

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 29 May 2024 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

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

Members Present:

Ernest Mallett MBE
Jeffrey Gray
Victor Lewanski
Scott Lewis
Catherine Powell
Jeremy Webster
Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
John Robini
Chris Farr
Tim Hall (as substitute)

Apologies:

Jonathan Hulley

17/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Jonathan Hulley. Tim Hall acted as a substitute.

18/24 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes were APPROVED as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

19/24 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

20/24 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

21/24 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

22/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

Item 9 - Cllr Chris Farr raised a non-pecuniary interest that he was a Tandridge District Councillor, a member of the Planning and Planning Policy Committee, and was a member of the Lingfield Surgery. The Member confirmed that had an open mind and was not predetermined.

Item 9 - Cllr Jeffrey Gray raised a non-pecuniary interest that he was a Tandridge District Councillor and that he had not expressed any options on the application.

23/24 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION MO/2023/1833 - LAND AT DORKING WEST STATION YARD, RANMORE ROAD, DORKING, SURREY, RH4 1HW [Item 7]

Officers:

David Maxwell, Senior Planning Policy Officer

Officer Introduction:

1. The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced the report and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted that the application was for the retention of a materials recycling facility including a building for the bulking up and processing of mixed skip waste, an office / welfare facility, storage units, skip storage, entrance gates and installation of an acoustic fence (part retrospective). Members further noted two corrections for the report which were that the site was 170m west of Dorking West Station, rather than east, and, within reason for refusal '5', 'to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency' should be deleted. Full details of the application were outlined within the published report.

Speakers:

Emily Hall spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following comments:

1. That the proposal sought to retain the existing materials recycling facility whilst at the same time proposed an acoustic fence and appropriate parking and cycle storage.
2. That the site was used to sought recycling materials including C, D and E waste and household waste.
3. That support was received from the minerals and waste policy team who had identified a shortfall in management capacity for the waste outlined above.
4. That the proposal would increase existing recycling capacity in Surrey contributing to the waste management requirements.
5. That the proposal would provide employment for nine full-time staff Members.
6. Provided a brief overview of the history and location of the site.
7. That the Landscape Officer had confirmed that the proposal would respect the quality and character of the landscape and would not result in an unacceptable level of harm.
8. That the site generated traffic would not pass by the nearby primary school.
9. That pedestrian safety was a priority for the site and that Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements would be kept to a minimum with all deliveries to be pre-booked and have allocated arrival times.
10. That the council's air quality consultant had confirmed that the proposal would represent appropriate use of the land and the impacts on the surrounding area would not be significant.

11. That the preparation of a Dust Management Plan had been recommended and in connection with this it was recommended that a sprinkler system is installed on site and that any further details could be secured by condition. A condition could also be imposed to ensure the maintenance of the existing tarpaulin fence to prevent dust from escaping the site,
12. Noted detail of the noise impact assessment.
13. Noted detail related to surface water and flooding mitigation.

A Member of the Committee requested more detail on the previously developed land. Members noted that the land was previously a skip hire site.

A Member of the Committee noted that the Environment Agency previously provided a permit for the Materials Recycling Facilities (MRF) in April 2022 that did not include any mechanical handling however mechanical handling was present on site. The Member asked for detail on the applicant's proposal to deal with this issue. The applicant's agent stated that the intention was to contact the Environment Agency once planning permission was granted to resolve the appropriate licencing.

The Local Member, Hazel Watson, made the following comments:

1. That she objected to the planning application and requested that the committee refuse as the site contained an unauthorised waste materials recovery facility and the proposal involved the importation of up to 7,500 tonnes per annum of skip waste material and the site would generate 50 HGV movements per day.
2. That a large number of objections had been received from local residents.
3. That the site for the facility was inappropriately located close to a primary school, a resident caravan site and a sound school. There was a safety risk for children when walking or cycling to school with HGVs entering and exiting the access track from Ranmore Road. There was also a safety risk for walkers and cyclist accessing the sound school, caravan site, allotments, community orchard, BMX track and the National Trust fields.
4. That the County Highways Authority objected to the application.
5. That there were concerns related to dust and noise from the site.
6. That SES Water had advised that the site was close to a number of Dorking bore holes and that the site's activities had the potential to impact on the water abstracted for drinking water.
7. That the application was inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

A Member of the Committee asked the Local Member if she was aware of any enforcement activities in relation to the site. The Local Member stated that she would defer to officers for this information as she was not aware. Officers stated that enforcement issues were not a matter for the committee to consider.

