

To: Planning & Regulatory Committee

Date: 29 March 2023

By: Planning Development Manager

District(s) Woking Borough Council

Electoral Division(s):

Woking South

Mr Forster

Case Officer:

Jessica Darvill

Purpose: For Decision

Grid Ref: 500320 154346

Title: Waste Application Reference: WO/2020/0993

10

Summary Report

Elm Nursery, Sutton Green Road, Sutton Green, Guildford, Surrey GU4 7QD

The installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective)

The application site, which is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, measures some 0.39 hectares (ha) and forms part of Elm Nursery which comprises of an area approximately 3.1ha in area. The application site comprises of an open yard area and is an established waste management facility, permitted under planning permission WO/2015/0605 18 August 2016 (the extant permission). The application site is not subject to any international, European, national or local designations with reference to nature conservation, landscape or heritage. It does, however, sit adjacent to the north-western corner of Sutton Park Conservation Area, and Sutton Park which is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden located some 0.25 kilometres (km) to the south beyond Sutton Green Road and a block of woodland, and there are ten Grade II Listed Buildings located within some 0.5km of the application site. The application site is within Flood Zone 1.

The application site is located on the northern half of Elm Nursery adjacent to its eastern boundary which is shared with the residential curtilage of Sutton Ridge House. There is an established hedgerow some 2 metres (m) in height between the application site and the residential curtilage.

The proposal seeks consent for the installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container. The application is in part retrospective in that the office building, welfare building, CCTV cameras on columns, fuel storage tanks, electricity generator and fuel storage container are already installed /sited on the application site.

The applicant states that the office use is for the co-ordination of operations at the application site and the associated arboricultural business, and that the adjacent welfare building has been installed as a necessary welfare addition which could not be accommodated within the existing main barn building.

The CCTV cameras (six in total) are located on aluminium poles, which are approximately 5m in height each. The CCTV cameras have been installed for the security purposes and have been positioned so they do not point outside of the application site. The fuel container and fuel storage tanks are required to service vehicles, plant and machinery associated with the permitted use of the land.

The applicant has also identified a need for an electricity generator on site as the shared supply with the adjacent nursery is insufficient for the site's operation. The generator is situated adjacent to the welfare unit to the south of the site and is proposed to be used for power loading equipment for one hour at the start of the day and one hour prior to closure.

An existing external storage bay is situated to the north of the main barn like structure (permitted under planning permission WO/2015/0605), and this application proposes two more open storage bays are to be sited in this location of similar size for additional storage of arboricultural waste-as there is currently insufficient space for machinery and efficient storage of wood within the permitted barn building. The open storage of wood that is currently located to the north of the proposed bays will be stored within the proposed open storage bays.

The applicant is not proposing an increase in the annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste, and the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end users. No changes to the existing permitted operational hours of the site are proposed.

The existing permission for the site (WO/2015/0605) permits vehicles and personnel access to the site 30 minutes before and after the permitted operational times (from 07:30 hours and until 17:30 hours). As part of this application the applicant is also seeking an additional half an hour relief at the start and end of each weekday (Monday to Friday) to allow staff and cars to enter the site from 07:00 hours and vacate the site by 18:00 hours during the weekday. The applicant explains that this will allow staff to review the day's planned activities and prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hour.

No objections have been received from Woking Borough Council and no objections have been received from any of the technical consultees subject to appropriate conditions regarding use of the site, access hours, noise limits and hours of use for the generator. The County Planning Authority (CPA) has received one representation objecting to this proposal on the grounds of inappropriate use of the site within the site's location in the conservation area and residential area, intensification of the development and protection of local area, request for the material change of use to be dealt with by Woking Borough Council and objection raised against the applicant applying for a retrospective application.

A key issue in determining this application is the need for the development and the Authority must also be satisfied that the potential impacts arising from the development are acceptable in terms of the closest residential properties and the local environment and amenities. The assessment in the report covers such environmental and amenity issues as noise, visual impact, impact on heritage, highways and traffic and drainage alongside impact on the Green Belt. Officers consider that the proposal as it is now submitted should enable high environmental standards to be maintained. Officers are satisfied that the applicant has advanced factors that amount to very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness and any other harm. Officers recommend the application be permitted.

The recommendation is to GRANT planning permission ref: WO/2020/0993 subject to conditions.

Application details

Applicant

Redwood Tree Services

Date application valid

28 October 2020

Period for Determination

27 January 2021, extension of time agreed until 14 April 2023

Amending Documents

- Measurements of proposed structures (redacted) dated 9 November 2020
- Drawing ref: A800 'Drainage System Plan' dated 15 February 2021
- Approved Drainage Details Elm Nursery Technical Note- Drainage dated 18 November 2016 (this information is already approved under planning permission WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017 and is just for point of reference)
- Condition 11 Details Letter from Redwood Tree Services dated 6 December 2016 (this information is already approved under planning permission WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017 and is just for point of reference)
- Elm Nursery Sustainable Drainage System Details (PDF) dated 23 February 2021 [SUPERSEDED]
- Elm Nursery Sustainable Drainage Systems Details (PDF) [undated] now been superseded by **Elm Nursery Sustainable Drainage Systems Details dated 26 March 2021**
- Elm Nursery NSL Plant Impact Noise Assessment (document ref: 89955, rev. 00) dated 8 June 2021
- Elm Nursery Drainage Details [undated] now been superseded by **Elm Nursery – Drainage Details dated 21 September 2021**
- Drainage details (email) dated 10 October 2022
- Drawing ref: 08 'Barn Drainage Systems' dated 18 May 2022
- Drawing ref: 09 'Sewage System Drainage' dated 18 May 2022
- Drawing ref: 10 'Officer Facilities Drainage' dated 18 May 2022
- Drawing ref:11 'Fuel Storage and Drainage Systems as Recommended by EA' dated 18 May 2022
- Email from Applicant Confirming Structure Sizes dated 17 November 2022
- Heritage Statement [undated] has now been superseded by **Heritage Statement dated August 2020**

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.

Issue	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Waste Management (Need)	Yes	35 - 65
Landscape and Visual Impact	Yes	66 - 80
Impact on Environment and Amenity (Including Noise)	Yes	81 - 108
Impact on Heritage	Yes	109 - 152

Flood Risk and Drainage	Yes	153 – 169
Highways, Traffic and Access	Yes	170 – 184
Metropolitan Green Belt	Yes	185 – 206

Illustrative material

Site Plan

Elm Nursery Plan 1

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1: Surrounding Area

Aerial 2: Application Site

Site Photographs

Figure 1: Accessing the site from the site entrance Jan 2023

Figure 2: Looking at the northern side of the site Jan 2023

Figure 3: Existing barn building on the eastern side permitted under WO/2015/0605 photo taken Jan 2023

Figure 4: Existing barn building permitted under WO/2015/0605 photo taken Jan 2023

Figure 5: Fuel storage tanks to the west side of site Jan 2023

Figure 6: Fuel storage tanks to the west side of the site Jan 2023

Figure 7: Looking at south east corner of the site with existing barn building Jan 2023

Figure 8: Looking southwards of the site with the car parking area Jan 2023

Figure 9: Electricity generator to south of site Jan 2023

Figure 10: Looking northwards from the south of the site Jan 2023

Figure 11: Office and welfare buildings to the south of site Jan 2023

Figure 12: Existing permitted open storage bays Jan 2023

Figure 13: Looking at the site from the northern boundary Jan 2023

Figure 14: Eastern boundary of the site next to Sutton Ridge House Jan 2023

Figure 15 – Looking at northern boundary June 2022

Figure 16 – Open storage bays June 2022

Figure 17 – Main hard standing area June 2022

Figure 18 – Looking towards south of site June 2022

Background

Site Description

1. The application site, which is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, measures some 0.39 hectares (ha)¹ and forms part of Elm Nursery which comprises of an area approximately 3.1ha in area. The application site comprises of an open yard area adjacent to greenhouse type structures and other ancillary buildings within the nursery.
2. Elm Nursery ('the nursery') is an existing and longstanding horticultural nursery which includes various buildings, structures and land-uses including several large poly-tunnels, a large greenhouse, a farm shop² with a small café, a petting zoo, a number of demountable buildings, a car-park for some 30-40 cars, and a dwelling belonging to the landowner(s).

¹ Including the access track to and from Sutton Green Road

² Which has been operational since 1982

3. The nursery is a rectangular shaped parcel of land which is well defined and enclosed by established planting along its boundaries. Additionally, there are a number of blocks of established planting within the nursery including directly north³ and north-west of the application site⁴. The land surrounding the nursery is primarily used for agricultural and residential purposes. The nursery itself is bounded by agricultural fields to the north, a dwelling and its curtilage to the east, Sutton Green Road to the south, and an agricultural field with associated buildings to the west with Whitmoor House beyond⁵.
4. The application site is located on the northern half of the nursery adjacent to its eastern boundary which is shared with the residential curtilage of Sutton Ridge House. Sutton Ridge House is some 65m from the south eastern corner of the application site. Public Footpath No. 38, agricultural fields and Tadpole House⁶ lie beyond this dwelling to the east. Vehicular access to the application site is gained via Sutton Green Road.
5. The application site is not subject to any international, European, national or local designations with reference to nature conservation, landscape or heritage. It does, however, sit adjacent to the north-western corner of Sutton Park Conservation Area.

Planning History

6. In August 2016 Surrey County Council granted planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016 (the extant permission) for the material change of use from agriculture to use involving importation, storage, processing and transfer of wood waste for biofuel. Erection of building for associated storage and welfare facilities.
7. Planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 was subject to seventeen conditions to control a range of matters, including the appearance of the building, hours of operation, permitted development rights, noise, drainage, plant and waste management. In November 2016, details were submitted by the applicant pursuant to Conditions 8, 11, 13 and 14 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 detailed 18 August 2016. The details included a mitigation scheme to reduce and manage noise from the use of the wood chipper; a scheme for disposing surface water; details of a 'scheme' of screening planting comprised of mature native planting of local provenance across the full extent of the eastern boundary of the application site; and the colours to be used on the external surfaces of all new structures to be constructed on the application site. These details were approved by virtue of decision notice ref: WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017.
8. In May 2020 a Non-material Amendment (NMA) application to planning permission ref: WO/2015/0608 dated 18 August 2016 was approved (planning ref: WO/2020/0018). The approved NMA allowed for a 20cm increase in height to height to the roof pitch of the permitted building, an overall increase of 8cm to the height of the permitted building, alterations to the western façade of the building (removal of one roller-shutter door) and the extension of the roof by 5 metres to cover the entire chip area.

The proposal

9. Consent is sought for the installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective). The application is in part retrospective in that the office building, welfare building, CCTV cameras on columns, fuel storage tanks, electricity generator and fuel storage container are already installed /sited on the application site. These structures are detailed below.

³ A band of coniferous trees

⁴ Mixed woodland coppice

⁵ Some 270m distant

⁶ Some 185m distant

10. To the east of the application site lies an existing barn like structure which is used for storage purposes (permitted under WO/2015/0605). To the south is a container style building used as an office with an adjacent smaller container style building (welfare building) containing staff toilets. The office is approximately 6.1meters (m) (length) x 2.4m (width) x 2.4m (height) in size, whilst the welfare building measures approximately 3m (length) x 1.8m (width) x 2.4m (height) in size. The applicant proposes that the office use is for the co-ordination of operations at the application site and the associated arboricultural business, and that the adjacent welfare building has been installed as a necessary welfare addition which could not be accommodated within the existing main barn building.
11. To the west of the application site lies a fuel container and two fuel storage tanks (approximately 2.5m in length and 1.75m in height (each)). The fuel container and fuel storage tanks are required to service vehicles, plant and machinery associated with the permitted use of the land.
12. An external storage bay is situated to the north of the barn like structure which was permitted under WO/2015/0605, and this application proposes two more open storage bays are to be sited at this location. The two open storage bays proposed are to be approximately 9.1m (length) x 9.1m (width) x 3m (height); and 18.3m (length) x 9.1 (width) x 3m (height) in size. The applicant states that the two additional open storage bays are proposed for additional storage of arboricultural waste-as there is currently insufficient space for machinery and efficient storage of wood within the permitted barn building. The open storage of wood that is located to the north of the proposed bays will be stored within the proposed open storage bays.
13. The applicant is not proposing an increase in the annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste (as permitted under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605), and the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end users.
14. Six CCTV cameras on aluminium poles (approximately 5m in height each) have been installed for the security purposes. The CCTV cameras and poles have been in place on all four corners of the application site, with one also placed in the centre of the application site next to the main barn building and one to the west of the site next to the fuel storage container. The CCTV cameras have been positioned so they do not point outside of the application site.
15. The applicant has also identified a need for an electricity generator on site as the shared supply with the adjacent nursery is insufficient for the site's operation. The generator is to be situated within the south west corner of the existing barn type building and is proposed to be used to power loading equipment for one hour at the start of the day and one hour prior to closure. The electricity generator is housed within a dark green metal container which is approximately 2.5m in length and 2m in height. Further details of the generator's specification have been included as part of the application.
16. In addition, the application site is only permitted to be accessed by vehicles and personnel 30 minutes before the permitted operational times and is required to be closed in all respects no later than 30 minutes after permitted operational times (as per Condition 4 of planning permission WO/2015/0605). The applicant is seeking an additional half an hour relief at the start and end of each weekday (Monday to Friday). This will allow staff and vehicles to enter the site from 07:00 hours and vacate the site by 18:00 hours (on weekdays). The applicant explains that this will allow staff to review the day's planned activities and prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hour. Otherwise, no changes are proposed to the permitted hours of operation associated with the existing use.

Consultations and publicity

District Council

17. Woking Borough Council No objection, subject to appropriate conditions regarding use of the site and surface water drainage to safeguard neighbouring amenity, and restricting hours of use.

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

18. Woking Borough Health Officer No objection, subject to appropriate conditions regarding restricting hours of access to the site and hours of use of the generator and noise restrictions.
19. Affinity Water Ltd No comments received.
20. Thames Water No comments received.
21. Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) No objection.
22. County Historic Building Officer No objection.
23. County Archaeological Officer No objection
24. Historic England No comments to make on the proposal.
25. Environment Agency No objection.
26. County Noise Consultee No objection, recommended that noise conditions brought forward are in line with current legislation and use of the generator is accordance with hours of use, and a condition is introduced to limit hours of use of the generator
27. County Highway Authority No objection.
28. County Landscape Architect No objection.

