

TO: PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE

DATE: 22 February 2017

BY: PLANNING DEVELOPMENT TEAM MANAGER

DISTRICT(S) WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):

Farnham Central
Mrs Frost

PURPOSE: FOR DECISION

GRID REF: 486404 147270

TITLE: MINERALS/WASTE WA/2016/2323

SUMMARY REPORT

Land at Runfold South Quarry, Guildford Road, Runfold, Farnham, Surrey GU10 1PB

The continued retention and operation of a mortar batching plant until 30 June 2017 without compliance with Condition 3 of planning permission ref: WA/2013/0721 dated 10 July 2013.

The proposal involved the retention of an existing ready mixed mortar plant (referred to here after as the mortar plant) at the Runfold South Complex until 30 June 2017. The retention period would involve five months (December 2016 – May 2017) of mortar and screed production and one month (4-5 weeks) of decommissioning and demolition of the plant, ancillary structures and breaking up and removing the concrete hardstanding.

A mortar plant at the application site within the Runfold South Complex has been in place since 1969. Previously the mortar plant was limited to the life of the permitted mineral reserves within Area A and then more latterly to the mineral reserves within Area C. Sand extraction from Area C has ceased and Area C is to be restored by December 2019. Planning permission WA/2013/0721 limited the life of the mortar plant until 31 December 2016. The applicant is now wishing for a limited extension of time until 30 June 2017 to use up the remaining Area C stockpile of sand (which can be seen in photograph 2) to meet existing local contracts. Once the Area C sand has been exhausted, the applicant proposes to remove all the plant and machinery. The applicant is not proposing to relocate the mortar plant itself due to its age. Instead the applicant is seeking to operate a new mortar plant at Marchwood in Southampton. Whilst this application was submitted before the expiry date of 31 December 2016, as this date has now passed this application is now retrospective.

The Farnham Society and the Moor Park Residents Association both object and raise concerns with this proposal due to the continuation of applications from the applicant seeking extensions of time for retention of the plant. The Farnham Society however have commented that a less welcome alternative is that the applicant be informed that no further extension of time will be permitted beyond 30 June 2017. One letter of representation has been received.

Officers identify the main issues in relation to this planning application are whether the proposal is likely to have unacceptable impacts on: its landscape setting and visual amenity, the local highway network, noise, dust emissions, the restoration of the application area within the wider Runfold South Complex, and the need for its retention.

Officers consider following advice from technical consultees and subject to the importation of planning conditions, that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the landscape or visual amenity of the site, an unacceptable impact on the local highway network, nor would it result in an unacceptable impact on amenity including dust and noise. Officers

recognise that the applicant is seeking a further extension of time for retention of the mortar plant and its ancillary equipment however Officers also recognise this is a limited short term extension being sought to enable the Area C sand stockpile to be exhausted and to meet local contracts. Officers therefore consider the proposal is in general accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the aims and objectives of planning policies contained in the Development Plan.

The recommendation is to PERMIT subject to conditions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Applicant

Tarmac Building Products Limited

Date application valid

25 November 2016

Period for Determination

24 February 2017

Amending Documents

Email dated 2 February 2017 and accompanying Noise and Dust Management Plan for Demolition Works at Tarmac Ltd.

SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES

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

	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Countryside Beyond the Green Belt	Yes	39-41
Need	Yes	42-49
Highways and Traffic	Yes	50-53
Restoration and Aftercare	Yes	57-60
Landscape and Visual Impact	Yes	61-67
Noise	Yes	68-72
Dust	Yes	73-84

ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Site Plan

Plan

Aerial Photographs

Aerial

Site Photographs

Photograph 1: View of the mortar plant

Photograph 2: View of the remaining sand stockpile

BACKGROUND

Site Description

1. The application site is located within a larger mineral site complex known as Runfold South (Princess Royal) Quarry and Landfill Complex (hereon referred to as Runfold South). The Runfold South complex comprises of five distinct mineral/ landfill areas including a ROMP (Review of Old Mineral Permissions) area, Area A, Area B, Area C and the Old Hogs Back area. Runfold South is approximately 80 hectares in total size. Runfold South lies immediately to the south of the Guildford Road (C119) with the A31 approximately 39m to the north. Runfold South is approximately 2 kilometres (km) to the east of Farnham, approximately 3km directly south of Aldershot town centre and 12km to the west of Guildford. Runfold South Quarry forms one of a number of existing and former mineral workings located along the A31 including Runfold North, the Jolly Farmer, Homefield and Seale Lodge all of which are at various stages of restoration. The River Wey lies approximately 136m at its closest point, to the west of Runfold South the other side of Moor Park Lane. Barfield School lies immediately adjacent to Runfold South's north eastern boundary.
2. When viewed from the A31 Runfold South is contained within a framework of trees and hedgerows, set in an undulating landscape, with land rising in a southeastern direction. Views of Runfold South are offered from a network of public rights of way, which both cross and circle Runfold South including footpath 121 through the centre of the site and footpath 208 along the southern boundary. To the southern boundary of Runfold South is the North Downs Way, a footpath which links Surrey to the Kent Coast.
3. Runfold South does not lie within any areas covered by national or higher-level nature conservation designations. The closest areas nationally important for nature conservation are the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at Moor Park (800m directly south) and Puttenham and Crooksbury Commons SSSI (2.6km southeast). The closest areas designated at the local level for conservation value are two Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI's) at Crooksbury Hill (1.4 km southeast) and the River Wey - North Branch (300m west). Runfold South is not covered by any areas that are considered to be at risk of flooding, but does lie within the boundaries of an area of Zone 3 (Total Catchment) groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) classified by the Environment Agency. The site lies within an area locally designated for landscape as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), and is approximately 230 metres to the west of the boundary of the nationally designated Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
4. The application area is located in the centre of the Runfold South complex within the south western part of the ROMP area. The ROMP area is due to be restored by 31 December 2021 under planning permission ref: WA98/1018. The application area is bordered to the west by an Inert Recycling Facility, to the east by open land (a former mineral workings restored by way of landfilling and part of the ROMP area); to the south east lies the Old Hogs Back area, to the south Area B and to the south west Area C. The application site is located in a bowl approximately 10m lower than the surrounding land. To the east of the site is a band of trees/hedgerow, and to the west public footpath 121 which runs in a north/ south manner¹. The application site is well screened from public views given its low level.

¹ Please note that footpath 121 is on a temporary diversion route around Area C until it meets with footpath 208

5. The closest residential properties to the application site are Moor Park Farm with the surrounding buildings some 358m to the west, Swifts Cottage and Temple Cottage approximately 355m south west; and The Lodge some 275m to the north beyond the Guildford Road. Barfield School lies approximately 279m to the north east.

