drawing No. 5596/003, Proposed Bund Planting, dated 04/03/15
 - Drawing No. 5253/005, Route to be used by HGVs entering and leaving the Blockade Services site at Perrylands Lane, July 2014
 - Drawing No. 5253/006, Layout of Vehicle Parking, Loading and Unloading Area, and Turning Area, July 2014
 - Drawing No. 5253/007, Extent of Landscaping on site at 2 Perrylands Lane, July 2014
 - Drawing No. 5253/008, Position of Wheel Washing Equipment, July 2014
 - Drawing No. 06 J7/01043, Details of Jakoustic Fencing System (date stamped 22.08.14)
 - Drawing No. 90627-TK02 rev A, Swept Path of Large Tipper Turning within Site (date stamped 22.08.14)
 - Drawing No. 90627-01, Visibility Splays (date stamped 22.08.14)
 - Figure 1, Location of Noise Mitigation Features (date stamped 22.08.14)
 - Drawing No. TSP/BSL/P2804/001, Rev C, Drainage Layout, dated 9 February 2016
 - Drawing No. P2804, 2 Perrylands Lane, Smallfield, Horley, RH6 9PR - Site Photos
 - Drawing No. 5596/004 (P2804), Photo Location Plan

- Drawing No. TSP/BSL/P2804/03, Rev A, Ditch Survey, dated 20 April 2015
- Plan of Revised Drainage Flows, dated September 2015

Pre-Commencement

3. Prior to the commencement of the egress of HGVs, the wheel wash facilities approved by notice ref: RE15/01408/CON dated 26 August 2015 shall be installed, maintained, and operated in accordance with the approved details and used whenever the operations hereby permitted involve the movement of HGVs to or from the site in conditions otherwise likely to give rise to mud or debris being carried onto the highway.

Limitations

4. No machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out, no servicing, maintenance or testing of plant shall be undertaken, no lights shall be illuminated (other than PIR security lights) and no deliveries taken at or despatched from the site outside the following times:

0800 - 1700 Mondays to Fridays,

0900 - 1330 on Saturdays

nor at any time on Sundays, Bank, National or Public Holidays.

This shall not prevent the carrying out of emergency operations but these are to be notified to the County Planning Authority, in advance or within 3-days of the operation having been undertaken.

5. Only inert construction and demolition waste shall be imported onto the application site. All incidental waste, to include rubbish and scrap, shall be removed from the site and disposed of at a suitably licensed waste management facility.
6. There shall be no crushing of any brick, concrete or stone.
7. The 2 formal passing bays constructed by the applicant along Perrylands Lane (between the motorway bridge and Ontario Close) shall be maintained in general accordance with the Section 278 legal agreement and the approved plans contained within Appendix 14 of the August 2014 Planning Statement and planning permission ref: RE11/1401 & TA11/1147 dated 14 November 2011 so that they are sufficient for a 20 tonne capacity lorry (and thus an equestrian or cyclist) to comfortably give way to another 20 tonne capacity lorry.
8. Site operations shall be carried out in accordance with the Working Scheme (Appendix 3 of the August 2014 Planning Statement) and Dwg 5596/001/H 'Proposed Site Plan', with stockpiles of processed and unprocessed waste to be no more than 4 metres in height.
9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no plant, building or machinery, whether fixed or moveable, other than that specifically authorised by inclusion in the following list shall be erected or brought onto the application site without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority.

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

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

Traffic and Access

10. All lorries used for carrying loads to and from the application site are to be sheeted.
11. There shall be no more than 30 HGV movements per day (15 in and 15 out) on Monday to Fridays and no more than 16 HGV movements (8 in and 8 out) on Saturdays. HGV movements shall not exceed 20 tonnes capacity (other than as required for the movement of the plant and machinery authorised under the terms of Condition 11).
12. Any HGV movements associated with the development hereby permitted shall be required to use the route as indicated on Drawing No.5253/005 so as to avoid the use of Broadbridge Lane to the south. Records of HGV movement to and from the site must be kept and submitted quarterly to the County Planning Authority in February, May, August and November for the preceding 3-months.
13. Space shall be laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked, for the loading and unloading of vehicles and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. The parking / turning area shall be used and retained exclusively for its designated purpose.

Noise

14. Except for temporary uses, the level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 3.6 metres from the façade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 60LAeq during any 30 minute period.
15. For the temporary operation of bund formation, the level of noise arising from this activity when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 3.6 metres from the façade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 70LAeq during any 30 minute period.
16. The bunds and acoustic fence as shown on Drawing Nos. 5596/001/H 'Proposed Site Plan', 5596/002 rev A 'Proposed Section Drawing', and 06 J7/01043 'Detail of Acoustic Fencing System' shall be maintained in a good condition through treatment and replacement where necessary, to ensure its acoustic performance.
17. All plant and machinery are to work only from ground level except within the hatched area of 'Drawing No. 5596/001/H – Proposed Site Plan – Received 11/06/15', where a single 360° excavator may operate up to 3m above ground level for the purpose of feeding the screener hopper.

Lighting

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

Dust

19. Within 6 months of the date of this planning permission, the approved sprinkler system shall be installed and used thereafter whenever the proposed use is in operation in dry or windy conditions in order that the operator will minimise dust generated from the site.
20. The mitigation measures outlined within the Dust Action Plan dated August 2010 R1390-R02-v3 shall be undertaken and adhered to at all times during the implementation of the development hereby permitted.
21. The Dust Action Plan shall be periodically reviewed and amended if required at no greater than two year intervals in the first six years, with five year reviews thereafter for the duration of the use of the site.
22. Having regard to the Dust Action Plan no activity hereby permitted shall cause dust to be emitted from the site. Should such emissions occur, the relevant activity shall be suspended until it can be resumed without causing any such emissions.