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

29. Sutton Green Association No comments received.

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

30. The application was publicised by the posting of 2 site notices and an advert was placed in the Surrey Advertiser on the 30 November 2020. A total of 1 of owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. The site notices were erected on the 12 November 2020. To date 1 representation has been received by the County Planning Authority (CPA).
31. The representation received can be summarised as follows:
- a.) Objection to the location of the site and inappropriate use of the site within the context of the Green Belt, the adjacency to a conservation area, residential house, and fields with horses. This goes against Woking Borough Council's approach which focuses on protecting the Green Belt.

- 10
- b.) Previous assessment of the Green Belt under WO/2015/0605 did not interpret the sequential test correctly and did not require the applicant to look at sites that had industrial use or more in keeping with the local environment.
 - c.) Objection to the proposal on multiple grounds previously and would not wish to see the development intensified. Intensification would be out of character with the local environment and Green Belt.
 - d.) Clarity regarding why Surrey County Council are dealing with the request for B1 and welfare facilities which were given consent for in the original consent and these should be handled and determined by Woking Borough Council. Noted that Woking Borough Council originally objected to the original consent on the grounds of protecting the Green Belt and the agricultural and residential nature of the area.
 - e.) Objection to how the applicant is applying for a retrospective application with installing and operating prior to planning consent.
 - f.) Objection raised regarding the actual use of the site, with concern that it is used for vehicle storage and maintenance site, where timber and chipping is temporarily held before loading into vast lorries that are to be chipped and incinerated at a waste energy plant. Therefore, considered a vehicle yard rather than waste processing site.
 - g.) Access on to Sutton Green Road is not appropriate for the type of vehicles using the site, and the access track to the site is adjacent to Elm Nursery where children are present. Further the surrounding roads including Sutton Green Road, Blanchard's Hill and Whitmore Lane are not suitable for the type of vehicles that Redwood have on site or that service their operation. The level of use and number of vehicles has substantially increased, and the access road is sub-standard for the size and nature of the vehicles.
 - h.) Concern raised about the siting of fuel tanks which could cause pollution and contaminate the water courses that flow from the site onto our property and potentially contaminate the artisan pond, which in turn flows into watercourses that flow into areas where protected newts are known to habitat in land adjacent to Frogs Farm.
 - i.) Inclusion of additional lights will affect the night light, impacting the Conservation Area and rural Green Belt location.

In respect of point (a) regarding the appropriateness of the principle of the development within the context of the local area, this has already been assessed and granted within the original planning permission (WO/2015/0605) against local and national policies and guidance and the conditions attached to that consent remain relevant and enforceable and ensures that the development remains appropriate within the context of the local area. This proposal is for the installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, and 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective), in which planning considerations regarding the need for the development, impact on the environment and local amenity, impact on landscape character, heritage and visual amenity, impact on surface water drainage and flood risk, highways and traffic implications, and the impact on the Green Belt have been assessed within this Officer report within the relevant sections. Woking Borough Council, however, are statutory consultees on this application and they have not raised any objection to this proposal subject to appropriate conditions. This is documented on their planning register, and they have provided their own report to support their no objection which is accessible via their planning register.

In terms of point (b) regarding the interpretation of the sequential test and the and the alternative site assessments for the operation of the waste management facility, this concern

predominately relates to how the principle of the development, which was permitted under the extant permission ref: WO/2015/0605, was undertaken and this is not the subject of this report. Officers note the concern to the Green Belt and the need for co-location of the proposed structures and details of this has been assessed within this Officer report within the relevant sections.

With regard to point (c) this application (WO/2020/0993) is not proposing to increase throughput on site or the operational hours, or the number of vehicles accessing the site (intensification). Restrictions on throughput, operational hours and permitted operations are still held by conditions under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. The current proposal is to include structures that would assist with the operation of the existing sites consent, including security measures such as CCTV and new fuel container and tanks, as well as more formalised storage in the form of a storage bay for operation, and the provision of an office base, welfare facility and electricity generator. The previous objections to the site that the representation notes relates to the principle of the development which was permitted under ref: WO/2015/0605 which were assessed under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 and therefore are not the subject of this application.

With regard to point (d) the original planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016 was granted for *the material change of use from agriculture to use involving importation, storage, processing and transfer of wood waste for biofuel. Erection of building for associated storage and welfare facilities*. This application did grant permission for office use and welfare facilities within the main barn building, however, the applicant has outlined that there is currently insufficient space within the main barn building to accommodate the office and welfare facilities. As part of this application (WO/2020/0993) the application therefore seeks permission for two separate cabin structures to the south of the main barn building for an office use and welfare facilities.

Officers note that the description of the development for this application was originally for *the change of use to a mixed use comprising Class E(g)⁷ Office Use and Sui Generis Waste Management and the erection of 1 x office building, 1 x welfare building, 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective)*. However, the description of the development has subsequently be amended to the following description *'The installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, and 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective)'*. This amendment has removed the *'material change of use to a mixed use comprising of Class E(g) Office Use and Sui Generis Waste Management'* as it is considered that the proposed structures are ancillary to the existing waste management facility on site only, and this proposal is therefore now not considered a material change of use. No other changes to the proposed structures have been made and no changes to the existing throughput of existing permitted operations are proposed as part of this application.

The use of land wholly or mainly for purposes of recovery, treating, storing, processing, sorting, transferring or depositing of waste are prescribed as county matters by the Town and Country Planning (Prescription of County Matters) (England) Regulations 2003. Therefore, Surrey County Council are the Planning Authority for this waste application. Woking Borough Council, however, are statutory consultees on this application and they

⁷ The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories of 'Use Classes'. Since the submission of this application there has been changes to the Use Classes and the Class B1 was revoked on 1 September 2020 and has been effectively replaced with a new Class E (g).

have not raised any objection to this proposal subject to appropriate conditions. This is documented on their planning register, and they have provided their own report to support their no objection which is accessible via their planning register. Woking Borough Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO) have also been consulted as part of this and have raised no objection subject to suitable conditions.

Regarding point (e) part of this retrospective application has occurred from changes in the operation of the site for a variety of reasons, such as changes in the market (supply/demand), and changes in machinery. The purpose of the retrospective application is to assess whether changes that have not been permitted but are on site are suitable for the site in regards to national and local policy and development guidelines. Retrospective applications are assessed in the same manner as to any other application, there is no bias towards approval or granting permission just because it is retrospective. Where applications are refused appropriate enforcement actions can be taken. For further clarifications on this, please refer to the Governments guidelines [Enforcement and post-permission matters - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk) (Paragraph: 012, Reference ID 17b-012-20140306, Revision date 06 03 2014).

With regard to point (f) the operations are subject to planning permission ref WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016 which was subject to a number of conditions. Routine site monitoring at this site is undertaken by Site Monitoring Officers, where the applicant is seen to be in breach of planning permissions and/or conditions appropriate enforcement action will be undertaken.

Regarding point (g) whilst Officers note the objection raised, these concerns relate to the existing arrangements for the access to/from this site and the permitted vehicle movements was permitted under the extant planning permission (WO/2015/0605). This proposal does not seek amendments to the access routes to/from the site nor does it propose an increase in vehicle movements that what is already permitted.

Officers do note that as part of this proposal the applicant is seeking an additional half an hour relief at the start and end of each weekday (Monday to Friday) to allow staff and cars to enter the site from 07:00 hours and vacate the site by 18:00 hours during the weekday. The applicant explains that this will allow staff to review the day's planned activities and prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hours. Although the applicant is seeking an additional half an hour relief at the beginning and end of the day, the applicant is not proposing to change the number of vehicles accessing the site. The County Highway Authority (CHA) has raised not objection to this proposal. Further details of highways and traffic implications have been discussed within the highways and traffic implication section of this report.

With regard to point (h) the applicant has outlined that the fuel is stored in steel tanks and is located on a concrete slab with a block wall surrounding the tanks. The block walls are 1 block high at the sides and front and are 6 blocks high at the back in line with the environmental protocols stipulated by the Environmental Agency to prevent spillage of diesel oil on site and to protect the fuel tanks from impact. The walls are designed to hold water which can be drained off or allowed to evaporate naturally. There is a tap installed in the wall to enable controlled drainage in the event of a spillage. No objection has been raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) or the Environment Agency (EA) on this proposal. In line with advice from the EA the applicant is reminded that businesses have a duty to ensure that they do not cause or allow pollution further details of this are outlined in the pollution control informative attached to this Officer Report.

Regarding point (i), there is no lighting proposed as part of this application and therefore is not considered as part of this application.

Planning considerations

Introduction

32. The guidance on the determination of planning applications contained in the Preamble/Agenda frontsheet is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraphs.
33. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Surrey Waste Local Plan (SWLP) (2020); Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012); and Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016). No relevant neighbourhood plans have been identified.
34. 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: the need for the development, landscape and visual impact, impact on the environment and amenity, impact to heritage, impact on surface water drainage and flood risk, highways and traffic implications, and the impact on the Green Belt.

WASTE POLICY AND NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP

Policy 1 – Need for Waste Development

Policy 2 – Recycling and Recovery (other than inert C, D & E and soil recycling facilities)

Policy 8 – Improvement or Extension to Existing Facilities

Policy 10 – Areas Suitable for Development of Waste Management Facilities

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

No Relevant Policies Identified

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

No Relevant Policies Identified

Planning Policies

35. In England, the waste hierarchy is both a guide to sustainable waste management and a legal requirement, which is enshrined in law through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. The waste hierarchy, which ranks options for waste management, has driven some progress towards better use of our resources. Priority goes to preventing the creation of waste in the first place, followed by preparing waste for re-use, recycling and then recovery, and last of all disposal (e.g. landfill). The focus is upon moving up the waste hierarchy, to minimise the amount of waste produced by improving resource efficiency and keeping products in circulation longer so that they do not become waste.
36. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) does not contain policies specifically relating to waste management. Instead, the national waste management policies are contained within the Waste management Plan for England (WMP) (2021) and set out by the National Waste Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) (2014).
37. The WMP (2021) is a high-level document which is non-site specific. It provides an analysis of the current waste management situation in England and evaluates how the WMP will support the implementation of the objectives and provisions of the Waste (England and

Wales) Regulations 2011. This is supplemented by a Waste Prevention Programme for England (WPPE) which sets out a plan for preventing products and materials from becoming waste, including greater reuse, repair and remanufacture supported by action to ensure better design to enable this to be done more easily. At present the WPPE has not yet been published and Defra are currently analysing feedback from the consultation held in 2021.

38. The WMP advocates that the dividends of applying the waste hierarchy will not just be environmental but explains that we can save money by making products with fewer natural resources, and we can reduce the costs of waste treatment and disposal, landfill or incineration should usually be the last resort for waste whilst waste can and should be recovered or recycled whenever possible.
39. The WMP envisages that the resulting benefits of such sustainable waste management will be realised in a healthier natural environment for future generations and reduced impacts on climate change well as in the competitiveness of our businesses through better resource efficiency and innovation.
40. The NPPW (2014) provides the planning framework to enable local authorities to put forward, through waste local plans, strategies that identify sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced facilities to meet the waste management needs of their areas. The NPPW (2014) also puts a strong emphasis on the application and promotion of the waste hierarchy. The NPPW (2014) sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource management; and explains that planning plays a pivotal role in delivering this country's waste ambitions through the delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency, including provision of modern infrastructure, local employment opportunities and the wider climate change benefits, by driving waste management up the waste hierarchy.
41. In addition, the NPPW (2014) states that when determining planning applications, the County Planning Authority (CPA) should:
 - a. Consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B of the NPPW (2014) and the location implications of any advice on health from the relevant health bodies but that the CPA should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessments in these respects.
 - b. Ensure that waste management facilities in themselves are well-designed so that they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located.
 - c. Concern themselves with implementing the planning strategy in the Local Plan and not with the control of processes which are a matter for the pollution control authorities. The CPA should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regimes will be properly applied and enforced.
42. Appendix B of the NPPW (2014) states that in determining planning applications the CPA should consider the following factors having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed: a) protection of water quality and resources and flood risk management; b) land instability; c) landscape and visual implications; d) nature conservation; e) conserving the historic environment; f) traffic and access; g) air emissions (including dust); h) odours; i) vermin and birds; j) noise, light and vibration; k) litter; and l) potential land-use conflict. These factors, where relevant to the development proposed, will be considered in the appropriate sections of this report.
43. The Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (SWLP) (2020) aims to ensure that the future waste needs of Surrey can be appropriately met through waste facilities situated in the most appropriate locations and with minimal impact on communities and the environment.

44. Policy 1 from the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for the development of new waste facilities will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development will contribute to achieving targets for recycling, recovery and the diversion of the waste away from disposal in a manner that does not prevent management of the waste at the highest point practical in the waste hierarchy.
45. Policy 2 from the SWLP (2020) states in part (A) that planning permission for development of recycling or recovery facilities (other than inert C, D & E and soil recycling facilities) and any associated development will be granted where;
- (i) The site is allocated in the Surrey Waste Local Plan for waste development (Policy 11a and Policy 11b).
 - (ii) The activity involves the redevelopment of a site, or part of a site, in existing waste management use.
 - (iii) The site is otherwise suitable for waste development when assessed against Policy 10 and other policies in the Plan.
46. Policy 10 from the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission will be granted for the development of facilities (excluding permanent deposit) at the following locations:
- (i) Site allocated under Policy 11a – Strategic Waste Site Allocations, not in the Green Belt.
 - (ii) On land identified as an ‘Industrial Land Area of Search’ as shown in the policies maps.
 - (iii) On any other land identified for employment uses or industrial and storage purposes by district and borough councils.
 - (iv) On land considered to be previously developed and/or redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages.
 - (v) On land that is otherwise suitable for waste development when assessed against other policies in the Plan.
47. Officers recognise that the site is not allocated in the Surrey Waste Local Plan. However, the proposal involves development of parts of an existing site in waste management use and the suitability of the principle of the use of the site for waste management has already been determined within the extant planning permission WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016; therefore, the proposal meets the requirements of Policy 2 part (A)(ii) and (iii).
48. In Part B of Policy 2 of the SWLP (2020) it states that development of waste recycling and recovery activities co-located with other waste and non-waste development will be supported where it can be demonstrated that there are benefits from the co-location which may include:
- (i) More efficient production, in terms of quantity or quality, or recycle and waste derived fuels.
 - (ii) Fewer lorry movements would be required as a result of co-location.
 - (iii) An additional beneficial use to associated with waste recycling and recovery operations at the site (e.g. efficient contribution to an energy network).
49. Policy 8 from the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for the improvement or extension (physical or temporal) of existing waste management facilities will be granted where:

- (i) Any resulting change to the type and/or quantity of waste managed at the site is consistent with this Plan's requirements for the management of waste and that the quantity of waste to be managed is equal to or greater than the quantity of waste currently managed on the site.
- (ii) Benefits to the environment and the local amenity will result.
- (iii) The improvement or extension of a recycling and recovery facility (other than inert C, D & E and soil recycling facilities) is consistent with Policy 2.

