

Schedule of Modifications

Who said it	What was said	Actions taken
County Air Quality Consultant - Waste Annex	<p>p.3 - Add Planning Practice Guidance: Air Quality to the guidance documents column.</p> <p>P.4 second column - indent and add bullet point to sentence '<b>where development proposal is likely to generate dust...</b>'</p> <p>p.4 references - change reference 5 to '<b>(Jan 2017) (v1.2)</b>' and add a weblink for reference 7.</p> <p>p.5 Operational Dust- Add SCC Dust Impact Assessment guidance note and Dust Impact Management Plans guidance note. Also add Planing Practice Guidance: Air Quality.</p> <p>p.5 Odour - Change sentence to '<b>For proposals involving putrescible waste and composting within 250m...</b>'</p> <p>p.6 Odour - Move 'Guidance on the assessment of odour for planning, Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), 2014' to top of guidance section.</p> <p>p.6 Odour top sentence - indent and bullet point 'details of control/mitigation measures proposed...'</p> <p>p.6 Odour - Add an additional bullet point; the residual odour impacts and their effects.</p> <p>p.6 Odour - Add sentence to start of 'The applicant should justify the methodolgy...' Add '<b>In accordance with the IAQM guidance on assessment of odour for planning, the...</b>'</p> <p>p.6 Odour final paragraph - Change to 'The assessment should also <b>describe...</b>'</p> <p>p.7 Bio-aerosols - Add '<b>and there are sensitive receptors</b>' to 'Where the proposal involves the rmanagement of putrescible waste or has the potential to suspend biologically-active particles in the air'.</p> <p>p.7 Bio-aerosols - Add '<b>such activities include, but are not necessarily limited to...</b>'</p> <p>p.7 Bio-aerosols - Add 'Guidance on the evaluation of Bioaerosol Risk Assessment for Composting Facilities, Cranfield University (2009)' to guidance section.</p> <p>p.8 Other pollutants - Change last bullet point in When Required to '<b>Other CHPs and centralised boilers ≥ 450kWth gas boiler or 30kw CHP</b>'</p>	All changes accepted
County Air Quality Consultant - Minerals Annex	<p>p.4 Air Quality Assessment - Add '<b>Planning Practice Guidance: Air Quality</b>' and change 'Planning Guidance' to '<b>Planning for Air Quality</b>'</p> <p>p.4 reference 5 - Change to '<b>(Jan 2017) (v1.2)</b>'</p> <p>p.4 reference 7 - Add a weblink to this reference.</p> <p>P.5 Operational Dust - Add '<b>SCC Dust Impact Assessment guidance note and Dust Management Plan guidance note</b>' and '<b>Planning Guidance Practice: Air Quality</b>'</p>	All changes accepted
County Air Quality Consultant - Regulation 3 Development Annex	<p>p.13 Air Quality Assessment (When Required) - Add to 3rd bullet point: '<b>that is proposed in or adjacent to an AQMA</b>'</p> <p>P.13 - Air Quality Assessment - Add 2 bullet points to When Required section: 'proposals that would generated development traffic exceeding the EPUK-???? indicative thresholds'</p> <p>proposals that introduce any centralised biofueled plant or any combustion plant with ???? single or combined gas boiler rating of ≥ 450kWth or 30kwe CHP.</p> <p>P.13 - Add an 11th reference to page - 'HDV flows (AADT) of 25 within/adjacent to an AQMA, or 100 elsewhere; LDV flows (AADT) of 100 within/adjacent to AQMA, or 500 elsewhere.</p>	All changes accepted

