

Annex 1 – Non-Representative Stakeholder Comments

A selection of non-representative comments made by stakeholders in response to the Issues and Options consultation.

- “Prior to this I was pretty uneducated in these things, it is not something that my attention is really drawn to. I think the fact that I’ve been called to participate in this shows that things are moving in the right direction in terms of getting people educated.”
- “It was illuminating to see the sites we have in the county where such stuff is actually produced, I guess I had never really thought about it before. I guess it is the sheer breadth and width of what any county in the UK would be expected to produce, you don’t think in great depth about what we need and how we use it.”
- “I was amazed just at how much work the council does behind the scenes. One thing that really sort of pricked my imagination if you like, was using the railways for transport. It was always in the back of my mind that all the big heavy lorries, if they could be taken off the roads it would help maintain the road surfaces, because they are the ones that break up the road surface. If all the freights could be carried on the railways at night, when there’s obviously no commuting and the railways are sort of standing idly by if you like, waiting for all this stuff to be moved around, then it’s only the short journeys from the depots to where the goods are actually required.”
- “...the Council would first like to congratulate SCC in moving towards a digital and interactive consultation format. The breaking down of documents into series, the interactive story, and infographic, we are sure will make the subject matter more accessible and has hopefully increased the level of responses received from County residents and local businesses.”
- “I found it hard to add meaningful comment on the questions without the necessary detailed background knowledge to provide an informed opinion. Let us hope that the survey for the next stage will provide a more practical insight to SCC’s intentions.”
- “The consultation documentation is overwhelming and 140 pages long. For ordinary people that don’t know much about it, it’s very overwhelming. I think there needs to be public meetings where things are explained very much in layman’s terms, without the use of jargon, so that people can understand more about it. This is all very subjective, and it needs to be people invited to understand it in simpler terms rather than expecting people to go through a long document.”

- “It all reads nice, but you think well ok, what’s the bits behind it? And it mentions Government requirements and that every time I keep seeing Government is Surrey County Council actually doing it because they want to do it, they feel it’s right, and they’ve got the resource to do it, or is it because they’ve got to actually fit in with the Government requirements?”
- “While we generally support the vision and objectives, we feel that more protection is needed for rural communities, the environment and landscapes and some assurance should be given that indicates the ability of communities to challenge decisions should sites and locations be designated by the plan.”
- “It is apparent that the emerging MWLP aims to strike a balance between protecting the environment and local communities whilst adhering to Government strategy and policy.”
- “North-West Surrey has been subject to extensive gravel extraction in the past and is the most densely populated part of the county. Residents live with airborne pollution at dangerously high levels. We ask that Surrey County Council ensures that all mineral workings in North-West Surrey will be at least 1000m away from residential settlements or schools.”
- “There are a couple of gravel pits that have actually been turned into nature reserves which is a fantastic thing for the public, for our children. But unfortunately, it’s a very small minority in comparison to all the quarries that are actually in the area. I live in Farnham which is in the south of the County.”
- “[We] are particularly encouraged to note that the Plan will seek to provide sufficient waste management capacity, whilst encouraging the prevention of waste and promoting the reuse, recycling, and recovery of waste over disposal. However, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, providing a sufficient waste management capacity to meet identified needs is the minimum requirement.”
- “Whilst there may well be limited opportunities for the movement of waste by sustainable modes, it is all the more important that where opportunities exist for the sustainable movement of waste by the railway, they should be maximised and form a key element of the Plan’s spatial strategy.”
- “Requiring more than 10% net gain for minerals specifically would not provide the ‘level playing field’ that Defra and Natural England are advocating through the use of the BNG Metric and would unfairly prejudice what is temporary development. It is notable that the level of biodiversity net gain set out in the act has been consulted upon and agreed in order to secure the aims of the wider aims of legislation. Suggesting increasing this for a specific industry goes against legislation. Perversely the minerals industry arguably delivers more biodiversity

benefit than any other industry in the UK as championed by the Mineral Products Association.”

- “Biodiversity net gain should be maximised and should be required to be fully aligned to the Surrey Nature Recovery Strategy (which should be in place when this policy framework is approved).“
- “It is Important to ensure that the impact on residents remains a primary concern. Human and ecological receptors whilst in combination are impactful, they should also be considered separately when assessing these. Restoration plans should be used to set out the benefits to be secured and tied to the end of the workings of the site in a timely fashion to ensure that these can be brought forward as quickly as possible. There remain several sites which have had further permissions, and this has pushed the date for restoration back, further delaying these benefits being secured for local residents.”
- “The Council supports targets for increased recycling and to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. However, these increases must be done in a sustainable way and not at the expense of locating new facilities in inappropriate locations. There appears to be limited information make reference to regard to the forecasts and further detail to demonstrate the increases proposed would be of great value.”
- “I’m interested in waste and waste management. I think we should be looking at reducing the amount of waste rather than just thinking well, ok. I appreciate there’s going to be an increase in population, but we should be working much harder at reducing the waste rather than just saying well, it’s going to increase, and we’ve got to find places to deal with it.”
- “Unfortunately, the Climate Change Statement is currently written in a way which seeks to downplay the role of the MWLP in mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change. We encourage the Council to reconsider this framing. Given the absolute urgency of addressing this issue it is imperative that the MWLP recognises and embraces its responsibilities.”
- “In the face of climate change and the major role that oil and gas plays in causing it there is growing pressure from a variety of voices for the Government to end exploration for these fossil fuels now. This should be recognised within Strategic objective 11 which relates to oil and gas development, as should the Government’s commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in line with delivering net-zero by 2050.”
- “I’ve been living in this area probably about 40 years, something like that, and this is the first time I’ve ever been involved in anything where it shows the council actually gives two hoots about what the residents actually think. I’m not

sure they have done over all these years but I actually think it's a positive that we're actually doing this call this morning, in regard to them wanting some feedback in regard to their plans."

- "I'm 52 years old and this is the first time I've ever been approached to do something like this in my life so I'm very pleased that we've all been asked. We've all got our own different expertise and our own different perspectives and it's about joining them up to try to come up with a consensus that will work for all of us."