A Member of the Committee asked the Local Member whether she was aware of any pedestrian safety issues related to the site. The Local Member stated that she believed there was an incident relating to a school child on Ranmore Road. It was further stated that the Highways Officers stated that the highways issues could not be mitigated.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member of the committee thanked officers for organising a Member visit to the site. The Member further added that they believed the site layout to be very confusing and said that they did not feel the fencing would mitigate the noise and air pollution impacts. The Member concluded by stating that they were against the proposal.
2. A Member stated that the site was obviously previously developed and that there was a need to deal with waste in Surrey. The Member further stated that the council had a responsibility to employment and businesses in Surrey and that the site would meet both of those objectives. The Member stated that, overall, it was difficult to accept the officer's conclusions however noted the issues related to the local roads and transport. The Member stated that they would be minded to approve the application.
3. A Member stated that they felt the officer's conclusions were clear and that he agreed with the points related to highways safety, pollution issues and dust and noise issues. The Member asked for clarification on whether the access was to the east of the site. Officers confirmed that there was a northern and southern access point. The northern access is the school access and is the only access that the applicant had demonstrated to have adequate visibility. The southern access did not have adequate visibility.
4. A Member stated that they agreed with the officers conclusion and that she understood the highways objection.
5. Members noted that that the application was for 7,500 tonnes of waste per year.
6. A Member felt that the officer's report was balanced and that they agreed with the officer's conclusion.
7. The Chairman moved the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission which received 10 votes for, 1 against, and no abstentions.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Planning and Regulatory Committee refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, which is partially located in the Metropolitan Green Belt, constitutes inappropriate development by definition. The use of this Green Belt land to provide access to the site would not preserve openness. Insufficient very special circumstances are considered to exist to outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and other identified harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraphs 152 and 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, Policy 9 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 and Policy EN1 of the draft Mole Valley Local Plan 2021.
2. It has not been demonstrated that there is safe and adequate means of access to the highway network, that the development is or can be made compatible with the transport infrastructure and the environmental character in the area and that vehicle movements

would have an acceptable impact on highway safety contrary to the requirements of Policy 15 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020, Policy CS18 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009, 'saved' Policy MOV2 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 and Policy INF1 of the draft Mole Valley Local Plan 2021.

3. It has not been demonstrated that the application would have an acceptable impact on communities and the environment in respect of public amenity and safety in relation to the impacts caused by dust, fumes and air quality and that the adverse impacts caused by dust will be mitigated or avoided contrary to the requirements of Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 and Policy EN12 of the draft Mole Valley Local Plan 2021.
4. It has not been demonstrated that the application would have an acceptable impact on communities and the environment in respect of public amenity and safety in relation to impacts caused by noise or that the impacts on existing noise-sensitive uses can be acceptably mitigated, contrary to the requirements of Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 and Policy EN12 of the draft Mole Valley Local Plan 2021.
5. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency that the application would have an acceptable impact on communities and the environment in respect of public amenity and safety in relation to the impact on the water environment including impacts on the quality of ground water resources and drinking water supplies resulting from the release of contaminated run-off from the site contrary to the requirements of Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020, 'saved' Policy ENV67 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 and policies EN12 and INF3 of the draft Mole Valley Local Plan 2021.

24/24 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EL2022/2183 - LAND AT FORMER JOHN NIGHTINGALE SCHOOL SITE, NOW HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, HURST ROAD, WEST MOLESEY, SURREY KT8 1QS [Item 8]

Officers:

Lyndon Simmons, PDP Planning Officer

Officer Introduction:

1. The Planning Officer introduced the report and the update sheet and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted that the application was for the construction of a new single, one and a half and two storey Hurst Park Primary School (420 Places) and Nursery (30 Places) together with provision of 26 parking spaces, and cycle and scooter parking; access off Hurst Road; laying out of outdoor learning and play areas and sports pitches; landscape planting and ecological habitats without compliance with Condition 1 (Approved Plans), Condition 7 (Landscape Planting and Habitat Creation Schemes) and Condition 8 (Landscape Planting and Maintenance) of planning permission ref: EL/2020/0021 dated 4 December 2020 to

enable material changes to details. Full details were outlined within the published report.

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member provide the committee with an overview of the history of the site and stated that he was not aware of any abrasive issues related to the site.
2. A Member stated that they felt it was a good application which improved biodiversity in the area.
3. The Chairman moved the officer's recommendation to approve which was unanimously agreed.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Planning and Regulatory Committee agreed that, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, application no. EL2022/2183 be permitted subject to the conditions outlined within the report.

25/24 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL TA2024/47 - SITE OF FORMER ORCHARD COURT CARE HOME, EAST GRINSTEAD ROAD, LINGFIELD, SURREY, RH7 6ET [Item 9]

Cllr Chris Farr raised a non-pecuniary interest that he was a Tandridge District Councillor, a member of the Planning and Planning Policy Committee, and was a member of the Lingfield Surgery. The Member confirmed that had an open mind and was not predetermined.

