


**To:** Planning & Regulatory Committee

**Date:** 13 October 2021

**By:** Planning Development Manager

**District(s)** Waverley Borough Council

**Electoral Division(s):**
**Farnham Central**
**Mr MacLeod**
**Farnham North**
**Ms Powell**
**Case Officer:**
**Stephanie King**
**Purpose:** For Decision

**Grid Ref:** 486348 147300

---

**Title: Minerals/Waste WA/2021/01284**
**Summary Report**
**Land at Runfold South Quarry, Guildford Road, Runfold, Farnham, Surrey GU10 1PB**

**The continued restoration of the former mineral workings without compliance with planning permission ref FAR 415/69 dated 11 February 1970 as amended by decision ref WA/2018/0016 dated 6 November 2018 to extend the duration of time set out in Condition 3 of WA/2018/0016.**

This application is one of four planning applications being reported to this committee all seeking an extension of time for completion of restoration for a period of four years. This planning application relates to the north eastern part of what is known as the 'ROMP' area at Runfold South Quarry which is located centrally within the overall Runfold South Quarry complex. The ROMP area comprises of five discrete planning permissions which were then aggregated for the purposes of Schedule 13 of the Environment Act 1995 for an Initial Review of Conditions in 1998 (reference number: WA98/1018 dated 4 August 1999. The purpose of the Initial Review of Conditions was to modernise and update the conditions that had been imposed on FAR 415/69, one of which imposed an end date for the restoration of the ROMP area. This being 31 December 2021. The First Periodic Review of the conditions retained the same end date.

The applicant is now seeking permission for the development of land without complying with condition 3 of FAR 232/50 to extend the time for a period of four years (until 31 December 2025) to complete the restoration of the whole of the ROMP area. Because WA/2018/0016 (the most recent decision notice for the ROMP area) is an approval of modern conditions and not a planning permission in its own right, this planning application is a Section 73<sup>1</sup> planning application of the last planning permission as amended/ updated by the most recent set of modern planning conditions. The three other planning applications on this agenda (ref: WA/2021/01282, WA/2021/01283, and WA/2021/01285) are seeking the same extension of time for their respective part of the ROMP area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Town and Country Planning Act 1990

There have been a number of factors that have led to a delay in the commencement of infilling and restoration process at the ROMP site and, whilst these have been resolved, has resulted in there being only 4 months before the time limit ceases on 31 December 2021. As such an extension of time for infilling and restoration operations is required. Alternative site restoration options and timescales have been considered and found that the proposed additional time to facilitate the filling and restoration of the ROMP area in accordance with the approved details represents the best option in terms of benefits gained and minimised impacts in the long term.

Infilling operations and subsequent restoration activities will be carried out in accordance with the approved details as secured by conditions and will not result in any significant adverse impact on environment and amenity. Biodiversity enhancements are proposed to compensate for the extension of time, which will be managed and monitored through a revised Aftercare Strategy. The local highway and existing access will support the vehicle movements associated with the infilling and restoration of the site and will not result in any significant adverse impacts as a result of traffic movements during the additional four year time period.

All statutory consultees with the exception of the County Enhancement Officer raise no objection or no comment to the proposal. Farnham Town Council, Seale & Sands Parish Council, Moor Park Residents Association, and Crooksbury Residents' Association raise objections to the proposal and one letter of representation has been made objecting to the proposal. Officers have addressed the concerns raised by objectors in this Officers report. Officers have considered the applicant's proposal and the objections and concerns raised and consider that the extension of time of four years is reasonable and proportionate.

The proposal has been thoroughly assessed and is considered to comply with the relevant Development Plan Policies.

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

---

## **Application details**

### **Applicant**

SUEZ Recycling and Recovery UK

### **Date application valid**

6 May 2021

### **Period for Determination**

20 October 2021

### **Amending Documents**

Applicant Amplifying Letter dated 3 September 2021

Drawing ref: Rsp-LOC-FAR-REF Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021

---

## **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.

<b>report</b>	<b>Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance</b>	<b>Paragraphs in the where this has been</b>
---------------	---	--

	<b>with the development plan?</b>	<b>discussed</b>
Sustainable Waste Management and Mineral Restoration	Yes	55 - 87
Environment and Amenity	Yes	88 - 122
Highways, Traffic and Access	Yes	123 - 133

---

## **Illustrative material**

### Site Plan

Site Plan 1: Site location plan and application site area

### Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1: Site location to the south of A3 and Central Area within wider Runfold South site

Aerial 2: Application site within red line boundary

### Application Plan

Application Plan 1: Drawing ref: Rsp-LOC-FAR-REF Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021 (all four applications red line boundary locations)

### Site Photographs

Figure 1: View looking north to former conveyor tunnel under A31

Figure 2: View looking north towards main void

Figure 3: View looking east towards main void

---

## **Background**

### Site Description

1. The application site falls within a larger mineral site complex known as Runfold South (Princess Royal) Quarry and Landfill Complex (hereon referred to as Runfold South). Runfold South is approximately 80 hectares (ha) in total size and comprises of five distinct mineral/landfill areas including: the ROMP (Review of Old Mineral Permissions) area, Area A, Area B, Area C and the Old Hogs Back area. Runfold South Quarry is located in south-western Surrey, immediately to the south of the A31, some 2 kilometres (km) east of Farnham, and roughly 7.5km south of Farnborough beyond which runs the M3. The site is accessed from Guildford Road (C119), which runs along its northern boundary, and is bounded on its eastern side by Bridleway 186, southern side by Public Footpaths 208 and 121 (which also form part of the North Downs Way), and western side by Bridleways 123 and 124. Public Footpath 121 also runs through the centre of the site, in a north-to-south alignment.
2. Barfield School lies immediately adjacent to the site's north-eastern boundary, while residential properties are mostly located to the north along Guildford Road, to the east along Crooksbury Road, to the south along Compton Way. The River Wey runs to the west of the site, being approximately 36m at its closest point.
3. Runfold South does not lie within any areas covered by national or higher-level nature conservation designations, with the closest being the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at Moor Park (800m directly south) and Puttenham &

Crooksbury Commons (2.6km south-east), as well as the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) approximately 230m to the west. The site does however lie within an area locally designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), with two Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) located at Crooksbury Hill (1.4km south-east) and the River Wey – North Branch. Although the site is not covered by any areas that are considered to be at risk of flooding, the site does lie within the boundaries of a Zone 3 (Total Catchment) groundwater Source Protection Zone as classified by the Environment Agency.

4. The ROMP area is approximately 18ha and is which is located within the northern, north eastern and central part of Runfold South. The ROMP area shares its eastern boundary with Barfield School, its southern boundary with Old Hogs Back and Area B, its south western boundary with Area C, its western boundary with Area A and its northern boundary with the Guildford Road. The ROMP area can be divided into three parts: the Central Area, the Playing Field and the Top Field. The ROMP Area is made of five parent planning permissions ref: FAR 232/50, ref: FAR 162/61, ref: FAR 297/62, ref: FAR 415/69 and ref: FAR 558/73:

FAR 232/50 – covers the western half of the ROMP area abutting Areas A, B and C. It is this area where most of the infilling and restoration works are required. This area has also been referred to as the Central Area given its position within the over Runfold South site.

- FAR 162/61 - covers a small area to the north west of the site pond in the north western section of the ROMP Area. No additional restoration work is required, so the currently approved end date for restoration of 31 December 2021 will be complied with. No extension of time is sought for this permission.
  - FAR 297/62 – covers the eastern half of the ROMP area part of which is known as 'Top Field' and abuts Old Hogs Back
  - FAR 415/69 – covers the north eastern part of the ROMP area and is mainly used as a playing field by the adjoining Barfield School
  - FAR 558/73 – stretches across the northern half of the ROMP area east – west and allowed for working of this part of the ROMP to be deeper than the rest of the quarry.
5. This application relates to the north eastern part of the ROMP area (ref: FAR 415/69) and is the western part of the ROMP area containing a pond in the north-western corner to which surface water from the wider Runfold South (except Area A) drains. The site access and associated site offices, welfare facilities and parking are also located within the northern part of the Central Area. The southern section of the Central Area has historically been worked for soft sand and had historically accommodated a mortar plant operated by Tarmac, a recycling plant operated by Collards, and site offices

### Planning History

6. Mineral working commenced at Runfold South in the 1950's, with planning permission being originally allowed on appeal in 1951 ref: FAR 232/50, with further extensions permitted in the 1960s (refs: FAR 162/61 and FAR 297/62), 1970s (refs: FAR 415/69 and FAR 558/73) and 1980s. Runfold South Quarry produced sand for building and construction purposes. Area A, Area B and Old Hogs Back are in formal aftercare. The Top Field (which forms part of the ROMP area) is also in formal aftercare. Area C is currently completing landfilling operations.
7. The Environment Act 1995 introduced a new requirement for an initial review and updating of old minerals planning permissions and then the subsequent periodic

review<sup>2</sup> of all mineral's permissions thereafter (known as ROMP reviews). An initial review<sup>3</sup> was undertaken for the ROMP area aggregating the five FAR planning permissions for that area. This was determined in 1999 (ref: WA98/1018) and the new conditions included amended controls over hours of working, access & highway protection, noise, dust, sand extraction, landscaping, rights of way and surface and groundwater protection.