50. Paragraph 81 of the NPPF (2021) expresses the Government's commitment to ensuring the planning system operates to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth and does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth which should be afforded significant weight in determining planning applications. Furthermore, Paragraph 84 outlines that planning decisions should support a prosperous rural economy by enabling (a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings; and (b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses; and (d) enable the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF (2021) goes on to state that the use of previously developed land and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.

Details Submitted

51. The proposal includes the installation and use of an office use and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective). The application is in part retrospective in that the office building, welfare building, CCTV cameras on columns, fuel storage tanks, electricity generator and fuel storage container are already installed /sited on the application site.
52. The office building is located to the south of the site and is a container style building which is approximately 6.1 meters (m) in length by 2.4m in width and 2.4m in height. The applicant outlines in the Planning Statement that the office is required to co-ordinate operations on the site and for administrative work to support the objective of sustainable forestry and waste management. The office is currently used by two members of staff in connection with the waste management business.
53. Adjacent to the office building lies the welfare building, containing staff toilets which is a smaller container style building. The welfare building has been installed as a necessary welfare addition which could not be accommodated within the existing main barn building permitted under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. The welfare building is approximately 3m in length by 1.8m in width by 2.4m in height.
54. The two fuel storage tanks and fuel container lie to the west of the site and are required to service vehicles, plant and machinery associated with the permitted use of the land. The fuel storage tanks are of a cylinder shape approximately measuring 1.75m in height and 1.25m in radius (2.5m in length) each. The fuel container lies adjacent to the fuel storage tanks and is a cube shape measuring approximately 1.2m in height by 1.2m in length.
55. The electricity generator is a super silent electricity generator (model: SSDK16M) which is located to the southwest of the existing barn building. The generator is used for power loading equipment for one hour (60 minutes) at the start of the day and on hour prior to closure. This additional electricity generator is required as the existing electricity on site is a shared supply with the adjacent nursery which is insufficient for the operation for the application site. The electricity generator is housed within a dark green metal container

which is approximately 2m in height and 2.5m in length. Super silent diesel generators are generators that have been enclosed to lower noise levels offering lower noise level performance compared to standby power sources.

56. Six CCTV cameras on aluminium poles (approximately 5m in height each) have been installed for the security purposes. The CCTV cameras and poles have been in place on all four corners of the application site, with one also placed in the centre of the application site next to the main barn building and one to the west of the site next to the fuel storage container. The CCTV cameras have been positioned so they do not point outside of the application site and are required by the applicant for security purposes.
57. The proposal also includes the erection of two open storage bays, of which one is proposed to be 9.1m (length) x 9.1m (width) x 3m (height) in size; and one is proposed to be 18.3m (length) x 9.1 (width) x 3m (height) in size. As outlined in the Planning Statement the applicant states that the two additional open storage bays are required for additional storage of arboricultural waste as there is currently insufficient space for machinery and the efficient storage of wood within the permitted barn building. The open storage of wood that is currently located to the north of the proposed bays will be stored within the proposed open storage bays. The applicant is not proposing an increase in the annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste (as per Condition 6 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605), and the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end users.
58. The hours of operation permitted on site are stipulated within Condition 4 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. The permitted operational hours include 08:00 hours to 17:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays. The applicant currently has permission under this Condition 4 of WO/2015/0605 for staff to access the site up to 30 minutes before the permitted operational times and to exit the site up to 30 minutes after the permitted operational times. As part of this application the applicant is seeking an additional 30 minutes on top of this for staff to access the site up to a total of 60 minutes before and after the permitted operational times during Monday to Friday only. The applicant explains that this will allow staff to review the day's planned activities and prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hour. Otherwise, no changes are proposed to the permitted hours of operation associated with the existing use.

Evaluation

59. The principle of the development has already been determined under planning permission WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2022 and there is no proposed increase in annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste or the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end use. Officers recognise that the proposal would continue to support the ongoing permitted development on site and assist in contributing to Surrey's waste ambition with securing the re-use and recovery of waste by moving waste up the waste hierarchy and is considered as an improvement to the existing waste operations on site in line with supporting the objectives of the NPPW (2014) and WMP (2021).
60. Officers consider that the proposed office building to facilitate the coordination of operations on site and for administrative work (currently used by two members of staff) and the welfare building are ancillary to the existing permitted waste management operations on site. Officers consider that these structures are acceptable given they are small in scale and are only to be used in connection with the permitted development on site and would not change the principal use of the site as a waste development site. These structures would seek to assist with the ongoing activities on site in a safe and secure location, supporting the

objectives of the NPPW (2014) and WMP (2021), and therefore would be acceptable. Officers consider these changes accord with Policy 2(ii) of the SWLP (2020).

61. The proposal also includes the introduction of two new storage bays to the north of the site for the additional storage of arboricultural waste as there is currently insufficient storage of wood within the existing permitted barn building. The proposed open storage bays would serve as a formalised area to store the additional arboricultural waste which would allow the existing site operations to work effectively and efficiently on site and would prevent the encroachment of the development onto undeveloped land on site. In this respect, Officers consider that the proposal supports the NPPW (2014) in terms of ensuring that waste management facilities are well designed so that they contribute positively to the character and the quality of the area that they are located in and is a positive enhancement to an existing waste management site to ensure that the waste operations on site continue to contribute to promoting waste up the waste hierarchy.
62. As outlined above, the two new storage bays would not increase the operational throughput of the site which is currently limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste. Officers consider that the storage of the wood benefits from being co-located on the same site as the existing established waste management use of the site, supporting the management of the county's demands for the management of arboricultural waste and would benefit from being stored in a formalised manner, supporting Part B of Policy 2 from the SWLP (2020).
63. Officers consider that the proposed two open storage bays would be development of an existing site in waste management use of which the principle of the use of the site as a waste development has already been determined and therefore would meet the criteria outlined in Policy 2 from the SWLP (2020). Furthermore, as the proposal does not propose to increase the annual of throughput of waste the proposed improvements to the site to accommodate better storage of arboricultural waste is considered to be consistent with Policy 8 from the SWLP (2020).
64. As per Condition 4 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605, vehicles and personnel are permitted to access the site 30 minutes before, and 30 minutes after the permitted operational times of 08:00-17:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 hours on a Saturday. The applicant seeks to increase this by an additional 30 minutes before and after the permitted operational times to allow for staff to review the day's planned activities and prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hour. No further changes are proposed to the permitted hours of operation associated with the existing use. The applicant also states in the Planning Statement that there would be a maximum of 6 cars any one time. Officers consider this would help to stagger personnel accessing the site and as it is limited to a maximum of six vehicles at any one time, it would not lead to an increase in activity on site as operational hours would remain as currently permitted under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605.
65. Officers consider that the proposal is appropriate in terms of the existing permitted development on site and seeks to improve the existing permitted operations on site both in terms of operation and security. The proposed development is considered to be an appropriate scale, form and character in relation to its location within the existing waste management site. Officers are satisfied that the proposal accords with the Development Plan Policies in regards to need for the development.

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP

Policy 13 – Sustainable Design

Policy 14 – Development Management

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

Policy CS21 – Design

Policy CS24 – Woking’s Landscape and Townscape

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

No relevant policies identified.

Surrey Landscape Character Assessment – Woking (2015)

SS12: Wyke to Mayford Settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland

Planning Policies

66. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) states that planning decisions should ensure that developments:

- a.) Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.
- b.) Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.
- c.) Are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding build environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

67. Paragraph 174 from the NPPF (2021) outlines that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status of identified quality in the development plan).
- e) Preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans.

68. Paragraph 185 of the NPPF (2021) states that planning decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:

- a.) Mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life⁸.
- b.) Identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.
- c.) Limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

⁸ See Explanatory Note to the *Noise Policy Statement for England* (Department for environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 2010)

69. Policy 14 Part (b) of the SWLP (2020) states that the planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it would result in significant adverse impacts on communities and the environment, which includes part (v) including impacts on the appearance quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its local distinctiveness including character areas defined at nation and local levels.
70. Policy CS21 of the WBCCS (2012) outlines that proposals should incorporate landscaping to enhance the setting of the development, including the retention of any trees of amenity value, and other significant landscape features of merit, and provide for suitable boundary treatment/s.
71. Policy CS24 of WBCCS (2012) states that all development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, and local distinctiveness and will have regard to landscape character areas.

Details Submitted

72. The applicant has provided details of the dimensions and specification of the plant and machinery that are associated with the proposal. This includes the following:
- **Office Building** – Located to the south of the site, a container style building approximately 6.1m in length by 2.4m in width, and 2.4m in height, constructed in a dark green colour.
 - **Welfare Building** – Comprised of staff toilets, adjacent to the officer building (south of the site). A container style building approximately 3m in length by 1.8m in width and 2.4m in height, constructed in a dark green colour.
 - **Electricity Generator** – Located to the south west of the existing barn building. The electricity generator is housed within a dark green metal container which is approximately 2m in height and 2.5m in length.
 - **Two fuel storage tanks and fuel container** - Located to the west of the site. The fuel storage tanks are of a cylinder shape approximately measuring 1.75m in height and 1.25m in radius (2.5m in length) each. The fuel container lies adjacent to the fuel storage tanks and is a cube shape measuring approximately 1.2m in height by 1.2m in length.
 - **Six CCTV Cameras** - The CCTV cameras and poles have been in place on all four corners of the application site, with one also placed in the centre of the application site next to the main barn building and one to the west of the site next to the fuel storage container. The CCTV cameras have been positioned so they do not point outside of the application site and are required for security purposes. The CCTV cameras are located on aluminium poles (approximately 5m in height each).
 - **Two Open Storage Bays** – Proposed to be located to the north of the site to store wood. The bays are proposed to be approximately 9.1m (length) x 9.1m (width) x 3m (height); and 18.3m (length) x 9.1 (width) x 3m (height) in size. The applicant is not proposing an increase in the annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste (as per Condition 6 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605), and the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end users. The storage bays are proposed to be designed similar to the existing bay on site as a barn like structure.
73. The applicant states within the Planning Statement that the site is not subject to any international, European, nation or local designations with reference to nature conservation,

landscape or heritage. However, it is recognised that the site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and is adjacent to the north western boundary of Sutton Park Conservation Area. Sutton Place a Grade II* listed park and garden is located 250m to the south. The application site's eastern perimeter is shared with a rear garden boundary of a residential dwelling. A mature hedgerow separates the site from the residential land. To the north boundary of the site already has established vegetation, and vegetation also exists beyond a field to the west of the site. The applicant does not propose to change the existing hedgerows and landscaping adjacent or within the site.

74. The surrounding land is largely agricultural in character with areas of woodland and some residential use. The application site lies within the SS12 Wyke to Mayford Settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland Landscape Character Area as set out in Surrey's Landscape Character Assessment – Woking (SLCAW) (2015) and is part of the green gap between Woking and Guildford. As discussed in the SLCAW (2015) the Landscape Character Area SS12, as associated with Elm Nursery, it is defined by gentle undulating landscape, underlain by Bagshot formation Sand, Camberley sand Formation Sand, Windlesham formation sand, silt and Clay solid geology. The landscape is comprised of a mosaic of land uses including areas on intact pastoral and arable field pattern, frequent woodland, including 19th Century plantations and copses and a number of wooded and heathland commons. There is mixed woodland, tree belts and copses of Oak, Scots Pine and birch, create a varied and enclosed landscape. Views of the landscape are often obscured by tree cover, but there are intermittent framed views. Specifically to the south east of the Landscape Character Area, where Elm Nursery is located near, is the large, cultural and historically important, Sutton Place, with a Tudor Manor House grade I listed and its grade II* listed grounds. The rural area contains rural traditional settlements which are often enclosed by the variety of woodland, with a sense of tranquillity and farmsteads and agricultural buildings are scattered across the character area.
75. The landscape strategy guidance outlined within the SLCAW (2015) for SS12 is to conserve peaceful enclosed areas with their mosaics of heathland, woodland and pastoral farmland, and to conserve historic villages and small-scale settlement set around greens and commons, including careful consideration of the impact from any further development and enhancement of recreation opportunities. There are opportunities for enhancement include management of the open heathlands and pastures to prevent encroachment by woodland and restocking hedgerows, as well as reducing visual impact of transport corridors locally. Specially, when considering the built development it is recommended that the development control should be maintained to ensure that new development is sympathetic to the wider pattern of settlement.

Evaluation

76. The County Landscape Architect (CLA) notes that the site is situated within the SS12 Wyke to Mayford Settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland Landscape Character Area, and the Metropolitan Green Belt. It is not in close proximity to any designated landscapes; however it is circa 135m to the north-west of the Grade II* Sutton Place Registered Park and Garden. The site is also adjacent to the Sutton Park Conservation Area, which lies to the immediate south and east. The CLA understand that the proposed development is similar to that permitted in 2016 under ref: WO/2015/0605, with the exception of some additional, predominantly low-level structures including extended chip bays. The CLA also considers that the site is relatively well-screened, and is set well back from Sutton Green Road. The CLA considers that the additional structures are unlikely to be seen from outside the site, except potentially the CCTV poles. The CLA also notes that the new screening planting along the eastern boundary (which formed part of the 2016 permission) appears to be establishing to an acceptable degree. In addition, the CLA raised that the applicant should continue to apply annual mulching, along with regular watering during dry spells and adjustment to tree ties, as their stems increase in girth. The tree ties should be removed when it becomes clear that the trees can support themselves.