Cllr Jeffrey Gray raised a non-pecuniary interest that he was a Tandridge District Councillor and that he had not expressed any options on the application.

Officers:

Janine Wright, Principal Planning Officer

Officer Introduction:

1. The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and update sheet and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted that the outline application was for the erection of part 2 and 3 storey building (with additional basement) for extra care accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities, electric substation and associated parking. Appearance and landscaping reserved. Full details of the application were outlined within the published report. A Member noted that the previous car home contained 63 bedrooms and the new proposal would be 54 units.

Speakers:

Carol Bell spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following comments:

1. That the redevelopment was part of a programme of extra care projects being delivered by Surrey County Council to address the critical gap in provision of affordable extra care housing for older people who need accommodation and support.
2. That the proposal offered a higher level of care compared to traditional sheltered housing. Further to this, residents maintained a higher level of independence than that offered by a traditional care home.
3. That residents in extra care housing were less likely to develop conditions that required intensive healthcare solutions.
4. That the Orchard Court site was selected as it met key sustainability criteria which included close proximity to the Lingfield Village Centre, public transport links and health infrastructure. The site would be fully wheelchair accessible throughout with adaptable accommodation that can address both current and future needs.
5. Noted that there would be added security by having a manager on site at all times.
6. That the site would have the latest in sustainable energy supplies and measures to minimise heat loss. The latest technology would also be used to provide care and support to residents.

The Chairman stated that going forward it would be helpful to understand the proposed layout of the units.

A Member asked whether staff would be available on site in addition to the manager. The speaker confirmed that there would be day and night staff, catering staff, and care workers. Members noted that five parking spaces would be allocated to staff.

The Local Member, Lesley Steeds, made the following comments:

1. That she was supportive of the amended scheme and that the changes in height positioning as well as increased parking were welcomed and addressed concerns that had been raised.
2. That Surrey County Council would be providing a much-needed facility for elderly residents wishing to move to smaller accommodation with facilities onsite.
3. That services would not be further strained as the site was for local elderly people allowing them to have independent living with easy access to local amenities.
4. Urged the committee to approve the application.

A Member asked for detail on Tandridge District Council's position on the proposal. The Local Member explained that the council had reservations due to the height of the proposal and parking spaces however the Local Member felt these had been addressed.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member stated that they supported the proposal and stated that it met a pressing social need for extra care housing. The Member added

that they did not agree with comments by Tandridge District Council outlined in the report and that he felt the proposal better maximised the use of the site.

2. Members noted that objection stated that the proposal was not in accordance with the Lingfield Village Design Plan due to the height of the development however officers noted that there were other buildings in the immediate area of the site which were three levels or higher.
3. A Member stated that the need for the application had been well expressed, that the location of the site was very good and that it would not be reasonable to object due to the height of the proposal.
4. Members noted that he reserve matters would be delegated to officers unless called in to committee or objections received.
5. The Chairman stated that it would be beneficial to reserve a parking space for a 'car club' to enable greater flexibility and reduce the demand for private cars.
6. A Member stated that they were in support of the application and were pleased with the location and parking available.
7. The Chairman moved the recommendation which received unanimous support.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Planning and Regulatory Committee agreed that, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992, the planning application ref: TA2024/47 be approved, subject to planning conditions.

26/24 AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT 2021/2022 AND AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT 2022 [Item 10]

Officers:

Benjamin Brett, Senior Planning Policy Officer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The officers introduced the report and explained that Members were asked to note the preparation of two Authority Monitoring Reports (AMR) relating to the 2021/2022 financial year and the 2022 calendar year. Members received a presentation, and full details were outlined within the published report.
2. In regard to the recycling of concrete, members noted that construction, demolition, and excavation waste was reported on both a waste side and a minerals side and that figures were available on the sales of secondary and recycled aggregates.
3. In regard to the restoring mineral workings listings, a Member said that they could not see the Homefield Site or a reservoir in East Molesey that they were aware of. Officers said that this could be due to timing as only sites which had progress in 2021 / 2022 or 2022. The officer added that they were not aware of any sites excluded from the report.

The Member stated that it would be helpful to receive information on the sites which were not progressing.

4. A Member asked if information was available on unauthorised sites. Officers explained that enforcement monitoring and how it was communicated to the committee was an issue being considered.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Planning and Regulatory Committee noted:

1. The progress made in performance against DHLUC KPIs since September 2022, and the performance of minerals and waste planning policies against their strategic objectives and monitoring indicators for the period 1 April 2021 to 31 December 2022.
2. The change in the reporting period of AMRs and the changed format of the document including its streamlined approach to displaying data and analysing policy performance.
3. That they are encouraged to provide feedback about the AMRs or other land-use planning monitoring functions undertaken by officers.

27/24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 12.10 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank