

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 18 October 2017 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting.

**Members Present:**

Mr Tim Hall (Chairman)  
Mr Keith Taylor (Vice-Chairman)  
Mrs Natalie Bramhall  
Mr Stephen Cooksey  
Mr Jeff Harris  
Mr Edward Hawkins  
Mr Ernest Mallett MBE  
Mrs Bernie Muir  
Dr Andrew Povey  
Mrs Penny Rivers

**Apologies:**

Mr Matt Furniss  
Mrs Rose Thorn

**234/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Matt Furniss and Rose Thorn. There were no substitutions.

**235/17 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 13 September 2017, were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

**236/17 PETITIONS [Item 3]**

There were none.

**237/17 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]**

There were none.

**238/17 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

There were none.

**239/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]**

Mr Stephen Cooksey informed the Committee that as Local Member for Item 7, Land off Bury Hill Wood, he had previously spoken against the application at the Public Inquiry to voice the concerns of the local community. Mr Cooksey assured Members he was taking an entirely different approach during this Committee meeting and would consider the items with no pre-determination. He also clarified that he was not present at the Mole Valley

District Council meeting when the item was discussed, nor was he a Member of the Mole Valley Planning Committee.

Dr Andrew Povey declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Trustee of the Surrey Hills Society.

**240/17 MO/2017/0911 - LAND OFF BURY HILL WOOD, COLDHARBOUR LANE, HOLMWOOD, SURREY, RH5 6HN [Item 7]**

An update sheet was tabled at the meeting. This is attached at Annex A.

**Officers:**

Caroline Smith, Planning Development Manager  
Samantha Murphy, Principal Planning Officer  
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Solicitor

**Speakers:**

As this item had been deferred from 2 August 2017 after public speaking had already taken place, no further public speaking was permitted on this item in accordance with Standing Order 67.10 of the Surrey County Council Constitution.

The Chairman agreed for the Local Member to speak on this item.

Hazel Watson, Local Member, made the following points:

1. The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) was unsafe, unworkable and not suitable for Coldharbour Lane.
2. The timings for Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements were unrealistic.
3. Cyclists would be put at danger due to the blind bends and steep gradients of the lane.
4. The width of vehicles, 2.8m, could damage the banks of the lane.
5. The route involving the M25 would be subject to unpredictable delays and HGVs could end up arriving at the site outside of permitted hours.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the report and update sheet and explained that clarifications had been made to address the four points of concern raised by Members at the meeting held on 2 August 2017. These being:
  - a) to take into consideration any information that arose from Mole Valley District Council's committee meeting that was held on the evening of 2 August (Mole Valley District Council objected to this planning application at their meeting of 2 August and this is covered at paragraph 47 onwards),
  - b) detail of the substance of the terms of agreement for the use of Ryka's Car Park,
  - c) the system of communications which can be relied upon to ensure all parties affected by the terms of the CTMP remain in contact,
  - d) confirmation of the type of surfacing material to be used at the site.
2. Members raised concern that traffic impact on Dorking Town Centre needed to be addressed and that in its current iteration, the TMP did

not do this adequately, and that the timings in the TMP were not realistic to anyone who knew the area well.

3. Members noted that whilst clarification had been sought on the system of communications, there was a lack of detail provided other than that it would be a satellite telephone system. This did not provide an assurance that it was a robust and adequate system whereby residents could make contact if required.
4. Members raised concern about the effectiveness of a traffic controller and banksman who would be required to conduct stop/go control across three junctions.
5. A Member stated he was disappointed that 3D imaging had not been provided. The 2D image showed the base width of the lane but did not take into account any arches or overhanging trees. Officers explained that this was not one of the clarifications sought by the Committee as part of the deferral, however the Planning Inspector was satisfied that, as part of the public inquiry, the drilling rig was able to pass down Coldharbour Lane with sufficient clearance.
6. Officers explained that the reason for the TMP was that where the lane narrowed, it was not possible for oncoming vehicles to pass a HGV. The TMP has arranged for vehicles to be held at a wider part of the lane to manage this safely. The drilling rig will travel down the lane during its three day closure.
7. Members commented that whilst clarifications had been made to address the points requested by the Committee, the response made by Mole Valley District Council's Development Control Committee (as detailed in the update sheet) raises new issues.
8. Some members of the Committee recognised that the need for oil and gas was of national importance and the approval of this application would be essential for the country's economy.
9. Officers explained that although 20 trees along Coldharbour Lane were protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO), this was not a reason to not approve development. The applicant would liaise with the Highway Authority to assess trees for any trimming that would be necessary as a protective measure.
10. It was stated that Europa could have down more to liaise with the residents that live down Coldharbour Lane.
11. The Planning Development Manager stated that if the item was to be deferred, it would need to be deferred in relation to Condition 19 and the Committee would need to specify what part of the condition they were not satisfied had been met.