- 10
77. The CLA have reviewed the proposal and considers in the context of the 2016 permission (Ref: WO/2015/0605), the additional structures forming this application is considered not to result in a significant harm to the local landscape character or visual amenity. The proposals are too distant and modest in scale to affect the landscape and visual amenity of the Sutton Place Registered Park and Garden. The CLA does not consider the proposal requires any additional visual and landscape mitigation, over and above that already implemented as part of the 2016 permission, which is continuing to establish and provide increased screening and biodiversity, and therefore raise no objection to the proposal. Officers recognise that whilst the proposal would introduce further development to the application site, given their scale and location within the application site, they would not impact the landscape character both in the immediate and wider context.
78. Officers recognise that whilst there is some visual impact observed with the proposal to introduce new structures onto the site, when assessing the proposal within the backdrop of the existing waste management facility on site, the visual impact is limited. The site benefits from established trees which provides a screening to the site from the surrounding area. The proposed office block, welfare facilities, and container housing the generator are proposed to be in a dark green colour which is in keeping with the existing structures on site, and the proposed additional open storage bays are also in keeping with the existing storage bay on site and are designed to complement agricultural characteristics found in the surrounding area. Apart from the CCTV cameras and associated poles, all of the proposed structures are no greater in height or size than the existing structures on site, and therefore this proposal would not introduce any features that are taller or have a greater massing than has previously been permitted for the waste management facility. In this respect, Officers, consider that the design and scale of the proposal will therefore seek to minimise their visual impact to the surrounding area, and therefore in this respect consider that the proposed new structures on the existing waste management site is consistent with the guidance outlined in the SLCAW (2015).
79. In terms of the CCTV cameras and associated poles, Officers recognise that they are contained within the existing site boundary and are required to provide suitable security for the site and although have some visual impact to the local surrounding area, are unlikely to have a significant impact to the overall visual impact of the site as the existing structures on site and the surrounding vegetation will provide an adequate screening to these CCTV cameras and poles. In this regard, Officers do not consider that the proposed CCTV would have a significant impact to the visual appearance of the site or cause a significant visual impact to the surrounding landscape and are appropriate within the guidance outlined in the SLCAW (2015).
80. Overall. Officers therefore consider that the proposal accords with the Development Plan policies for the protection and enhancement of the landscape.

ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY (Including Noise)

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP

Policy 14 – Development Management

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

Policy CS21 – Design

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

Policy DM5 – Environmental Pollution

Policy DM7 – Noise and Light Pollution

General Planning Policies

81. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2021) advises that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the local environment by preventing new and existing developments from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air and noise pollution. When determining applications planning authorities should encourage opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments (Paragraph 180 part (d)).
82. The NPPF (2021) Paragraph 185 states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:
- a.) Mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life⁹.
 - b.) Identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.
 - c.) Limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.
83. Accordingly, the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) (2014) states in paragraph 5 that an assessment of cumulative impact of existing and proposed waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on the environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion of economic potential. The NPPW also states in Paragraph 3 that consideration to the extent to which the capacity of the existing operational facilities would satisfy any identified need.
84. The NPPW also includes a Locational Criteria (Appendix B) which provides guidance on testing the suitability of sites. Appendix B Criteria J states that considerations will include the proximity of sensitive receptors.
85. Policy 14 part (b) of the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it would not result in significant adverse impacts on communities and the environment, which includes (i) public amenity and safety including impacts caused by noise, dust, fumes, odour, vibration and illumination; (v) impact on appearance, quality and character of the landscape and any features that contribute to its distinctiveness; and also (vi) impacts on the natural environment, including biodiversity and geological conservation interests including sites of local importance (SNCI) for biodiversity or geodiversity, irreplaceable habitats and protected species.
86. Policy CS21 from the WBCCS (2012) states that proposals for new development should:
- Create buildings and places that are attractive with their own distinct identity; they should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land.
 - Achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk proximity or outlook.

⁹ See Explanatory Note to the *Noise Policy Statement for England* (Department for environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 2010)

- Incorporate landscaping to enhance the setting of the development, including the retention of any trees of amenity values, and other significant landscape features of merit, and provide for suitable boundary treatment/s.
- Protect and where possible enhance biodiversity within new developments (in line with Policy CS7 of WBCCS 2012).
- Create a safe and secure environment, where the opportunities for crime are minimised.
- Be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity, resulting from noise, dust, vibrations, light or other releases.

87. Policy DM5 from the WDPD (2016) states that when assessed individually or cumulatively, development proposals should ensure that there will be no unacceptable impact on: air quality, surface and ground water quality. Land quality and condition, health and safety of the public. Development which has the potential, either individually or cumulatively, for an unacceptable impact on environmental amenity, biodiversity, or water quality by reason of pollution but is considered desirable for reasons of economic or wider social need will be expected to provide an appropriate scheme of mitigation. In assessing a scheme of mitigation, account will be taken of:

- The location, design and layout of the proposed development.
- Measures to bring levels of pollution to an acceptable level.
- Measures to control run-off and other diffuse pollution.
- Hours of operation.

Development will not be permitted if mitigation cannot be provided to an appropriate standard with an acceptable design, particularly in proximity to sensitive existing uses or sites.

Noise Planning Policies

88. Specifically, in regards to noise, the NPPF (2021) refers to the Noise Policy Statement for England (NSPE) (2010) which states in Paragraph 2.3 that the broad aim of noise management has been to separate noise sources from sensitive noise receivers and to 'minimise noise as far as reasonably practical', as contained within the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

89. Surrey County Council has produced its own noise guidance under The Surrey Guidelines for Noise and Vibrations Assessment and Control (dated January 2020) to assist in assessing noise impacts from waste development proposals. These guidelines are designed to ensure that noise (including vibration) from new developments does not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the natural environment, human health or quality of life. The guidelines state in part 4.2 that noise from waste facilities should be addressed following methodology in BS414:2014, which includes also the evaluation of the residual and background sound levels and evaluation of specific sound levels from the facility.

90. The BS414:2014 states that the following factors are pertinent when considering the context:

- The absolute level of sounds.
- The character and level of residual sound compared to the character and level of specific sound,

- The sensitivity of the receptor and whether dwellings or other premises used for residential purposes will already incorporate design measures that secure good internal and/or outdoor acoustic conditions.

The above factors should be evaluated at each receptor and, where adverse impact is identified mitigation as reasonably practical must be established.

91. Part 5.10 of the Surrey guidelines for Noise and Vibration Assessment and Control (dated January 2020) states that fixed plant sources should be assessed in accordance with BS4142:14, and recommends that normal working hours (weekdays between 07:00 and 19:00), that the difference between the rating levels and the background sound level should be no greater than +5dB depending on the context. Lower differences may be appropriate at other sensitive times of the day, depending upon the context.
92. Policy DM7 from the WDPD (2016) states that the Council will require noise generating forms of development or proposals that would affect noise sensitive uses to be accompanied by a statement detailing potential noise generation levels and any mitigation measures proposed to ensure that all noise is reduced to an acceptable level.

In assessing such a scheme of mitigation, account will be taken for noise generating development, of:

- The location, design and layout of the proposed development.
- Existing levels of background noise.
- Measures to reduce or contain generated noise.
- Hours of operation and servicing.

Development will only be permitted where mitigation can be provided to an appropriate standard with an acceptable design, particularly in proximity to sensitive existing uses or sites.

Details Submitted

93. Whilst the proposal includes a number of different components, Officers consider the elements that could give rise to noise would be the generator and potential use of the storage bays. In addition to this the applicant is seeking an additional 30 minutes for staff to access the site Monday – Friday to review activities and for preparation purposes above that already permitted. This would not be for the movement of plant or machinery or receipt/export of waste materials.
94. The proposal includes the erection of two open storage bays on the northern end of the existing barn for additional storage of arboricultural waste as there is currently insufficient space for machinery and efficient storage of wood within the permitted barn building. The open storage of wood that is currently located to the north of the proposed bays will be stored within the proposed open storage bays. As outlined above, the applicant is not proposing an increase in the annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste and the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end users.
95. The electricity generator is a super silent electricity generator (model: SSDK16M) which is located to the southwest of the existing barn building. The applicant outlines in paragraph 3.4 of the Planning Statement that it was necessary to install an electricity generator on site as the shared supply with the adjacent nursery was insufficient for the applicant's needs.

The generator is currently situated in a dark green metal container (approximately 2m in height and 2.5m in length) adjacent to the office block and welfare unit. The generator is used for power loading equipment for one hour at the start of the day and for one hour prior to closure. Paragraph 5.2 of the Planning Statement states that there is no proposed changes to the hours of operation or the number of vehicle movements than what is already permitted under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605.

96. The applicant has submitted specification details of the Super Silent Generator (Model SSDK16M) providing details of the specification in relation to noise. Following initial consultation with the County Noise Consultant (CNC) the applicant submitted additional details in the form of a Noise Impact Assessment (document: 'Plant Noise Impact Assessment' document ref: 89955/NIA, rev.00 dated 8 June 2021) to provide further information to demonstrate that the electricity generator on its own and/or in combination with other plant or machinery in use on site at the same time can operate in accordance with Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605.
97. The applicant states that the generator is installed within an acoustic enclosure near to the eastern boundary of the property it serves and is set back approximately 135m from the road. The nearest noise sensitive property is the residential property located immediate east of Elm Nursery (Sutton Ridge House), located along Sutton Green Road approximately 65m southeast of the generator. Other residential properties are located along Frog Lane to the east and Whitmore Lane to the west and are located substantially further away from the generator than Sutton Ridge House.
98. As part of this noise impact assessment an environmental sound survey was undertaken to establish the prevailing background sound pressure levels at a location representative of sound levels outside the nearest noise sensitive receptors on site. The applicant states within the noise impact assessment that noise emissions from the generator were measured and assessed in accordance with BS4142:2014 in order to determine compliance with Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605, and assessments of the specific noise levels were undertaken using both L_{Aeq} and L_{A90} parameters to ensure the results were not affected by extraneous sources. The results demonstrated that the generator would comply with the requirements of Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 of not exceeding 55dB.
99. The applicant has also stated within the Planning statement that there is no wood processing currently occurring on site which has reduced the creation of dust and bioaerosols and there is no burning of waste or composting on site further minimising environmental impacts. A dust suppression spray pump is already available on site as per the dust management plan as part of WO/2015/0605.

Evaluation

100. Officers note that the scale and design of the proposal is congruous with the previous development on site. The overall building designs respects the surrounding scale, height, proportion of the existing buildings and is sympathetic in design to the surrounding area. The external finishes of officer building, welfare unit and container housing the generator are in a dark green colour which is consistent with the finishes on the existing buildings in site, and the proposed open storage bays are also in consistent design with the existing storage bay on site. Officers are therefore satisfied that the design of the proposal is in keeping with other buildings on site and therefore meets Policy 14 from the SWLP (2020); Policy CS21 from the WBCCS (2012); and Policy DM5 from the WDPD (2016).
101. With regards to the six CCTV cameras on aluminium poles (approximately 5m in height each) have been in place on all four corners of the application site, with one also placed in the centre of the application site next to the main barn building and one to the west of the site next to the fuel storage container. The CCTV cameras have been positioned so they do

not point outside of the application site and are required for monitoring the site for security purposes. Officers consider that the CCTV equipment is for the purpose of monitoring and the applicant has outlined within the Validation Response Letter dated 1 July 2020 that this data is to be stored for 31 days before it is automatically deleted, with the applicant only having access to the camera data. Officers consider that the CCTV cameras are in line with Policy CS21 from the WBCCS (2012) which outlines that proposal should create a safe and secure environment, where the opportunities for crime are minimised. Officers therefore consider that should planning permission be granted, a condition is imposed on the relevant permission to require compliance with Data Protection Codes of Practice and Act.

102. With regards to noise, the County Noise Consultant (CNC) has reviewed the documents submitted and considers that the proposed extended the arrival and departure times of personnel by an additional 30 minutes (e.g. 1 hour before and 1 hour after the permitted hours of operation) is acceptable providing that there are no noisy activities taking place during these periods of time.
103. The CNC has reviewed the Noise Impact Assessment and notes that the assessment has been carried out in accordance with BS4142:2014 'Methods for Rating and Assessing Industrial and Commercial Sound'. The CNC recognises that a newer version was published in 2019 which included minor changes, such as correcting typos and improving working. However, as the noise assessment was carried out in accordance with Condition 7 of WO/2015/0605 which refers to the 2014 version, the use of BS4142:2014 is considered an acceptable method in this instance.
104. The CNC considers that the noise impact assessment indicates that the electricity generator can comfortably operate within the requirements of Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605, but it doesn't demonstrate that it can operate in combination with any other plant or machinery in use on the site at the same time within the criteria. However, given the generator is likely to operate at least 10 dB below the criteria, the CNC considers it is unlikely to significantly contribute to the overall rating level from the site.
105. The CNC therefore raises no objection to the proposal, subject to Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 is brought forward and reworded to reflect the current version of BS4142:2014 + A1:2019, and a condition is included to restrict the use of the generator in accordance with the applicants proposed hours of use, such as 08:00 to 09:00 and 16:00 to 17:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 09:00 and 12:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturday. Furthermore, the CNC has based this response on the basis that should planning permission be granted for the proposed development, the processing of waste by chipping and splitting will remain subject to conditions as outlined in planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605.
106. Officers consider that noise generated from this proposal predominately relates to the introduction of an electricity generator on site. The generator is a super silent generator which is proposed to be housed within a container to further assist with minimising noise impact. The generator is proposed to be limited to power loading equipment which will involve using the generator for an hour in the morning and an hour in the evening in line with the existing permitted operational hours of use of the site under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 and also in line with the noise limitations outlined in Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. As such Officers therefore consider that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the proposed development would not result in a significant adverse effect with regards to noise and would comply with the Development Plan with regards to noise and neighbouring amenity.
107. In regard to the additional opening and closing time for staff, Officers recognise that the scale of this (up to six small vehicles) is not significant in size within the context of the surrounding area, and has received no objection from the County Highway Authority. Woking Borough Council have raised no objection to this proposal other than no changes to the existing operational times of the site are maintained and that the additional opening and closing time for staff is conditioned to only Monday to Friday as there is insufficient need to

require this during a Saturday, where rush hour does not exist. Officers, therefore, consider that providing additional access time for staff would not cause further adverse impacts to residential amenity in line with Policy 14 from the SWLP (2020) and Policy DM5 from the WDPD (2016).