8. The first periodic review of these conditions was undertaken and approved in 2018 (ref: WA/2018/0016 dated 6 November 2018), with further amended controls and revised contour levels with a reduced level of fill material to cover the restoration and aftercare of the Central Area of Runfold South Quarry.
  9. The following conditions under WA/2018/0016 have been approved and discharged: Condition 5 (Settlement Assessment) (ref: WA/2019/1441 dated 9 April 2020), Condition 6 (Programme of Contaminated Land, Groundwater and Gas Investigation, Risk Assessment and Analysis) (ref: WA/2020/1926 dated 12 July 2021), Condition 8 (Bat Habitat Creation Scheme) (ref: WA/2019/2022 dated 18 February 2020), Condition 19 (Dust Management Plan) (ref: WA/2020/1925 dated 7 April 2021), Condition 20 (scheme of progressive infilling and restoration) (ref: WA/2021/0008 dated 26 April 2021), Condition 23 (Surface Water Management Plan) (ref: WA/2021/0477 dated 20 May 2021), Condition 31 (imported soils use and management) (ref: WA/2019/0763 dated 24 July 2019), and Condition 32 (Five Year Aftercare Strategy) (ref: WA/2019/1835 dated 30 January 2020).
- 

## The Proposal

10. At the time of the Initial Review of conditions in 1998 (ref: WA98/1018), the applicant had anticipated that completion of infilling and restoration of the Central Area would take 10 years between 2011 to 2021, with an end date of 31 December 2021 agreed with the County Planning Authority (CPA) and secured by condition. The scheme as submitted with WA98/1018 was also for higher contour levels and consequently more landfilling materials. However, with the subsequent granting of planning permission for additional extraction in Area C on appeal in 2007<sup>4</sup> mineral processing in the Central Area continued until 2016 with the processing plant not removed until 2017. Consequently, restoration could not commence until the Central Area was cleared of the processing plant and accordingly over half of the 10 years anticipated for infilling and restoration of the Central Area of the ROMP area was lost. To address this, the applicant sought a revised lower level landform as part of planning application ref: WA/2018/0016 with a reduced quantity of infill material, a volume which was assumed at the time could be sourced and imported within the remaining three years.
11. As several conditions imposed by WA/2018/0016 require the submission of details prior to the commencement of infilling, material engineering and restoration activities, even though the applicant has been submitting these for approval, this has caused some delay to the commencement of infilling and restoration at the ROMP area.
12. Additionally, in order to import the infill material required for the restoration of the ROMP area in accordance with the approved restoration scheme, the applicant requires a Deposit for Recovery Environmental Permit ('Recovery Permit') from the

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 13

<sup>3</sup> Schedule 14

<sup>4</sup> Appeal refs: APP/B3600/A/06/2020101 and APP/B3600/A/06/2020102

Environment Agency. Obtaining the Recovery Permit from the Environment Agency has taken longer than originally anticipated with it being approved in May 2021, two years after that process began and has also delayed the ability to commence the infilling and restoration of the ROMP Area. With the Recovery Permit now in place, restoration operations can commence, but it is clear that the currently approved deadline for this activity of 31 December 2021 will not be met.

13. Accordingly, the applicant has submitted a planning application seeking permission to extend the time to deliver the approved final restoration for the ROMP area by four years from 31 December 2021 to 31 December 2025 through varying the wording of Condition 3 approved under ref: WA/2018/0016 dated 6 November 2018.
14. In addition to the extension of time sought, these applications also seek to add a new planning condition to secure the removal of the environmental management and monitoring infrastructure within six months of it being decommissioned in the interest of improved planning control and consistency with other permissions at Runfold South Quarry.
15. Please note that apart from the extended period for infilling and restoration of the ROMP area until 31 December 2025, three additional conditions and the submission of a revised Aftercare Strategy, no other changes are proposed and the other 30 conditions imposed by WA/2018/0016 would remain unchanged and existing measures to control and minimise impacts would continue. Should planning permission be granted, the proposed extended timescale for infilling and restoration would be secured by a new condition.

#### *Need for four applications*

16. The ROMP area is made up of five parent planning permissions ref: FAR 232/50, ref: FAR 162/61, ref: FAR 297/62, ref: FAR 415/69 and ref: FAR 558/73 (hereafter referred to as the five FAR permissions). Their combined areas make up the ROMP area. Please note that these five FAR permissions are 'live' planning permissions which have been maintained through subsequent planning acts.
17. In accordance with the Environment Act 1995, an initial review and updating of the old minerals planning permissions (five FAR permissions) was undertaken and a decision was made under ref: WA98/1018. This planning decision under ref: WA98/1018 is an aggregate of the five FAR permissions under one planning reference for expediency to treat as a single site, which ensured that activities undertaken in the Central Area all had to comply with the same set of planning conditions.
18. The aggregation of the five FAR permissions continued with the first periodic review of conditions under ref: WA/2018/0016. Accordingly, each of the five FAR permissions are subject to the same 32 conditions set out in ref: WA/2018/0016. As FAR 162/61 does not require further restoration works and no extension of time, the applicant is only seeking an extension of time for the other four FAR permissions.

---

## **Consultations and Publicity**

### ***District Council***

19. Waverley Borough Council No objection.



Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 20. County Ecologist                       | No objection.   |
| 21. County Enhancement Officer             | Objection on the basis that the four year time period does not represent restoration at the earliest opportunity and that two years is achievable.  |
| 22. Environment Agency                     | No objection subject to informative that All works need to meet the criteria set out in their <a href="#">Groundwater Protection publication</a> .  |
| 23. County Geologist Consultant            | No objection.   |
| 24. County Landscape Officer               | No objection.   |
| 25. Natural England                        | No comment to make.   |
| <u>County Highway Authority</u>            |   |
| 26. Rights of Way                          | No comment to make  |
| 27. Transport Development Planning         | No objection  |
| 28. County Noise Consultant                | No objection. Noise is already being controlled via existing planning conditions, which should be bought forward as is or updated in line with current guidance. The proposed changes are, therefore, unlikely to give rise to significant noise impacts. |
| 29. County Air Quality Consultant          | No objection. The time extension would not have a significant impact on local air quality and agree that the potential impacts would be appropriately controlled by existing planning and permit conditions.  |
| 30. Lead Local Flood Authority             | No objection. As there is no change to the drainage strategy or Surface Water drainage system, they have no further comments.   |
| 31. Surrey Strategic Land and Assets       | No views received.  |
| 32. Health and Safety Executive - Quarries | No views received.  |
| 33. Surrey Highways Structures Team        | No comment to make  |
| 34. Southern Water                         | No views received.  |
| 35. Thames Water                           | No views received.  |

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

36. Farnham Town Council

Objection. Though it is recognised that recent progress has been made, this momentum must be maintained and a renewed schedule of works be devised. The restoration must be completed as soon as possible, well in advance of 31 December 2025.

37. Seale & Sands Parish Council

Objection. Concerned that full restoration will be further delayed and consider a four-year extension is unacceptable unless a final plan is agreed, including regular progress reports and keeping to full restoration time plan. Draw attention to previous failings at meeting restoration deadlines on site.

38. Tongham Parish Council

No views received.

39. Moor Park Residents Association

Objection. The applicant does not have a good reputation for delivering timely and completed restoration across other sites in the wider area, which is contrary to restoration at the earliest opportunity as set out in NPPF. If granted permission, the applicant should be required to produce an annual report summarising work done in the previous year and a schedule for the proposed remaining restoration works.

40. The Farnham Society

No views received.

41. Seale, Sands & Runfold Amenity Society

No views received.

42. Crooksbury Residents' Association

Objection. Concerns proposed four year extension does not represent restoration at the earliest opportunity in accordance with the NPPF. As a minimum, consider applicant should produce an annual report summarising work done in the previous year to meet NPPF 210h and a schedule for the proposed remaining restoration works and volumes of infill required.

43. Runfold Action Group

No views received.

44. Farnham Biodiversity Partnership

No views received.

45. Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership

No views received.



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

46. The application was publicised by the posting of 6 site notices and an advert was placed in the Surrey Advertiser Newspaper on 18 June 2021. A total of 53 of owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter.
47. One letter of representation has been received objecting to this application. The concerns raised and reason for objection are:
- The proposed four year extension is too long and goes against development plan policy that restoration must be completed by the earliest possible date. The applicant has consistently not met restoration dates across the site and locally, leaving residents with little confidence that the proposed new deadline will be met. The applicant's focus appears to be on profit rather than a detailed plan to meet the earliest possible date for restoration. The applicant has been poor at communicating the need for more time and the number of years require. Accordingly, Surrey County Council must require a detailed, time-lined plan to demonstrated restoration by the earliest possible date.
  - The approved landscape restoration to agriculture, with an assumption of wire-fenced fields grazing sheep, is not typical of the area and is not sustainable in view of the ongoing decline of lamb consumption in the UK. In view of the proximity of the Surrey Hills AONB and location within an AGLV, the restoration plan must be redeveloped with Surrey County Council and other local environmental experts to an appropriate standard taking due consideration of the nationally important landscape and habitats of the AONB.
  - The applicant has ignored advice on appropriate site clearance and biodiversity features from Surrey County Council and other local experts and should clarify the value of minor biodiversity features being provided as compensation for the restoration delay.
  - It is strongly recommended that Surrey County Council require the applicant to implement a third party expert survey and monitoring programme across the whole site to measure the current habitat quality and biodiversity indicators, and to monitor and demonstrate biodiversity net gain across the restoration period and the five year aftercare periods of each of the restoration areas. This recommendation is in view of expectations of the Environment Bill to be enacted this year.

### Officer comment:

48. Officers note concern regarding the final restoration for the site, however the currently approved restoration plan is to agriculture consistent with the aftercare regime at Old Hogs Back and Area A. This application only relates to additional time within which to complete the approved restoration plan. In view of this, Officers do not consider this planning application to be the appropriate mechanism to redesign the approved restoration plan. In addition, Officers note that the approved Farnham Neighbourhood Plan has allocated the site for new outdoor sports facilities and other appropriate greenspace uses, therefore a change from agriculture to nature conservation would conflict with the development plan.
49. Officers acknowledge the concern and importance of the Environment Bill and the proposed requirements for 10% biodiversity net gain for all new developments. However, Officers note that this is not a current statutory requirement and does not relate to this planning application. Nonetheless, Officers recognise the concern regarding the valuing and monitoring of biodiversity features and have sought to

address this with the applicant through the rewording of Condition 32 to secure the provision of an updated Aftercare Strategy which establishes a biodiversity baseline and the subsequent review of enhancements on a yearly basis through the five year aftercare period.