*The meeting was adjourned at 11:30am and resumed at 11:42am.*

12. A Motion was put forward by Mr Stephen Cooksey, seconded by Mrs Penny Rivers that the TMP should be refused as the application and TMP does not satisfy Condition 19.
13. Officers advised the Committee to vote with caution, as the applicant had already provided clarifications and some of the discussions around the M25 congestion and drivers' tachograph readings are outside of the applicants' control and the applicant could appeal the decision on the grounds of non-determination.
14. The Motion to refuse was put to a vote, in which two voted for and eight voted against; therefore the motion was lost.
15. Mr Edward Hawkins put forward a Motion, seconded by Mrs Bernie Muir that:

The application be deferred in order to receive further information to address the following:

- i. For the area of the TMP to be widened to include the dedicated 'holding area'
  - ii. Confirmation that Cobham motorway services are prepared to create a dedicated holding area and are prepared to extend waiting beyond the current time limit.
  - iii. How the banksmen will deal with any HGVs arriving late to the site
  - iv. For the applicant to engage with all relevant parties listed in the report in order to understand issues and seek to mitigate these.
16. The Motion to defer was put to a vote. There were seven votes for; therefore the Motion was carried and the application deferred.

#### RESOLVED

That application MO/2017/0911- **LAND OFF BURY HILL WOOD, COLDHARBOUR LANE, HOLMWOOD, SURREY, RH5 6HN** be **DEFERRED** in order to receive more information on the following;

- v. For the area of the TMP to be widened to include the dedicated 'holding area'
- vi. Confirmation that Cobham motorway services are prepared to create a dedicated holding area and are prepared to extend waiting beyond the current time limit.
- vii. How the banksmen will deal with any HGVs arriving late to the site
- viii. For the applicant to engage with all relevant parties listed in the report in order to understand issues and seek to mitigate these.

#### **241/17 MO/2016/1563 - LAND AT BURY HILL WOOD, COLDHARBOUR LANE, HOLMWOOD, SURREY RH5 6HN [Item 8]**

An update sheet was tabled at the meeting and this is attached at Annex B

#### **Officers:**

Caroline Smith, Planning Development Manager  
Samantha Murphy, Principal Planning Officer  
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Solicitor

#### **Speakers:**

Alan Hustings, local resident, made the following points:

1. Planning permission for Europa was granted, subject to strict conditions. The first was regarding the site plan, with a clear red line area of 0.79 hectares (ha). This application has expanded the site in every direction.
2. This application is for both buildings and fences to be erected on the enlarged site, breaching Condition 6. The applicant and officers claim the conditions do not apply as this is not a modification or addition to an existing application, but instead a new one.
3. The site plan shows changes to the access track and the western boundary has been moved four metres outwards to give more space on the site.

4. The site was carefully kept at under 1.00 ha to minimise the risk of being deemed a major development. By setting these conditions, the Planning Inspectorate expected these to be adhered to.
5. The Council should expect a legal challenge if this application is approved.

Max Rosenberg, local resident, made the following points:

1. The Inspector's primary reason for granting permission was that the site was smaller than 1.00 ha. This application for fencing and ancillary buildings violates that rationale, as the size of the site has increased from 0.79 ha to 1.01 ha. The Inspector explicitly stated that sites greater than 1.00 ha were considered to be major developments. It is probable that the Inspector would not have granted permission if the site was 1.01 ha at the time of the original application.
2. The original application was considered by the Inspector not to be harmful to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) due to its lack of visibility. This new application makes the site visible from Coldharbour Lane, with at least 100m-200m of industrial fencing on the roadside.
3. Europa claimed the application was needed due to a change in the security environment, however the Environmental Impact Assessment was written in 2014, after protest activity had begun.
4. Security fencing should have been included in the original application.

Vicki Elcoate, frequent user of Coldharbour Lane:

1. The only other fence on the lane is rustic and wooden and blends into the surroundings. The fencing proposed in this application will industrialise the lane and cause major visual impact in an AONB.
2. There was a lack of clarity regarding the length of the fence.
3. 18 weeks was not an insignificant length of time given the number of cyclists and visitors to the area all year round.
4. A pathway on the western side of the development would be cut off, impacting on public access. This route could be a Public Right of Way which had not be recorded on the definitive map. Surrey County Council should assess this route for inclusion in the map and then follow procedures for temporary closure of a right of way accordingly.

