

**To:** Planning & Regulatory Committee

**Date:** January 2025

**By:** Planning Development Manager

**District(s)** Runnymede Borough Council  
Elmbridge Borough Council

**Electoral Division(s):**

**Woodham & New Haw**

**Mr Lewis**

**Weybridge**

**Mr Oliver**

**Addlestone**

**Mr Furey**

**Case Officer:**

**Janine Wright**

**Purpose:** For Decision

**Grid Ref:** 506063 163297

---

**Title: Minerals/Waste RU.21/0115**

### **Summary Report**

**Land at Addlestone Quarry, National Grid Entrance, Byfleet Road, New Haw, Surrey KT15 3LA**

**Retention of existing plant and continued extraction of sand and gravel and bagshot beds from 61 HA with importation of inert waste and progressive restoration of the site partly to agriculture and partly to reedbed shallows without compliance with Conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16 of planning permission ref: RU09/1103 dated 11 December 2015 in order to extend the time period for mineral extraction and restoration, allow revision to the approved plans and drawings, provide details of amended surface water management scheme and revise timing of submission of aftercare and ecological management scheme.**

This application is for the retention of existing plant and continued extraction of sand and gravel and importation of inert waste and progressive restoration of the site.

The application site is approximately 61ha and is located within the borough of Runnymede, between the settlements of Addlestone and Byfleet.

A temporary aggregate recycling facility (ARF) is situated along the southern boundary of the application site, within the existing quarry processing and plant area. A separate planning application, ref: 2020-0166, for the temporary retention of the ARF is currently pending consideration.

The proposal is made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and is seeking to substitute planning conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16 of planning permission RU09/1103 granted on 11 December 2015.

Applications made under Section 73 of the Act can only consider the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted. The proposal seeks to substitute planning conditions to allow for an extended timescale to fully restore the site by 31 December 2029. The proposed amendments include:-

- Revised operational timescales for the completion of restoration works
- Revised restoration plan
- Revised surface water drainage scheme
- Revised aftercare and ecology management plan

Planning conditions not subject to amendments and attached to planning permission ref: RU09/1103, with respect to soil stripping and formations, permitted development, access arrangements, dust, hours of operation, vehicle movements and noise, will continue to apply. If granted the Section 73 application would result in the issuing of a new planning permission incorporating the proposed changes.

The application was publicised by the posting of site notices and an advertisement within the local newspaper. Owner/occupiers and businesses within the surrounding area have been directly notified by letter.

Twenty-five letters of representation have been received, including twenty-one objections to the proposal. No objections have been received from Runnymede and Elmbridge Borough Councils.

The officer's report is a summary of the assessments which have been made, including the identification of any potential harm arising from the amendments to the conditions. This primarily relates to impacts on landscape, residential amenity and the Green Belt due to the extended timeframes of operations.

Officers are satisfied that the information submitted in support of the application is sufficient to allow amendments to planning Conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16. Subject to the inclusion of existing and revised planning conditions the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts.

The proposal is considered to comply with National and Local Planning policy (as updated) and officers have made a recommendation to permit the proposal.

**The recommendation is PERMIT planning application RU21/0115**

## ***Application details***

### ***Applicant***

Cappagh Public Works Ltd

### ***Date application valid***

18 December 2020

### ***Period for Determination***

19 March 2021 – EOT 31 January 2025

## 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.

	Is this aspect of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
<b>Principle of Development</b>	YES	53-57
<b>Infill and revised phasing scheme</b>	YES	58-70
<b>Landscape</b>	YES	71-78
<b>Noise</b>	YES	79-85
<b>Dust</b>	YES	86-94
<b>Highways, Traffic and Access</b>	YES	95-106
<b>Green Belt</b>	YES	107-115
<b>Surface Water</b>	YES	116-122
<b>Restoration and Aftercare</b>	YES	123-134

***Illustrative material***

**Site Plan**

Plan 1 – Site Location Plan  
 Plan 2 – Restoration Plan

**Aerial Photographs**

Aerial 1 – Wider Area of Site  
 Aerial 2 – Existing Site

***Background***

***Site Description***

1. Addlestone Quarry, also known as Wey Manor Farm, lies to the east of New Haw between the settlements of Addlestone and Byfleet. The full site covers an area of 61 hectares. Prior to the commencement of mineral extraction, the land was mainly agricultural. The application site is located in Runnymede Borough, close to the boundary with the boroughs of Elmbridge to the east/south-east and Woking to the south-west.
2. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and access is gained via Byfleet Road. A purpose built haulage road, south-east of the quarry, services the National Grid electricity sub-station and the wider quarry site. The M25 is located west of the quarry access road, with the main and branch railway lines situated on the eastern and southern boundaries. Brooklands Industrial Park is located to the south-east and a residential development is situated along Byfleet Road (A318) to the south.
3. The main plant area is situated on the south-western boundary of the site and is screened by the railway embankment and areas of trees including ancient woodland.

The plant site area accommodates the mineral processing plant (no longer in use), site office, welfare and other facilities.

4. The aggregates recycling facility (ARF) covers an area of approximately 1ha. It is situated towards the south-east of the main plant area where the mortar plant was previously located. This area has also previously been used for material stockpiling associated with the mortar plant.
5. The quarry area is approximately 61ha with 53ha already restored to an agriculture or nature conservation end use. Infilling to the north-west of the quarry, approximately 7.44ha, continues with an area of 0.81ha of mineral reserves (sand and gravel) yet to be extracted.
6. The application site is operated by Cappagh who acquired the site in 2014.