Planning Officer - Annex 1 and 2	<p>Under the guidance documents, we should refer to the AMR, Surrey Local Aggregate Assessment and the Aggregates Monitoring Update. These are all updated annually.</p> <p>I am validating an application where the Planning Statement relies on the latest published AMR 2014/15 (as of time of writing), and includes no reference to more relevant and up to date monitoring info contained in the LAA and the Aggregates Monitoring Update. Hence the reason for mentioning.</p> <p>These monitoring documents are also relevant for inclusion under "Planning Statement" in relation to Annex 2 - Waste concerning proposals for aggregates recycling / secondary aggregate production facilities - if not picked up already ?</p>	All changes accepted
County Noise Consultant - Minerals Annex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The contents is a mix of environmental topics, developments (airports) and required supporting documentation – items 12 and 13. The mix seems a bit odd – maybe the contents could be split into sections?</li> <li>- AQ is standalone but noise is included under amenity. This seems a little odd as you get nuisance dust etc.</li> <li>- Assessments/Reports/Survey – Suggest rewording: <b>For any noise sensitive development, existing or consented, potentially affected by the minerals development, a noise assessment should be prepared by a competent person that defines the baseline sound environment, following appropriate guidance, usually established through measurement, and the impact of the proposed development using prediction and measurement techniques as appropriate. Where criteria in appropriate guidance may be exceeded, mitigation measures should be provided such that the criteria are not exceeded.</b></li> <li>- BS 4142:2014 provides guidance on competent persons if this is required to be defined.</li> <li>- BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 provides guidance on plant noise levels and prediction methods.</li> <li>- As you are aware, the SCC guidelines are being revised – should this be stated?</li> </ul>	All changes accepted
County Noise Consultant - Waste Annex	<p>Comments as for minerals.</p> <p>Should BS 4142:2014 be included for developments not subject to minerals guidance?</p>	All changes accepted
County Noise Consultant - Regulation 3 Development Annex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggest using the <b>bold</b> text above.</li> <li>- I don't see that the EA is relevant for these or that the SCC Guidelines would apply in their current form.</li> <li>- BS 4142:2014 would be relevant to industrial sources – HVAC etc in schools, fire stations etc.</li> <li>- Should the DMRB be included for roads + Calculation of Road Traffic noise?</li> </ul>	All changes accepted
Planning Officer - Introduction and National Validation Requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 2, final para re Invalid Applications - I think this should refer to Part 3 of Statutory Instrument 2015 no. 595: The T&amp;CP (DM Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - rather than 2013;</li> <li>2. Page 5 - 'The correct fee'. Might be worth adding somewhere that in the case of a section 73 application, the correct fee needs to be received by the CPA before permission expires and that there is no postal delivery to County Hall on a Saturday or Sunday. Legal advised as such when I discussed two cases with them for example an application where the cheque is dated Friday, planning permission expires 2 days later on Sunday, and the cheques were received a day later on Monday - hence not valid;</li> <li>3. Page 5 - 'Ownership Certificates' - I think the third column should refer to Article 13 or 14 of the T&amp;CP DM Procedure (England) Order 2015 rather than Article 11 ?</li> </ol> <p>NB: The above statutory instrument requires the local list to be published or republished every 2 years. Otherwise, we cannot rely on it as justification for finding an application invalid under Article 11 (3d) of the above as we would be open to challenge through a validation dispute. This appears to be a drawback with the current local list which will shortly be addressed. Might be worth adding a clear publication date to the list. If too onerous to update every 2 years, all we need to do is simply republish it, pending the next review.</p>	All changes accepted

Resident	<p>The current document only requires a limited and unspecified need to demonstrate that the developer has consulted locally. I suggest the requirement shown on Page 2 of this document beginning "Details of consultations with the County Planning Authority and wider community/statutory consultees...." should be changed to "Details of consultation with the County Planning Authority and wider community (SUCH AS LOCAL RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS, WHERE THESE EXIST) as well as statutory consultees ..." Details of most, if not all, Residents Associations in Surrey are available from local borough councils, although I believe Surrey should be required to maintain a central list of these. My addition would help ensure that the community impacted by the minerals related development was involved at the earliest opportunity. It would hopefully also mean that communication between the community and developers was as transparent and open as possible and thus might alleviate some of the issues and problems which often arise as a result of lack of early communication. I strongly feel that my suggested change is in keeping with paragraph 189 of the National Policy Planning Framework (Pre-Application Engagement and Front Loading).</p>	All changes accepted
Woldingham Association - all Annexes	<p>Our comments have three common themes that apply to Annexes 1,2 and 3. To ensure that they are recorded against each document, we have repeated this attachment.</p> <p>1. Sloping sites and undulating topography: Where proposals are located in areas with sloping or undulating topography, all of the planning statements, assessments and other supporting information that are required by Annexes 1-3 should include sufficient information so that the relationship between the proposal and nearby areas, buildings, public and private viewpoints, can be assessed in order to understand the full impact of the proposal. Undulating topography can create surprising views into and out of a site as well as a whole range of issues with adjacent landowners in all directions from the proposal, and so it is important that sloping site issues are recognised in all of the application documents.</p> <p>For example, the Planning Statement section of Annexes 1-3 could be amended to "describe the topography of the site and the surrounding area". Plans will be required that show contours of the site and nearby areas. Landscape and visual impact assessments must consider the impact from a range of heights, ridges, hillsides and valleys.</p> <p>2.For the Water section, the Assessment Reports must include the impact on adjacent areas. This is to address unexpected situations that arise on sloping sites, e.g. perimeter hardstanding areas or soakaways flooding downhill landowners. For Amenity/Lighting, the report/assessments required must taken into account the impact of lighting from all relevant near and far viewpoints.</p> <p>3. Habitats, trees and landscaping: We have seen numerous examples where developers have removed habitats and felled trees just prior to submission, and in so doing, were granted permission for larger schemes than we believe would otherwise have been allowed. We would like to see this unintended incentive for habitat destruction and tree felling eliminated, if possible, and would urge Surrey County Council to consider adding some words to that effect in the validation checklist.</p> <p>4. Traffic and Highways: Where traffic is intended to be restricted to certain routes, the proposal must include details of how this is to be accomplished with certainty, which may include penalties for non-compliance. This would help ensure that appropriately robust traffic schemes are implemented so that the actual realised traffic patterns occur as intended.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.</p>	<p>1. changes accepted      2. this is already covered  3. this is outside the control of the validation checklist  4. changes accepted</p>
SCC Countryside Access Team - all Annexes	<p>Please add a reference to the Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) as a 'policy driver' in all three Annexes</p>	All changes accepted
SCC Aboricultural Manager - all Annexes	<p>All comments are simple wording issues or errors, so I have not included them here. I will accept these changes as they seem reasonable.</p>	All changes accepted

This page is intentionally left blank