## Planning Considerations

50. 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.
51. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Surrey Minerals Local Plan 2011, the Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 – Policies 2020, the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018, the Waverley Borough Local Plan Saved Policies 2002 and the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2020.
52. Waverley Borough Council are currently producing the Waverley Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. A Pre-Submission consultation (Regulation 19) on Local Plan Part 2 ran from 27 November 2020 to 29 January 2021. As the Council are yet to decide whether to submit the Local Plan Part 2 to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for examination by an appointed Inspector, Officers consider minimal weight can be attached to any draft policies within this draft Plan.
53. In addition to the development plan, it is also necessary to consider Government policy and guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
54. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations. 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: Sustainable Waste Management and Mineral Restoration; Environment and Amenity; Highways, Transport and Access.

## SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINERAL RESTORATION

### **Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP 2011)**

Policy MC17 - Restoring mineral workings

Policy MC18 - Restoration and enhancement

### **Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 (SWLP 2020)**

Policy 5 – Recovery of Inert Waste to Land

### *Policy*

55. Paragraph 211(e) of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications mineral planning authorities should provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity, to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions.
56. SMP 2011 Policy MC17 sets out that restored mineral sites should be: (i) sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area; and (ii) capable of sustaining an appropriate after-use; and that the restoration of minerals workings

should be completed at the earliest opportunity and progressive restoration will be required where appropriate. Policy MC17 goes on to say that the applicant will be expected to agree a scheme with the mineral planning authority detailing how the land will be restored and managed before, during and after working.

57. SMP 2011 Policy MC18 advocates that the mineral planning authority will encourage and work with mineral operators and landowners to deliver benefits such as enhancement of biodiversity interests, improved public access and provision of climate change mitigation such as greater flood storage capacity. Additionally, where appropriate, a wider area enhancement approach should be developed, with links to other green infrastructure schemes.
58. SWLP 2020 Policy 5 states that the recovery of inert waste to land will be granted where this is necessary, inter alia, to implement mineral restoration and non-inert landfill restoration schemes and for other development involving the deposit of inert waste on land that will not prejudice mineral restoration and non-inert landfill restoration activity within the county if: i) there is a significant benefit or improvement from the development; ii) the benefit or improvement cannot practicably and reasonably be met in any other way; iii) the waste cannot practicably and reasonably be re-used, recycled or processed in any other way; iv) the use of the inert waste material replaces the need for non-waste materials, and v) the development involves the minimum quantity of waste necessary.

#### *Need for more time*

59. As detailed in the proposal above, the applicant is seeking an additional four years within which to complete the restoration of the ROMP area due to a number of delays that have prevented the commencement and completion of restoration in accordance with the currently approved deadline of 31 December 2021.
60. The submitted Planning Statement explains that the applicant had previously sought to address delays to restoration through a reduced restoration profile from an estimated 430,000m<sup>3</sup> to circa 166,000m<sup>3</sup> (including soils) as part of WA/2018/0016 but that further issues prevented the applicant from being able to complete restoration by 31 December 2021. These included the need to discharge a number of pre-commencement conditions attached to ref: WA/2018/0016 and the need to secure an approved Recovery Permit from the Environment Agency prior to commencement of infill material importation.
61. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and a pre-existing backlog of applications, it took until May 2021 for the Recovery Permit to be approved and until July 2021 for all the pre-commencement conditions to be discharged. Therefore, the applicant has been unable to commence restoration activities until the end of July 2021 leaving five months to meet the approved deadline of 31 December 2021.
62. Consequently, the applicant has submitted four applications to extend the time to deliver the approved final restoration for the ROMP area by four years from 31 December 2021 to 31 December 2025.

#### *Timescale*

63. The void space that requires infilling within the ROMP area is 166,000m<sup>3</sup>. This is focused within the Central Area covered by FAR 232/50 and part of FAR 297/62. As outlined above, the County Enhancement Officer has objected to the period of four years sought by the applicant and considers a period of 2 years is more achievable

for the site. Other statutory and non-statutory consultees have raised similar comments. To address this, the applicant has provided amplifying information that explains that the proposed additional time scale is based on the average tonnage input to Areas A and C at Runfold South Quarry over a four year period from 2015 to 2019. This equates to an average of circa 85,000 tonnes per annum (tpa). The applicant has used Areas A and C because these are the two areas at Runfold South Quarry where infilling has taken place most recently. This time period was used to exclude the impact the COVID-19 pandemic had on input rates because the infill rates were much lower. Officers note that whilst fill rates for Areas A and C have been used, the type of material going into those areas are of a different make up to the material that is expected for the ROMP area because of the Recovery Permit.

64. To assess how long, in the applicant's opinion, it would take to infill the void space of 166,000m<sup>3</sup> at a rate of 89,000 tonnes per annum (tpa), the applicant has used a conversion rate for tonnage to volume of 2t/m<sup>3</sup> (that every metric cubed = 2 tonnes). Based on this conversion rate this would equate to 42,500m<sup>3</sup> per annum into the ROMP area. Based on this annual importation rate, the applicant states it would take 3.9 years (3 years and 10 months) to complete infill (including soils) of the ROMP area, hence the application for a four year extension. It should be noted this does not include restoration activities such as planting/ seeding.
65. Officers understand why a conversion factor of 2 has been used as it represents a more clay like material. However, a lower conversion rate of between 1.3 and 1.5 (used for soils) could be more suitable given the typical nature and density of the fill material proposed. However, this is caveated by the fact that the Recovery Permit requires cleaner fill material meaning the heavier materials are removed and a higher conversion rate could be more appropriate.
66. Additionally, Officers note that the cleaner nature of fill means preparation and lining of the existing quarry void in the Central Area is not required, so onsite filling and completion of phases will be quicker. Furthermore, the applicant states that as the site has a Recovery Permit there will be no landfill tax payable and therefore the site should attract more fill material.
67. To assess whether a shorter timescale for filling and completion of restoration could be appropriate, Officers have included a comparison table of different tonnage to cubic metre conversions to outline the difference the conversion has on timescale and vehicle movements based on the average input rate from Areas A and C at Runfold South over a four year period.

**Table 1: Impact of tonnes per cubic metre squared conversion rate on time needed to fill void space and number of daily vehicle movements based on average rate of importation for Areas A and C from 2015 to 2019.**

<b>Conversion rate</b> <i>tonnes per metre squared (tpm<sup>3</sup>)</i>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>Annual average volume in m<sup>3</sup> coming to ROMP area</b> <i>85000 tpa / conversion rate</i>	65,384.62	60,714.29	56,666.67	42,500.00
<b>Number of years to fill void space</b> <i>166000m<sup>3</sup> (total void) / annual average volume</i>	2.54	2.73	2.93	3.91
<b>Total number of inbound vehicle loads to fill the ROMP area</b> <i>annual average volume coming to ROMP area / vehicles with 8m<sup>3</sup> load</i>	8,173	7,589	7,083	5,312

<b>Number of inbound vehicle loads per week</b> <i>Total vehicle loads to the site to fill the ROMP area / 51 weeks<sup>5</sup></i>	160	149	139	104
<b>Number of inbound vehicle loads per day</b> <i>Vehicle loads per week / 5.5 days per week</i>	29	27	25	19
<b>Daily vehicle movements</b> <i>Vehicle loads per days x 2</i>	58	54	51	38

68. The County Enhancement Officer has raised an objection to the proposal on the basis that four years does not represent restoration at the earliest opportunity and that restoration is achievable in two years. However, even when considering the lowest conversion rate of 1.3, it is clear that based on the rate of fill importation for Areas A and C and regardless of conversion rate, it is not possible to achieve restoration in two years.

69. The County Enhancement Officer has queried the annual importation rate of 85,000tpa to the site and that it could be higher. The applicant has submitted information showing the annual importation rates for A and C since 2015 and that while the average rate of importation was approximately 85,000tpa, there were a couple of years with a much higher rate of between 135,556 tonnes in 2018 and 139,760 tonnes in 2015 respectfully. Again, to assess the implications of there being a higher importation rate to the ROMP area, Officers undertook the same calculations from table 1 with a conversion rate of 1.5 and 2 and the higher rates of importation to establish the time needed to fill at this higher rate. The results are in table 2 below.

**Table 2: Time need to fill void space based on Areas A and C 2018 and 2015 rate of importation.**

<b>Importation rate in tonnes</b>	<b>Areas A and C 2018 importation</b>	<b>Areas A and C 2018 importation</b>	<b>Areas A and C 2015 importation</b>	<b>Areas A and C 2015 importation</b>
	135,556	135,556	139,760	139,760
<b>Conversion rate</b> <i>tonnes per metre squared (tpm<sup>3</sup>)</i>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Amount of void space to fill in tonnes</b> <i>Void in m<sup>3</sup> (166,000) x conversion rate</i>	249,00	332,000	249,000	332,000
<b>Number of years to fill void space</b> <i>Void to fill in tonnes / importation rate in tonnes</i>	1.84	2.45	1.78	2.38

70. Looking at the third and fifth column clearly shows that with a higher rate of importation, two years remains insufficient time for the importation of the infill material and the restoration of the ROMP area. In this instance, columns two and four represent a best case scenario. Considering the last few years it is clear that development rates and therefore access to infill material can be unpredictable. Therefore, Officers consider reliance on a best case scenario to be unreliable and untenable.

71. In addition, the third row of table 1 and 2 (number of years to fill void space) only covers the estimated time required to import the infill material and restoration soils. Officers note that restoration of the ROMP area also involves the seeding and

<sup>5</sup> excluding week for Christmas

planting of the site, which is limited by planting seasons and may be subject to failures, therefore time is required on top in addition to the estimated time periods in the third row.

72. Seeding and planting will be undertaken in the first available planting season following the restoration of an area which is limited between December to March as detailed in the approved Scheme of Progressive Infilling and Restoration for Central Area (ref: WA/2021/0008). As seeding and planting can be undertaken progressively, the amount of time to complete seeding and planting will depend on what time of year each area is filled and soiled and when this is in relation to the next available planting season.

73. Therefore table 3 has been drawn up to consider what rate of fill importation would be required to achieve restoration within two years using the conversion rate of 2, allowing 20 months for importation and filling and four months for planting and seeding; *and* a comparison with the proposed four years, allowing 44 months for importation and filling and the same four months for final area planting and seeding. Four months for planting and seeding has been selected as crude time estimate assuming infilling and soiling of the final area lines up with the planting season.