Planning History

6. The planning history with regards to the Runfold South Complex is as follows. Runfold South produces sand for building and construction purposes and has been partially restored. Runfold South has a long planning history with regards to mineral working. Mineral working commenced at Runfold South in the 1950's, with planning permission being originally allowed on appeal in 1951 (Ref. FAR 232/50). Further extensions were permitted in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. These form the ROMP area. In 1996 two further extension areas, known as Area A (13.2 hectare (ha)) and Area B (8.8ha) were permitted on appeal (Refs: T/APP/B3600/A/95/257618/P5 & T/APP/B3600A/95/257619/P5 respectively), with restoration to be completed by 31 December 2004 for Area B, and 31 December 2011 for Area A. The planning permission for Area A was subsequently amended by planning permission ref: WA11/0779 extending the life of Area A until 31 December 2018. A scheme of restoration and aftercare for Area A was approved in November 2015.
7. In 1999 new planning conditions for mineral working, restoration and aftercare pursuant to the Environment Act 1995 were approved (Ref. WA98/1018) (the ROMP area) in respect of the older workings in the northern and central part of Runfold South. As part of the ROMP process, a further ten years after the completion of Area A (2011) was considered necessary for the final working and restoration of the ROMP site area. This meant that all offices, hardstandings and internal access roads would be removed and the ROMP site finally restored to a landscaped parkland setting with an agricultural use on or before 31 December 2021.
8. In September 2001, planning permission ref WA00/0460 was refused for the extraction of sand and infilling with commercial and industrial wastes in the western extension (Area C) of the existing operations. In July 2003, a further application ref: WA03/1492 was submitted for the extraction of sand from Area C, with the subsequent restoration by infilling with inert waste materials only, including the temporary diversion of footpath 121 around the western margin of the site. Due to concerns voiced by the Environment Agency over the alignment of the proposed haul road and the impact of the engineered landfill area, the application was placed in abeyance.
9. In January 2006 planning permission ref: WA03/1492 and WA05/2073 were refused for extraction of sand from Area C, with the subsequent restoration by infilling with inert waste materials only. These proposals comprised the extension of the existing quarry by 1.7ha (to form Area C) with the extraction of sand and the subsequent restoration of the land to agriculture by infilling with inert waste materials and the temporary diversion of Public Footpath 121 to the west of Area C; and for the construction and use of a haul road specifically for Area C. The applicant subsequently appealed these refusals and the Appeal was upheld and planning permission was granted for Area C ref: APP/B3600/A/06/2020101 and APP/B3600/A/06/2020102 in August 2007. This appeal decision was subsequently varied by planning permission ref: WA12/1652 extending the life of Area C until 31 December 2019. A scheme of restoration and aftercare for Area C was approved in September 2016.
10. With regards to the mortar plant, a mortar plant has been at Runfold South since 1969 (ref:FAR/85/69). Recent permissions for the mortar plant include:
 - Planning permission WA/2013/0721 granted for the retention of a mortar batching plant and associated infrastructure to be supplied with sand from Area C of Runfold South

Quarry; and continued importation of sharp sand, until 31 December 2016 (Retrospective).

- Planning permission WA/2011/2061 granted for the retention of a ready mixed mortar plant and associated infrastructure to be supplied with sand from Area C of Runfold South Quarry, until 31 December 2012
- Planning permission WA06/1438 granted for the retention of a ready mixed mortar plant and associated infrastructure for a temporary period until sand extraction at Area A ceases or until 31 December 2011, whichever the earlier.

THE PROPOSAL

11. The applicant is seeking retention of the mortar plant for a further period of six months beyond 31 December 2016, i.e. 30 June 2017. The applicant states this is because there is currently a stockpile of sand extracted from Area C to be used solely by the mortar plant. The mortar plant needs to remain on site to process this sand. The mortar plant does not solely make mortars but also screeds which involves the importation of sharp sand to the application site. The applicant estimates there is approximately 4,700 tonnes of sand reserves in the stockpile. The applicant proposes this would take five months to exhaust at a rate of 1000 tonnes per month with lower operating levels during the months of November, December and January.
12. Once the sand has been used in the mortar plant, the applicant proposes to dismantle the current mortar plant. For the last month on the application site, the applicant proposes to disconnect the mortar plant and all ancillary facilities and to remove them from the application site. The applicant states any inert recyclables such as remaining mortar waste, the broken up concrete structures and bay walls, would be sent to the adjoining recycling facility located in the Runfold South Complex. The applicant states the site would be cleared and levelled which would include removing the concrete hardstanding.
13. The applicant states that retention of the plant for a further period of six months would not affect current traffic levels; and as the plant itself would not alter noise levels and impact on the landscape would also not change.
14. The application site lies within the ROMP area. This area is due to be restored by 31 December 2021. With regards to the other areas within the Runfold South Complex, Area A should be restored by 31 December 2018 and Area C by 31 December 31 December 2019. Area B and the Old Hogs Back have been restored already.

CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

District Council

15. Waverley Borough Council : No comments received
16. Borough Environmental Health Officer : No objection

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

17. Principal Enhancement Officer : The proposal would not adversely affect or delay restoration of this part of the Runfold Complex so no objection on these grounds.
18. The Environment Agency South East : No objection however make the following comments that the site is situated within a sensitivity location for groundwater protection. The applicant should follow best practice for pollution prevention as detailed in the Groundwater protection: Principles and practice (GP3). It is noted that surface water drainage is recycled for use in the mortar plant and therefore there is no discharge

to ground. If this changes the Environment Agency wish to be contacted. Provided the activity is permitted correctly the Environment Agency have no concerns. Acquiring an Environmental Permit is a separate process from seeking planning permission.