Julian Everett, local resident, made the following points:

1. Questioned why the application was not submitted as part of the Public Inquiry in 2015 in order to allow the Planning Inspectorate to make an informed decision.
2. Europa submitted its standalone application in October 2016. The community response was to set up a protection camp as a result. The applicant has retrospectively blamed the protection camp as the reason for their application.
3. Applicant has made no attempt to engage with the local community. Residents want to preserve a natural legacy for future generations.
4. Right of protest is within the constitution of democracy. Exercising of democracy does not require enhanced security measures.
5. The application should be rejected as it risks escalating tensions further between residents and the applicant.

Hazel Watson, Local Member, made the following points:

1. The proposal seeks to increase the well site area by 25%.

2. The fencing was not in-keeping with the landscape in an AONB. It would have an adverse impact on the landscape and on public enjoyment.
3. The proposed structures constituted inappropriate development on the Green Belt.
4. Asked the Committee to vote against the application.

Claire Brindley and Paul Foster, Applicants Agents, made the following points:

1. The application is for a temporary security fence and welfare facilities for the temporary exploratory well site that was granted planning permission in August 2015.
2. Security environment has changed significantly since the application was first submitted in 2008. It is standard industry practice to have enhanced security on sites and this need has been demonstrated with a protest camp being set up on site since October 2016.
3. The applicant has a duty of care to its workforce and the public by ensuring safety measures are in place.
4. No objection had been raised by the Surrey Hills AONB officer, except the importance to adhere to the 18 week timescale to mitigate impact.
5. The development would be wholly reversible, and the site would be restored for use by the Forestry Commission on cessation of exploratory activities.
6. The 28 vehicular movements for the delivery and collection of the fencing and facilities are to be considered as part of the Traffic Management Plan.
7. There would be no additional external lighting and a condition will be applied by officers to this effect.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. There was some discussion around why the fencing application was not submitted as part of the Public Inquiry.
2. A Member suggested that welfare facilities at the site were required on a practical basis.
3. A Member highlighted that the Inspector's judgement was based on the size of the original site and that this inclusion could have led to the Inspector's refusal.
4. Members questioned how no further lighting can be needed if 24 hour security would be in operation. The case officer clarified that, as part of the light management plan that had already been approved by the Committee, lighting would be only be on 24 hours a day during the drilling phase due to health and safety requirements. Outside of the drilling phase, no lighting was permitted outside of the hours of 7:00am-6:00pm. The officer confirmed that the generator would be in operation 24 hours a day, which the noise consultant was satisfied with.
5. There was some discussion about the presence of Japanese knotweed on site and its treatment. The officer explained that the applicant had committed to spraying the Japanese Knotweed using approved chemicals in accordance with Condition 14 and Environment Agency requirements.
6. The Planning Development Manager read out paragraph 98 from the Inspectors appeal decision to address points of discussion about the increased size of the site.

*Jeffrey Harris left the room at 12:40 and returned at 12:43, therefore did not take part in the vote.*

7. The Chairman moved the recommendation to permit the application. There were seven votes for, two votes against; therefore the recommendation was carried and the application permitted.

**RESOLVED**

That application MO/2016/1563- **LAND AT BURY HILL WOOD, COLDHARBOUR LANE, HOLMWOOD, SURREY, RH5 6HN** - be **PERMITTED** subject to the conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

**242/17 RE16/02556/CON - HORSE HILL 1 WELL SITE, HORSE HILL, HOOKWOOD, HORLEY, SURREY RH6 0RB [Item 9]**

An update sheet was tabled, and this is attached at Annex C

**Officers:**

Duncan Evans, Senior Planning Officer  
 Caroline Smith, Planning Development Manager  
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Solicitor

**Speakers:**

Melissa More, local resident, made the following points:

1. During the acid using flow-test last year, horses had respiratory problems, residents fainted, had nausea and nosebleeds. It was unknown what the long term affects would be.
2. The CEO of UKOG stated the exploration was a complex technological issue and that the flow has come from a rock unit that has never been tested before. Local residents are not willing to be an experiment.
3. Over 80% of studies state there are numerous health risks linked with living in close proximity to an active well site.
4. Drilling techniques are known to cause earthquakes. Dorking and Reigate are built on sand caves.