108. Overall, Officers consider that the proposal meets Policy 14 from the SWLP (2020); Policy CS21 from the WBCCS (2012); Policy DM5 from the WDPD (2016); Paragraphs 174, 180 and 185 of the NPPF (2021) in terms of its impact on the amenity of local occupants and supports the need for co-locating structures that are ancillary to waste facilities on site within a suitable location as outlined in the NPPW (2014) Locational Criteria (Appendix B). Furthermore, Officers consider that the noise generated from this proposal would not result in significant adverse impacts to local amenity subject to appropriate conditions, including meeting noise limitations as outlined in Condition 7 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 and limiting the hours of operational use of the generator. In this regard, Officers consider that the proposal would not cause significant adverse impacts to residential and visual amenity.

IMPACT TO HERITAGE

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP

Policy 13 – Sustainable Design

Policy 14 – Protecting Communities and the Environment

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

Policy CS20 – Heritage and Conservation

Policy CS21 – Design

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

Policy DM20 – Heritage Assets and their Settings

Planning Policies

109. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF (2021) states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
110. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF (2021) further goes on to state that the County Planning Authority (CPA) should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
111. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF (2021) goes on further state that any harm, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its

setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; (b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional¹⁰.

112. Paragraph 201 of the NPPF (2021) states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Paragraph 202 outlines that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
113. The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) provides further guidance on the assessment of heritage assets when considering planning applications. Paragraph 007 (Reference ID: 18a-007-20190723 dated 23 July 2019) states that heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. This paragraph goes on to state that being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.
114. Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 18a-013-20190723 dated 23 July 2019) of the NPPG explains that setting is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. It outlines that although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of impacts on settings, the way in which an asset is experienced it is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity. This paragraph goes on to clarify that the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting and that the contribution may vary over time. The NPPG goes on to further state that when assessing any applications which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, the CPA may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.
115. Accordingly, paragraph 018 (Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723 dated 23 July 2022) of the NPPG is clear that what matters in assessing whether a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset which derives not just from its physical presence but also its setting. This paragraph also makes plain that it is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed.
116. Historic England has published a series of guidance notes to assist in the determination of planning applications that could have an impact on heritage assets. These include: 'Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment – July 2015'; 'Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition) – December 2017'; and 'Good Practice Advice in Planning: 4 Enabling Development and Heritage Assets – June 2020'. Hereafter these advice notes are referred to 'Advice Note 2 (2015)'; 'Advice Note 3 (2nd Edition 2017)', and 'Advice Note 4 (June 2020)' respectively.
117. In paragraphs 7 and 8 of Advice Note 3 (2nd edition 2017) it is recognised that the extent of a setting cannot have a fixed boundary and may alter over time due to changes in circumstance. Furthermore, paragraph 11 explains that views can contribute to setting of heritage assets. For example, where a view is a fundamental aspect of the design of the

¹⁰ Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

asset, is part of a viewing point, or where assets were meant to be seen by one another for aesthetic, functional, ceremonial or religious reasons (paragraph 12).

118. Advice Note 2 (2015), at paragraph 4, explains that the first step in assessing the impact a development proposal may have on a designated heritage is to understand the significance of any affected heritage asset and, if relevant, the contribution of its setting to its significance. The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic and artistic interest.
119. Advice Note 4 (2020) outlines the balanced approach to assessing when to enable development against Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021). It states in paragraph 20 that considerations in the assessment will include the importance and significance of the heritage assets(s), the nature of the planning policies that would be breached, the severity of the breach or breaches, whether the asset(s) have been subject to deliberate neglect and giving great weight to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 21 goes on further to state that a decision-maker can only properly decide if the development is justified if they can assess the full scale of the enabling development needed to deliver the necessary benefits to secure the future of the heritage asset.
120. Within Appendix B of the NPPW (2014) it states that in testing the suitability of sites the CPA should consider the factors listed in the appendix and bear in mind the envisaged waste management facility in terms of its nature and scale. In respect of heritage assets, the NPPW (2014) Appendix B Criteria E requires consideration of the potential effects on the significance of heritage assets, whether designated or not, including any contribution made by their setting.
121. Policy 13 from the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the development is of a scale, form and character appropriate to its location. Policy 14 from the SWLP (2020) goes on further to state that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it (A) it would be consistent with relevant national planning policy with respect to the following key environmental assets nationally important heritage assets, including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, and Registered Parks and Gardens where those located within the county or could be affected by development located within the county. Part (B) of Policy 14 from the SWLP (2020) goes on further to state that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it would not result in unacceptable impacts on communities and the environment including:
- (v) 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.
 - (vii) The historic landscape, on sites or structures of architectural and historic interest and their settings, and on sites of existing or potential archaeological interest or their settings.
122. Policy CS20 from the WBCCS (2012) outlines that new development must respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area in which it is proposed whilst making the best use of land available. New development should also make a positive contribution to the character, distinctiveness and significant of the historic environment, including heritage assets at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. The heritage assets of the Borough will be protected and enhanced in accordance with relevant legislation and national guidance as set out in the NPPF. There will be presumption against any development that will be harmful to a listed building. Policy DM20 from the WDPD (2016) outlines that a proposal affecting the character or setting of heritage assets will be required to show that the works are in harmony with and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage asset and/or its setting in

terms of quality of design and layout, and that it would not have an adverse impact on views of or from the heritage asset.

123. Policy CS21 from the WBCCS (2012) outlines that proposals for new development that should be designed to create buildings and places that are attractive in their own distinct identity and should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

124. Surrey County Council's Historic Building Officer notes that there is no legislative requirement for assessing the impact on a Registered Park and Garden. As the site is outside of a Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 does not apply.
125. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a "General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions". Subsection (1) provides: "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess". Section 66 of the Act gives a ruling on how planning applications are to be considered in cases affecting listed buildings, and also includes an obligation to protect the setting of listed buildings. The legislation has been assessed by the Courts on various occasions, invariably finding that, if there would be harm to a listed building or its setting, that harm must be given considerable importance and weight and not treated merely as a 'material consideration' to which decision-makers can attach such weight as they think fit. The courts have confirmed that following the process set out in the NPPF for assessing the impact on heritage assets corresponds with the duty set out in section 66 of the Act.

Details Submitted

126. The applicant has submitted a Heritage Statement dated August 2020 which outlines the application site and its contribution to the surrounding area and the proposals impact upon the character and appearance of both the Sutton Green Conservation Area and Sutton Place Parks and Gardens.
127. The applicant goes on to state within the Heritage Statement that the Sutton Green Conservation Area is a largely rural area containing a number of historic buildings and structures the setting of which contributes to the areas character. The applicant considers that the proposed development is well screened by established and new planting which was required by conditions attached to the extant permission and existing structures on site. Furthermore, the applicant goes on to outline that the structures within the application site are of an agricultural character similar to those found in the surrounding rural locality, and therefore would assist in minimising the adverse effect on the character of the conservation area nor cause harm to the setting of the listed Sutton Place gardens to the south of the site.
128. The applicant acknowledges that the setting of a heritage asset includes the surrounding in which it is experienced, and that noise can have a detrimental impact on the setting. The applicant states within the Heritage Statement that the noise is limited as wood is mainly prepared off site and the number of HGV vehicles is restricted by the extant planning conditions. The applicant goes on further to state that the application site is separated from the conservation area by the nursery and the existing road of Sutton Green Road and therefore this proposal would not alter the existing levels or vehicles number that are already permitted on this site and thus the impact on the setting of the identified heritage assets

would be limited. The silent generator (SSDK16M model) which is proposed as part of this application is also encased within a storage unit which further assists in minimising the noise produced from the generator. A noise assessment has also been submitted as part of this application which is discussed within the noise section of this Officer report.

Sutton Green Conservation Area

129. The application site is not located within a Conservation Area, however it does sit adjacent to the north-western corner of Sutton Park Conservation Area. The Sutton Park Conservation Area contains numerous buildings which are nationally listed for their architectural and historic interest, together with a number of ancient monuments scheduled for their national importance.
130. The proposal introduces new structures which are proposed to be located within the existing permitted site and does not encroach beyond the existing site boundary and all, except the CCTV poles, would be below the height of the existing barn. Whilst there would not be any physical impact on the Sutton Park Conservation Area, due to the proximity of the proposal to Sutton Park Conservation Area it may have the potential to undermine the prevailing characteristics of the conservation area which Officers consider to be of a rural and agricultural nature.
131. Officers note that the proposed new structures are to improve existing functionality of the site and do not propose to alter the existing level of activity or vehicle numbers on site than what is already permitted under the extant planning permission (WO/2015/0605). In this respect therefore Officers do not consider that the proposal would adversely affect the conservation area by way of noise or material increase in vehicle movements along this part of the highway.
132. In respect of views to and from the conservation area, Officers recognise that the site benefits from screening from both native planting on site and adjacent horticultural nursery along the boundaries of the site, which Officers consider are appropriate and provide adequate screening to and from the conservation area. The design of the new structures are in keeping with the existing permitted structures on site and are of a small scale and the proposed new storage bays in keeping with the visual appearance and character of structures often found within the surrounding agricultural land. Officers recognise that the new silent generator could generate noise that could affect the setting of the Conservation Area. However, the County Noise Consultant (CNC) has confirmed that the generator proposed to be used as part of the development are within the margins that would be acceptable with respect to the guidance in BS 4142:2014 + A1:2019¹¹ and given the generator would be used for specified hours at the beginning and end of the permitted operational times, Officers do not consider that the development proposed as part of this application, including the generator, would materially alter the existing noise environment.
133. Officers therefore consider that the potential impact to the prevailing characteristics of the conservation area are limited and are not increased than what is already permitted under the extant permission. Thus, in respect of the Sutton Park Conservation Area the proposed development in terms of structures would not undermine the character or cause harm to the setting or significance by way of views to and from the conservation area, and the proposed development aligns with Policies 13 and 14 from the SWLP (2020) and Policies CS20 and CS21 from WBCCS (2012) with making best use of the land available whilst maintaining the development respects the character and appearance of the area, whilst being of a suitable scale.
134. The County Historic Building Officer has reviewed the proposal with regard to the Conservation Area and has commented that while the site maybe glimpsed from buildings

¹¹ Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.

on the north side of Sutton Green Road, the proposed buildings are of a sufficiently small scale that they will no result in harm to the setting of the Conservation Area. Historic England wish to make no comments on this matter.

Listed Buildings

135. The proposal would not result in any direct impact on listed buildings themselves by either altering or demolishing them. As such, it is appropriate to assess whether this proposal would harm the setting of any of the listed buildings and thereby affect their significance. The setting of a Heritage Asset is defined in the NPPF Glossary as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. Officers have identified ten heritage assets in the vicinity of the application site. These are detailed below.

Schedule Ancient Monument The 'Old Manor House (site of) west of Roman Catholic Church Sutton Park' – Historic England List ID 1005933

136. This monument is located approximately 500m away to the south of the application site beyond buildings and structures within the nursery, Sutton Green Road, a block of woodland to the south of the application site which runs parallel to Sutton Green Road, hedgerows, fields and buildings. This monument is also located 50m west of St Edward's Roman Catholic Church, Sutton Park. The monument comprises of the site of a medieval manor house, which was designated as an ancient monument as manorial centres were important foci of medieval rural life. The monument includes a medieval manor house, believed to date to the 12th or 13th century, surviving as upstanding and buried remains.

The 'Disc Barrow on Whitmoor Common' – Historic England List ID 1011599

137. This monument is situated to the south-west of the application site beyond buildings and structures within the nursery, Sutton Green Road, the block of woodland to the south of Sutton Green Road, Clay Lane, hedgerows, fields and buildings (approximately 800m away). Disc barrows are the most fragile type of round barrow being funerary monuments of the Early Bronze Age with most examples dating to the period between 1400 and 1200 BCE. Disc barrows are rare nationally, and their richness in terms of grave goods provides importance evidence for chronological and cultural links amongst prehistoric communities. Despite partial excavation, the disc barrow on Whitmoor Common survives well and is a fine example of this rare form.

The Grade II Registered Park and Garden at 'Sutton Place' – Historic England List ID 1001554*

138. Sutton Place is Grade II* listed and extends to approximately 90 hectares (ha) in size and lies adjacent to the north west of the A3 London to Portsmouth Road and is bounded to the east and south by flood meadows through which the River Wey runs. The estate is bounded by agricultural land to the west and north, which includes land occupied by Elm Nursery and residential dwellings.

139. The park and garden at Sutton Place is located some 250m south of the application site beyond buildings and structures within the nursery, Sutton Green road, the block of woodland to the south of Sutton Green Road, and a field. Apart from an access off Blanchards Hill, the park and garden at Sutton Place is largely enclosed by dense, mature and established planting.

140. The principal building within the gardens is the Grade I Listed Building Sutton Place constructed between 1520 and 1540, and stands towards the centre of the estate. This two-

storey mansion is brick built with stone and terracotta dressings, and is a fine example of Tudor domestic architecture. An irregular shaped service wing is attached to the north-west of the building beyond which stands the U-shaped Grade II Listed Stable Block constructed in the 18th Century. The mansion is partly enclosed by a further area of formal and informal gardens, which are arranged around a spinal terrace lawn which runs parallel and adjacent to the south west front. To the south and west of these gardens lie the informal pleasure grounds, partly enclosed by a circuit walk and bounded to the south west by the unimproved arm of the Wey.

Grade II Listed Whitmoor House (including cottage to the rear) – Historic England List ID 1236958

141. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. It is located some 270m west of the application site beyond buildings and structures within the nursery, a mature field hedgerow, and the adjacent agricultural field and associated buildings. The house comprises three sections – 16th Century construction to the rear; 18th Century addition to the front; and 19th Century addition in similar style to the left end.