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 19. | Transportation Development Planning | : | No objection |
| 20. | Rights of Way | : | No comments received |
| 21. | Southern Water | : | No comments received |
| 22. | South East Water | : | No comments to make |
| 23. | County Noise Consultant | : | No objection subject to conditions |
| 24. | County Dust Consultant | : | Considers the sensitivity of the area for human-health impacts is low. For dust impacts on people and property in terms of soiling also consider to be low. Satisfied the control measures set out in Section 4 and 5 of the submitted Noise and Dust Management Plan are appropriate for this low risk site. |

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 25. | Farnham Town Council | : | No objections though welcomes the ultimate discontinuation of use and the restoration of the land. |
| 26. | Runfold Action Group | : | No comments received |
| 27. | Crooksbury Residents' Association | : | No comments received |
| 28. | Moor Park Residents Association | : | seriously concerned that Tarmac has once again applied to extend the plant operation. If granted, this would be the third extension in the last five years, and we have little confidence it would be the last. Instead of managing their stockpile to comply with their planning condition, they are now using it as a justification for further extension. This is a most unsatisfactory situation. |
| 29. | The Farnham Society | : | objects to the planning application on the following grounds - |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been three previous applications seeking to retain the mortar plant, each being successful and each giving an end date • The plant uses sand from the non-operational Area C with much larger quantities of sand imported into the plant from elsewhere (two to three times as much) • The application starts there is only a small amount of remaining sand from Area C which will be used over the 6 months before the plant is relocated elsewhere. Over those 6 months there will be some 10,000 tonnes of sand imported by truck to the plant as well as some 15,000 tonnes of mortar exported. The community has put up with a large number of lorries going from the site and it is now unreasonable that this should continue. • There is nothing in the current application that provides certainty about the proposed 6 month timetable. The operator may well extend this. • In our view the plant should be relocated immediately and should the operator wish to utilise the remaining sand it should be shipped out to this relocated area. • As a less welcome alternative, the applicant should be informed that as part of any consent given that no further extension of time will be permitted beyond 30 June 2017. |
| 30. | Seale & Sands Parish Council | : | No comments received |
| 31. | Seale, Sands & Runfold Amenity Society | : | No comments received |
| 32. | <u>Officer comment:</u> the applicant does import sand to the mortar plant but this is sharp sand for blending with the Area C sand to produce screeds. The volumes and percentages for blending can be seen below in paragraph 43. With regards to removing the mortar plant immediately and relocating it in the local area, this point is discussed below at paragraph 45. | | |

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

33. The application was publicised by the posting of three site notices. A total of six owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. Whilst four letters of representation have been recorded on Waverley Borough Council's webpages, only one letter of representation has been received. This is because one address has been recorded twice, one address is The Farnham Society's comments; and one

address is missing and there are no comments. As such Officers have recorded that only one representation has been received raising the following comments

- The last application made for this mortar plant (granted by Surrey County Council) was retrospective, and this application is essentially retrospective as the permission expires in December 2016 giving insufficient time to comment before its expiry
- There are historic breaches of this mortar plant in terms of its use and what sand it has used for example between October 2007 and June 2010 as there was no sand extraction at Runfold South, the sand must have been imported
- Given the history of the mortar plant previously importing sand on to the site in breach of conditions, should planning permission be granted then conditions must be clear that all sand, except sharp sand required for blending, must be sourced from the existing stockpiles and importing of other sand would result in a financial penalty for such a breach.
- The request for the extension of time appears to be based upon a lack of planning to construct a replacement facility elsewhere. It had been previously requested that a clear plan for the closure of the facility be provided one year prior to its closure and this has not been provided.
- Should planning permission be granted and given that the applicant is not planning to operate the facility anywhere near its capacity (55,000 tonnes of mortar products per annum) it would seem appropriate to modify the operating hours of the mortar plant production to 07:30am instead of 07:00am.

34. Officer comment: the applicant was asked if the opening hours of the site could have a later start time of 07:30am. The applicant has responded that a later start time of 07:30am would impact on satisfying their clients requirements of a pre 08:00am delivery of screeds which are produced from the mortar plant. The applicant has stated that the reduction of half an hour would bring vehicles carrying screed into conflict with heavy traffic condition with the resultant impact of vehicles struggling to reach customers by the required delivery time and returning later to the mortar plant for second loads.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

35. The guidance on the determination of planning applications, found at the end of this report, is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraphs.
36. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP2011) and the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (WBLP2002). Waverley Borough Council are in the process of updating their Local Plan and submitted the Waverley Local Plan Pre-submission Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites (WLPP2016) to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on 21 December 2016 for independent examination. Given the document has been submitted to DCLG for consideration, Officers consider that some weight can be given to the document and the policies it contains. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations.
37. In assessing the application against development plan policy it will be necessary to determine whether the proposed measures for mitigating any environmental impact of the development are satisfactory. In this case the main planning considerations are: the need for the development, highways and traffic; landscape and visual impact, noise, dust and restoration of the site.
38. The proposed application was screened under Regulation 7 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011 where it was determined that the proposal would not be EIA development and an Environmental Statement was not required. This was on the basis that:
- the proposed scheme does not exceed the relevant criteria for sand and gravel working,

or the manufacture of cement set out in the national Planning Practice Guidance on EIA, as the site measures some 1.26 hectares and EIA is more likely to be required for new waste disposal facilities occupying 10 hectares or more.

- The proposed scheme is concerned with extending the time period for which retention and operation of the facility is permitted by some six months, and would not alter the amount of mortar produced by the facility on an annual basis.
- The application site is located some 230m to the west of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), but occupies a small area of land situated within a wider quarry operation, that has been present in the locality since before the designation of the AONB. The impact of the quarry and associated operations on the integrity of the AONB would not be significantly altered by the proposed temporary extension of time for the mortar batching plant.

COUNTRYSIDE BEYOND THE GREEN BELT AND GREEN BELT

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011

Policy MC3 – Spatial strategy – mineral development in the Green Belt

Waverley Local Plan 2000

Policy C2 – Countryside Beyond the Green Belt

39. The application site currently lies within the land use designation of Countryside Beyond the Green Belt. A Green Belt Review is proposed as part of the Waverley Local Plan. The NPPF states that new Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and clearly justified. In the Waverley Green Belt review three areas have been identified for their potential to be added to the Green Belt. One of these areas includes Runfold South on the basis that this would protect the land from further intrusion and reinforce the existing Green Belt. The detailed changes to the boundaries will be made in Part 2 of the Local Plan however there is a need for consideration of this.
40. WBLP2002 Policy C2 and draft Policy RE1 seek to protect the countryside for its own sake. The policy states that building in the open countryside away from existing settlements will be strictly controlled. Paragraph 3.19 of the Local Plan goes on to set criteria by which development in Countryside beyond the Green Belt may be acceptable of which mineral extraction and facilities proposed in association with waste management are listed as one. Whilst this application is situated on land that has been worked historically for soft sand, the application proposal is for an extension of time to retain a building at the application site and within the landscape. However whilst the application is to retain the building it is for a limited, short period of time and would not affect either the short or long term restoration and aftercare of the Runfold South Complex. As such whilst the proposal would cause harm to the Countryside Beyond the Green Belt in principle Officers recognise that the harm would be temporary and time limited and given the proposal would not affect the restoration of the application site or the wider Runfold South Complex, Officers are satisfied that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy C2 in terms of returning the land back to countryside and not detracting from it.
41. The Waverley's proposed Local Plan Part 1 is proposing to remove some areas within the borough from land designated as Green Belt; and allocate new land to the Green Belt. One of these areas where it is propose to add new land is the area of Compton, Farnham (draft Policy RE2) and this area includes the whole of Runfold South so including the application area. Whilst mineral development need not be inappropriate development in Green Belts as it is a temporary operation that can be carried out without compromising openness, restoration of mineral workings should have regard to Green Belt objectives of making a positive contribution to providing opportunities for access to open countryside, retaining and enhancing attractive landscapes, improving damaged and derelict land; and securing nature conservation interests. Policy MC3 of the SMP2011 requires that the highest environmental standards of operation are

maintained and the land restored to beneficial after-uses consistent with Green Belt objectives. Officers acknowledge that this draft policy carries some weight however the site is yet to be designated Green Belt. Nevertheless if it were to be, Officers consider the proposed retention of the mortar plant for a limited short term period would not be in conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt given the site would be restored following cessation of use.