**Table 3: Number of daily movements needed to import sufficient material to fill void space within 20 months and 44 months.**

<b>Time period for infilling</b>	<b>20 months</b>	<b>44 months</b>
<b>Volume of material needed to be brought to site per calendar month (in m<sup>3</sup>)</b>	8,300	3773
<b>Number of importation loads required over whole period</b> <i>166000 / vehicle loads (8m<sup>3</sup>)</i>	20750	20750
<b>Average number of HGV loads per month</b> <i>8300m<sup>3</sup> / 8m<sup>3</sup></i>	1038	472
<b>Average loads per day (rounded up)</b> <i>Number of vehicles per month / working days</i>	45	20
<b>Average daily movements (rounded up)</b> <i>Average loads per day x 2</i>	90	40

74. Table 3 shows that there is an expected difference in the number of daily loads and movements that would be required to meet a shorter deadline of two years. Comparing this with the average daily movements for the fill importation to Areas A and C in table 1 also shows an increase in movements. Furthermore, Officers note that movements will not be capped by condition, but by the volume of void space, hours of operation and restoration deadline. Moreover, daily movements will not be consistent with the average but may be higher or lower from day to day depending on the source of fill material. While Runfold South Quarry has historically accommodated up to 300 two way movements per day in the past, more recently the number of vehicle movements has been less than this which has been accepted.

75. In considering the information above, Officers consider that a reduced time period of two years would not be achievable. To achieve infilling and restoration of the ROMP area within two years would require an annual tonnage input of 199,200<sup>6</sup> which is much higher than has been historically experienced at Runfold South Quarry. Whilst Officers accept the type of waste the ROMP area would be different to that imported

<sup>6</sup> 166,000m<sup>3</sup> x conversion rate of 2 = 332,000tonnes.  
332,000 tonnes for total void space/20 months to fill = 16,660 tonnes per calendar month  
16,660 tonnes per calendar month x 12 months = 199,200 tonnes per annum



in to Areas A and C and the importation rate for the ROMP area could be higher than the average of 85,000 tpa, Officers are aware that there are other external factors and no guarantee that this volume of waste would be received at the ROMP site within two years.

76. Officers note that the above tables and figures are all caveated and are only a guide for the predication of future importation rates. In addition, there are a number of limitations to consider that will impact the availability of fill and rate of material importation. This includes the volatile nature of the development market and the wider economy as the recent pandemic has clearly demonstrated. Such changes in fill material availability is unpredictable and will experience peaks and troughs. Additionally, whilst Area C infilling is nearing completion, access to Area C remains through the ROMP area. The approved Scheme of Progressive Infilling and Restoration for Central Area does provide flexibility for continued access to Area C, but Officers consider it is worth highlighting the impact this will have.
77. There is also the outstanding requirement to fill the former conveyor tunnel which goes underneath the Guildford Road and the details of how this would be achieved have yet to be approved alongside an agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 which needs to be agreed and can be a timely procedure. While filling operations can be undertaken in other areas of the ROMP area in accordance with the approved Scheme of Progressive Infilling and Restoration, the former conveyor tunnel would also require fill material.
78. In addition, as discussed above, the efficiency of the planting programme is limited by the planting season over winter, any vegetation failures throughout the planting programme, and when the final phase of infilling in the ROMP area is completed.
79. As such, whilst Officers recognise statutory and non-statutory consultee concerns that any form of delay to the completion of the restoration of the ROMP area would be at odds with Policy MC17 and the NPPF para 211(e), when considering the above information Officers consider that the requested extension of time for infilling and restoration is reasonable and acceptable. Officers recognise objectors concerns with regards to the operators previous record for restoration completion of other areas on the site and note that this is the first time an extension of time to the restoration deadline has been sought for this particular area. To address the concerns and comments raised, Officers consider that the applicant could provide biannual update reports on phasing and infilling progress including the amount of fill imported and reasons for any low fill rates to demonstrate infilling progress and to assist with identifying any issues with meeting the final restoration deadline. In addition, Officers consider that the applicant could provide an annual topography surveys to further illustrate phasing and filling progress ahead of the final restoration deadline.
80. Accordingly, Officers are of the opinion that four years is a reasonable and proportionate time period within which filling and restoration can be completed, and therefore consider the proposal accords with Policy MC17 of the SMP 2011 in this regard.

### *Alternatives*

81. Consultees and the representation received have questioned whether there are alternative methods of restoration for the ROMP area with regards to no fill being used or less fill being used to achieve restoration at the earliest opportunity in accordance with Policy MC17 of the SMP 2011.



82. Officers note that the approved restoration scheme is for the importation and use of site 166,000m<sup>3</sup> materials including restoration soils. Policy MC17 of the SMP 2011 requires restored sites to be sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area and capable of sustaining an appropriate after-use. Officers are satisfied that the approved scheme for importation of fill would achieve this. Officers recognise that while a no fill or minimal fill alternative could reduce the time needed to import material and fill the site, time would still be needed to produce, submit and approve a revised restoration scheme to that which is already approved. This would also require an amendment to the Environmental Permit.
83. The submitted Planning Statement explains that a no fill restoration raises other concerns regarding groundwater contamination due to continued soakaway through the uncapped historic landfill and ponding within the two deep voids in contact with previously dry waste on the void sides. Therefore, the approved surface water drainage strategy for the site would need to be amended to address contamination and ensure sustainable surface water drainage. Furthermore, as there are no restoration and top soils present on site, there would be little suitable good growing medium for consistent and natural regeneration, leading to increased opportunities for erosion and further contamination and silting. Finally, by not filling the site, the two large voids and uneven levels would remain, which is not a natural-looking landform and limits the future uses of the site and represents a safety risk to those using the Public Footpath through the site and agriculture workers on the site.
84. Therefore, in addition to a revised restoration scheme, these issues would also need to be addressed through planning by producing, submitting and approving details, including revised Settlement Assessment, Programme of Contaminated Land, Groundwater and Gas Investigation, Risk Assessment and Analysis, and Surface Water Management Plan. The production of these details by the applicant and the subsequent determination of planning applications would take time.
85. In their response, the County Landscape Officer (CLO) stated that they agree with the 'need' for the restoration of the central area, including the need to provide a natural-looking landform, particularly given the location of the site within the AGLV and in close proximity to the Surrey Hills AONB. Having reviewed the alternative landforms considered by the applicant within this planning application, the CLO states that the minimal/reduced fill options would indeed allow a quicker restoration of the central area in practice, however with lower completed levels the area is less likely to integrate naturally with the surrounding gently undulating landform. The CLO acknowledged however that there may be other overriding planning reasons that meant alternatives were preferred and in which case work could be undertaken to ensure the best landscape 'fit' for alternative restoration.
86. Considering a minimal fill restoration poses similar issues regarding the need to produce, submit and approve revised restoration details, but would also require a new Environmental Permit, which would add further delays to the commencement of restoration on site. The submitted Planning Statement explains that minimal fill restoration was considered as part of the first review of mineral conditions ref: WA/2018/0016 but is not considered a reasonable option as the former mineral conveyor tunnel still needs to be fully decommissioned by infilling with engineering material, would still leave a significant void in the centre of the site resulting in a landform unsuited to the approved agricultural after-use, and would still require designed drainage through a piped culvert buried approximately 4m below the surface of the historic waste. All these issues would need to be addressed through revised schemes and approved through planning permission.

## Conclusion

87. Therefore, Officers consider that the proposed additional time for the restoration of the ROMP area is reasonable and necessary and supports the restoration of the site at the earliest opportunity while also addressing stability, contamination and drainage issues in a visually harmonious and effective manner. Officers are satisfied that the applicant has sufficiently considered alternative options for restoration and adequately demonstrated the advantages and disadvantages with them in relation to development plan policy. Officers consider that while alternative restoration fill levels, types and landforms could mean the restoration on the ground could be quicker, the need to revise the currently approved restoration scheme and associated details and secure planning permission alongside the need for a new Environmental Permit would need to be built into the overall timeframe for the restoration of the ROMP area. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal accords with Policy MC17 of the SMP 2011 and Policy 5 of the SWLP 2020 in this regard.

## ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY

### **Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP 2011)**

Policy MC14 - Reducing the adverse impacts of mineral development

### **Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 (SWLP 2020)**

Policy 13 – Sustainable Design

Policy 14 – Protecting Communities & the Environment

### **Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 (WBLP 2018)**

Policy SP1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy SP2 - Spatial Strategy

Policy RE1 - Countryside beyond the Green Belt

Policy RE3 - Landscape Character

Policy NE1 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

### **Waverley Borough Local Plan Saved Policies 2002 (WBLP SP 2002)**

Policy D1 - Environmental Implications of Development

Policy D2 - Compatibility of Uses

### **Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2020 (FNP 2020)**

Policy FNP10 - Protect and Enhance the Countryside

Policy FNP26 – Sites for New Outdoor Sports Facilities and Other Greenspace Uses

88. The National Planning Policy for Waste 2014 (NPPW) states in paragraph 7 that when determining waste planning applications, waste planning authorities should consider the likely impact on the local environment and upon amenity, against the criteria set out in their Appendix B. Appendix B lists matters to take into account, the most relevant being: protection of water quality, resources and flood risk, land stability, landscape and visual impacts, nature conservation, traffic impacts, including dust, noise, and potential land use conflict.

89. SMP 2011 Policy MC14 states that in determining planning applications for mineral development, potential impacts related to the following (where relevant) will be considered: (i) noise, dust, fumes, vibrations, illumination, including that related to traffic, generated by the development; (ii) flood risk, including opportunities to enhance flood storage; (iii) the appearance, quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness; (iv) the natural environment, biodiversity and, geological conservation interests; (v) public open spaces, the rights of way network, and outdoor recreation facilities; (vi) cumulative impacts arising from the interactions between mineral developments, and between mineral and other forms of development; (vii) any other matter relevant to the planning application.