### ***Planning History***

7. RU88/0876 - Extraction of sand and gravel, erection of a processing plant, importation of inert waste material and the restoration of the site to agriculture and a landscaped lake. Granted at appeal (ref: APP/B3600/A89/133939) in October 1990.
8. RU01/0718 – Extension of time for the development until 31 December 2009. Granted in November 2004.
9. RU09/1103 – Retention of plant and continued extraction of minerals and progressive restoration of the site until 31 December 2020. Granted in December 2015.
10. RU16/1960 – Use of the land for the importation of construction, demolition and excavation (C, D & E) waste and siting of aggregates recycling facilities (ARF), involving the placement of mobile crushing and screening plant to enable recovery of recycled aggregates for sale and export for a temporary period until 31 December 2020. Granted in June 2017. A separate application for the variation of conditions 1, 2 and 9 of planning permission RU16/1960 has been submitted and is currently under consideration. This application relates to a small area of the current application site, located to its south-eastern boundary.

---

### ***The proposal***

11. This application, made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), seeks to substitute planning Conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16 of planning permission RU09/1103 granted on 11 December 2015. As approved, the Conditions are as follows:-

#### **Current Condition 1**

*“The development to which this application relates shall be completed in all respects not later than 31 December 2020”.*

#### **Current Condition 3**

*“The phased working and restoration of the site shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings”:*

<b>Drawing Number:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
P3/876/1 Rev A	Site Plan	September 2005
ADD18X14	Addlestone Land Ownership	July 2012 revised October 2014
P1/876/16 Rev E	Restoration Plan	22 July 2015
04	Site Specific Flood Map	June 2015
05A	Surface Water Management Plan	October 2015
06	Site Specific Flood Map (inclusive of climate change)	June 2015

### **Current Condition 7**

*“A scheme of surface water management following restoration of the site, based on approved Drawing No. 05A dated October 2015, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority within 6 months of commencement of extraction. The scheme shall include details of how the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite, in addition to flow control systems, details of how the SuDS system will be protected during construction and provision of a maintenance plan (that includes responsibilities and the maintenance regime of each SuDS element).*

*The scheme of surface water management shall be agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority and complied with thereafter”.*

### **Current Condition 8**

*“A scheme of aftercare and ecological management for a period of 5 years shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority within 6 months of commencement of extraction setting out the necessary steps and timescale to bring the land to the required standard for use for agriculture. The scheme shall include the following details:*

- *Provision of a field drainage system, taking into account the scheme submitted under Condition 7 above;*
- *Chemical analysis to be taken of the subsoils and topsoils to determine the lime and fertilisers required prior to soil replacement;*
- *Reptile Survey and Mitigation Strategy from Section 3.0 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal Final Report dated 6 June 2014, prepared by GPM Ecology, including:*
  - *Extent of Reptile Habitat;*
  - *Receptor Site Location;*
  - *Receptor Site Management;*
  - *Translocation Strategy;*
  - *Enhancement Landscape Scheme;*
  - *Requirements for further survey work; and*
  - *Removal of fox earth*
- *The Woodland Restoration Plan from Section 5.2.1 of the submitted Protected Species Survey Final Report dated June 2014, prepared by Finnemore Associates, in order to control the removal of Himalayan Balsam and retention of any dead trees;*
- *The measures from Section 6 of the submitted Bird Survey dated April 2014, prepared by Kevin Morgan (GPM Ecology), including protecting the trees on the edge woodland along the haul route and the acid grassland plateau to be retained.*

The scheme of aftercare and ecological management shall be agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority and complied with thereafter”.

### **Current Condition 16**

“All buildings, plant, conveyor belts, machinery both fixed and otherwise, and any engineering works connected therewith on or related to the application site (including any hard surface constructed for any purpose) shall be removed from the application site and the land where such works stood restored in accordance with Drawing No. P1/876/16 Revision E dated 22 July 2015 by 31 December 2020”.

12. This application is seeking to amend the wording of the condition as follows:-

#### **(Proposed) Amendment to Condition 1**

“The development to which this application relates shall be completed in all aspects not later than 31 December 2029”.

#### **(Proposed) Amendment to Condition 3**

“The phased working and restoration of the site shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

<b>Drawing Number:</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
ADD03920	Location Plan	September 2020
EPP-19224	Existing and Proposed Planting Scheme	19 February 2024
RPP-19224	Restoration Phasing Plan	19 February 2024
DOC3-19224	Revised Restoration Plan	19 February 2024
04	Site Specific Flood Map	June 2015
06	Site Specific Flood Map (inclusive of climate change)	June 2015
Rev 4	Flood Risk Assessment Addendum	March 2023

#### **(Proposed) Amendment to Condition 7**

Within 6 months from the date of this permission, a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority.

The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS.

The drainage scheme shall include:

(a) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. Associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of the Qbar Greenfield run-off rate for the site.

(b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).

(c) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk.

(d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.

(e) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

(f) Within 6 months of completion of restoration, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.

**(Proposed) Amendment to Condition 8**

Within 6 months from the date of this permission, a scheme of aftercare and ecological management for a period of 5 years shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority.

The aftercare and ecological management scheme shall include:

(a) The necessary steps and timescales to bring the land to the required standard for use for agriculture;

(b) Provision of field drainage system, taking into account of the surface water drainage scheme, submitted and approved under condition 7 above;

(c) Chemical analysis of the subsoil and topsoil to determine the lime and fertilisers required prior to soil replacement;

(d) Reptile survey and mitigation strategy from Section 3.0 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal Final Report dated 6 June 2014, prepared by GPM Ecology, including:

- Extent of Reptile Habitat
- Receptor Site Location
- Receptor Site Management
- Translocation Strategy
- Enhancement Landscape Scheme
- Requirement for further survey work and
- Removal of fox earth

(e) The Woodland Restoration Plan from Section 5.2.1 of the submitted Protected Species Survey Final Report dated June 2014, prepared by Finnemore Associates, in order to control the removal of Himalayan Balsam and retention of any dead trees;

(f) Measures from Section 6 of the submitted Bird Survey dated April 2014, prepared by Kevin Morgan (GPM Ecology), including protecting the trees on the edge of the woodland along the haul route and the acid grassland plateau to be retained;

(g) A carp management plan detailing how the carp population within the waterbodies will be monitored and controlled



*The scheme of aftercare and ecological management shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.*

### **(Proposed) Amendment to Condition 16**

*All buildings, plant, conveyor belts, machinery both fixed and otherwise, and any engineering works connected therewith on or related to the application site (including any hard surface constructed for any purpose) shall be removed from the application site and the land where such works stood restored in accordance with the Revised Restoration Plan Drawing No. DOC3-19224 dated 19 February 2024 by 31 December 2029.*

13. The effect of these substitutions would be to allow a continued period of operations and restoration ensuring that the site is fully restored by 31 December 2029. It would also allow for the provision of revised plans for the aftercare and restoration of the site.