NEED

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011

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

42. SMP2011 Policy MC1 states that mineral extraction for soft sand will be concentrated on land within the Lower Greensand Formation in southwest and eastern Surrey, such as this site. There are no other policies within the SMP2011 that specifically relate to the retention of plant or equipment at mineral sites.
43. The applicant is seeking to retain an existing mortar plant for a period of 6 months from the expiry of 31 December 2016. The mortar plant has been in place at Runfold South since the 1960's using sand within Runfold South. The mortar plant that is currently on site has the capacity to process up to 55,000 tonnes per annum of mortar however as can be seen from the figures below the mortar plant is not currently operating at this scale. The mortar produced at Runfold South is of a particular colour which is borne from the colour of the sand extracted at the site first from Area A and then more latterly from Area C. In order to produce the mortar the sand from Runfold South is blended with sharp sand that is imported into Runfold South; and cement. This is done to a ratio of 47% Runfold sand, 38% sharp sand and 15% cement.
44. Over the past six months Tarmac have said that the amount of finished product leaving the site was 14,414 tonnes. Of this, 85% is made up of sand which would be 12,251 tonnes. Taking into consideration 10% moisture this brings the total amount of sand consumed to 11,026 tonnes. Of this, 4962 tonnes were imported sharp sand. The remaining 7289 tonnes was soft sand from Area C.
45. The applicant has said that there is currently a stockpile of sand that has been extracted from Area C and is being stored solely for use by the mortar plant. As of 1 November 2016, 4700 tonnes of sand was within the Area C stockpile. The applicant states that the drawdown rate of the stockpile is circa 1000 tonnes/ month however during the winter months and including the Christmas period, the drawdown rate was expected to be circa 500 tonnes/ month. Based on this drawdown rate all material within the stockpile would be used by May 2017. The applicant has sought retention of the site until the end of June 2017 as this would also then allow for a decommissioning period of the application site which the applicant states would be 4-5 weeks. This decommissioning period would align with the drawdown rates proposed.
46. The applicant has stated that the extension of time is sought to allow the applicant time to relocate operations to their new site at Marchwood, Southampton. The Marchwood site already has an asphalt plant operated by Tarmac. The applicant has stated that they have looked elsewhere in the vicinity to relocate the mortar plant rather than retain the plant at Runfold South. The applicant states that they have looked at sites in Camberley, Kingsley Quarry (approximately 12.5km south west of Runfold South) and Park Royal in London however these options have not proved viable and have space constraints. The applicant has said they have looked at the possibility of utilising concrete plants for production of screeds but this would not be possible due to contamination issues, sand storage, sand blending and plant capacity issues. The applicant states that retaining the mortar plant at Runfold South would enable the continuation of production and to maintain the customer base until the new plant at Marchwood is operational.

47. Officers recognise that retention of the mortar plant beyond the date of 31 December 2016 was not envisaged when the application was last considered in 2014 and also recognises that the mortar plant has had a number of extensions of time for its retention. However the mortar plant does utilise sand from that extracted at Area C and only imports cement and sharp sand for making the mortar as has historically been the case. The proposal would not lead to an importation of soft sand or an activity that is not related to that carried out at Runfold South. Officers note the comments that historically there was a breach at the site in terms of importing sand however this would not be the case here and Officers are satisfied that a condition can be imposed that only Runfold Area C sand should be used in the mortar plant but also that the drawdown rates correlate with the time period sought.
48. Officers also note that the applicant has provided a decommissioning programme which shows intent for the site to be decommissioned and closed. The County Enhancement Officer has given reservations that the quantity of indigenous sand the application is quoting is actually on site however does not object on this point stating that if the County Planning Authority are minded to permit the extension of time, that a condition be imposed that not only restricts the application to a 6 month extension period but also requires the site to be decommissioned and cleared on depletion of the indigenous sand whichever the sooner. Officers agree that such a condition be imposed.
49. Officers recognise that the applicant is seeking another extension of time. However, Officers consider that given the drawdown rates provided correlate with the amount of sand believed to be in the stockpile, that the applicant's intent is to relocate the mortar plant operations to Marchwood; that given there are a lack of suitable other sites in the locality to house the mortar plant for such a limited period of time that there is a need to retain the mortar plant in its current location for the temporary period of 6 months. Officers are encouraged by the submission of a decommissioning programme to show intent that the mortar plant is to be removed. Officers also consider the retention of the mortar plant to utilise the remaining sand on site represents a sustainable use of indigenous reserves whilst they are available.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011

Policy MC15 – Transport for Minerals

Waverley Local Plan 2002

Policy M2 – The Movement Implications of Development

50. SMP2011 Policy MC15 states that mineral development involving the transportation by road will only be permitted where: there is no practicable alternative to the use of road based transport, the highway network is of an appropriate standard for use by the traffic generated by the development; and arrangements for site access and the traffic generated by the development would not have any significant adverse impacts on highway safety, air quality, residential amenity, the environment or the effective operation of the highway network. WBLP2002 Policy M2 states that all development proposals should provide safe access for pedestrians and road users, including cyclists, designed to a standard appropriate for the highway network in the vicinity and the level of traffic likely to be generated by the development. Proposals for major trip generating developments will be expected to be supported by a Transport Assessment and, in appropriate circumstances, by Travel Plan.
51. The application site is within a well established and existing quarry. The mortar plant site is also well established having been in place for a number of years. The access into and out of Runfold South onto the Guildford Road (C119) has been constructed and is still operational, to highway standards. The application site is not located near to any waterways or railways that would facilitate the movement of sand or mortar by these

methods. The proposal itself would not see an increase in the number of lorry movements to/ from the site to that historically seen at the site. All vehicles associated with the mortar plant load, unload, park or turn within the confines of the mortar plant operational area therefore remain on hard surfaced roads with no contact with the un-surfaced landfill or quarry areas. The quarry and landfill operator, SUEZ, sweep all internal haul routes and the public highway on a daily basis.