Lisa Scott, local resident, made the following points:

1. An increase of people working from home, cycling and a proposed plastic bottle deposit scheme all reduce the need for oil.
2. During the flow test last year, whilst running, I inhaled a noxious substance and felt at risk of losing consciousness. A GP confirmed inflammation to back of the throat. During the flow testing period, my daughter had a nosebleed and family experienced headaches, all known symptoms linked to well activity.
3. Public footpath is now impassable, causing a loss of trade to local pubs and businesses and increasing the risk of drink-driving as a result.
4. There is some inconsistency on the numeric details regarding oil quantities in the application documents.
5. The revised Horse Hill traffic management scheme does not adequately answer questions.



David Bruml, local resident, made the following points:

1. Water is being put at risk by these new invasive techniques.
2. UKOG reported problems with the cement seal at Billingshurst last week.
3. The geology through the weald is cracked so could lead to contamination. The site is in the catchment of the River Mole. There have been a number of fish deaths in the River Mole due to contamination in the last week.
4. With proximity to lots of water, it is not an acceptable risk in an area with aquifers and springs.
5. Called for a halt to all deep oil drilling in the weald until a public inquiry is carried out to assess the water risks posed by these new techniques.

Jane Sheppard, local resident, made the following points:

1. The CEO of UKOG stated that to be commercially viable, wells would need to be drilled back to back across the weald basin. This contradicts Reigate and Banstead's Mineral Waste policy not to industrialise rural nature of the county. It also goes against the Paris Climate Change Agreement to reduce the use of fossil fuels.
2. The site is on a major fault line, with high risk of tremors, earthquakes and building subsidence if acid, water and sand are injected at high pressure into unstable rock.
3. Major international airport in the vicinity. Questioned whether the Council had requested a geological survey of the whole area.
4. The aquifers at Horse Hill are within the Lower Thames drinking water safeguarding zone.

Gareth Wilson, the Applicant's agent made the following points:

1. The Government policy and National Planning Policy Framework make it clear that minerals, including hydrocarbons are essential to sustain economic growth and quality of life. As such, government expects local Planning Authorities to give great weight to the economic benefit when considering applications for hydrocarbon extraction.
2. This application is for conventional hydrocarbon production only.
3. A rigorous Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken.
4. Site has been carefully selected to minimise adverse impact to the environment, surrounded by woodland in a sparsely populated area in a low flood risk zone and outside of the groundwater protection zone.

Matt Cartwright, Chief Operating Officer/ applicant, UKOG.

1. Drilling in 2014 was carried out with full regulatory compliance. This recorded a record level oil flow rate and it is considered to be of National importance.
2. Will resume community liaison groups as previously. Viewing platform will be installed for residents who wish to see the process.
3. Noise and light impact will be mitigated by tree cover and noise will be monitored.
4. Traffic onto and off site will be reduced to a minimum.
5. Environment Agency has approved the permits for full Horse Hill work plan.

Stephen Sanderson, Executive Chairman/ applicant, UKOG.



1. UKOG has adopted industry leading safe and sound practices with oil regulators and will adhere to the same policies and ethos whilst operating at Horse Hill.
2. We have agreed to use non-toxic biodegradable drilling fluids to ensure safe standards of drinking water are maintained.
3. No statutory consultees have objected to the application.
4. The appraisal of Horse Hill is of national economic importance and government expects Local Planning Authorities to give great weight to the benefit of such developments.

Key points made during the discussion:

1. The officer introduced the report and update sheet.
2. 650 letters received on the application, including approximately 300 in support.
3. The Highway Authority require a traffic management plan and have recommended that contingency measures around protest activity having an impact on traffic should also be included within the traffic management plan.
4. The Chairman moved the recommendation to permit. There were eight votes for, with two abstentions. Therefore the recommendation was carried.

**RESOLVED**

That application RE16/02556/CON – **HORSE HILL 1 WELL SITE, HORSE HILL, HOOKWOOD, SURREY, RH6 0RB** be **PERMITTED** subject to the planning conditions and informatives set out in the report.

**243/17 GU09/P/00482 - ALDERSHOT CAR SPARES, CHAPEL FARM, GUILDFORD ROAD, NORMANDY, GUILDFORD, SURREY GU3 2AU [Item 10]**

**Officers:**

Stephen Jenkins, Deputy Planning Development Manager  
 Caroline Smith, Planning Development Manager  
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Solicitor

**Speakers:**

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Keith Witham, Local Member registered to speak. As Keith was unable to attend the meeting, he provided a short statement for the Chairman to read out on his behalf.

“Having liaised with the Surrey County Council Planning Case Officer about this for a considerable time, I strongly support the Officer recommendation for refusal of this application. The location is very close, within metres, of residential homes at Chapel Farm, and such a facility at this location would be very detrimental to the residents affected at Chapel Farm. It would have a most adverse effect on the local environment, noise, pollution and I hope the committee will support the recommendation to refuse the application by Aldershot Car Spares for all the reasons as set out in the report”.