### **District Council**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 14. Runnymede Borough Council (Environmental Health) | No adverse impacts on the application in relation to air quality, contaminated land and noise |
| 15. Elmbridge Borough Council                        | No objection  |

### **Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 16. County Air Quality Consultant              | No objection  |
| 17. County Ecologist                           | No objection, subject to conditions   |
| 18. County Enhancement and Restoration Officer | No objection, subject to conditions   |
| 19. County Geotechnical Consultant             | No objection, subject to surface water drainage conditions  |
| 20. County Landscape Officer                   | No objection, subject to conditions   |
| 21. County Highway Authority                   | No objection  |
| 22. County Noise Consultant                    | No objection, subject to retention of existing noise conditions   |
| 23. Environment Agency                         | No objection, the existing conditions are deemed to be sufficient.  |
| 24. Health and Safety Executive                | No comments received  |
| 25. Heathrow Airport Safeguarding              | No objection  |
| 26. County Historic Buildings Officer          | No objection  |
| 27. Lead Local Flood Authority                 | No objection, subject to revised conditions   |
| 28. National Grid                              | No objection, subject to confirmation that the proposal would not have an impact on the National Grid assets. |

**Officer's comments:** The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed works would not have an impact on the pylons or assets owned by the National Grid.



- |     |                 |  |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| 29. | Natural England | No comments received   |
| 30. | Network Rail    | Holding objection, additional information requested to ensure that the rail network would not be impacted by the proposed works. |

**Officer's Comments:** Following discussions with Network Rail, the applicant has installed a silt trap to capture materials entering into the nearby culvert. Network Rail have been provided with additional supporting information to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an impact on their network. No response has been received from Network Rail following the submission of additional information. The applicant is advised to contact Network Rail directly.

- |     |                             |  |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|
| 31. | Rights of Way               | No objection, sufficient space should be left between the planted hedgerow and footpath edge and thorny species should be avoided. |
| 32. | Surrey Wildlife Trust       | No comments received   |
| 33. | RSPB                        | No comments received   |
| 34. | Affinity Water Ltd          | No comments received   |
| 35. | Thames Water                | No objection   |
| 36. | Surrey Ramblers Association | No comments received.  |

### **Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups**

- |     |                                  |  |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| 37. | Wey Manor Residents' Association | No comments received   |
| 38. | New Haw Residents' Association   | Objection, in relation to the following points:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on public highway and high volume of HGV movements to and from the site</li> <li>• Inaccurate and inconsistencies in tonnage volumes</li> <li>• Non-compliance with planning conditions</li> <li>• No direct community engagement between the applicant and residents</li> <li>• Large articulated lorries used on site (40 ton vehicles)</li> <li>• Omission of volumes imported for direct infilling</li> </ul> |

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

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 39. | The application was publicised by posting five site notices and placing an advert in the local newspaper on 15 April 2022. Owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties have been directly notified by letter.  |
| 40. | A total of twenty-five letters of representation have been received. Twenty-one objections have been received in relation to this application.  |
| 41. | The following concerns have been raised within the letters of objection:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in vehicle movements to and from the site</li> <li>• Air pollution from dust and traffic particulate matter</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• Noise pollution and vibrations within the immediate area</li> <li>• Damage to drainage and road networks</li> <li>• Environmental Impacts and risk to wildlife and human health</li> <li>• Changes to the character and appearance of the area</li> <li>• Impacts on low level railway bridge due to increased usage of larger HGV vehicles</li> </ul> |

- Disregard to planning conditions
- Contrary to development plan policies and national planning policies
- Contamination due to leaching from stockpiles of waste materials
- Debris on highway and damage to surrounding highway networks
- Unsheeted vehicles causing inordinate amounts of dust in the air
- Risk to safeguarding the community
- Road Safety

42. Officers have considered all the letters of representation which have been submitted.
43. Officers acknowledge the comments received from the New Haw Residents' Association and letters of representation regarding alleged breaches of planning conditions. Any matters relating to enforcement are separate from the consideration of this application. However, any new permission granted under this application would form the basis for addressing any non-compliance with conditions as arising. The comments received have been considered within the context of the County Planning Authority's Enforcement Policy and paragraph 60 of the NPPF.

---

## ***Planning considerations***

### ***Introduction***

44. 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.
45. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 2020 (SWLP), Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 (SMP), Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 2011 (SADPD), The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (RLP).
46. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations. In this case the main planning considerations are; the impact on the delivery and completion of the restoration, aftercare, sustainable drainage and ecological management of habitats.

## **Procedural Matters**

### **Section 73 Application (S73)**

47. This application is submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Section 73 allows for applications to be made for permission to develop without complying with a condition(s) previously imposed on a planning permission. Permission can be granted unconditionally or subject to different conditions, or the application can be refused if the Planning Authority decides that the original condition(s) should continue.
48. Applications made under Section 73 seek to consider the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted. Planning conditions not subject to the amendments and attached to planning permission ref: RU09/1103, with respect to soil stripping and formations, access arrangements, dust, hours of operation, vehicle movements and noise, have been reviewed (including the updated development plan policies) and will continue to apply. If granted the Section 73 application would result in the issuing of a new planning permission incorporating the proposed changes. Thus, the application must have reference to wider considerations and be determined according to the current development plan and other material considerations. These conditions would be updated to reflect current local plan policies, and any other guidance/policy changes since the original permission was granted.