52. The applicant states that the extension of time would involve an average of 10 vehicle movements per day with vehicles movements declining towards June 2017. The applicant states that in 2013 the mortar plant generated some 18 movements per day and in the Officers report for WA11/2061 it stated that the site was generating a maximum of 33 movements per day. These figures show a declining number of lorry movements to the application site. The applicant also outlines that the sharp sand delivered to the site generates approximately 2 lorry loads (4 movements) per day.
53. The County Highway Authority have reviewed the proposal and based on the number of lorries accessing and egressing the application site being lower than that historically associated with the site, raise no objection to the proposal on highway safety or capacity grounds. Officers are satisfied that given the existing access/ egress from the application site and Runfold South already exists and meets highway standards, that the proposal would not generate any increase in lorry movements to/ from the application site; and given the site is not located in proximity to other transportation methods; that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy MC15 of the SMP2011 and Policy M2 of the WBLP2002.

ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011

Policy MC14 – Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Mineral Development

Policy MC17 – Restoring Mineral Workings

Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002

Policy C3 – Areas of Great Landscape Value

Policy C6 – Area for Landscape Enhancement

Policy D1 – Environmental Implications of Development

Policy D2 – Compatibility of Uses

54. SMP2011 Policy MC14 states that mineral development will be permitted only where a need has been demonstrated and that the applicant has provided information sufficient for the mineral authority to be satisfied that there would be no significant adverse impacts arising from the development. The policy goes on to set out a list of environmental factors and their potential impacts that should be considered in determining planning applications for mineral development. The relevant environmental factors pertinent to this application are i) noise and dust; iii) landscape appearance, quality and character; and vi) the natural environment.
55. Policy D1 of the WBLP2002 states that the Council will have regard to the environmental implications of development and will promote and encourage enhancement of the environment. Development will not be permitted where it would result in material detriment to the environment by virtue of inter alia (c) loss of general amenity, including material loss of natural light and privacy enjoyed by neighbours and disturbance result from the emission of noise, light or vibration; (d) levels of traffic which are incompatible with the local highway network or cause significant environmental harm by virtue of noise and disturbance; (e) potential pollution of air, land or water, including that arising from light pollution and from the storage and use of hazardous substances. In the same vein Policy D2 states that the Council will seek to ensure that proposed and existing land uses are compatible. In particular inter alia (a) development which may have a materially detrimental impact on sensitive uses with regard to environmental disturbance or pollution, will not be permitted.

56. Draft Policy SP1 “Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development” of Waverley Local Plan Pre-submission Local Plan Part 1 (WLPP2016) states the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF to find solutions where possible and secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. the policy states that planning applications that accord with policies within that Local Plan will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The policy goes on to state that where policies are out of date or a local plan is silent on such matters, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise taking into account any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Restoration and Aftercare

57. SMP2011 Policy MC17 states that mineral working will be permitted only where the mineral planning authority is satisfied that the site can be restored and managed to a high standard. The policy goes on to state that restored sites should be sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area; and capable of sustaining an appropriate after use. The policy requires that restoration should be completed at the earliest opportunity with progressive restoration required as appropriate.
58. The application site is an area formerly worked in the 1950s and 1960s and was never infilled or restored. The mortar plant has been in place since that period using indigenous sand from Runfold South. The application is seeking an extension of time until 30 June 2017 which would include the dismantling of the mortar plant and removal of all other associated plant and equipment and the removal of the concrete pads the plant sits upon. The applicant proposes all this would be completed by the 30 June 2017 date. Officers recognise that this is a further extension of time to a mortar plant that has had several extension of time applications. However Officers consider the proposed extension of time would not impact adversely on the restoration of the Runfold South Complex or cause setbacks to the restoration as the application area sites in the centre of the Complex which would be restored last in the phasing of the restoration programme. Furthermore the Runfold South Complex is not required to be restored until December 2021 and given the application area is one of the last areas to be restored, removal of the mortar plant by June 2017 would not impact upon this timescale.
59. The County Enhancement Officer has commented that the proposal would not adversely affect or delay the restoration of this part of the Runfold South Complex. The County Enhancement Officer has also comments that it should be noted, and welcomed, that whilst previously SUEZ (the operator and land owner of the Runfold Complex) had informed the Community Liaison Group for the Runfold South Complex that the intention was for Tarmac to clear the site to ground level, it is now proposed as part of this application to additionally remove the concrete pads that are insitu. The County Enhancement Officer also wishes to note support for the fact the application includes a timescale and budget to clear the site in totality.
60. Officers recognise that the proposal seeks a further extension of time for retaining the mortar plant on site however with regards to restoration and aftercare, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not adversely affect the restoration timescale for Runfold South Complex given the application area is one of the last areas to be restored. Furthermore the proposal would not affect the overall restoration date or the aftercare use of the overall Runfold South Complex which is to set out in a Masterplan to be submitted as part of the ROMP review process. Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not be contrary to Development Plan Policy with regards to restoration and aftercare.