The committee unanimously agreed the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED

That application GU09/P/00482- **ALDERSHOT CAR SPARES, CHAPEL FARM, GUILDFORD ROAD, NORMANDY, GUILDFORD, SURREY. GU3 2AU** be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report.

**244/17 THE DRAFT COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT (REGULATION 3) MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT PROTOCOL [Item 11]**

**Officers:**

Caroline Smith, Planning Development Manager

RESOLVED

Members **APPROVED** the adoption of the Surrey County Council Development (Regulation 3) Monitoring and Enforcement Protocol.

**245/17 THE SURREY CODE OF BEST PRACTICE IN PLANNING PROCEDURES [Item 12]**

RESOLVED

The item was deferred.

**246/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]**

The next meeting of the Planning & Regulatory Committee will be held on 15 November 2017.

Meeting closed at 1.26 pm

---

**Chairman**

Planning &amp; Regulatory Committee 18 October 2017

Item No

7

2

**UPDATE SHEET****MINERALS/WASTE MO/2017/0911****DISTRICT(S)** MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL**Land at Bury Hill Wood, off Coldharbour Lane, Holmwood, Surrey RH5 6HN****Details of a Traffic Management Scheme pursuant to Condition 19 of appeal ref: APP/B3600/A/11/2166561 dated 7 August 2015.****CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY*****District Council***

Mole Valley District Council Development Control Committee met on 4 October 2017 where this planning application was tabled and discussed. The Committee resolved to object to the planning application, as consultee, on the following grounds:

- The failure to address issues relating to traffic in Dorking town centre
- The failure to consider the full impact of traffic movements associated with the development on school children in the vicinity
- Question the structural stability of the aluminium trackway and the potential for noise to the surrounding area from the use of such a material
- Traffic movements have not been reduced in the drilling phase
- The passing place is only wide enough for 1 HGV
- Concern raised about what happens when 2 HGVs follow each other
- Question the assumption that the vehicles would travel at a constant speed of 30 mph and that they would not meet cyclists travelling in the opposite direction or that there would be no slower movement traffic e.g cyclists or horses
- There are concerns that there may be no banksmen in the right places if a vehicle turned up unexpectedly
- Does the applicant have permission to use the Cobham MSA

***Parish Councils and Interest Groups***

Leith Hill Action Group (LHAG) have written a letter dated 11 October raising the following concerns:

*The principal concern was the feasibility of getting the required number of HGV movements in the time available during the drilling period without closure of Coldharbour Lane to non-site traffic - what we have referred to as the "workability" of the scheme. A related concern was realistic assessment of driver delay for nonsite traffic. The two are obviously interlinked in that HGV traffic causes delays to public traffic and vice versa.*

*The new "analysis" of these issues (presented at paragraph 7.23 – 7.35 and drawing 4100 CTMP 15 of the September TMP) relies on absurd assumptions (Note A) and therefore arrives at impossible results. The analysis calculates HGV journey times based on these assumptions. It considers a limited number of ideal scenarios and fails to consider likely scenarios (example at Note 2) which will arise (even in the absence of cyclists, equestrians and pedestrians) and lead to much longer delays.*

*The absurdity of some of the underlying assumptions in the new “analysis” was pointed out in our consultation response and that fact is referred to in passing in the Officer’s Report; the issue itself, however, is not addressed. Instead these demonstrably erroneous results have been relied upon to support officers’ conclusions that the requisite number of movements can be achieved and delays to non-site traffic will be minimal.*

*Given the invalidity of the underlying assumptions, it is less important that the results set out in 4100 CTMP 15 clearly contain errors<sup>1</sup>. The invalidity of the underlying assumptions cannot be dismissed as trivial; it is these figures that are used to calculate driver delay and transit times, and hence the very workability of the TMP.*

*A further point: your Committee asked for 3D analysis of the route. The Applicant has supplied pairs of 2D drawings. These do not constitute 3D analysis, for the reasons we set out in our consultation response. The concern here is not just for trees and banks, it is also for the consequences to the pavement of the road and traffic disruption if a low loader should ground on a sharp crest.*

*In order to get some clarity and avoid endless iterations, we have suggested a meeting with officers and the Applicant. That suggestion has so far been ignored. As things stand, the reliable information required to make an informed decision still does not exist. As a consultee, LHAG has done its best to help in this respect, and will continue in that effort.*