49. New primary legislation, set out within Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021), introduced mandatory provisions for biodiversity net gain (BNG) within new development sites. Section 73 permissions where the original permission was made before 12 February 2024 are exempt from the 10% BNG requirement. The pending application (Section 73) is exempt from BNG provision as the original planning permission was determined before 12th February 2024.
50. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other aspects.

## **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

51. An EIA screening request has been requested by the applicant and the screening opinion, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2020, confirmed that the proposal would not comprise EIA development.

## **Relevant Development Plan Policies**

52. Since the determination of the previous application (re: RU09/1103), The Runnymede Local Plan 2020 and the Surrey Waste Plan 2020 have been adopted. Both Plans introduce policies that reflect the current legislation and are compliant with National and Local planning frameworks and guidance.
53. The Development Plan Policies and guidance considered to be relevant to the proposal include:

### **Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Management Plan 2011 (SMP)**

Policy MC1 – Location of Mineral Development  
 Policy MC3 – Development in the Green Belt  
 Policy MC6 – Safeguarding mineral resources and development  
 Policy MC7 – Aggregates Mineral Supply  
 Policy MC14 – Reducing the adverse impacts of mineral development  
 Policy MC15 – Transport and Connectivity  
 Policy MC17 – Restoring Mineral Workings  
 Policy MC18 – Restoration and enhancement

### **Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 2011 (SADPD)**

Policy MA1 – Aggregate Supply

### **Surrey Waste Plan 2020 (SMP)**

Policy 1 – Need for Waste Development  
 Policy 5 – Recovery of Inert Waste to Land  
 Policy 14 – Protecting Communities & the Environment  
 Policy 15 – Transport and Connectivity

### **Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020 (RLP)**

Policy EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Quality  
 Policy EE2 – Environmental Protection  
 Policy EE9 – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation  
 Policy EE11 – Green Infrastructure  
 Policy EE13 – Managing Flood Risk  
 Policy SD4 – Highway Design and Considerations

### **Other relevant policies or document**

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and non-statutory guidance:

Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document (Restoration SPD)

### **National Planning Policy and Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)  
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

### **Principle of Development – Mineral Extraction**

54. This application relates to a well-established and authorised quarry for the extraction of sand and gravel. The site is safeguarded through Policy MC6 of the SMP which seeks to protect strategically important mineral sites such as soft sand and aggregate to prevent sterilisation of these resources.
55. Paragraph 222 of the NPPF states that it is essential that there is sufficient supply of minerals to provide infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation. Paragraph 224 states that when determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction.
56. The principle of development has been considered within the historic permission granted in October 1990 (ref: appeal reference - APP/B3600/A89/133939) for the extraction of sand and gravel, erection of a processing plant, importation of inert waste material and the restoration of the site to agriculture. A number of Section 73 applications have been approved since planning permission was originally granted. These include application references RU01/0718 (granted in November 2004) and RU09/1103 (granted in December 2015). The Policies, as set out in paragraph 53 above, are considered to be relevant and material to the determination of this application.
57. As such, the principle of development, in relation to minerals extraction has not been revisited as part of this application, apart from ensuring its continued general compliance with policy in relation to mineral working.

### **Infilling and Revised Phasing Scheme**

58. As set out above, the principle of development has already been established through the granting and implementation of planning permission in the 1990s. Since the granting of this permission, the County Council has approved application RU09/1103 dated 11 December 2015, to vary the original planning conditions. Permission RU09/1103 has been fully implemented. Condition 1 on that permission required that all operations ceased and the land restored by 31 December 2020.
59. Paragraph 223 (f and h) of the NPPF states that, (f) planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that the permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health; (h) ensure that worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites take place.
60. Policy MC17 of the SMP only permits mineral working where the site can be restored and managed to a high standard. Sites should be restored progressively where appropriate and restoration completed at the earliest opportunity. Applicants are

expected to provide a scheme of restoration detailing how the land will be restored and managed, before, during and after the workings ensuring that the restoration works are sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area and sustain an appropriate after-use.

61. This Section 73 application involves the extension of time, to allow for the completion of the restoration works at an established quarry. The applicant has requested that the timescale be extended to 31 December 2029.
62. The applicant has advised that the restoration works at the site have fallen behind the timescales approved under the 2015 permission, due to landfilling operations within the wider quarry site, not progressing as originally anticipated. A number of factors have affected the operation of the site and the rate at which the applicant has been able to attract materials to infill the site.
63. The applicant states that over recent years, the quarry has struggled to compete with several other filling sites (including golf courses, bunds, land raising and driving ranges) within the immediate and surrounding areas. It is stated that these sites have attracted greater volumes of waste (inert materials) due to competitive gate fees and less stringent EA permitting requirements. Under the Environment Agency (EA) permit, Addlestone Quarry is only able to accept inert subsoil and clay for the restoration works. The sourcing of these materials has been problematic and has resulted in delays to the restoration works.
64. It is stated that other key considerations affecting both the rate of extraction and the restoration works include economic uncertainty and on-going impacts resulting from Brexit and the Covid19 pandemic. Other contributing factors include the energy crisis in early 2023, rising interest rates and inflation which have resulted in construction projects being postponed and/or cancelled.
65. It is also stated that the temporary suspension of the HS2 project, from Old Oak Common to Euston, has had a widespread impact on the local construction industry leading to less availability of inert material.
66. The applicant has confirmed that the site will be fully restored by 31 December 2029 in accordance with the timetable as set out within an email dated 17 January 2025. Full restoration of the site, in accordance with the revised restoration plan, would include materials sourced from the on site Aggregate Recycling Facility (ARF). The ARF currently provides materials for infill and has contributed partially to the restoration works which have already been completed. A separate planning application (ref: 2020-0166) for the retention of the mobile crushing and screening plant for the ARF is currently pending consideration. Officers have made a recommendation to approve that application.
67. As set out above, the applicant has demonstrated that there have been difficulties securing materials to infill the land and complete the restoration works by 31 December 2020. A revised phasing scheme (ref: restoration phasing plan RPP-19224 dated February 2024) and restoration plan (ref: restoration plan DOC3-19224 dated February 2024) have been provided by the applicant demonstrating how the final restoration works will be implemented.
68. Based on the information provided by the applicant and the progress made on site, officers conclude that there is a need to extend the completion timescale to allow for the restoration works to be fully completed. The updated restoration phasing scheme would continue to align with the revised timescale to ensure that the site is fully restored at the earliest opportunity and no later than 31 December 2029. On the basis of the information submitted, officers are satisfied that full restoration by this date can be achieved.