Landscape and Visual Impact

61. The Runfold South Complex is located within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and Wealden Greensand Character Area being crossed and bordered by well used public footpaths. The WBLP2002 (saved policies) states that the council [Waverley Borough Council] will protect and conserve the distinctiveness of the landscape character areas within the Borough. Management and enhancement of landscape features to conserve landscape character and retain diversity will be promoted. Development appropriate to the countryside will be expected to respect or enhance existing landscape character by appropriate design. Landscapes designated as Areas of Great Landscape Value are considered to make a valuable contribution to the quality of Waverley's countryside and the setting of towns. Strong protection will be given to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the landscape character. WBLP2002 Policy D1 states that regard will be given to promote and encourage enhancement of the environment and that development will not be permitted where it would result in material detriment to the environment by virtue of loss or damage to landscape value; or harm to the visual character and distinctiveness of a locality. D2 seeks to ensure that proposed and existing land uses are compatible in particular that development which may have a materially detrimental impact will not be permitted.
62. Policy C3 seeks to protect and conserve the distinctiveness of the landscape character areas within the Borough of Waverley with promotion of the management and enhancement of landscape features. The policy goes on to state that development appropriate to the countryside will be expected to respect or enhance existing landscape character by appropriate design. Specifically with regards to the AGLV the policy states that these landscapes make a valuable contribution to the quality of the countryside and strong protection will be given to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the landscape character. In addition to this, Policy C6 seeks to secure improvements to the landscape within the Borough, with emphasis given to areas shown on the Proposals Map which are already showing signs of landscape deterioration. Runfold South Complex lies within an area of landscape enhancement.
63. Emerging Core Strategy Policy CS15 states that new development must respect and where appropriate enhance the distinctive character of the landscape in which it is located, and that the Area of Great Landscape Value will be retained for its own sake, until such time as there has been a review of the Surrey Hills AONB boundary.
64. Policy MC14 of the SMP2011 requires when determining planning applications for mineral development, consideration should be given to the appearance, quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness.
65. The application site is in the centre of the Runfold South Complex with land surrounding the application area either having been restored or being in currently used for operations connected with the Complex. The site is some 10 metres below the level of the surrounding land and is screened by the surrounding topography and vegetation as can be seen on Photograph 1. The facility is well established in this low level setting within the quarry site. The closest residential properties to the application site are Moor Park Farm with the surrounding buildings some 358m to the west, Swifts Cottage and Temple Cottage approximately 355m south west; and The Lodge some 275m to the north beyond the Guildford Road. Barfield School lies approximately 279m to the north east.
66. This facility is well established in this low level setting within the quarry site. Given the application area is set at a lower level than the immediately surrounding land and the scale and nature of the activity within the context of the larger quarry and landfill setting, Officers consider that the visual impact is limited. Officers recognise that the proposal seeks a further extension of time to retain the mortar plant for a further six months beyond that previously given, however Officers are mindful of the limited short duration sought by the applicant and that the time period sought is directly linked to the exhaustion of the sand within the current stockpile (which can be seen in Photograph 2).

67. As the consent is of very limited duration with the site being restored as part of a wider Masterplan for the Runfold South Complex, it is considered that the landscape character of the area can therefore be protected. Officers are satisfied that the site is proposed to be restored to an agricultural aftercare with enhanced biodiversity elements to reflect the local landscape character. Officers consider that the development does not conflict with the objectives of policies relating to landscape and visual amenity; and as such would not have an unacceptable impact on the landscape or visual amenity of the site / wider environs.

Noise

68. As outlined above, Policy MC14 requires consideration of noise as part of mineral development proposals; and Policy D1(c) states development will not be permitted should there be disturbance by noise emissions. Surrey has produced its own 'Guidelines for Noise Control: Minerals and Waste Disposal' (1994). The Guidelines are based on the approach set out in the former Minerals Planning Guidance Note 11 (MPG11) which has now been superseded by the NPPF and the NPPG but the advice in terms of noise remains consistent and relevant. Paragraph 123 of the NPPF² states that planning decisions with regards to noise should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of the new development; mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise through the use of conditions; and recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes to nearby land uses.
69. The Surrey Noise Guidelines set noise limits for activities and use of plant and machinery on a day to day basis alongside noise limits for temporary operations for example decommissioning of a site and the breaking up of concrete.
70. The mortar plant has had to accord with noise limits set on previous permissions which is that noise levels shall not exceed 45 LAeq during an 30 minute period between 0700 and 1600 hours Monday to Friday and 0700 and 1300 hours on Saturdays. The mortar plant has complied with these noise limits and no complaints with regards to noise have been received by the County Planning Authority. Officers would seek to impose the same condition on the operation of the plant over the remaining months sought by the applicant.
71. In addition to this, as the proposal also seeks the decommissioning and the breaking up of concrete Officers would look to impose the higher, temporary noise limit. As this aspect are works for construction/ demolition related and not minerals, BS 5228 Part 1 2014³ is the relevant guidance on this matter. Annex E provides example criteria and, for rural areas, the County Noise Consultant states that Example Method 1, Category A is adopted which has a maximum level of 65 dB(A) for daytime. The decommissioning activities would involve the breaking up of concrete structures and bay walls, demolition of the plant, and removal of the site buildings. Any rubble would be taken to the adjoining and existing recycling site which is located within the Runfold South Complex. The applicant proposes this to take 4-5 weeks.
72. The County Noise Consultant has reviewed the submitted information and raises no objection to the continuation of noise levels from the mortar plant and recommends a condition is imposed on the hours of operation. With regards to the decommissioning

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/11-conserving-and-enhancing-the-natural-environment>

³ Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.

phase, the County Noise Consultant recommends a condition be imposed limiting noise levels from the site during this phase to 65 dB. The County Noise Consultant also recommends that a Noise Management Plan be provided prior to the decommissioning phase which would set out best practicable means for mitigation measures to control noise during this phase. The applicant raises no objection to the imposition of these conditions.

Dust

73. The proposal involves the continuation of an existing operational mortar plant for a further limited period until May 2017; and then the demolition the mortar plant, the feed bins and the bay; and the breaking up and removal of the concrete hardstanding at the site. These would then be transferred to the existing adjoining recycling facility⁴ that is within Runfold South Complex. Both these activities have the potential for creating dust emissions. The other buildings such as the site office would be removed from site.
74. The NPPF expects planning authorities, through policies in plans and in determining planning applications, to ensure that proposals do not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the natural environment or human health by “preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution” (paragraph 109). To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution planning decisions should ensure new development is appropriate for its location and that the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and take account of the potential sensitivity of the area to adverse effects from pollution (paragraph 120). In relation to dust emissions, policy in the NPPF 2012 is that unavoidable dust emissions should be controlled, mitigated or removed at source. For the purposes of the NPPF 2012 dust is the generic term used in BS6069 (Part 2) ‘Characterisation of air quality Glossary’ (1987) to describe particulate matter in the size range 1–75 µm (micrometres) in diameter. Particles that are less than or equal to (\leq) 10 µm in diameter are commonly referred as PM10 .
75. As mentioned above one of the ten issues identified in Policy MC14 in the SMP2011 (Reducing the Adverse Impacts of Mineral Development) is i) noise, dust, fumes, vibration, illumination, including that related to traffic generated by the development. With regards to the operation of the mortar plant, this is a continuation of existing activities. The applicant has stated that best practice dust suppression measures are currently employed on the site by the applicant and by SUEZ the owners / operates of the wider site. During dry weather the operational area and haul road are sprayed with water to minimise dust creation. Dust generation by vehicles is minimised by the maintenance and sweeping of haul roads so they remain free of dust generating material. Furthermore the plant is a wet mortar plant so dust is generally low.
76. Emissions of dust to air can occur during demolition processes and can vary from day to day and on the weather conditions. The Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) document “Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction” 2014 is relevant in consideration of this application. The document recognises that some phases of mineral development share common features with construction activities but can be on a larger scale. As such the guidance advises that a qualitative assessment for a mineral site can be carried out in accordance with the guidance in that document using the underlying source-pathway-receptor model. The guidance recognises that the main air quality impacts that may arise during demolition activities are: dust deposition resulting in the soiling of surfaces, visible dust plumes, elevated PM10 concentrations; and an increase concentration of airborne particles.