Grade II Listed Granary 15 yards south west of Whitmoor House – Historic England List ID 1236959

142. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. It is located approximately 290m west of the application site beyond buildings and structures within the nursery, a mature field hedgerow, the adjacent agricultural field and associated buildings, and Whitmoor House. It is a 17th Century timber framed Granary with brick infill and underbuilt in brick.

Grade II Listed Sutton Green House – Historic England List ID 1236803

143. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. It is located approximately 340m east of the application site off Foxes Path, beyond Sutton Ridge House, a field and the block of woodland east of Sutton Green Road. The building is a 16th Century house encased in 18th and 20th Century additions.

Grade II Listed Oak House – Historic England List ID 1236805

144. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. The building comprises a 16th Century house with a 19th Century addition to its rear. It is located about 380m south of the application site beyond Sutton Green Road and the block of woodland which runs parallel to the southern side of the same.

Grade II Listed The Manor House – Historic England List ID 1236932

145. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. It is an 18th Century house with a 19th Century parallel range beyond. The Manor House is located some 390m south east of the application site beyond Sutton Ridge House, a field, and the block of woodland on the southern side of Sutton Green Road.

Grade II Listed Frog Land Farmhouse – Historic England List ID 1378244

146. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. The building comprises a 16th Century house with a 19th Century cross wing to left and extension to the right. It is located some 400m north of the application site beyond the curtilage of Sutton Ridge House, mature hedgerows, and two fields.

Grade II Listed The Old Post Office – Historic England List ID 1236801

147. This building is listed for its special architectural or historic interest. It is a 16th Century timber framed house located approximately 430m north east of the application site beyond Sutton Ridge House, a field, Frog Lane, a block of woodland, New Lane, Sutton Ridge Garage, and several residential dwellings.

Grade II Listed Bull Lane Cottages – Historic England List ID 1044714

148. 1 and 2 Bull Lane Cottages is a 16th Century building listed for its special architectural or historic interest. The building is located some 470m south of the application site beyond buildings and structures within the nursery, Sutton Green Road, the block of woodland parallel to the southern side of Sutton Green Road, fields and further planting.

Evaluation

149. The suitability of the site for use as a waste management facility within the context of the heritage setting has already been established as being acceptable in the extant planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. This proposal does not fundamentally change the existing use of the site but it does introduce an increase in the built form on site from that which is already permitted and therefore the cumulative impact needs to be assessed.
150. The County Archaeological Officer (CAO) has reviewed the proposal and notes that the original grant of permission under WO/2015/0605 had no requirement for archaeological mitigation attached. As the site does not lie within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, and nor does the boundary of site application cover more than 0.4ha in total area, it therefore does not meet the requirements under Woking Local Plan to have to consider the impacts of development on as-yet unknown heritage assets. The CAO consider the works at this site are reasonably small in scale and there are no nearby heritage assets that suggest the site has significant potential for archaeological remains. The CAO is satisfied that there are no archaeological concerns regarding these proposed changes.
151. The County Historic Building Officer has also assessed the proposal in accordance with Paragraphs 195 and 199 of the NPPF and has commented the application site is close to Sutton Park which is a Grade II* Registered Park and Gardens. The County Historic Building Officer comments that the boundary on Sutton Green Road is predominately wooded with hedges and there is no intervisibility between the park and garden and the application site and as such there is no impact on this heritage asset.
152. The County Planning Authority in the form of the County Historic Building Officer, have identified heritage assets in the vicinity of the application site and have assessed the particular significance of these heritage assets in accordance with Paragraph 195 of the NPPF. The County Historic Building Officer considers there will be no material impact on the significance of the Conservation Area or Registered Park and Garden. Officers consider that the proposal would not harm the setting or significance of Sutton Park Conservation Area or any heritage assets within the vicinity of the application site. The proposal does not seek to amend the principle of the development as a waste management site, rather it seeks to improve the operational functionality of the existing waste management facility that was considered acceptable within the heritage context in planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. As such Officers consider that the development proposed satisfies the requirements of Policies 13 and 14 of the SWLP (2020), Policies CS20 and CS21 from WBCCS (2012) and Policy DM20 from the WDPD (2016).

SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE AND FLOOD RISK

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP
Policy 13 – Sustainable Design

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

Policy CS9 – Flooding and Water Management

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

Policy DM5 – Environmental Pollution

Planning Policies

153. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF (2021) states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
154. Paragraph 167 of the NPPF (2021) states that when determining planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment¹². It goes on to state that development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in light of this assessment it can be demonstrated that:
- a.) Within the site the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location.
 - b.) The development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it can be quickly brought back to use without significant refurbishment.
 - c.) It incorporates a sustainable drainage system, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.
 - d.) Any residual risk can be safely managed.
 - e.) Safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.
155. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF (2021) states that the planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution.
156. In respect of the protection of water quality and resources and flood risk management the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) (2014) Appendix B Criteria A requires consideration of the proximity of vulnerable surface and groundwater or aquifers and the suitability of locations subject to flooding, with consequent issues relating to the management of potential risk posed to water quality from waste contamination.
157. Policy 14 from the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it would not result in significant adverse impacts on communities and the environment which include the water environment, such as flood risks (including impacts on, and opportunities to provide enhance flood storage and surface water drainage capacity); and water resources. Policy 13 also seeks to ensure that

¹² A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zone 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more, land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems, land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being increased flood risk in the future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.

development is resilient to the effects of climate change including the management of flood risk.

158. Policy CS9 of the WBCCS explains that the Council will expect development to be in Flood Zone 1 and will require all significant forms of development to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems as part of any proposal. It goes on to state that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required for development proposals within or adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding. Moreover, to further reduce the risk from surface water flooding, all new development should work towards mimicking Greenfield run-off situations.
159. Policy DM5 of the WDPD (2016) states that when assessed individually or cumulatively, development proposals should ensure that there will be no unacceptable impacts on surface and ground water quality. Development which has the potential, either individually or cumulatively, for an unacceptable impact on water quality by reason of pollution but is considered desirable for reasons for economic or wider social needs will be expected to provide an appropriate scheme of mitigation. The aims of the Water Framework Directive should be taken into account in planning decisions affecting water quality and management. In assessing a scheme of mitigation, account will be taken of: the location, design and layout of the proposed development; measures to bring levels of pollution to an acceptable level, measures to control run-off and other diffuse pollution; and hours of operation. Development will not be permitted if mitigation cannot be provided to an appropriate standard with an acceptable design, particularly in proximity to sensitive existing uses or sites.

Details Submitted

160. The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore is at low risk of flooding, however the site is identified by the Environment Agency as being at significant risk of surface water flooding. In light of this, the parent permission for use of this site for waste management purposes (WO/2015/0605) was subject to Condition 11 which required approval of a scheme disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system. In accordance with this condition details of a scheme for disposing of surface water by means of sustainable drainage system was approved under planning permission WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017. The approved scheme comprised of two rainwater harvesting tanks (a combined volume of 35,000 litres) collecting rainwater. In the event of the two tanks reaching capacity an overflow soakaway has been designed to contain all runoff for up to the 1 in 100 year flood event, including a 30% allowance for climate change. These approved details have also been submitted as part of this application for information purposes.
161. As outlined in the Sustainable Drainage System Details submitted by the applicant directing water from the rainwater collection tank to the toilets was found to be unfeasible in practice and the position of the water tanks were amended. The rest of the approved drainage details have been fully implemented on site. The current drainage system on site is outlined the following plan A800 'Drainage System' dated 15 February 2021. The applicant states within the Sustainable Drainage System Details that the drainage system allows rainwater to be collected from the roof of the main barn building into a 10,000 litre capacity internal water tank. This tank is connected to four outlets, which includes an outlet for an irrigation system watering trees planted along the site boundary for screening, an outlet for a dust suppression system which operates within the open storage bays to minimise pollution when loading and unloading, an outlet for washing down equipment, and on the rare occasion that the water tank is full an overflow an outlet for an overflow to the sites soakaway. Two WCs are located on site which are connected to a septic tank.
162. The applicant outlines that the soakaway is an underground holding tank with a water holding capacity of 19,000 litres which then in turn allows water to soak away into the natural ground water in a controlled manner. The holding capacity is sufficient to accommodate a 1 in 100 year flood event plus a 30% climate change allowance. The groundwater table is

known to be approximately 1.4m below ground level with a 1m clear ground between the soakaway base and the water table.

163. The areas of the site covered by buildings is impermeable and therefore the rainwater is collected and managed. The rest of the site is permeable area, and the topography of the land is not proposed to be altered, therefore allowing the rainwater to drain naturally.
164. The new chip bays proposed are proposed to be walled in and have a slight slope in the centre. The bays are to be filled with wood chip for a majority of the time which will absorb water. It is proposed that concrete panels around the bays will be constructed to prevent water from escaping.
165. The fuel is stored in steel tanks and is located on a concrete slab with a block wall surrounding the tanks. The block walls are 1 block high at the sides and front and are 6 blocks high at the back in line with the environmental protocols stipulated by the Environmental Agency to prevent spillage of diesel oil on site and to protect the fuel tanks from impact. The walls are designed to hold water which can be drained off or allowed to evaporate naturally. There is a tap installed in the wall to enable controlled drainage in the event of a spillage.
166. Following initial review by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), additional information was submitted regarding the increase in the impermeable area and proposed changes to the existing soakaway scheme to accommodate for this additional increase in the impermeable area. These are outlined in the plans 08 'Barn Drainage Systems' dated 18 May 2022; 09 'Sewage System Drainage' dated 18 May 2022; 10 'Office Facilities Drainage' dated 18 May 2022; and 11 'Fuel Storage and Drainage Systems as Recommended by the EA' dated 19 May 2022. The soakaway proposed is approximately 19m x 0.5m x 3.5m in size, with the gravel pit by the new office building approximately 15m x 0.3m x 0.3m in size, and the gravel pit by the oil storage building approximately 8m x 0.3m x 0.6m in size.

Evaluation

167. The LLFA have reviewed the surface water drainage strategy proposed for the development and the additional information submitted against the requirements of the NPPF, its accompanying PPG and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems. The LLFA are satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the NPPF, its accompanying PPG and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems and raise no objection with the development proposed. The applicant is reminded that if proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the LLFA should be contacted to obtain prior written consent. Furthermore, if proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards. Sub ground structures should be designed so they do not have an adverse effect on groundwater.
168. The Environment Agency (EA) have also reviewed the documents submitted for the proposed development and raise no objections.
169. Officers are satisfied that the details submitted to mitigate flood risk and surface water drainage are appropriate for the nature and scale of the proposed development and material change of use. The site is 0.39 hectares in size and is located on land within the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1). It is proposed that the existing sustainable drainage system that was approved under planning permission WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017 will continue to be deployed and appropriate adjustments have been made to accommodate for the increase in the impermeable area proposed by including a new soakaway and gravel pits for additional drainage. Officers therefore consider that the proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF and satisfy the local development plans and national guidance.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP

Policy 14 – Protecting Communities and the Environment

Policy 15 – Transport and Connectivity

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

Policy CS18 – Transport and Accessibility

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

No Relevant Policies Identified.

170. The proposal does not seek to increase the throughput of the site, the vehicular or pedestrian access into/from the site or the number of HGVs access in the site. The only change proposed relating to highway matters is the applicant seeking an additional amount of time for staff to come and go from the site at the beginning and end of the day to plan site logistics for the day. There are no other changes proposed to operations at the site as part of this proposal.

Planning Policies

171. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF (2021) states that it should be ensured that for specific applications for development that safe and sustainable access to the site can be achieved for all users, and that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF (2021) further states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Paragraph 113 of the NPPF (2021) states that all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

172. Appendix B of the NPPW (2014) states that in testing the suitability of sites the CPA should consider the factors listed in the appendix and bear in mind the envisaged waste management facility in terms of its nature and scale. In terms of highways, traffic and access, Criteria F of Appendix B explains that such considerations will include the suitability of the road network and the extent to which access would require reliance on local roads.

173. Part (b) of Policy 14 of the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that it would not result in unacceptable impacts on communities and the environment.

174. Policy 15 of the SWLP (2020) states that planning permission for waste development will be granted where it can be demonstrated that transport links are adequate to serve the development or can be improved to an appropriate standard; the distance and number of vehicle movements associated with the development are minimised; the residual cumulative impact on the road network of vehicle movements associated with the development will not be severe and there is safe and adequate means for access to the highway network and the vehicle movements associated with the development will not have an unacceptable impact on the highway safety when compared against current national and local guidance.

175. Policy CS18 of the WBCCS (2012) outlines that the Council is committed to developing a well integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects to jobs, services and community facilities and minimised impacts on biodiversity and that this is to be achieved by taking the following steps:

- a.) Joint working with key stakeholders through the Transport for Woking Partnership to ensure that the principal objectives and overall vision of the Surrey Local Transport Plan are met.
- b.) Locating most new development in the main urban areas, served by a range of sustainable transport modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling to minimise the need to travel and distance travelled.
- c.) Ensuring development proposals provide appropriate infrastructure measures to mitigate the adverse effects of development traffic and other environmental safety impacts (direct or cumulative).
- d.) Requiring development proposals that generate significant traffic or have significant impact on the strategic road network to be accompanied by a travel plan, clearly setting out how the travel needs of occupied and visitors will be managed in a sustainable manner.

176. The Surrey Transport Plan (LTP4) (2022) outlines the plan for transforming the transport network from 2022-2032 and beyond. The LTP4 aims to significantly reduce carbon emission from transport to meet the commitment to net zero emissions in 2050, in line with the Government's national legal commitment. This will be achieved through (i) avoiding unnecessary travel by reducing the number and length of trips needed; (ii) shifting travel choices to more sustainable modes of transport, including public transport, walking and cycling, away from car use; and (iii) improving the energy efficiency of vehicles and operational efficiency of roads through technology improvements.