90. SWLP 2020 Policy 13 states that planning permission for waste development where it can be demonstrated that the development follows relevant best practice and that:
- i) the development is of a scale, form and character appropriate to its location;
  - ii) any associated lower-carbon energy generation such as heat recovery and the recovery of energy from gas produced from the waste activity is maximised; and
  - iii) during its construction and operation measures are included to:
    - a. Maximise landscape enhancements and biodiversity gains, and other measures that may contribute to green infrastructure provision
    - b. Maximise efficiency of water use.
    - c. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions, including through energy efficiency.
    - d. Ensure resilience and enable adaptation to a changing climate.
91. SWLP 2020 Policy 14 is clear that waste development permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it would be consistent with relevant national planning policy with respect to key environmental assets, including protected landscapes, Sites of international, European or national importance, and nationally important heritage assets. Policy 14 is also clear that waste development must not result in unacceptable impacts on communities and the environment for a variety of topics, the most relevant to this application being: i) Public amenity and safety through impacts caused by noise, dust, and impact on public open space, the rights of way network, and outdoor recreation facilities; ii) Air Quality; iii) the Water Environment through Flood risk and opportunities to provide and enhance, flood storage and surface water drainage capacity, and quantity and quality of surface water and ground water resources; iv) the landscape including impacts on the appearance, quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness, including character areas defined at the national and local levels; v) the natural environment, including biodiversity and geological conservation interests; vi) Land and soil resources including impacts on their use, quality and integrity and including opportunities for remediation, the need to protect any best and most versatile agricultural land, and the need to address existing and potential contamination and land stability issues; vii) Cumulative impacts arising from the interactions between waste developments, and between waste development and other forms of development; and viii) Any other matters relevant to the proposed development.
92. WBLP 2018 Policy SP1 is clear that that when considering development proposals, the CPA will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants to find solutions so proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Planning applications that accord with the policies in Development Plan will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
93. WBLP 2018 Policy SP2 sets out the spatial strategy for the Borough. It states that in order to maintain Waverley's character whilst ensuring that development needs are met in a sustainable manner, where relevant the Spatial Strategy to 2032 is to: (i) avoid major development on land of the highest amenity and landscape value, such as the AONB and to safeguard the Green Belt; (ii) focus development at the four main settlements including Godalming; and (iii) maximise opportunities for the redevelopment of suitable brownfield sites for housing, business or mixed use.

94. WBLP 2018 Policy RE1 is clear that within areas shown as Countryside beyond the Green Belt on the Adopted Policies Map, the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and safeguarded in accordance with the NPPF.
95. WBLP 2018 Policy RE3 explains that new development must respect and where appropriate, enhance the distinctive character of the landscape in which it is located. The protection and enhancement of the character and qualities of the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), will be a priority which will be retained for its own sake and as a buffer to the AONB, until there is a review of the Surrey Hills AONB boundary, whilst recognising that the protection of the AGLV is commensurate with its status as a local landscape designation.
96. WBLP 2018 Policy NE1 concerns biodiversity and geological conservation. It states that the CPA will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity within Waverley. Development will be permitted provided that it: (i) retains, protects and enhances features of biodiversity and geological interest and ensures appropriate management of those features; and (ii) ensures any adverse impacts are avoided, or if unavoidable, are appropriately mitigated.
97. WBLP SP 2002 Policy D1 states that the CPA 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: (i) loss or damage to important environmental assets, such as buildings of historical or architectural interest, local watercourses, important archaeological sites and monuments and areas of conservation, ecological or landscape value; (ii) harm to the visual character and distinctiveness of a locality, particularly in respect of the design and scale of the development and its relationship to its surroundings; (iii) loss of general amenity, including material loss of natural light and privacy enjoyed by neighbours and disturbance resulting from the emission of noise, light or vibration; or (iv) potential pollution of air, land or water, including that arising from light pollution and from the storage and use of hazardous substances.
98. WBLP SP 2002 Policy D2 is clear that the Council will seek to ensure that proposed and existing land uses are compatible, in particular development which may have a materially detrimental impact on sensitive uses with regard to environmental disturbance or pollution will not be permitted.
99. FNP 2020 Policy FNP10 seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development and states that a proposal for development will only be permitted where it would: (i) be in accordance with Policy FNP16, FNP17 and FNP20 in the Neighbourhood Plan or other relevant planning policies applying to the area; (ii) protect the green belt; (iii) conserve and enhance landscape and scenic beauty of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting – including those Areas of Great Landscape Value under consideration for designation as ANOB; (iv) retain the landscape character of, and not have a detrimental impact on, areas shown on Map E as having high landscape value and sensitivity and Map F Old Park as having high landscape sensitivity and historic value; and (v) enhance the landscape value of the countryside and, where new planting is involved, use appropriate native species.
100. FNP 2020 Policy FNP26 states that Runfold South Quarry is allocated for new outdoor sports facilities and other appropriate greenspace uses, including new sports pitches, associated changing rooms and supplementary landscaping, subject to environmental and land restoration considerations.

### *The development*

101. The landscape and visual amenity, ecology and biodiversity, dust, noise, flood risk and surface water drainage, land stability, Rights of Way, and residential amenity impacts of the proposed restoration were considered and found to be acceptable as part of the first periodic review of mineral conditions ref. WA/2018/0016 dated 6 November 2018. The submitted Planning Statement is clear that the only changes to the proposed restoration of the ROMP area is the four year extension to the restoration deadline and that all other operations and management measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Officers therefore acknowledge that it is only the extension of this impact over the proposed additional four years which needs to be considered as part of this application.

### *Landscape and visual amenity*

102. The applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment dated March 2021 (LVIA), which provides an assessment of likely landscape and visual effects of the proposed development, to extend the deadline for infilling and restoration of the Central Area until the end of 2025, in comparison to the existing 'baseline' situation, whereby the ROMP area would not be infilled and would be left at current levels to re-vegetate naturally.

103. The LVIA identifies Public Footpath 121 as the main visual receptor as it runs north to south, directly to the west of the ROMP area. The LVIA highlights that footpath users are close-range receptors that would experience a short-term visual impact for the additional four years while the ROMP area is filled and restored. However, the LVIA is clear that in the longer term, the restoration to the approved levels would be beneficial by tying in the landform and land cover with neighbouring areas and the wider countryside.

104. The LVIA identifies other visual receptors include users of the North Downs Way National Trail, which runs to the south of the site, and road and footpath users around the main site entrance on Guildford Road. The LVIA outlines that views of the ROMP area from these representative viewpoints are either screened by landform and/or vegetation or provide minor glimpses and/or filtered views.

105. The County Landscape Officer (CLO) considers that the submitted LVIA is a robust assessment and broadly agrees with its judgements that the proposed four year delay to restoration would not result in significant adverse landscape or visual effects. The CLO acknowledges that the proposed restoration by the end of 2025 would be completed in accordance with the already approved restoration details and masterplan, and therefore is satisfied that the applicable restoration and aftercare conditions will be carried forward where necessary. Accordingly, the CLO raises no objection to the proposal or the LVIA.

106. Officers concur with the LVIA assessment and CLO's views that there will be some limited but not significantly adverse landscape and visual impacts to users of the Public Footpath 121 for the additional temporary period of four years but that this is outweighed by the landscape and visual benefits of the restored site on the wider landscape and area in accordance with the approved restoration details. Accordingly, Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with SMP 2011 Policy MC14, SWLP 2020 Policy 14, WBLP 2018 Policies RE1 and RE3, WBLP SP 2002 Policy D1 and FNP 2020 Policy FNP10 in this regard.



107. In addition to the extension of time sought, this applications also seek to add a new planning condition to secure the removal of the environmental management and monitoring infrastructure within six months of it being decommissioned in the interest of improved planning control and consistency with other permissions at Runfold South Quarry. Officers consider that this application is an appropriate opportunity to include this through a new condition to ensure the plant, when it is no longer necessary, is removed from the site and the landscape.

### *Ecology and biodiversity*

108. The submitted Planning Statement is clear that no significant ecological impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposal and that that the additional time will allow for the site to be restored in accordance with the approved restoration scheme which includes measures to optimise the biodiversity of the approved agricultural restoration. In addition, the applicant seeks to provide additional environmental mitigation for the delayed restoration through the details contained within the submitted Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP).

109. The BEP includes the use of rich grassland species with wildflower interest in the northern field of the ROMP area by very limited grazing in order to retain tussocky grassland attractive to a wide range of ground nesting bird species. Furthermore, the BEP proposed the creation of solitary bee and wasp habitat at the north western end of the mineral conveyor tunnel cutting, additional bat habitat provision in a former WW2 pillbox, and providing dormouse-friendly field gates.

110. In their initial consultation response, the County Enhancement Officer (CEO) supported the provisions of the BEP but considered that this was only sufficient to compensate a two year extension and that further biodiversity seeding of agricultural areas should be explored for four years. In response, the applicant discussed further options with the CEO and it was agreed that it would not be appropriate to agree a specific seed mix at this stage because the nature of the restoration soils are not yet known and could vary across the site depending on the origin of the materials as detailed in the Applicant Amplifying Letter dated 3 September 2021. The CEO confirmed in their reconsultation response to the Applicant Amplifying Letter that their concerns in this regard had been addressed.

111. As the BEP has been produced after the approval of the Aftercare Strategy for the ROMP area, the enhancements lack a management strategy. The letter of representation received raised concerns over the lack of valuing and monitoring of biodiversity net gain across the restoration period and the five year aftercare period. To address this, the applicant has agreed to revised wording of Condition 32 and the submission and approval of an updated Aftercare Strategy to include additional details for the management of the BEP enhancements, and the establishing of a biodiversity baseline and subsequent monitoring of the biodiversity enhancements over the aftercare period.

112. Waverley Borough Council, the County Ecologist and the County Enhancement Officer raise no objection to the proposal in regard to ecology and biodiversity. Officers are satisfied that the proposal will not result in adverse impacts to site ecology and supports the provision of additional enhancements and a revised Aftercare Strategy. Officers consider that the proposal will therefore result in biodiversity enhancements and therefore accords with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policies 13 and 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, Policies D1 and D2 of the WBLP SP 2002, and Policy FNP10 of the FNP 2020.