⁴ The recycling facility operates under planning permission ref: WA/2011/2160. Condition 13 of that permission relates to dust emissions from the recycling facility.

77. Para 4.3 of the Guidance outlines that the risk of dust emissions from a demolition project causing loss to amenity and/ or health or ecological impacts is related to: the activities being undertaken, the duration of those activities, the size of the site, the meteorological conditions, proximity of receptors to the activities, adequacy of mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate dust; and sensitivity of receptors to the dust. However the Guidance does recognise that there is an exponential decline in both airborne concentrations and the rate of deposition with distance.
78. The Guidance provides an approach to assess the risk of dust impacts from demolition and construction projects when there are no mitigation measures in place; breaking down those activities to be assessed into demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout. Only demolition and trackout activities are relevant for this application. The guidance then sets out how this approach should be taken firstly by assessing the dust emission magnitude based on the scale of the anticipated works and whether they should be classified as small, medium or large. For demolition this is based on the total building volume to be demolished alongside the height above ground when that activity takes place⁵. For trackout this again is classified as large, medium or small based on the number of HGVs leaving the site in any one day and the length of the unpaved surface they would be travelling along⁶.
79. The second part of the assessment is based on the sensitivity of the area which is the number, type⁷ and distance of receptors to the application site and the potentially dusty activity. The assessment then divides this into the sensitivity of the area to the soiling effects of dust on property and people (i.e. nuisance dust); and then the sensitivity of the area to human health impacts (i.e. PM₁₀).
80. Having looked at the proposal the Officers conclude that the potential dust emission magnitude from the proposal in terms of demolition would be 'small' as the total building volume would be less than 20,000m³ and because the works would be carried out some 10m below ground level. For trackout Officers conclude the potential for dust emission would be 'large' due to the length of unpaved road length to the Guildford Road from the application site.
81. With regards to sensitivity to dust soiling on property and people; and sensitivity of the area to human health from demolition activities, Officers recognise that whilst the receptors near to the site are dwellings and a school which would equate to a high sensitivity receptor; given the distance and the number of receptors under 350m to the application area where the demolition and trackout would occur this would result in a 'low' sensitivity for both soiling and health.
82. In order to define the risk of impact of the demolition aspect of the proposal with no mitigation measures from dust on soiling and health, the dust emission magnitude is then combined with the sensitivity of the area. For demolition this would be combining a small dust emission magnitude with a low sensitivity of the area. This would result in negligible risk of impact from the demolition activities proposed for dust. The same process is followed for trackout by combining the large dust emission magnitude due to

⁵ Large – total building volume >50,000m³, potentially dusty construction material e.g. concrete, on site crushing and screening, activities >20m above ground level

Medium – total building volume 20,000m³ – 50,000m³, potentially dusty construction material, demolition activities 10-20m above ground level

Small – total building volume <20,000m³, construction material with low potential for dust release, activities <10 above ground, demolition in wetter months.

⁶ Large - >50 HGVs outward movements in one day potentially dusty surface material, unpaved road length >100m

Medium – 10-50 HGV outward movements in one day, moderately dusty surface, unpaved 50m-100m

Small - <10 HGV outward movements in one day, unpaved road length <50m

⁷ For example a high sensitivity receptor is a dwelling, school hospital. A medium sensitivity receptor are places of work. A low sensitivity receptor are public footpaths, playing fields and parks.

the long length of unpaved surface with the low sensitivity of the area. This would result in a low risk of impact from dust when there are no mitigation measures proposed.

83. The applicant has also provided a Noise and Dust Management Plan which sets out controls with regards to dust from the demolition of the buildings at the mortar plant site. This document outlines that all internal site roads will be kept damp and any vehicles leaving the site carrying materials shall be covered to avoid dust release. However, the applicant has stated that dust generation by vehicles is minimised by the maintenance and sweeping of haul roads so they remain free of dust generating material. All mobile plant to be used will be regularly maintained, serviced and subject to a thorough inspection to ensure it meets current legislation. The applicant acknowledges that there may be stockpiles of materials for short periods prior to their removal from site and these would be sprayed to suppress dust. All other material would be placed in to 40m³ skips as soon as is reasonably practical and removed from site. The applicant has stated that a site log would be kept to record details and action taken in response to exceptional incidents or dust causing episodes. The applicant has confirmed for the demolition, all operatives will be fully trained and competent to carry out this work.
84. Therefore given there are mitigation measures in place for the control of dust from roads and trackout, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to significant adverse harm from dust emissions from trackout. With regards to the demolition activities, as the assessment shows above when using the IAQM Guidance, Officers are satisfied that the demolition of buildings and concrete would not give rise to significant adverse impacts with regards to dust. The applicant has also provided details of what mitigation measures would be in place during demolition activities. The County Dust Consultant has reviewed the information submitted and agrees with the review undertaken which is outlined in the above paragraphs. The County Dust Consultant comments that the mitigation and control measures provided by the applicant are appropriate for this low risk site and does not request any further assessment. Officers are satisfied that the proposal meets the requirements of the Development Plan and propose to recommend conditions be imposed to ensure the mitigation and control measures proposed are implemented.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

85. The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, found at the end of this report, is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.
86. The Officer's view is that the articles of the Convention are not engaged. This proposal will have no adverse impact on public amenity and has no human rights implications.

CONCLUSION

87. The application site is located in Countryside Beyond Green Belt boundary and falls within the AGLV and an area for landscape improvement. The proposed development involves the retention and then subsequent demolition and removal of a mortar plant facility, which has been in operation since 1969. Issues are raised relating to the protection of residential amenity and environment. It is necessary to be satisfied that the impacts of the development can be satisfactorily managed. A number of potential impacts have been examined, in particular noise, dust and landscape issues, and the development is considered acceptable and would not give rise to nuisance or harm to residential amenity or environmental interests.
88. Officers recognise the proposal is for a further extension of time to retain the mortar plant, however Officers are satisfied the application would not impact on the short or long term restoration of the ROMP area or the Complex (the wider Runfold South site).