Details Submitted

177. No changes to the permitted hours of operation or levels of vehicle movements as permitted under Conditions 4 and 5 of planning permission WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016 are proposed as part of this proposal. Under Condition 4 of the extant planning permission (WO/2015/0605) vehicles and personnel are permitted to enter or vacate the site 30 minutes before or after the hours. The applicant has proposed this is increased to 60 minutes before or after the hours to allow sufficient time for staff to review the day's planned activities and to prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hour. The vehicles required would be small in size with a maximum of six vehicles at any one time. Vehicles are proposed to continue to be parked in the existing car parking arrangements located to the western side of the site.

178. The applicant states within the Planning Statement that although the application site is in a rural location, it is easily accessible by the local road network and the applicant's customer sites are principally local to the site minimising road transport miles.

Evaluation

179. As outlined above in the NPPF (2021) which states that *development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.* Officers consider in this regard that the proposal to allow access to and from the site for vehicles and personnel, in small vehicles, up to 60 minutes before and after the permitted operational times would not result in significant residual cumulative impacts to the road. A maximum of six cars at any one time is proposed. The proposal for small vehicles and personnel to access and leave the site 60 minutes prior to the operational hours allows staff to avoid the local commuting times where traffic is likely to be congested, helping to reduce the impact to the local road network during Monday to Friday.

180. The principle of this development has already been found acceptable in terms of highway safety and capacity under planning permission WO/2015/0605. This proposal does not propose any changes to the existing permitted hours of operation, or the permitted operational throughput (1,000 tonnes of agricultural waste imported per annum), and therefore this proposal would not increase traffic levels beyond the levels already permitted by the existing planning permission WO/2015/0605. Due to the small scale of the proposal, additional details regarding a transport statement and travel plan are not required.
181. The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority (CHA), who have 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 therefore have no highway requirements for this application.
182. Woking Borough Council raised no objection to the proposal but consider that the whilst no objection is raised to the additional hour in the evening, Monday-Fridays only, it is considered that the additional hour in the morning would only be acceptable on a Monday-Friday and not Saturdays and propose that a suitable condition worded to specify the additional hour is only for use on a Monday-Friday.
183. In addition, Woking Borough Council also recommended that a condition is included to exclude the running of all other vehicles (other than vehicles used for staff arrivals and departures) and all plant on the site, during the additional hour. Officers note that there is no proposed changes to the existing operational hours permitted under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 and this condition regarding operational hours would remain intact and enforceable.
184. Officers are satisfied that as there are no proposed changes in terms of traffic and highway implications to what already exists as part of the operation of the site that is already permitted under planning permission WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016, that this proposal will not result in an adverse impact to the highways, and as such would accord with development plan policies and the NPPF in this regard.

GREEN BELT

Surrey Waste Local Plan – Part 1 Policies (2020) SWLP

Policy 9 – Green Belt

Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (WBCCS) (2012)

Policy CS6 – Green Belt

Policy CS24– Woking’s Landscape and Townscape

Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (WDPD) (2016)

Policy DM13 – Buildings in and Adjacent to the Green Belt

Planning Policies

185. Elm Nursery is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt where policies of restraint apply. The protection of Green Belts around urban areas is one of the key planning principles of the NPPF (2021). Paragraph 137 of the NPPF (2021) states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 138 of the NPPF (2021) states that the Green Belt serves five purposes. Of those five purposes, purpose (c) which seeks to assist in safeguarding the

countryside from encroachment, is relevant to this planning application. Paragraph 147 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances, and Paragraph 148 goes on to state that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt when considering any planning application and that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

186. Paragraph 149 outlines that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development except in certain circumstances. Of the exceptions given in Paragraph 149, this proposal does not fall within these. Paragraph 150 sets out that certain forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided these preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Waste-related development is not included and therefore, waste-related development is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
187. Furthermore Paragraph 7 of the NPPW (2014) states that when determining waste planning applications, waste planning authorities should consider the local environment on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B and the locational implications of any advice on health from relevant health bodies. In addition, it should be ensured that waste management facilities are well-designed so that they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located.
188. Surrey Waste Local Plan (2020) (SWLP) Policy 9 states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate waste management development in the Green Belt unless it is shown that very special circumstances exist. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations associated with the proposal, either on their own or in combination. In addition, the SWLP (2020) outlines that other considerations which need to be weighted when determining whether very special circumstances exist may include:
- i.) The need to find locations well related to the source of waste arisings.
 - ii.) The characteristics of the waste development including scale and type of facility.
 - iii.) The wider environment and economic benefits of sustainable waste management.
189. Policy CS6 from the WBCCS (2012) outlines that development should ensure that the Green Belt continues to serve its fundamental aim and purpose and maintains its essential characteristics, it will be protected from harmful development.
190. Policy CS24 of the WBCCS (2012) states that all development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, and local distinctiveness and will have regard to the landscape character areas. To protect local landscape and townscape character development will be expected to conserve and where possible enhance existing character.
191. Policy DM13 of the WDPD (2016) states that unless very special circumstances can be clearly demonstrated, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings and forms of development other than those specifically identified on allocated sites in the Site Allocations DPD as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, the policy also states that subject to other Development Plan policies, exceptions to this are detailed in Section 9 of the NPPF¹³ and Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. As such Policy DM13 goes on to state that extensions and alterations of buildings within the Green Belt where the proposal does not result in

¹³ Now replaced by Section 13 in the NPPF (2021) version

disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building as it exists at the 1 July 1948 or if it was constructed after the relevant date, as it was first built.

Harm

192. The proposal includes the installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container.
193. Under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 the existing structures amount to approximately 489m² in area¹⁴. This proposal would bring onto the application site structures amounting to approximately 338m² in area of development in addition to the existing structures on site. In addition to the area there is a need to consider the height of the structures within the Green Belt. The tallest structures would be the CCTV poles at 5m in height. The other elements of the proposal are 2.4m in height or less.
194. Officers consider that the built form of the proposal amounts to harm to the Green Belt by virtue of inappropriateness and visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt and may only be permitted where very special circumstances are demonstrated which clearly outweigh the harm caused. In line with policy it is for the applicant to demonstrate very special circumstances exist in order to justify the inappropriate development.

Very Special Circumstances

195. The applicant outlines factors which they consider constitute very special circumstances within the Green Belt Statement dated 3 July 2020, these include:
- The proposal is to be sited on an existing waste management facility in which its principal use as a waste management facility was considered acceptable under planning permission WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016. The existing waste management facility is now well established and instrumental in managing the county's huge demand for the management of arboricultural waste. The improvements to the site proposed provide ancillary support to the existing waste management and are not of a sufficiently large scale to justify the relocation of the established facility to another location. Therefore, the waste management facility cannot be located off site an alternative location as outside of the Green Belt.
 - The additions to the site do not extend beyond the existing boundary on the site, and the proposal helps to support the ongoing processing of waste close to its source providing sustainable advantages and environmental benefits. In accordance with this aim, the applicant states that 90% of the arboricultural waste is sourced from sites within 15km of the application site demonstrating that local demand for the service is strong. The proposal does not increase the volume of waste associated with the site and the primary use remains for the storage of waste before it is transferred to its end users. The proposed office is to be used for the coordination of works on and off site.
 - The structures proposed have been designed to be in keeping with the existing nature of the established waste management use and the existing permitted structures. The design has also been considered in accordance with the visual appearance and character of structures found within the surrounding agricultural land. The site will continue to benefit from screening of established planting and the adjacent horticultural nursery, assisting with limiting the visual impact on the openness of the greenbelt.

¹⁴ As outlined in WO/2015/0605 Officer report, the existing barn building is approximately 404m² and the concrete storage pit is approximately 85m² in size (a total of 489m²)

Conclusion on Green Belt

196. In assessing the proposal against the context of the Green Belt, an assessment of what the harm to the Green Belt for this proposal in terms of the harm itself, openness, and whether the very special circumstances presented outweigh the harm as set out in the NPPF is required.
197. Officers recognise this proposal would encroach on the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the proposed structures and CCTV poles. Officers recognise the proposal would cause harm to the Green Belt by virtue of inappropriateness and harm to the openness given its physical structure and presence, however when considered against the use of the existing site permitted under planning permission WO/2015/0605, the proposed development would not be more intrusive beyond what is already permitted.
198. With regard to the other purposes of including land in the Green Belt, Officers consider the proposal would not cause sprawl of large built-up areas, would not cause neighbouring towns to merge into one another, would not impact on the setting or special character of historic towns; and as no impact on influencing urban regeneration. Consequently, Officers concur that the proposal does not conflict with these purposes of the Green Belt. Regarding permanence, Officers recognise the proposal would be for permanent structures to support an already existing and operational waste management facility.
199. Officers consider that the factors advanced by the applicant as very special circumstances above demonstrates that the inclusion of the office building, welfare building, electricity generator, fuel tanks and storage, and CCTVs are ancillary to the operational use of the site that is already permitted under planning permission WO/2015/0605 and recognise the need to be located in close proximity to where the waste is arising. There are no other locations for these structures to be located outside of the Green Belt area without leading to further disruption in terms of vehicle movement and development to the local area.
200. Officers also recognise that this proposal supports opportunities for a sustainable way to move waste up the waste hierarchy. The addition to the two storage bays allows for the storage of the wood chip to be formalised on site and increasing the efficiency of the site and waste management. It is considered that the additional two storage bays would enhance the operation of the existing site.

Other Harm to Green Belt

201. In accordance with Paragraph 148 of the NPPF (2021) the impact of the development needs to be assessed in terms of any other harm to the Green Belt in addition to the inappropriateness of the proposal. The extent of harm to the Green Belt, and in particular the impact the proposal has on the purpose of including land in Green Belts through its impact on openness is influenced by scale and location of the proposed development.
202. The location of the additional structures will be within the existing site. It does not extend the physical area of the site and would not increase the activities or throughput permitted on site. The proposal is relative low level in scale and other than the CCTV poles is no greater in height than existing structures on site. The site benefits from screening of existing vegetation and from the adjacent horticultural nursery and therefore it is considered that the impact of the CCTV poles will not significantly alter the landscape. Given the limited physical nature of the proposal and that the proposal would not lead to encroachment beyond the existing site boundaries, alongside it being in keeping with the existing site in terms of scale, style, and use, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not lead to greater impact on the openness or other harm.

Conclusion

203. Officers recognise that the presence of the office building, welfare building, CCTV cameras on columns, fuel storage tanks, open storage bays, electricity generator, and fuel storage, within the Green Belt will impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. However, Officers consider that these buildings and structures serve as ancillary functions to the existing operation of the site and the proposed addition of two new storage bays supports moving waste up the waste hierarchy which is required by local and national development plan policies. There is a need to be co-located next to where the waste is arising and is being stored, and therefore there are no other locations for which these structures could be effectively located at. The structures would be within the confines of the existing site and thus would not encroach on the Green Belt beyond the existing site and therefore would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.
204. Officers consider that the proposed development is in keeping with the existing site facilities and the size of the proposed structures is small in comparison to the wider site. The impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt from the height of the structures associated with the proposal is lessened as it sits within the boundaries of the existing site and the location of the site benefits from screening of existing vegetation that runs along the eastern boundary of the site and the existing horticultural nursery beyond the western boundary of the site. Therefore, Officers consider that the impact on openness is limited.
205. Overall, whilst Officers recognise that any waste development is inappropriate development within the Green Belt, there are factors including the need to effectively manage waste arising up the waste hierarchy and manage waste close to the source that it is arising. The proposal is recognised to be seeking to make best use of an existing site and maximise the efficiency of already permitted development. In this regard the proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF and policy 9 of the SWLP (2020) very special circumstances and with regard to the Surrey waste hierarchy.
206. Officers consider that none of the factors identified in the application and considered above can, on their own be considered to constitute very special circumstances and clearly outweigh the harm by virtue of inappropriateness and the loss of openness and encroachment on the countryside. However, Officers consider that the factors identified above when taken collectively can amount to very special circumstances that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness, any other harm and impact to the openness to the Green Belt. The proposal is considered to not cause any greater level of harm to the Green Belt in terms of openness or potential harm from the proposed development on the local environment and amenity with regards to lighting, noise, surface drainage and flooding, and traffic and highways matters (which have been assessed above within this report) than the current extant planning permission permitted. Consequently, Officers consider that the proposal can be permitted as a departure to the Development Plan in this regard.

Human Rights Implications

207. The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, contained in the Preamble to the Agenda is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.
208. Officers do not consider that this application should interfere with any Convention right. The applicant must of course ensure that all CCTV equipment affects only activities within the application site and in any event complies with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) which applies to video surveillance which may include personally identifiable information. It is mandatory to comply with the GDPR and avoid data privacy violations.
-

Conclusion

209. The purpose of this planning application is for the installation and use of an office building and welfare building ancillary to the permitted waste operations at Elm Nursery and the erection of 6 x CCTV cameras on columns, 2 x fuel storage tanks, 2 x open storage bays, 1 x electricity generator, and 1 x fuel storage container (part retrospective). The application is largely in part retrospective in that the office building, welfare building, CCTV cameras on columns, fuel storage tanks, electricity generator and fuel storage container are already installed /sited on the application site. The applicant proposes that the office use is for the co-ordination of operations at the application site and the associated arboricultural business, and that the adjacent welfare building has been installed as a necessary welfare addition which could not be accommodated within the existing main barn building.
210. One representation has been received objecting to this proposal, on the grounds of inappropriate use of the site within the sites location in the conservation area and residential area, intensification of the development and protection of local area, request for the material change of use to be dealt with by Woking Borough Council and issues raised about the use of a retrospective application.
211. Officers consider that the proposed office building to facilitate the coordination of operations on site and for administrative work (currently used by two members of staff) and the welfare building are ancillary to the existing permitted waste management operations on site. Officers consider that these structures are acceptable given they are small in scale and are only to be used in connection with the permitted development on site and would not change the principal use of the site as a waste development site as permitted under planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605. These structures would seek to assist with the ongoing activities on site in a safe and secure location, supporting the objectives of the NPPW (2014) and WMP (2021), and therefore would be acceptable. Officers consider these changes accord with Policy 2(ii) of the SWLP (2020).
212. The CCTV cameras on aluminium poles have been installed for the security purposes and have been positioned so that they do not point outside of the application site. No objections have been received from statutory consultees regarding the implementation of the CCTV cameras, and Officers consider these are acceptable subject to a relevant condition to be imposed to address the data protection issue for the use of CCTV equipment.
213. The fuel container and fuel storage tanks are required to service vehicles, plant and machinery associated with the permitted use of the land. The electricity generator is to be used to power loading equipment for one hour at the start of the day and one hour prior to closure. The two additional open storage bays are proposed for additional storage of arboricultural waste-as there is currently insufficient space for machinery and efficient storage of wood within the permitted barn building.
214. In addition to the proposed structures the applicant is also seeking an additional half an hour (30 minutes) relief at the start and end of each weekday (Monday to Friday) to allow staff and associated vehicles to access the site before and after permitted operational times. The applicant explains that this will allow staff to review the day's planned activities and prepare to leave for work sites prior to the commencement of rush hour. Otherwise, no changes are proposed to the permitted hours of operation associated with the existing use.
215. Officers acknowledge that this proposal does not seek to increase the annual throughput of waste to be managed by the existing facility which is limited to 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste (as per Condition 6 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605), and the primary waste management activity associated with the existing facility will remain limited to the storage of waste before its transfer to the end users. The site is considered to be a relatively small-scale waste management facility and the additional structures seek to further support the efficiency of this site and assist in contributing to the County's net sustainable waste management capacity and driving waste management up the waste hierarchy. In this respect the development meets the criteria outlined within the National Planning Policy for

Waste (2014); the Waste Management Plan for England (2013), and the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020.