69. The proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan Policies, NPPF, NPPG and supplementary guidance, in as far as they relate to the principles of facilitating the working of minerals, and the necessity for ensuring appropriate restoration and aftercare.
70. It is however necessary to also assess other potential impacts of extending the timeframe for the operations and restoration of this site.

### **Landscape**

71. Policy EE1 of the RLP refers to landscape quality and states that development proposals will be supported where they contribute to and enhance the quality of the landscape setting through high quality and inclusive hard and soft landscaping schemes and ensure no adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties or uses.
72. The key direct effects of the proposal on the landscape character, relate to the delayed restoration works and the continued mineral extraction in the north-west of the site.
73. Officers acknowledge that there would be a temporary short term impact on the landscape character, as a result of the delayed works. However, the landscape character would be re-established and enhanced, once the site has been fully restored and the plant and machinery permanently removed from the land.
74. Once fully restored the site would bring about additional benefits such as improvements to the visual landscape and ecological habitats, secured through amendments to Condition 8 (aftercare, ecological management & soils).
75. The County Landscape Architect (CLA) has been consulted on the proposal. The CLA has concluded that the proposed extension would continue to result in a degree of less than substantial harm to the visual amenities of nearby receptors. The harm identified would be for a temporary period and would cease once the site has been fully restored. No objections to the proposal were raised, subject to the inclusion of planning conditions and the requirement for an Aftercare and Ecological Management Plan.
76. The County Environment Enhancement officer (CEE) has reviewed the documentation submitted within the application and raised no objections to the proposal, subject to the inclusion of appropriate planning conditions.
77. Officers have concluded that although there would be some temporary harm to the landscape, caused by the stationing of plant machinery and equipment, the restoration works would be undertaken to a high standard providing opportunities such as improved landscaping, enhanced biodiversity opportunities and reinstatement of the land to an agricultural use.
78. The proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan Policies, NPPF, NPPG and supplementary guidance in relation to landscape.

### **Noise**

79. Policy MC14 of the SMP states that development will only be permitted where there would be no significant adverse impacts arising from the development. Policy EE2 of the RLP states that proposals which have or would be subject to unacceptable adverse effects will not be supported.
80. The main impacts on residential amenities arising from this proposal are considered to be noise generated from plant and machinery as well as HGV vehicles.
81. Officers have considered the noise impacts on the nearby receptors. It is accepted that there would be some harm to nearby receptors as a result of the continued use of plant machinery and equipment on site. However, there would be no increase in noise levels



and/or traffic movements. Any harm to nearby receptors as a result of the plant, machinery and traffic would be mitigated through existing planning conditions. In addition, the harm would be temporary and following full restoration any noise impacts would cease.

82. The operating hours at the quarry would remain:-

07:00 – 17:30 Monday to Friday

08:00 – 13:00 Saturdays

No working on Sundays, Bank, Public or National Holidays.

83. Officers consider that the existing operating hours, as set out above, are acceptable within the current policies requirements and would continue to mitigate the harm on nearby receptors. Officers propose to carry the hours of operation condition forward to the revised permission.
84. The County Noise Consultant has reviewed the documentation submitted with the application and raised no objections, subject to the inclusion of Conditions 23 and 24 of planning permission RU09/1103. The applicant is not seeking to amend the previously imposed noise conditions and therefore no changes are proposed.
85. Officers have considered the temporary harm, resulting from the extended period of operation and restoration works, and have concluded that the land would be fully restored and used for agricultural by 31 December 2029. Furthermore, the use of existing planning conditions, carried forward from the previous permission (ref: RU09/1103), would ensure that noise generated from the site would continue to be controlled.

## **Dust**

86. Policy EE2 of the RLP seeks to protect the environment and states that planning permission will only be granted where mitigation measures to reduce impacts can be secured and implemented.
87. The nearest receptors are approximately 130m and 200m to the west of the extraction and restoration areas. A mature belt of trees and established vegetation provide screening and separate the residential properties from the extraction and restoration areas.
88. The air quality (dust) impacts, resulting from the extraction of the minerals and the restoration of the site, have been assessed as part of the original application. Paragraphs 8.35-8.46 of the Planning Statement (PS) refers to supplementary information on air quality (dust).
89. The application site is an existing quarry which has established procedures and practices to control dust emissions. The established procedures ensure that dust emissions are appropriately managed and do not cause harm to nearby receptors.
90. The damping down of haulage roads and the use of water sprays when unloading and spreading restoration materials etc have been put in place to accord with planning conditions 21 and 22 of planning permission RU09/1103. Further control measures are imposed within the Environmental Permit, issued by the Environment Agency, which seeks to ensure that the operational development would not cause pollution through fugitive emissions.
91. Paragraph 201 of the NPPF states decisions should focus on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of the land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a



planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issue should not be revisited through the permitting regime operated by pollution control authorities.

92. The combination of the abovementioned planning conditions and the requirements of the Environmental Permitting regime ensure that pollutants do not cause harm to the environment and amenities of nearby residents.
93. The County Noise Consultant and Environmental Health Officer at Runnymede Borough Council have reviewed the submitted documentation and raised no objections to the proposal, subject to the inclusion of previous planning conditions.
94. Officers are satisfied that any harm caused would be suitably mitigated through existing planning conditions, noting also the existence of Environmental Permitting regulations which are enforced by the Environment Agency.