## *Dust*

113. In the submitted Planning Statement, the applicant explains that the Dust Management Plan (DMP) approved under ref: WA/2020/1925 dated 7 April 2021 identified potential sources, pathways and receptors for dust and established appropriate management measures to control and mitigate the impact of dust arising from the restoration of the ROMP area.
114. The County Air Quality consultant raises no objection to the proposal and explains that the time extension would not have a significant impact on local air quality and agrees that the potential impacts would be appropriately controlled by existing planning conditions. Officers recognise that the proposed methods of restoration will remain the same as approved and it is only the extended impact arising from the proposed four year extension to the restoration deadline which needs to be considered as part of this application. Officers are therefore satisfied that the approved DMP will sufficiently ensure the mitigation of dust impacts arising from the restoration of the ROMP area. To ensure the DMP remains in place and mitigates the impacts of dust for the proposed additional four years, Officers will secure the use of the DMP by way of condition. Accordingly, Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policy 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, and Policies D1 and D2 of the WBLP SP 2002 regarding dust.

## *Noise*

115. The submitted planning statement is clear that three existing noise conditions, which carried forward for the additional four years will ensure noise emissions do not give rise to unacceptable impacts on communities or the environment. These conditions impose a 55dB LAeq noise limit at sensitive receptors, with a higher limit of 70dB LAeq at sensitive receptors during soil stripping and replacement operations. These conditions also request all onsite vehicles and plant to be fitted with silencers and noise minimising reversing warning systems.
116. The County Noise consultant (CNC) raises no objection to the proposal, stating that noise is already being controlled via existing planning conditions, which should be bought forward as is or updated in line with current guidance. The proposed changes are, therefore, unlikely to give rise to significant noise impacts. Officers concur with CNC and consider that the existing noise controls are acceptable as the proposed restoration operations will not change from that already assessed under WA/2018/0016. Officers will carry forward these controls through new conditions and are satisfied that this will ensure noise emissions are controlled and minimised such that they will not result in significantly adverse impacts to sensitive receptors during the proposed additional four years of site operations. Accordingly, Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policy 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, and Policies D1 and D2 of the WBLP SP 2002 regarding noise.

## *Flood risk and surface water drainage*

117. The submitted Planning Statement explains that the restoration of the ROMP area will allow for the implementation of the approved Surface Water Drainage Plan. The placement of material over the historic waste will direct clean surface water passively towards the existing attenuation pond where it can safely soakaway into the groundwater rather than pool within the current void spaces and create contamination issues as detailed in paragraph 83 above.



118. Waverley Borough Council, Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) raise no objections to the proposal in regard to flood risk and surface water drainage, and the LLFA explains that as there is no change to the drainage strategy or Surface Water drainage system, they have no further comments. Officers are satisfied that the proposed extension of time for restoration will not change the design of the onsite surface water drainage plan but will ensure the approved plan can be implemented to ensure flood risk and surface water drainage can be suitably managed without risk of groundwater contamination, and therefore accords with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policy 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, and Policies D1 and D2 of the WBLP SP 2002.

#### *Land stability*

119. The additional four year period will not change the results and actions from the approved assessments under Condition 5 and 6 of the ROMP decision ref: WA/2018/0016, therefore land stability will not be affected by the proposal. Waverley Borough Council and the County Geological Consultant raise no objection to the proposal, and Officers are satisfied that the proposal will not result in adverse land stability impacts in accordance with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policy 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, and Policy D1 of the WBLP SP 2002.

#### *Rights of Way*

120. The submitted Planning Statement explains that Public Footpath 121 which runs from north to south through the Runfold South site will be raised in levels by several metres as part of the approved restoration plan and therefore a further diversion will need to be put in place prior to commencing works in that part of the ROMP area. This diversion will route along the western edge of the ROMP area on the restored eastern edge of Area A and will need to be agreed with Surrey Rights of Way. The proposed extension to the restoration of the ROMP area will prolong the diversion of the Public Footpath but the noise, dust and visual impacts to users of the diverted footpath will remain controlled and mitigated in accordance with the approved details discussed above.

121. Waverley Borough Council has raised no objection to the proposal regarding the public footpath and Rights of Way have no comment to make on the proposal. Officers are satisfied that the prolonged and further diversion of Public Footpath 121 will facilitate the restoration of the site in accordance with the approved restoration details and will not result in any significantly adverse impacts to the footpath users, therefore Officers consider that the proposal accords with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policy 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, and Policy D1 of the WBLP SP 2002.

#### *Residential amenity*

122. As detailed in the Environment and Amenity sections above, neighbouring and local residents views of the ROMP area will continue to be screened by the wider site and boundary vegetation and the relevant management plans will ensure noise and dust impacts are mitigated. Waverley Borough Council raises no objection to the proposal on the ground of adverse residential amenity impact and Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with Policy MC14 of the SMP 2011, Policy 14 of the SWLP 2020, Policy NE1 of the WBLP 2018, and Policies D1 and D2 of the WBLP SP 2002. in this regard.

## HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ACCESS

### **Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP 2011)**

Policy MC15 - Transport for minerals

### **Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 (SWLP 2020)**

Policy 15 – Transport and Connectivity

### **Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 (WBLP 2018)**

Policy ST1 – Sustainable Transport

### **Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2020 (FNP 2020)**

Policy FNP30 - Transport Impact of Development

9

#### *Policy*

123. SMP 2011 Policy MC15 is clear that mineral development involving transportation by road will only be permitted where: (i) there is no practicable alternative to the use of road-based transport that would have a lower impact on communities and the environment; (ii) the highway network is of an appropriate standard for use by the traffic generated by the development or can be suitably improved; and (iii) 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 operation.
124. SWLP 2020 Policy 15 sets out that waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that: i) where practicable and economically viable, the development makes use of rail or water for the transportation of materials to and from the site; and ii) transport links are adequate to serve the development or can be improved to an appropriate standard.
125. Policy 15 further details that where the need for road transport has been demonstrated, the development will ensure that: i) waste is able to be transported using the best roads available, which will usually be main roads and motorways, with minimal use of local roads, unless special circumstances apply; ii) the distance and number of vehicle movements associated with the development are minimised; iii) the residual cumulative impact on the road network of vehicle movements associated with the development will not be severe; iv) there is safe and adequate means of access to the highway network and the vehicle movements associated with the development will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety when compared against current national and local guidance; v) satisfactory provision is made to allow for safe vehicle turning and parking, manoeuvring, loading, electric charging and, where appropriate, wheel cleaning facilities; and vi) low or zero emission vehicles, under the control of the site operator, are used which, where practicable, use fuels from renewable sources.
126. WBLP 2018 Policy ST1 requires that development schemes: (i) are located where opportunities for sustainable transport modes can be maximised, reflecting the amount of movement generated, the nature and location of the site and recognising that solutions and measures will vary from urban to rural locations; (ii) make the necessary contributions to the improvement of existing, and provision of new, transport schemes that lead to improvements in accessibility and give priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, users of public transport, car sharers and users of low and ultra low emission vehicles; (iii) include measures to encourage non-car use such as on-site cycle parking; (iv) ensure development proposals are consistent with, and contribute to the implementation of the Surrey Local Transport Plan; (v) require the submission of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans and other appropriate measures in new developments that generate significant traffic volumes or have

significant impact on the Strategic Road Network; (vi) contribute to transport infrastructure improvements, where appropriate and viable; (vii) are consistent with the objectives and actions within the Air Quality Action Plan; (viii) encourage the provision of new and improved footpaths, bridleways and cycleways, provided there would be no significant effect on SPAs and other areas of importance for nature conservation (Policies NE1 and NE3); and (ix) make appropriate provision for car parking, having regard to the type of development and its location, in accordance with local standards.

127. FNP 2020 Policy FNP30 is clear that proposals will be permitted where they, inter alia, would not significantly add to traffic congestion in the town; would not add inappropriate traffic on rural lanes and would not require highway works or footpaths which would result in unsympathetic change to the character of a rural lane; and would maintain or enhance the existing local footpath and cycle network and where possible extend the network through the site and connect the development to them.

### *Highways, Transport and Access*

128. The submitted Planning Statement is clear that the overall volume of material required to restore the ROMP area will not change with this application and that the only change in traffic terms is the time period within which the vehicle movements relating to waste importation to the site will occur.
129. There have been no significant changes to the highway network standards in the locality and the site access remains as the same as approved under the first periodic review of mineral conditions ref. WA/2018/0016 dated 6 November 2018.
130. The County Highway Authority (CHA) has undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The CHA is also satisfied that the proposed extension of time will not change the overall volume of material required to restore the ROMP area at the site.
131. The CHA considers the proposal will lead to an increase in vehicle movements in relation to waste importation however these movements would be within the levels of traffic movements as seen previously in 2012. The whole Runfold South site has previously generated up to 300 movements. As such, the CHA does not consider that the proposed development will result in a significant increase in vehicular trips on the surrounding highway network. The CHA is also satisfied that the proposal will not have a material impact on highway safety. Accordingly, the CHA has no highway requirements.
132. Waverley Borough Council raises no objection to the proposal and the Surrey Highways Structure Team and Rights of Way consultees raise no comments. While the impacts as a result from the generated traffic for the proposed development will continue for a further year, Officers consider these impacts are not considered significant as they remain the same as previously permitted and is not resulting in an overall extension to the activities at Runfold South and on the local highway as a result of the development on this site.
133. Accordingly, Officers are satisfied that the existing highway and access infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate movements for an additional four years and that the proposal will not result in adverse impact to the highway and highway users safety by virtue of traffic movements. Therefore, Officers consider that the

proposal accords with Policy MC15 of the SMP 2011, Policy 15 of the SWLP 2020 and Policy FNP30 of the FNP 2020.

---

## Human Rights Implications

134. 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.
135. Article 8 of the Convention, one of the most commonly relied upon articles, safeguards the right of the individual to respect for a private and family life. Officers recognise that the proposal is for an extension of time to complete the infilling and restoration of the ROMP area for a period of four years. However, Officers consider this timescale is reasonable and realistic for this site and the circumstances that have led to an extension of time being sought. As such, the Officer's view is that the proposal will have no adverse impact on public amenity and has no human rights implications.