*For the avoidance of doubt, our object here is not to sabotage anything, but to arrive at a traffic scheme that will allow the development to be carried out to time and with minimum disruption to the public. If that requires closure of Coldharbour Lane throughout the drilling period, your Committee, and the public, must know that before a decision is made.*

### **Additional key issues raised by public**

178 further letters of representation have been received since the Officer report was published. Some of these letters are from residents who have previously made representations. Some are from residents who have not. The following comments are issues raised within these representations in addition to comments made and documented within the Officer report:

#### *General*

- 1) Object to the proposal
- 2) There should be a Members site visit
- 3) Driving away the very people who bring prosperity to the area.
- 4) The proposal is unrealistic and dangerous.
- 5) There is already Japanese Knotweed there which will likely end up all over the town.
- 6) Europa has made no effort at all to educate the populace about their plan.
- 7) Concerns over the planning application has unlawfully been rush through MVDC.

#### *Support*

- 8) The Oil & Gas Authority implements amongst the most stringent conditions for oil & gas companies to operate in the word. I have every faith in their ability to ensure safe.

#### *Trees and Tree Preservation Order*

- 9) As 20 trees have TPO status it will be a contradiction to allow large vehicles along this sunken lane where there is no room for another vehicle to pass
- 10) There are no details about protecting the trees.
- 11) Vulnerable trees close to its edge could be easily damaged.

#### *Lawful right to protest*

- 12) The CTMP does not consider the impact from lawful, democratic protest - the applicant must act responsibly.

*Consultation period*

- 13) The 14 day consultation period is woefully short.
- 14) No regard for local democratic processes

*Area of Outstanding Beauty*

- 15) The site is within the AONB.
- 16) The proposal will permanently damage the AONB
- 17) Leith Hill is a historical and cultural landmark

*Environmental Impact Assessment*

- 18) There is no EIA for the CTMP

*Access to the site*

- 19) The site is accessed by sunken lanes - how will the CTMP protect the banks of the sunken lane.
- 20) The lane is unsuitable for Heavy Vehicles/ Coldharbour Lane is not wide enough
- 21) Coldharbour Lane will effectively be closed to non-site traffic for the duration of the development.
- 22) It says there will be 48 hours to notify SCC of any damage to road surfaces. This is too long.
- 23) The knock on effect on alternative routes will be chaotic and expensive.
- 24) How will other small lanes cope with extra traffic?
- 25) The sunken lanes will be trashed.
- 26) Coldharbour Lane will become dangerous, muddy and are wholly inadequate for this traffic load.

*Lorries*

- 27) There will be hundreds of lorries
- 28) The lorries bringing in equipment have shown damage to the lane. Dread to think what 1000+ lorries will do
- 29) 1000+ number of movements is unimaginable
- 30) The lorries will not be able to travel at 25mph but more likely 10mph
- 31) The lorries will not be able to travel at a consistent 30mph
- 32) The whole area will be affected by the heavy traffic involving HGVs and tankers.

*CTMP*

- 33) Concern the CTMP would allow HGV movements through Dorking during rush hour and school arrival/ leaving times
- 34) There should be 3D survey to give a physical size of Coldharbour Lane
- 35) The driver delay assessment is simplistic based on absurd assumptions
- 36) Ask for heavier penalties to drivers who damage the road and banks
- 37) If the CTMP changes the nature of the lane through removal of foliage then it should not be permitted
- 38) The document does not give confidence to the community of a smooth running/ Inadequate and concerning TMP.
- 39) How much notice will be given to residents of Knoll Road & Coldharbour Lane of the suspension of parking bays?
- 40) Saying SCC endorse the use of aluminium trackway lacks credibility
- 41) If aluminium trackway proves unworkable then a new CTMP will need to be submitted for stone

- 42) It is unacceptable to close the road for 6 days to move the rig.
- 43) The mitigations offered provide scant tangible benefits, suggested changes to the frequency of vehicle movement.

*Residents*

- 44) The impact of those living on the route will be unacceptable
- 45) There has been no engagement with the community by the applicant
- 46) People won't have access or will have delayed or reduced access to emergency services
- 47) Coldharbour Lane has been closed on numerous occasions for filming and bike races and closed with banksmen operating the road closures. We have had to wait 20 minutes
- 48) It will totally inconvenience those of use who work and live in the area
- 49) The proposal will adversely affect my business
- 50) Public transport will be affected with the additional traffic on the road
- 51) Traffic will cause unnecessary stress

*Dorking*

- 52) The existing levels of traffic in Dorking are too high for this proposal
- 53) Concern about the air quality in Dorking from the additional lorries

*Knoll Road*

- 54) It is inappropriate to use Knoll Road
- 55) Knoll Road will experience heavy traffic, noise, air pollution and damage from the proposal
- 56) Knoll Road is used as a 'rat run'

*Pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians*

- 57) There will be a risk to pedestrians
- 58) The report does not take into account the number of cyclists on weekdays
- 59) There will be a risk to equestrians

*The drilling*

- 60) The drilling will cause serious impact
- 61) The proposal will damage aquifers
- 62) The decision to frack will affect the countryside
- 63) We are generating more energy from renewables
- 64) Uncertain whether oil extraction by acidification can ever be economically viable.