### **Highways, Traffic and Access**

95. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF 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, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.
96. Policy SD4 of the RLP refers to highway design considerations and states that proposals which maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access, egress and servicing arrangements will be supported.
97. Policy MC15 (ii) of the SMP states that mineral development involving transportation by road will be permitted where the highway network is of an appropriate standard for use by the traffic generated by the development
98. The original application, granted at appeal in 1990, has been assessed in relation to highways, traffic generation and the access. A review of the highway considerations was carried out during the assessment of the previous application RU09/1103. In addition, a separate highway assessment was carried out during the determination of the original ARF application (ref: RU16/1960), granted in June 2017.
99. Section 7 of the submitted Planning Statement provides updated information on transport and states that the HGV movements for the entire site, controlled through planning conditions on both the ARF and quarry applications, would remain unchanged.
100. Condition 20 of application RU09/110 restricts the total HGV movements to and from the site, to 200 per day on a 5 day average. Similarly, there are restrictions on the interlinked application for the ARF, which is currently pending consideration (application reference: RU21/0085).
101. The wording of Condition 20 currently states that:

“The average accumulative number of HGV movements to and from the site shall not exceed 200 per day (on a 5 day average). Records of HGV movements to and from the site shall be maintained for up to 1 year at any one time and shall be made available to the County Planning Authority on request”.
102. The applicant has confirmed that the HGV movements to and from the site would remain unchanged as would the access.
103. A number of representations, in relation to this application, have raised concerns regarding debris on the road, highway safety and traffic congestion. With regard to debris on the road, an existing planning condition (Condition 19) requires the access

road to be maintained to a good state of repair and kept clean and free of mud and other debris at all times. No changes are proposed to Condition 19 and the wording of the condition would be retained on the new permission.

104. The County Highway Officer has reviewed the updated information and has concluded that the proposed amendments would not have an impact on highway safety and/or highway users, subject to the inclusion of previous planning conditions.
105. Officers have concluded that the proposed amendments to planning Conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16 of planning permission RU09/1103 would not be impacted. Furthermore, highway safety and the needs of all highway users would continue to be taken into account and any harm mitigated through planning conditions.
106. The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant Development Plan Policies, and NPPF and NPPG guidance, subject to the inclusion of planning conditions.

### **Green Belt**

107. The application site is situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
108. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that great importance is attached to Green Belts and the fundamental aim of the policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
109. Paragraph 154 further states that certain forms of development are excepted from being inappropriate development within the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These include part H:  
  
(i) mineral extraction and ii) engineering operations.
110. Policies MC3 of the SMP states that mineral extraction in the Green Belt will only be permitted where the highest environmental standards of operation are maintained and the land restored to beneficial afteruses consistent with Green Belt objectives within agreed time limits. Policy MC17 requires mineral working proposals to provide restoration and post restoration management to a high standard. Sites within the Green Belt should have an appropriate afteruse, such as agriculture or forestry, for their designation.
111. A Green Belt assessment was undertaken during the determination of the original application. Paragraphs 8.13 – 8.20 of the Planning Statement (PS) refers to Green Belt considerations.
112. The site has been progressively worked and restored to reestablish and enhance the local character. The restoration works that have already taken place have been completed to a high standard and the land returned to an agricultural afteruse, appropriate for this designation and consistent with paragraph 223 (f and h) of the NPPF and Policy MC17 of the SMP.
113. It is recognised that the extended period being sought by this application would result in some harm being caused to Green Belt openness, as full restoration would be delayed. However it is considered that the harm would be outweighed by the factors identified above as full restoration has not been achievable within the original life of the permission. In granting this permission, a new and enforceable timeframe would be imposed providing a clear framework for the full restoration of the site by 31 December 2029, at which point the Green Belt openness would be restored.
114. The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed works are necessary and compliant with paragraph 142 of the NPPF.

115. As such, officers have concluded that the proposal would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and the proposal would accord with the development plan policies, NPPF and NPPG guidance.

### Surface Water

116. Condition 7 of planning permission RU09/1103 refers to the provision of a surface water management scheme (SWMS) following the restoration of the site. The proposed SWMS should include details of how the sustainable drainage system will provide for system failures and/or exceedance events both on and off site. Details of how the SuDS system would be protected during the construction phases and provision of a maintenance plan should also be included.
117. Paragraph 181 of the NPPF, states that local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment.
118. Policy EE13 of the RLP states that new development will be guided to areas of low flood risk from all sources of flooding. A specific flood risk assessment (FRA) should be provided for development over 1ha within flood zone 1 or within Flood Zones 2 and 3. New development is expected to manage flood risk, ensuring that adequate flood resilience and resistance measures are provided over the lifetime of the development, in accordance with Environment Agency advice.
119. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (ref: 425.064611.00001 SLD V4 dated March 2023) in support of the application.
120. The submitted FRA addendum established that no fundamental changes have occurred on site since the previous FRA was reviewed. The document concluded that the proposed infilling and quarrying were not in areas where regular flooding occurred or where flood water was required to be stored or conveyed during periods of flooding. Based on this the development was deemed appropriate for the flood zone, subject to preparation and implementation of a Flood Emergency Plan. The assessment also concluded that, subject to stockpiling not occurring below 13.78m AD, the proposal was unlikely to give rise to adverse impacts on fluvial flows passing through the site.
121. A holding objection was originally raised by the Environment Agency (EA) and following the submission of additional information the objection has been removed. The EA have concluded that they are satisfied with the submitted documentation and the existing planning conditions are sufficient. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have also reviewed the submitted documentation and concluded that they are content with the information provided, subject to a minor variation to the wording of Condition 7.
122. The proposed amendments to the surface water drainage condition remain in accordance with the relevant Development Plan Policies, and NPPF and NPPG guidance, subject to the inclusion of planning conditions.