Drainage

23. Within 6 months of the date of this planning permission, the drainage system as shown on the approved Drawing No. TSP/BSL/P2804/001, Rev C, Drainage Layout, dated 9 February 2016 shall be installed and connected to the adjoining ditch network, as shown on Drawing No. TSP/BSL/P2804/03, Rev A, Ditch Survey, dated 20 April 2015 to utilise the newly formed ditch. The culvert under the bund shall be installed and have a minimum diameter of 450 mm.
24. The drainage ditches on the north, west and south boundaries of the site and the land drain within the site, shall be provided in conjunction with the repositioning and construction of the bunds in accordance with Drawing No. 5596/001/H 'Proposed Site Plan' and the Drawing No. TSP/BSL/P2804/001, Rev C, Drainage Layout, dated 9 February 2016. The drainage system shall be maintained and kept clear of debris at all times throughout the duration of the development hereby permitted.
25. If the surface water drainage system fails, the development hereby permitted shall be suspended until the surface water drainage system is operating properly to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

Landscaping

26. All trees on and immediately adjoining the site shall be protected from damage as a result of operations on site, to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority in accordance with the

guidance in British Standard BS5837:2012. Any trees or parts of trees removed without the County Planning Authority's consent or die or become in the opinion of the County Planning Authority seriously diseased or otherwise damaged within 5 years following completion of the planting shall be replaced not later than the end of the first available planting season.

27. The proposed hedgerow shall not exceed 4m in height when measured from the base of the hedgerow.
28. The landscaping of the site shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing Nos. 5596/002 rev A 'Proposed Section Drawing' and 5596/003 'Proposed Bund Planting' dated 04/03/15 and Scheme of Maintenance dated April 2015.
29. The maintenance of the landscaping for both planting and fencing shall be carried out in accordance with the 'Scheme For the Maintenance of the Landscaping Planting and Fencing at Blockade Services' dated April 2015, approved under notice ref: RE15/01107/CON dated 21 July 2015.

Reasons:

1. To accord with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to enable the County Planning Authority to control the development and monitor the site to ensure compliance with the planning permission.
2. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
4. To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
5. To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
6. To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
7. In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
8. To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.

9. To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
10. In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
11. In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
12. In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
13. In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policies Mo4, Mo5, Mo7 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005.
14. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality to comply with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
15. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality to comply with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
16. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality to comply with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
17. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid noise nuisance to the locality to comply with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
18. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of lighting on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
19. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of dust on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3.
20. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of dust on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3.

21. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of dust on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3.
22. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact in respect of dust on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC3.
23. In order to prevent the increased risk of flooding and to ensure that the drainage system within the site is provided and surface water drainage of the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policy CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014.
24. In order to prevent the increased risk of flooding and to ensure that the drainage system within the site is provided and surface water drainage of the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policy CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014.
25. In order to prevent flooding onsite and elsewhere and to ensure that the drainage system within the site is provided and surface water drainage of the site is not compromised in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and Policy CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014.
26. In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
27. In order to ensure the hedgerow remains stable in the long term in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
28. To comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of biodiversity and conservation to comply with policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
29. To comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of biodiversity and conservation to comply with policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.

Informatives:

1. The applicant's attention is drawn to the Section 278 Legal Agreement with regard to maintenance of the two passing bays on Perrylands Lane.
2. The applicant is advised that any culvert, diversion, weir, dam or like obstruction to the flow of a watercourse requires the separate consent of the Environment Agency and/or Internal Drainage Board, under the Land Drainage Act 1991.
3. Any works to be carried out which will affect the flow or storage of water within, or which place or alter a structure/obstruction within an ordinary watercourse will require Ordinary Watercourse Consent. These can include permanent or temporary structures or works. An 'ordinary watercourse' is a watercourse that is not part of a main river and includes rivers, streams, ditches, drains, cuts, culverts, dikes, sluices, sewers (other than public sewers within the meaning of the Water Industry Act 1991) and passages, through which water flows. Consent within Surrey is

issued by the Sustainable Drainage and Consenting Team within Surrey County Council. The team can provide information on the requirements for consent and the application procedure and is contactable by email on SuDS@surreycc.gov.uk. Please note consent cannot be issued retrospectively. Works affecting designated Main River require consent from the Environment Agency.

4. The applicant is advised that if *Thuja plicata* is not available that suitable alternatives would be Laurel, *Caragana arborescens*, *Buxus sempervirens* or *Ceanothus*.
5. The applicant is advised that it would be beneficial if a backward sloping step could be formed in the bank profile along the tree planting line as this will help retain water moving down the bank face.
6. Because of the high ambient noise from non-site related sources, it may be necessary to measure noise from site operations closer to the source and use noise modelling techniques or calculations based on the provisions of BS 5228 – 1:2009.
7. Attention is drawn to the requirements of Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and to the Code of Practice for Access of the Disabled to Buildings (British Standards Institution Code of Practice BS 8300:2009) or any prescribed document replacing that code.
8. The County Planning Authority confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of paragraph 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

CONTACT

William Flaherty

TEL. NO.

020 8541 8095

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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

Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Policy for Waste 2014

National Planning Practice Guidance 2012

The Development Plan

Surrey Waste Plan 2008

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014

Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 (saved policies 2014)

Other Documents

Planning permission ref: RE14/02134/CON dated 21 January 2015

Planning permission ref: RE15/00816/CON dated 21 July 2015

Planning permission ref: RE15/01107/CON dated 21 July 2015

Approval of details ref: RE15/01408/CON dated 26 August 2015