*Wildlife*

- 65) Little regard for the local flora and fauna

In addition to the letters of representation, 12 types of proforma letter have been received.

Lack of consultation

Of the further comments received, 3 of those have stated that the consultation on the amendments is inadequate/ too short. The following provides information on this:


- An amended CTMP was submitted with a revised plan on 21 September and this went out for re-consultation and re-notification of the public on 22 September with a deadline for responses on the re-consultation and re-notification on 6 October. This is a period of 14 days.
- There is no date set out within the Development Management Procedure Order 2015 or the NPPG as to how long a further consultation should take place. The best practice

approach adopted by the County Planning Authority for all planning applications is to re-consult and re-notify for a period of 14 days.



This page is intentionally left blank







This page is intentionally left blank

**ANNEX B**

Planning &amp; Regulatory Committee 18 October 2017

Item No 8

2

**UPDATE SHEET****MINERALS/WASTE MO/2016/1563****DISTRICT(S)** MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL**Land at Bury Hill Wood, Coldharbour Lane, Holmwood, Surrey RH5 6HN**

**The installation of perimeter security fencing consisting of 2 metre (m) high Heras fencing and 3m high deer fencing; an office and wc at the site entrance; and office, welfare accommodation, water fuel and a generator, all ancillary to and in association with appeal decision APP/B3600/A/11/2166561 dated 7 August 2015.**

**CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY*****District Council***

Mole Valley District Council Development Control Committee met on 4 October 2017 where this planning application was tabled and discussed. The Committee resolved to raise no objection to the proposal.

***Additional key issues raised by public***

Two further letters of representation have been received following the publication of the Officer's report objecting to the proposal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 3 should be amended to say the following:

*The Development shall not be implemented unless and until written confirmation has been submitted to the County Planning Authority of the commencement of the hydrocarbon development permitted under Appeal Decision ref: APP/B3600/A/11/21665*

This page is intentionally left blank

## ANNEX C

Planning &amp; Regulatory Committee 18 October 2017

Item No 9

2

## UPDATE SHEET

## MINERALS/WASTE RE16/02556/CON

DISTRICT(S) REIGATE &amp; BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Horse Hill 1 Well Site, Horse Hill, Hookwood, Horley, Surrey RH6 0RB

The retention of the existing exploratory well site and vehicular access onto Horse Hill; the appraisal and further flow testing of the existing borehole (Horse Hill-1) for hydrocarbons, including the drilling of a (deviated) sidetrack well and flow testing for hydrocarbons; installation of a second well cellar and drilling a second (deviated) borehole (Horse Hill-2) and flow testing for hydrocarbons; erection of security fencing on an extended site area; modifications to the internal access track; installation of plant, cabins and equipment, all on some 2.08ha, for a temporary period of three years, with restoration to agriculture and woodland.

The title to the officer report should be amended and now read:

## MINERALS/WASTE RE16/02556/CON

## CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

*Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public*

For paragraph 86 of the officer report, two additional letters of representation have been received and one member of the public has written again. The total figure of representations should now read 650.

Officer Comment

No new relevant planning issues to the development proposal have been raised.

## RECOMMENDATION

The following conditions should replace those in the Officer report:

Condition 2 (Noise) currently reads with errors:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of noise mitigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The mitigation measures will ensure that the noise levels set out in Conditions ~~18 and 19~~ are met. Mitigation shall be put in place prior to any operations taking place and shall be retained and maintained for the duration of the works.

**Condition 2 (Noise) should read:**

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of noise mitigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The mitigation measures will ensure that the noise levels set out in Conditions 21 and 22 are met. Mitigation shall be put in place prior to any operations taking place and shall be retained and maintained for the duration of the works.

*Reason:* To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality to comply with the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 Policy MC14.