### Restoration and Aftercare

123. Condition 8 refers to a scheme of aftercare and ecological management for a period of 5 years. It requires the applicant to submit the information to the County Planning Authority within 6 months from the date of extraction, providing the necessary steps and timescales to bring the land to the required use for agriculture.
124. Section 15 of the NPPF refers to "*Conserving and enhancing the natural environment*" and seeks to ensure that that the natural environment and habitats are protected. Paragraph 192(b) of the NPPF seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, seeking to promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological

networks and protection of species. Paragraph 186(d) seeks to support development which aims to conserve or enhance biodiversity, especially where measurable net gains can be secured.

125. Policy MC17 of SMP states that mineral works will only be permitted where the County Council is satisfied that the site can be restored and managed to a high standard and for sites to be restored progressively where appropriate. Restoration should be completed at the earliest opportunity along with an agreed scheme for restoration. The restoration should be sympathetic to the character and setting of the wider area and it should be appropriate for afteruse. Policy MC18 of the SMP further states that mineral operators and landowners should work together to deliver benefits such as enhancements of biodiversity, improved public access and provision of climate change mitigation.
126. Policy EE9 of the RLP seeks to achieve net gain in biodiversity, through restoration, enhancement and management of habitats and features to improve the status of priority habitats and species.
127. Although the application is exempt from statutory BNG requirements, the applicant is proposing to significantly increase the quantum of on-site planting, which is detailed on the revised restoration plan (ref: Doc3-19224 dated 19 February 2024). The enhancements include hedgerow creation, planting of trees, re-establishment of ancient woodland, reedbed creation and owl boxes.
128. The revised restoration plan has also included the retention of a scrub bank (mound) to the south of Footpath 12. Although the mound is at odds with the natural topography of the land, the ecological benefits of retaining this feature include reptile, bee and wasp breeding as well as scrub habitats for supporting birds. The mound also provides some visual and aural screening for the nearby residential properties. The trees and shrubs growing within the scrub bank disguise this feature ensuring that it is not prominent within the immediate and wider landscape.
129. As set out in the above paragraphs, it is accepted that the extended timescale to 31 December 2029 would continue to temporarily harm the landscape. However, following restoration, the proposed enhancements would provide opportunities for new and existing habitats as well as visual improvements to the wider area. The revised ecological management plan would also ensure that the landscape character and habitats are safeguarded.
130. The applicant has submitted an Ecological Appraisal (ECA) (ref: GPM Ecology dated 10 December 2020), Technical Note (ref: Biodiversity Benefits of Revised Restoration – GPM Ecology dated 9<sup>th</sup> February 2024) and Response note (ref: Firstplan dated 14<sup>th</sup> February 2024) in support of the application.
131. The ECA states that the application site is developing into a landscape with varied habitats, including ancient woodland, hedgerows and wetlands. Whilst the restoration of the site has been slow, livestock are grazing across much of the site and biodiversity opportunities such as bird and reptile breeding, meadows, woodland and waterbodies have been created, on the areas of land previously restored.
132. It has been noted within the ECA that there are large populations of carp within the 'wildlife lake'. Large populations of carp are considered to be detrimental to the value of the wildlife waterbodies. As such the applicant has suggested that a management plan be introduced to control the carp levels. The County Ecologist is in agreement with this approach.
133. The County Ecologist has reviewed the documentation submitted by the applicant and raised no objections to the proposed development, subject to the amendment of Condition 8 and the inclusion of a carp management plan.

134. The proposed amendments to the condition remain in accordance with the relevant Development Plan Policies and NPPF and NPPG guidance, subject to planning conditions.

---

### **Human Rights and Equalities Implications**

135. 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.
136. In this case, it is the Officer's view that the scale of such impact is not considered sufficient to engage Article 6 or Article A of Protocol 1 and any impacts can be mitigated by conditions, taking into account representations made in relation to the impact of the development on their residential amenities. The proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention rights.
137. The Council is required by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to eliminate conduct prohibited by the act, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people with protected characteristics and people who do not. The level of "due regard" considered sufficient in any particular context depends on the facts.
138. In this instance, the Council has considered its duty under the Equality Act 2010 and has concluded that this application does not give rise to any equalities considerations.

---

### **Conclusion**

139. The application is seeking permission to amend the current permission (ref: RU09/1103 dated 11 December 2015) under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to allow for changes to the approved plans and documents.
140. Since the most recent permission (granted in 2015), development plan policy has changed as a result of the adoption of the Surrey Waste Plan 2020 and the Runnymede Local Plan 2030 (adopted in 2020). A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has also been published (December 2024). The application has been considered in relation to current guidance and development plan policy.
141. Officers consider, subject to the amended conditions, the development would not give rise to unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts. Officers consider that appropriate conditions, in relation to the continued development, can be carried forward from planning permission RU09/1103 dated 11 December 2015, to a new planning permission.
142. Overall, Officers are satisfied that the information submitted in support of the application is sufficient to allow for Conditions 1, 3, 7, 8 and 16 to be amended. The applicant has demonstrated that the amendments are necessary in order to support the restoration works and as such planning permission should be granted, subject to the revised planning conditions.

### **Recommendation**

The recommendation is to PERMIT application RU20/0115 subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Time Limit

The development to which this application relates shall be completed in all respects not later than 31 December 2029.



**Reason:** To enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control hereby permitted and comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Display of Decision Notice

The terms of the planning permission shall be held at the offices on the site, and shall be made known to any person(s) given the responsibility for the management or control of operations.