---

## Conclusion

136. The proposal is for the continued restoration of the former mineral workings without compliance with planning permission ref FAR 415/69 dated 11 February 1970 as amended by decision ref WA/2018/0016 dated 6 November 2018 to extend the timescale for infilling and restoration of the ROMP area for a period of four years.
137. Officers recognise there have been factors that have led to a delay in the commencement of infilling and restoration process at the ROMP site and, whilst these have been resolved, has resulted in there being only 4 months before the time limit ceases on 31 December 2021. As such Officers agree an extension of time for infilling and restoration operations is required. Officers are satisfied that the applicant has considered alternative options for the restoration of the site and that the proposal for additional time to facilitate the filling and restoration of the ROMP area in accordance with the approved details represents the best option in terms of benefits gained and minimised impacts in the long term.
138. Officers acknowledge concerns raised by Farnham Town Council, Seale & Sands Parish Council, Moor Park Residents Association, Crooksbury Residents' Association, and the representation received alongside the objection from the County Enhancement Officer regarding the possibility for an earlier restoration date but having explored scenarios described above, Officers do not consider a two year time period would afford sufficient time for the infilling and restoration of the ROMP area. Officers consider that the proposed time period of an additional four years is acceptable and represents an achievable timeframe within which filling and restoration can be completed as this allows sufficient time to import the fill material and restoration soils and undertake the required seeding and planting within the next available planting season following completion of infilling.
139. Officers are satisfied that the infilling operations and subsequent restoration activities will be carried out in accordance with the approved details as secured by conditions and will not result in any significant adverse impact on environment and amenity. Officers consider the biodiversity enhancements proposed in the BEP to be appropriate and that the management and monitoring of biodiversity enhancements shall be secured through conditioning the submission and approval of a revised Aftercare Strategy. Officers are also satisfied that the local highway and existing access will support the vehicle movements associated with the infilling and

restoration of the site and will not result in any significant adverse impacts as a result of traffic movements during the additional four year time period.

140. The relevant statutory development plan for consideration of this application comprises the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011, Surrey Waste Plan Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033, Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018, Waverley Borough Local Plan Saved Policies 2002, and Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2017. In considering the development, Officers have assessed its acceptability against the development plan policies and material considerations in respect of sustainable waste management and mineral restoration; environment and amenity; and highways, traffic and access aspects of the development. All statutory consultees with the exception of the County Enhancement Officer raise no objection or no comment to the proposal. Farnham Town Council, Seale & Sands Parish Council, Moor Park Residents Association, and Crooksbury Residents' Association raise objections to the proposal and one member of the public has made a representation objecting to the proposal. Officers have addressed the concerns raised by objectors in this Officers report.

141. In view of paragraphs 50 to 140, Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with the relevant development plan policy and should therefore be approved.

### **Recommendation**

142. The recommendation is to **PERMIT** planning application ref: **WA/2021/01284** subject to the following conditions:

### **Conditions:**

Approved Plans

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the following plans/drawings:
  - Rsp-LOC-0714-01 rev 3 Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021
  - Rsp-MPP-0714-01e rev E Runfold South Mineral Planning Permissions dated January 2021
  - Rsp-CONT-0518-02 Central Area Proposed Low Level Restoration Contours dated May 2018
  - Rsp-CONT-0518-03 Central Area Proposed Low Level Restoratin Contours Nov 2017 Topo Survey Overlay dated May 2018
  - Rsp-CONT-0518-04 Central Area Isopachyte Contours to show Material Depths Required to Achieve Proposed Restoration Contours dated May 2018
  - Rsp-CS-0518-04 Central Area Proposed Low Level Restoration Contours Cross Sections dated May 2018
  - Rsp-P1-1117 Topographic Survey November 2017 dated November 2017
  - Rsp-PLS-R-0518-01 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (on completion of restoration) dated May 2018 (1:4000 @ A3)
  - Rsp-PLS-R-0518-02 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (at Environmental Permit Surrender) dated May 2018 (1:4000@A3)

- Rsp-PLS-R-0518-03 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (on completion of restoration dated May 2018 (1:2500 @ A3)
- Rsp-PLS-R-0518-04 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (at Environmental Permit Surrender) dated May 2018 (1:2500 @ A3)
- 2445/1/001 rev A Central Restoration Area Surface Water Management Plan dated October 2017
- 2445.4.001 Made Ground Historic Deposits dated 12 July 2018
- 2445.2.003 rev A Central Area Monitoring and Borehole Location Plan dated 04/18
- Rsp-PER-P4-0318 Monitoring Location Plan Perimeter Gas & Groundwater Monitoring Points dated March 2018.
- Rsp-PB-0514-01b Rev B Permit Boundaries dated April 2021
- Rsp-LOC-FAR415-69 Site location Plan dated April 2021
- Rsp-LOC-FAR-REF Mineral Site Review Location Plan dated April 2021

2. From the date of this permission until the cessation of the operations to which it refers, a copy of this permission including all documents hereby approved and any documents subsequently approved in accordance with this permission, shall be displayed (made available) at the offices on the site, and shall be made known to any person(s) given the responsibility for the management or control of operations.

#### Duration

3. The development hereby permitted shall cease on or before 31 December 2025 by which date all offices, hardstandings, internal access roads shall be removed and the site shall be restored in accordance with plans Rsp-PLS-R-0518-01 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (on completion of restoration) dated May 2018 (1:4000 @ A3), Rsp-PLS-R-0518-02 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (at Environmental Permit Surrender) dated May 2018 (1:4000@A3), Rsp-PLS-R-0518-03 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (on completion of restoration dated May 2018 (1:2500 @ A3) and Rsp-PLS-R-0518-04 Proposed Restoration Masterplan (at Environmental Permit Surrender) dated May 2018 (1:2500 @ A3); and any subsequent details required by this permission.

#### Hours of Working

4. No operations or activities shall be carried out, and no light except intermittent security lighting within the plant and office areas shall be illuminated, except between 0730 and 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0730 and 1300 hours on a Saturday and there shall be no working on Sundays or Public, Bank and National Holidays.

#### Settlement Assessment

5. The placement of infill material shall be carried out in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2019/1441 dated 9 April 2020 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

#### Groundwater and Gas Investigation and Contamination



6. Earthworks and infilling shall be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2020/1926 dated 12 July 2021 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.
7. In the event that contamination that was not previously identified is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, a detailed assessment of the unexpected contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority including:
  - a. a survey of the extent, scale and nature of the contamination;
  - b. an assessment of the potential risks to previously identified receptors, and;
  - c. if necessary an appraisal of remedial and mitigation options, and the proposed remediation strategy in accordance with the UK Government Guidance on Land contamination risk management (LCRM) How to assess and manage the risks from land contamination. Land contamination risk management (LCRM) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm>

Where remediation or mitigation is necessary to bring the ground to a condition suitable for the intended use or to suitably reduce the risks to identified receptors (for example, human health or controlled waters), a detailed scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority which shall include the scope of works to be undertaken, timetable of works, objectives, site management procedures, remediation criteria and a verification plan. The remediation or mitigation shall be completed in accordance with the approved plan.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme for the unexpected contamination, a verification report shall be submitted in writing within 21 days of completion the County Planning Authority for written approval.

#### Former Mineral Conveyor Tunnel

8. The creation of an alternative bat habitat and bat mitigation measures shall be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA2019/2022 dated 18 February 2020 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.
9. Prior to the commencement of infilling works to the former mineral conveyor tunnel located under the Guildford Road (C119) as shown on plan Rsp-MPP-0714-01b rev B Runfold South Minerals Planning Permission dated July 2018, a bat survey shall be undertaken by a licenced bat worker to ascertain whether bats are present. If any bats are found they should be removed to a place of safety and released that evening, with details submitted to the County Planning Authority within 72 hours of such taking place.
10. Prior to the commencement of infilling works to the former mineral conveyor tunnel located under the Guildford Road (C119) as shown on plan Rsp-MPP-0714-01b rev B Runfold South Minerals Planning Permission dated July 2018, a scheme detailing how the former conveyor tunnel is to be infilled shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of a method statement detailing how the former conveyor tunnel will be filled, a verification plan and a verification report. Infilling of the former conveyor tunnel shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.



11. Prior to the commencement of infilling works to the former mineral conveyor tunnel located under the Guildford Road (C119) as shown on plan Rsp-MPP-0714-01b rev B Runfold South Mineral Planning Permission dated July 2018, a Section 278 agreement shall be entered into with the County Highway Authority for the permanent decommissioning of the former conveyor tunnel and agreement of suitable structural material to ensure the future structural support to the public highway is maintained together with all associated works and any associated works needed to keep Guildford Road (C119) in a safe and stable condition.

#### Limitations

12. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary under Part 17 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent Order
  - a) no plant, building or machinery where fixed or moveable shall be erected on the application site without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority in respect of the siting, design, specification and appearance of the installation, such details to include the predicted levels of noise emission, and their tonal characteristics.

#### Highways, Traffic and Access

13. Sole vehicular access to the site shall be via the existing access onto the Guildford Road.
14. The access shall be maintained in a clean condition and wheel cleaning facilities maintained and operated in such a manner as to prevent the deposit and spread of extraneous material on the public highway.
15. No loaded lorries shall enter or leave the site un-sheeted.

#### Noise

16. Noise from the permitted operation shall not exceed 55dB LAeq, 1 hour when measured at (or calculated as at) a height of about 1.2m and at least 3.5m from the façade of any noise sensitive property, except during the soil stripping/ replacement operations when noise shall not exceed 70dB LAeq 1 hour at noise sensitive properties.
17. All vehicles and plant on site shall be fitted with silencers in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendation and shall operate to minimise noise emissions.
18. All moveable plant and machinery based on site shall be fitted with a reversing warning system which will minimise, as far as reasonably practical and subject to maintaining safety, the generation and level of noise emissions from that system.