216. Officers recognise that introducing new structures onto the site will cause harm to the Green Belt due to it being inappropriate development, however the proposed development is contained within the existing site boundaries and does not further encroach into the Green Belt. The structures are ancillary to the existing waste management activities at Elm Nursery and therefore cannot be reasonably located elsewhere and require to be co-located with the waste management activities. Officers consider that the design of the proposed structures are in keeping with the existing permitted structures on site and are where possible agricultural in nature representing the structures commonly found on agricultural land within rural Surrey. The application site also benefits from well-defined and established planting along its boundaries which provides screening to the site and the County Landscape Architect (CLA) raises no objection on landscape character or visual amenity grounds. Officers and the County Historic Building Officer are satisfied that the proposal would not harm the setting of Sutton Park Conservation Area, Sutton Park or any other listed building within the vicinity of the application site.
217. The proposal does not seek to increase vehicles accessing/egressing the site, and the County Highway Authority raises no objections to this proposal. The increase in seeking an additional half an hour (30 minutes) for staff and associated vehicles to access the site before and after permitted operational times Monday to Friday is considered acceptable against Development Management Policies. Woking Borough Council and Woking Borough Environmental Health Officer have raised no objection to this proposal subject to this is conditioned appropriately.
218. The applicant has demonstrated in the Noise Impact Assessment that the electrical generator proposed would meet the criteria of noise limitations as outlined in the extant permission WO/2015/0605 (Condition 7). The County Noise Consultant (CNC) has reviewed the information submitted and raises no objection to the proposal on the grounds of noise, subject to the provision of a noise limitation condition and a condition limiting the hours of operation of the electrical generator. Furthermore, it is considered that other operations permitted under WO/2015/0605 such as wood chipping and splitting are still to be held in accordance with the conditions stipulated in WO/2015/0605. Officers acknowledge that character of the sound arising from the generator would lead to an increase in noise on site.
219. In relation to the drainage on site, the applicant has put forward drainage details including a soakaway. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has raised no objection to this proposal and the Environment Agency has confirmed that they have no comments to make about the proposal. Officers therefore considered it to accord with development plan policies and the NPPF in this regard.
220. Consequently, Officers recognise that a need has been demonstrated to co-locate these ancillary structures on site to allow for efficient operation of the existing permitted waste management facility at Elm Nursery, which supports achieving sustainable waste management within the County. Officers consider that these structures are ancillary to the operation of the existing waste site facility which require to be located on site, and these factors amount to very special circumstances that clearly outweigh harm by virtue of inappropriateness and the harm to openness. Officers consider the proposal can be permitted as an exception to policy and are satisfied that the proposal can be permitted as a departure from the Development Plan and should be permitted subject to relevant conditions.

Recommendation

221. Accordingly, Officers recommend that planning permission ref: **WO/2020/0993** is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

Commencement

1. The development to which this permission relates to shall begin no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the following plans/drawings:
 - Drawing ref: A050, rev. 2 'Site Location Plan' dated July 2020
 - Drawing ref: A060 'Block Plan' dated July 2020
 - Drawing ref: A251 'Elevations as Built' dated July 2020
 - Drawing ref: A201, rev.01 'Floor Plan as built' dated July 2020
 - Drawing ref: A351, rev. 02 'Elevations Proposed' dated August 2020
 - Drawing ref: A301, rev.02 'Floor Plan Proposed' dated August 2020
 - Drawing ref: A701 'Irrigation and Water Distribution' dated 22 October 2020
 - Drawing ref: A800 'Drainage System' dated 15 February 2021
 - Drawing ref: 08 'Barn Drainage System' dated 18 May 2022
 - Drawing ref: 09 'Sewage System Drainage' dated 18 May 2022
 - Drawing ref: 10 'Officer Facilities Drainage' dated 18 May 2022
 - Drawing ref: 11 'Fuel Storage and Drainage Systems as Recommended by EA' dated 18 May 2022

Permitted Development Rights

3. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary under Schedule 2 Part 2 (Class A); Part 4 (Class A); and Part 7 (Class I, J and L); of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any subsequent Order: No plant, building or machinery whether fixed or moveable shall be erected or extended on the application site without prior written approval of the County Planning Authority in respect to the location, design, specification and appearance of the installation, such details to include predicted levels of noise emission and their tonal characteristics; and no gates, fences, walls, other means of enclosure, or hard surface shall be installed, constructed or erected at the application site.

Hours of Operation

4. The development hereby permitted shall only be undertaken between 08:00 hours to 17:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours on Saturdays. The application site shall only be accessed by vehicles and personnel 1 hour before the permitted operational times on Monday to Friday and shall be closed in all respects no later than 1 hour after permitted operational times. The application site shall only be accessed by vehicles and personnel 30 minutes before the permitted operational times on a Saturday and shall be closed in all respects no later than 30 minutes after permitted operational times.

No working shall be undertaken on Sundays or bank, public or national holidays. This condition shall not prevent emergency operations, but these are to be notified in writing to the County Planning Authority within 3 working days of such emergency works commencing.

5. During the additional 2 hours (Monday to Friday, 07:00 to 08:00 hours and 17:00 to 18:00 hours) and additional 1 hour (Saturday 07:30 to 08:00 and 13:00 to 13:30) permitted for staff to access the site, the running of all other vehicles (other than vehicles used by staff to arrive and depart the site) and all plant on site shall not be used.
6. The generator shall only be used between 08:00 to 09:00 hours and 16:00 to 17:00 hours Monday to Friday and then 08:00 to 09:00 and 12:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays. The generator shall not be used on Sundays or bank, public or national holidays.

Operational Throughput

7. As permitted under planning permission WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2015, no more than 1,000 tonnes of arboricultural waste shall be imported to the application site per annum. No other types of waste materials shall be imported to the application site. Accurate records of the volumes of waste imported to the application site shall be maintained for up to 12 months at any one time and shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority on 1 March and 1 September each year for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Office Building Use

8. The office building and welfare facilities hereby permitted as shown on Drawing A301 rev 02 'Floor Plan Proposed' dated August 2020, shall be used solely in connection with the waste management activities as permitted by planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016 site and for no other purpose.

Electric Generator

9. The metal container that houses the electricity generator hereby permitted shall be provided with a dark green painted external finish (RAL 6009 – Fir Green / RAL 6028 – Pine Green, or equivalent colour agreed in writing with the County Planning Authority) within 3 months of the date of this permission, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Noise

10. The rating of noise arising from any operation, plant or machinery on the application site, when assessed using BS4142:2014 + A1:2019 shall not exceed a level of 5dB above the prevailing background sound level during any 1-hour period. The prevailing background sound level shall be agreed with the County Planning Authority.

Surface Water Drainage

11. Surface water drainage shall be maintained in accordance with the details submitted under the following documents:
 - Planning Statement (document ref: FL11437, rev.1) dated 8 May 2020
 - Technical Note – Drainage, Mayer Brown dated 18 November 2016 – Approved Strategy under planning permission ref: WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017
 - Condition 11 Details dated 6 December 2016 – Approved Strategy under planning permission ref: WO/2017/0102 dated 31 March 2017
 - Drawing ref: A701 'Irrigation and Water Distribution' dated 22 October 2020

- Drawing ref: A800 'Drainage System' dated 15 February 2021
- Sustainable Drainage System Details, Fuller Long dated 26 March 2021
- Drainage Cover Note, Redwood Tree Services Ltd dated 21 September 2021
- Drainage Details (email) dated 10 October 2022
- Drawing ref: 08 'Barn Drainage System' dated 18 May 2022
- Drawing ref: 09 'Sewage System Drainage' dated 18 May 2022
- Drawing ref: 10 'Officer Facilities Drainage' dated 18 May 2022
- Drawing ref: 11 'Fuel Storage and Drainage Systems as Recommended by EA' dated 18 May 2022

This drainage scheme shall be implemented and maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Wood Chip

12. No composting shall take place on the application site. Wood chip shall not be turned mixed or treated in any manner whilst on the application site. All wood chip, and residual waste material generated as a result of the development hereby permitted (branches, leaves, twigs etc.) shall be removed from the application site on a monthly basis. Accurate records of the volumes of wood chip produced on the application site on a monthly basis, and wood chip and residual waste removed from the application site on a monthly basis shall be maintained for up to 12 months at any one time and shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority on 1 March and 1 September each year for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Fuel Tank and Fuel Storage Containers

13. Any oil, fuel, lubricant or other potential pollutant shall be handled in such a manner as to prevent pollution of any watercourse or aquifer. This shall include storage in suitable tanks and containers which shall be housed in an area surrounded by bund walls of sufficient height and construction so as to contain 110% of the total contents of all containers and associated pipework. The floor and the walls of the bunded area shall be impervious to both fuel and any liquid stored therein.

Stockpiles

14. No stockpile on the application site, or within the storage bays permitted, shall exceed 3m in height at any time.

Burning

15. No wood waste shall be burnt on the application site at any time.

Data Protection

16. The six CCTV cameras installed as part of the development hereby permitted shall only be operated in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018, the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, the Human Rights Act 1998, the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice issued under the Protection of Freedom Act 2012, and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or any act or procedures revoking or enacting these.

Lighting

17. No artificial external lighting shall be installed or used at the site other than in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

Reasons:

1. To comply with Section 91 (1)(a) of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.
3. In the interest of local amenity and the environment, and so as to maintain the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policies 9, 13 and 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 and Policy CS6 of Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM13 of Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) respectively.
4. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
5. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
6. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
7. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
8. To enable the County Planning Authority to control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan (2020); Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
9. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; and Policies CS21 and CS24 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012).
10. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
11. In accordance with paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 to ensure that flood risk is not increased onsite or elsewhere; and in accordance with Policies 13 and 14 from the Surrey Waste Local Plan (2020); Policy CS9 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

- 10
12. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
 13. To prevent pollution of water environment in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020.
 14. In the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020.
 15. In the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020.
 16. To enable the County Planning Authority to control the development and to ensure that the development is undertaken in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan (2020); and Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012).
 17. To comply with the terms in the application and in the interests of the local environment and amenity in accordance with Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020; Policy CS21 from the Woking Borough Council Core Strategy (2012); and Policy DM5 from the Woking Local Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).

Informatives:

1. The applicant is reminded that operations on site regarding wood chipping and wood splitting should be undertaken in accordance with the requirements outlined under Conditions 5, 8, 9 and 10 of the existing planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016.
2. The applicant is reminded that the noise control on the facilities operations should be in accordance with the requirements under Condition 7, 8, 9, and 10 in respect of noise control of the existing planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016.
3. The applicant is reminded that the vegetation on site must be maintained in accordance with Condition 13 of planning permission ref: WO/2015/0605 dated 18 August 2016.
4. If proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written consent. More details are available on our website.

If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.

Sub ground structures should be designed so they do not have adverse effect on groundwater.

If there are any further queries please contact the Flood Risk, Planning and Consenting Team via SUDS@surreycc.gov.uk .

5. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Environment Agency (EA) advice as set out in their letter dated 13 November 2020 regarding pollution. Businesses have a duty to ensure they do not cause or allow pollution. Pollution is when any substance not naturally found in the environment gets into the air, water or ground.

The EA have a number of publications available to help you do this, including but not limited to;

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pollution-prevention-for-businesses>

<https://www.gov.uk/dispose-business-commercial-waste>

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/storing-oil-at-a-home-or-business>

<https://www.gov.uk/oil-storage-regulations-and-safety>

6. In determining this application the County Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant by: assessing the proposals against relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework including its 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. Issues of concern have been raised with the applicant including impacts of and on flooding and addressed through negotiation and acceptable amendments to the proposals. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Contact Jessica Darvill

Tel. no. 020 8541 8095

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, are available to view on our [online register](#). The representations received are publicly available to view on the district/borough planning register.

The Woking Borough Council planning register for this application can be found under application reference WO/2020/0993.

Other documents

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

[National Planning Policy Framework](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance](#)

[Waste Management Plan for England \(2021\)](#)

[National Planning Policy for Waste \(2014\)](#)

[Noise Policy Statement for England \(2010\)](#)

The Development Plan

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

[Woking Borough Council Core Strategy \(2012\)](#)

[Woking Borough Council Development Management Plan Development Plan Document \(2016\)](#)

Other Documents

[Surrey Landscape Character Assessments – Woking Borough \(April 2015\)](#)

[Surrey 2015 Landscape Character Assessment – Woking Map](#)

[Surrey Transport Plan – LTP4 \(2022\)](#)

[Surrey County Council Guidelines for Noise and Vibration Assessment and Control \(2020\)](#)

[Methods for Rating and Assessing Industrial and Commercial Sound \(2019\) \(BS4142:2014 +A1:2019\)](#)

[Good Practice Advice In Planning: 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment \(2015\)](#)

[Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets \(2nd Edition\) \(2017\)](#)

[Good Practice Advice in Planning: 4 Enabling Development and Heritage Assets \(2020\)](#)