Condition 4 (Lighting) currently reads with errors:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a detailed Lighting Scheme for all lighting proposed for the development shown on 'Illustrative Site Plan Drilling Mode Lighting Plan', Drawing No.13, 'Revised Location of Lights' Dated: 09.02.17, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority and be approved in writing. The lighting scheme shall include:

- Details of the height and location of all lights including details of all lamps sources confirming lumen output for each lamp type.
- Assessment of the spread and direction for both spill and confirmation of %sky glow of all lighting proposed and methods of any shielding that is deemed necessary to reduce light Spill outside of the site boundary.
- Confirmation of the illumination levels of the work areas including all access ways and general circulation spaces, specified in lux. This shall take the form of a detailed isolux contour plan drawing.
- Vertical illumination levels shall be confirmed where applicable to residential properties that are adjacent to the site. We would suggest this is modelled using software such as Dialux, Relux or Lighting Reality.
- The times when the proposed lighting will be illuminated.
- Confirmation that none of the installed flood lighting luminaires are tilted from horizontal any greater than 15 degrees.
- Confirmation that all rig linear luminaires are installed inward and downward facing.

The lighting shall be installed and operated in accordance with the approved Lighting Scheme. The applicant shall confirm that all lighting required for operations and maintenance will be locally switched and manually operated, on an 'as required' basis, and that the ~~install~~ luminaires over the cabins/stores doors (**assumed**) will be controlled by presence detection with a manual override.

**Condition 4 (Lighting) should read:**

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a detailed Lighting Scheme for all lighting proposed for the development shown on 'Illustrative Site Plan Drilling Mode Lighting Plan', Drawing No.13, 'Revised Location of Lights' Dated: 09.02.17, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority and be approved in writing. The lighting scheme shall include:

- Details of the height and location of all lights including details of all lamps sources confirming lumen output for each lamp type.
- Assessment of the spread and direction for both spill and confirmation of %sky glow of all lighting proposed and methods of any shielding that is deemed necessary to reduce light Spill outside of the site boundary.
- Confirmation of the illumination levels of the work areas including all access ways and general circulation spaces, specified in lux. This shall take the form of a detailed isolux contour plan drawing.
- Vertical illumination levels shall be confirmed where applicable to residential properties that are adjacent to the site. We would suggest this is modelled using software such as Dialux, Relux or Lighting Reality.
- The times when the proposed lighting will be illuminated.
- Confirmation that none of the installed flood lighting luminaires are tilted from horizontal any greater than 15 degrees.
- Confirmation that all rig linear luminaires are installed inward and downward facing.



## ANNEX C

The lighting shall be installed and operated in accordance with the approved Lighting Scheme. The applicant shall confirm that all lighting required for operations and maintenance will be locally switched and manually operated, on an 'as required' basis, and that the luminaires over the cabins/stores doors will be controlled by presence detection with a manual override.

*Reason:* To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality to comply with the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 Policy MC14.

### Condition 22 (Noise) currently reads with errors:

For operations other than temporary, including workover, drilling, ~~side drilling~~ and flaring, the noise limit is 48 dB LAeq,30min between 08:00 hours and 18:30 hours Monday to Friday, and between 09:00 hours and 13:00 hours Saturday. At all other times the noise limit is 42 dB LAeq,30min, which is applicable to drilling and associated activities. The noise limit applies 3.5 m from the façade of any affected property.

### **Condition 22 (Noise) should read:**

For operations other than temporary, including workover, drilling, and flaring, the noise limit is 48 dB LAeq,30min between 08:00 hours and 18:30 hours Monday to Friday, and between 09:00 hours and 13:00 hours Saturday. At all other times the noise limit is 42 dB LAeq,30min, which is applicable to drilling and associated activities. The noise limit applies 3.5 m from the façade of any affected property.

*Reason:* To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality to comply with the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 Policy MC14.

### Condition 26 (Ecology) currently reads with errors:

A licensed bat worker shall be in attendance to supervise any felling ~~of~~ lopping of mature trees in connection with any works hereby permitted. If any further trees are to be removed or lopped, they will have to be checked for evidence of bats and emergent surveys conducted, if necessary. If bats are found, the works will either need to be timed to avoid harm to the bats or a license obtained from Natural England.

### **Condition 26 (Ecology) should read:**

A licensed bat worker shall be in attendance to supervise any felling or lopping of mature trees in connection with any works hereby permitted. If any further trees are to be removed or lopped, they will have to be checked for evidence of bats and emergent surveys conducted, if necessary. If bats are found, the works will either need to be timed to avoid harm to the bats or a license obtained from Natural England.

*Reason:* To comply with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations 2010 and to protect species of conservation concern in accordance with the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 Policy MC14.

This page is intentionally left blank