#### Dust

19. Infilling operations within the central area shall be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2020/1925 dated 7 April 2021 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

#### Infilling, Landscaping and Restoration

20. Infilling operations shall be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2021/0008 dated 26 April 2021 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.
21. There shall be no removal, damage or destruction to the existing hedgerows, trees, woodland or areas of grass which line the perimeter of the application site and/ or are present within the application site outside of the areas of infilling operations. During the period of operation any such hedgerows trees, woodland or areas of grass which die, or are severely damaged or diseased as a result of restoration operations shall be replaced/ made good with the same species of equivalent age and size within 1 year of their death, damage or disease or during the next available planting season, whichever the soonest.
22. No material other than clean, inert waste or non-waste material shall be used in the reclamation of the area defined as the Central Area as shown on plan Rsp-CONT-0518-02 Central Area Proposed Low Level Restoration Contours dated May 2018. The area defined as the Central Area as shown on plan Rsp-CONT-0518-02 shall be progressively filled in accordance with the infilling and restoration scheme submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2021/0008 dated 26 April 2021.

#### Drainage

23. Surface water drainage shall be undertaken during ground disturbance, earthworks and infilling shall be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2021/0477 dated 20 May 2021 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.
24. On completion of the top soiling, forming of batters and grass-seeding, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer to demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme carried out by a qualified drainage engineer shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

#### Surface and Groundwater Protection

25. No solid matter shall be deposited so that it passes or is likely to pass into any watercourse.

#### Soils

26. No site vehicles shall run on soil surfaces in the course of restoration or on restored land unless engaged in restoration works.
27. Subsoil and topsoil shall not be used for the purposes of restoration unless they are in a suitably dry and friable condition to prevent compaction.
28. No rocks/ large stones exceeding 150mm in any dimension or other deleterious material to be within 900mm of the surface before topsoil is replaced.
29. All soil and soil forming materials shall be handled in accordance with MAFF's Good Practice Guide for Handling Soil 2000, Sheets 1 - 4 (handling soil using excavators and dump trucks) See:

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090306103114/http://www.defra.gov.uk/arm/environment/land-use/soilguid/index.htm>

Soil compaction arising as a result of restoration shall be remediated in accordance with Sheet 19 of the above guidance (soil decompaction by bulldozer drawn tines). Plant or vehicle movements shall be confined to clearly defined haul routes or to the infill surface and shall not cross areas of topsoil or subsoil except for the express purposes of soil stripping or replacement operations.

30. Pre-settlement restoration levels for topsoil shall be marked out with profile boards at 50m centres. In any part of the site where settlement occurs during the restoration and aftercare periods, any depression shall be filled to the final settled contours specified in the scheme of restoration with suitable soil as may be agreed beforehand in writing with the County Planning Authority.
31. Imported soil use and management shall be undertaken in accordance with the details submitted and approved under planning permission ref: WA/2019/0763 dated 24 July 2019 and shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

#### Aftercare

32. Within six months of the date of this permission an updated Aftercare Strategy shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority in writing for written approval. The aftercare shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme for a period of five years from the completion of restoration. The updated Aftercare Strategy shall establish the existing biodiversity baseline and include details of enhancement monitoring, management and maintenance. The annual Aftercare Report shall include an update on biodiversity changes during the preceding 12 months.

#### Environmental management and monitoring infrastructure

33. Within six months of the decommissioning of the gas and leachate control system, all fixed and mobile plant, structures and access tracks no longer required shall be removed and the land reinstated in accordance with the approved restoration plan.

#### Progression of Infilling

34. Within six months of the date of this permission and then every six months after that until completion of infilling operations at the site, details of the progress of infilling and restoration within the area as shown on plan Rsp-LOC-FAR415-69 Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021 and Rsp-LOC-0714-01 rev 3 Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021 shall be submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority for review. The details shall include information on the rate of infilling that has taken place over the six months preceding the date of the submission, where the infilling has taken place, any limitations or information experienced on obtaining infill and restoration materials and actions that may be taken to remedy any delay.
35. Within the first month of May following the date of this permission and then every May and November after that until completion of filling operations at the site, details of a topography survey within the area as shown on plan Rsp-LOC-FAR415-69 Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021 and Rsp-LOC-0714-01 rev 3 Mineral Review Site Location Plan dated April 2021 shall be submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority for review.

#### 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 Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14, Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1 and Waverley Local Plan Part 1 Policy RE1.

2. 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 the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14, Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1 and Waverley Local Plan Part 1 Policy RE1.
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 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC17, Waverley Local Plan 2002 and Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 Policy FNP10.
4. 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 the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14, Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1 and Waverley Local Plan Part 1 Policy RE1.
5. In the interests of the environment, local amenity and human health in accordance with Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
6. In the interests of local amenity, the environment and/or human health pursuant to Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1.
7. In the interests of the environment, local amenity and human health in accordance with Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
8. In the interests of amenity and wildlife conservation in accordance with the terms of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
9. In the interests of amenity and wildlife conservation in accordance with the terms of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
10. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC15 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy M2.
11. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC15 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy M2.
12. To safeguard the environment and protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with the terms of Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policies MC3 and MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.

13. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC15 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy M2.
14. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC15 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy M2.
15. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC15 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy M2.
16. To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1.
17. To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1.
18. To ensure the minimum disturbance and avoid nuisance to the locality to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1.
19. In the interests of local amenity, the environment and/or human health pursuant to Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC14, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1.
20. To secure restoration to the required standard and assist in absorbing the site back into the local landscape to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and pursuant to Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC17, Waverley Local Plan 2002 Policy C6 and Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 Policy FNP10.
21. To enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development so as to safeguard the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with the terms of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
22. To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the operation in the interests of local amenities and to ensure the protection of the water environment in accordance with the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
23. In accordance with paragraph 166 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 to ensure that flood risk is not increased onsite or elsewhere; and Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 and Policy CC4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018.
24. To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time in accordance with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC17, Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14 and Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 Policy D1.

25. In order to prevent the risk of pollution of surface and groundwater supplies and to accord with Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
26. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to secure restoration of the site to a condition capable of beneficial afteruse to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policies MC3 and MC17.
27. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to secure restoration of the site to a condition capable of beneficial afteruse to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policies MC3 and MC17.
28. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to secure restoration of the site to a condition capable of beneficial afteruse to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policies MC3 and MC17.
29. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to secure restoration of the site to a condition capable of beneficial afteruse to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policies MC3 and MC17.
30. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to secure restoration of the site to a condition capable of beneficial afteruse to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policies MC3 and MC17.
31. To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to secure restoration of the site to a condition capable of beneficial afteruse to comply with Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policies MC3 and MC17.
32. To secure restoration to the required standard and assist in absorbing the site back into the local landscape to comply with Schedule 5 paragraph 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and pursuant to Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 Policy MC17, Waverley Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 Policies RE1 and RE3, Waverley Local Plan 2002 Policy C6 and Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 Policy FNP10.
33. To safeguard the environment and protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with the terms of Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policies MC3 and MC14 and Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 Policies 2019-2033 Policy 14.
34. 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 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC17, Waverley Local Plan 2002 and Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 Policy FNP10.
35. 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 Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Core Strategy Policy MC17, Waverley Local Plan 2002 and Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 Policy FNP10.



## Informatives:

1. In determining this application the County Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant by: entering into pre-application discussions; assessing the proposals against relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework including its associated planning practice guidance and European Regulations, providing feedback to the applicant where appropriate. Further, the County 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. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

2. The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (Section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or is being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this Act.

Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1 March and 31 August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity during this period and shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

3. Any alteration to, or replacement of, the existing boundary with the public right of way, or erection of new fence lines, must be done in consultation with the Surrey County Council Rights of Way/Countryside Access Team. Please give at least 3 weeks' notice.
4. Access along a public right of way by contractors' vehicles, plant or deliveries can only be allowed if the applicant can prove that they have a vehicular right. Surrey County Council's Rights of Way/Countryside Access Team will look to the applicant to make good any damage caused to the surface of the rights of way connected with the development.
5. The applicant is reminded that the granting of planning permission does not authorise the obstruction or interference with a public right of way.
6. For soils containing more than 18% clay the criteria for determining dry and friable shall be based on a field assessment of the soils wetness in relation to its lower plastic limit according to the following test. 'An assessment shall be made by attempting to roll a ball of soil into a thread on the surface of a clean plain glazed tile (or plate glass square) using light pressure from the flat of the hand. If a long thread of less than 3mm diameter can be formed, the soil is wetter than the lower plastic limit and soil moving should not take place until the soils have dried out. If the soil crumbles before a long thread of 3mm diameter can be formed, then the soil is dry enough to move. This assessment shall be carried out on representative samples on each major soil type. For all soil types (including sand loams, loamy sands and sands) no soil handling should proceed during and shortly after significant rainfall, and/ or when there are any puddles on the soil surface'.
7. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any



expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecute persistent offenders (Highways Act 1980 Section 131, 148, 149).

8. Notwithstanding any permission granted under the Planning Acts, no signs, devices or other apparatus may be erected within the limits of the highway without the express approval of the Highway Authority. It is not the policy of the Highway Authority to approve the erection of signs or other devices of a non-statutory nature within the limits of the highway.
9. Attention is drawn to the requirements of Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and to the Code of Practice for Access of the Disabled to Buildings (British Standards Institution Code of Practice BS 8300:2009) or any prescribed document replacing that code.
10. All works need to meet the criteria set the out in the Environment Agency's Groundwater Protection publication:  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection>
11. In accordance with Paragraph 10(1) of Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 1995 these conditions shall come into effect when this application is finally determined - i.e. all proceedings on the application, including appeals to the Secretary of State and the High Court have been determined, and the time period for any further appeal has expired.

---

**Contact Stephanie King**

**Tel. no. 020 8541 9525**

---

### **Background papers**

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

For this application, the deposited application documents and plans, and response to consultations, are available to view on [our online register](#). The representations received are publicly available to view on the district/borough planning register. The Waverley Borough Council planning register entry for this application can be found under:

- [WA/2021/01284](#)

### **Other documents**

The following were also referred to in the preparation of this report:

#### **Government Guidance**

[National Planning Policy Framework](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance](#)

[National Planning Policy for Waste](#)

#### **The Development Plan**

[Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033](#)

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

[Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018](#)

[Waverley Borough Local Plan Saved Policies 2002](#)

[Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2020](#)

---



This page is intentionally left blank