Officers are also satisfied there is a need to retain the plant in this location for the limited short term period sought given the lack of alternative sites in the locality. Given the temporary and small scale of the development, Officers consider that the proposal is in accordance with Development Plan policies and that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions

RECOMMENDATION

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

Conditions:

Approved Plans

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the following plans/drawings:
G048-000098 `Site Location Plan` dated 10 November 2016
G048-00007 `Planning Application 2016` dated 10 November 2016

Displaying Site Notice

2. From the date of this decision notice until the cessation of the development/ completion of the operations to which it refers, a copy of this decision including all documents hereby approved and any documents subsequently approved in accordance with this decision, shall be available to the site manager, and shall be made available to any person(s) given the responsibility for the management or control of operations.

Duration

3. The development hereby permitted shall cease by 30 June 2017 or on depletion of indigenous sand from Area C, whichever is the soonest; and all fixed plant or machinery, internal access roads and hardstandings subject to this permission, together with their foundations and bases, shall be removed from the site.

General Permitted Development Order

4. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary under Part 17 (Class A, B, C, L & M) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any subsequent Order,
 - a. No plant, building or machinery whether fixed or moveable shall be erected on the application site without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority in respect of the location, design, specification and appearance of the installation, such details to include predicted levels of noise emission and their tonal characteristics;
 - b. No waste materials other than materials approved for use in the restoration of the site shall be deposited at the site without the prior written agreement of the County Planning Authority; and
 - c. no external lighting or fencing other than those permitted by this application shall be installed or erected at the application site

Limitations

5. The mortar plant hereby permitted shall use soft sand extracted from the adjoining consented mineral workings (Area C ref. APP/B3600/A/06/2020101) and no other sand, with the exception of sharp sand for blending purposes, shall be imported from elsewhere for use in the plant hereby permitted.

Hours of Working

6. No operations or activities authorised or required by this permission shall be carried out, and no light except intermittent security lighting within the plant and office areas shall be illuminated except between:
0700 and 1600 hours on Monday to Friday
0700 and 1300 hours on Saturdays
and there shall be no working on Sundays or Bank, Public and National Holidays.

Highways, Traffic and Access

7. Sole vehicular access to the site shall be via the existing access onto Guildford Road.
8. The access shall be maintained in a clean condition and wheel cleaning facilities maintained and operated in such a manner so as to prevent the deposit and spread of extraneous material on the public highway.

Noise

9. The level of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the site, when measured at, or recalculated as at, a height of 1.2m above ground level and 3.6m from the façade of a residential property or other noise sensitive building that faces the site shall not exceed 45 LAeq during any 30 minute period between 0700 and 1600 hours Monday to Friday and 0700 and 1300 on Saturdays.
10. During the decommissioning phase, the level of noise arising when measured at, or recalculated at, a height of 1.2 metres above ground level and 1.0 metre from the façade of any residential property or other noise sensitive building shall not exceed 65 dB LAeq,1h during any 1-hour period, during the permitted hours set out in Condition 6.
11. Within one month of the date of this permission, a Noise Management Plan (NMP) shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority in writing for approval. The NMP shall take into account the permitted hours set out in Condition 1 and the noise limits set out in Condition 2, and shall include details of the best practicable means control measures that will be employed to minimise the impact of noise and vibration from the decommissioning phase. The approved NMP and the control measures it contains shall be implemented for the duration of the decommissioning phase.
12. All plant and machinery shall operate only in the permitted hours, except in emergency, and shall be silenced at all times in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Surface Water and Groundwater Protection

13. Any above ground oil storage tank(s) should be sited on an impervious base and surrounded by a suitable liquid tight bunded compound. No drainage outlet should be provided. The bunded area should be capable of containing 110% of the volume of the largest tank and all fill pipes, draw pipes and sight gauges should be enclosed within its curtilage. The vent pipe should be directed downwards into the bund.

Dust

14. No activity hereby permitted shall cause dust to be emitted so as to adversely affect adjacent residential uses and/or other sensitive uses and/or the local environment. Should such an emission occur, the activity shall be suspended immediately until, as a result of different methods of working, the addition of additional dust suppression measures or changed weather conditions, it can be resumed without giving rise to that level of dust emissions.

15. The decommissioning activities shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Noise and Dust Management Plan for demolition works at Tarmac Ltd.

Reasons:

1. 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 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC14
2. To ensure that site operatives are conversant with the terms of the planning permission in the interests of the local environment and amenity to accord with Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.
3. To enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the operation so as to minimise the impact on local amenity and to ensure the prompt and effective restoration to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Policy MC17 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.
4. To safeguard the environment and protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with the terms of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.
5. To safeguard the environment and protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with the terms of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.
6. To enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development so as to minimise disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality, to safeguard the environment and protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with the terms of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.
7. In order to ensure that the development should not prejudice the free flow and condition of safety on the highway, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to comply with the terms of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy M2 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).
8. In order to ensure that the development should not prejudice the free flow and condition of safety on the highway, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to comply with the terms of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy M2 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).
9. To ensure minimum disturbance from operations and avoidance of nuisance to the local community and local environment from noise in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).
10. To ensure minimum disturbance from operations and avoidance of nuisance to the local community and local environment from noise in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).
11. To ensure minimum disturbance from operations and avoidance of nuisance to the local community and local environment from noise in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).
12. To ensure minimum disturbance from operations and avoidance of nuisance to the local community and local environment from noise in accordance with the requirements of the

National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).

13. In order to prevent the increased risk of flooding and prevent pollution of the local surface water and groundwater environment in accordance with the requirements of Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.
14. To ensure minimum disturbance from operations and avoidance of nuisance to the local community and local environment from dust in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).
15. To ensure minimum disturbance from operations and avoidance of nuisance to the local community and local environment from dust in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 (saved policies).

Informatives:

1. In determining this application the Minerals Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant by: assessing the proposals against relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework including its accompanying technical guidance and European Regulations providing feedback to the applicant where appropriate. Further, the Minerals Planning Authority has: identified all material considerations; forwarded consultation responses to the applicant; considered representations from interested parties; liaised with consultees and the applicant to resolve identified issues; and determined the application within the timeframe agreed with the applicant. Issues of concern have been raised with the applicant including impacts of and on noise/dust and addressed through negotiation and acceptable amendments to the proposals. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the potential need to modify the existing Environmental Permit for the site prior to the commencement of any works. Information on Environmental Permits can be obtained from the following website:
<https://www.gov.uk/topic/environmental-management/environmental-permits>
3. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the advice set out in the Environment Agency's letter dated 1 February 2017.

CONTACT

Samantha Murphy

TEL. NO.

020 8541 7107

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](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance](#)

The Development Plan

[Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document \(DPD\) 2011](#)

[Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates DPD 2011](#)

Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002

Other Documents

Waverley Borough Local Plan Pre-submission Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites

“Guidance for Noise Control: Minerals and Waste Disposal” Surrey County Council, 1994

“Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction”, Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), 2014