**Reason:** To ensure the permission is implemented in accordance with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the development pursuant to Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

3. Programme and Restoration

The phased working and restoration of the site shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the following approved plans and documents :-

ADD03920 Location Plan C.H. Surveys Ltd dated September 2020  
RPP-19224 Restoration Phasing Plan dated 19 February 2024  
DOC3-19224 Revised Restoration Plan  
FPP-02823 Fill Phasing Plan dated 2 August 2023  
04 Site Specific Flood Map dated June 2015  
06 Site Specific Flood Map (inclusive of climate change) dated June 2015  
EPP-19224 Existing and Proposed Planting Scheme dated 19 February 2024  
Flood Risk Assessment Addendum Version 2 dated December 2020

**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and to enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policies MC3, MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

4. Restoration

No material other than inert waste shall be imported for use in back-filling the site.

**Reason:** To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policies MC3, MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

5. Restoration

Restoration of the site shall return the land contours to those shown on approved restoration plan drawing RPP-19224 dated 19 February 2024.

**Reason:** To enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise the impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with Policies MC3, MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

6. Surface Water Drainage

The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (SLR Reference: 402.00930.00004) Version 3 dated July 2015 (including June 2015 Drawing Nos: 01, 02, 03 & 04), Flood Risk Addendum V2 dated December 2020 (prepared by SLR ref: 425.00930.00010) and letters dated 3 September 2015 (including Drawing No. 06 dated June 2015) and 2 November 2015 (including Drawing No. 5A) from SLR Consultants and the following mitigation measures detailed within these documents:

- There shall be no stockpiling of any materials, including soil, within the 1 in 100 with an allowance for climate change flood extent, as shown on approved Drawing No. 06 dated June 2015;
- The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the Surface Water Management Plan, as shown on approved Drawing No. 05A dated October 2015;
- The applicant shall prepare a Flood Emergency Plan and subscribe to the Environment Agency's 'Floodline' warning system; and
- The remaining sand extracted shall be dry screened only and there shall be no washing process.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development does not increase flood risk on or off site and meets the technical standards for SuDS in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011, Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 and Policy EE13 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

## 7. Surface Water Drainage

Within 6 months from the date of this permission, a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority.

The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS.

The drainage scheme shall include:

- (a) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. Associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of the Qbar Greenfield run-off rate for the site.
- (b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).
- (c) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk.
- (d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
- (e) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.
- (f) Within 6 months of completion of restoration, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.



**Reason:** To ensure that the development does not increase flood risk on or off site and meets the technical standards for SuDS in accordance with Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011, Policy 14 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 and Policy EE13 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

## 8. Ecological Management

Within 6 months from the date of this permission, a scheme of aftercare and ecological management for a period of 5 years shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority.

The aftercare and ecological management scheme shall include:

- (a) The necessary steps and timescales to bring the land to the required standard for use for agriculture;
- (b) Provision of field drainage system, taking into account the surface water drainage scheme, submitted and approved under condition 7 above;
- (c) Chemical analysis of the subsoil and topsoil to determine the lime and fertilisers required prior to soil replacement;
- (d) Reptile survey and mitigation strategy from Section 3.0 of the submitted Ecological Appraisal Final Report dated 6 June 2014, prepared by GPM Ecology, including:
  - Extent of Reptile Habitat
  - Receptor Site Location
  - Receptor Site Management
  - Translocation Strategy
  - Enhancement Landscape Scheme
  - Requirement for further survey work and
  - Removal of fox earth
- (e) The Woodland Restoration Plan from Section 5.2.1 of the submitted Protected Species Survey Final Report dated June 2014, prepared by Finnemore Associates, in order to control the removal of Himalayan Balsam and retention of any dead trees;
- (f) Measures from Section 6 of the submitted Bird Survey dated April 2014, prepared by Kevin Morgan (GPM Ecology), including protecting the trees on the edge of the woodland along the haul route and the acid grassland plateau to be retained;
- (g) A carp management plan detailing how the carp population within the waterbodies will be monitored and controlled.

The scheme of aftercare and ecological management shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

**Reason:** To safeguard and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE9 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

## 9. Soil Management

All topsoil and subsoil shall be retained on the site. After soil stripping and the formation of storage mounds the quantities shall be measured and recorded on a suitable plan showing the location, contours and volumes of the bunds, and identifying the soil types and units contained therein. The plan shall be retained for use on site during soil replacement and restoration and made available on request to the County Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To prevent loss or damage of soil and to ensure that the land is restored to a condition suitable for agriculture/afteruse and to comply with Policies MC14 and MC17 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 10. Hydraulic Excavators and Dump Truck

If the use of hydraulic excavators and dump trucks is not proposed for soil stripping and replacement and bund formation and removal operations specified in Condition 9 above, the period for soil movement will only be between 1 May and 30 September.

**Reason:** To comply with the terms of the application and to enable the County Planning Authority to exercise planning control over the operation so as to secure restoration to the required standard and assist in absorbing the site back into the local landscape in accordance with Policies MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 11. Topsoil

Topsoil, subsoil and soil making material mounds shall be constructed with only the minimum amount of compaction necessary to ensure stability and shall not be traversed by heavy vehicles or machinery except during stacking and removal for respreading during the restoration of the site.

**Reason:** Topsoil, subsoil and soil making material mounds shall be constructed with only the minimum amount of compaction necessary to ensure stability and shall not be traversed by heavy vehicles or machinery except during stacking and removal for respreading during the restoration of the site in accordance with Policies MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 12. Seeding of Mounds

In the first available seeding season following their formation all mounds of topsoil, subsoil and soil making materials shall be seeded to grass and the sward shall be managed throughout the period of storage until the soils are required for use in the restoration of the site.

**Reason:** To secure restoration to the required standard and return the site back to the local landscape in accordance with Policies MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 13. Top Depth

The top 1 metre depth of the replaced overburden shall be free from large solid objects which may damage cultivation machinery. This depth to be thoroughly ripped or deeply cultivated so that any compacted layers are effectively broken up.

**Reason:** To secure restoration to the required standard and return the site back to the local landscape in accordance with Policies MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011

#### 14. Subsoil and Topsoil

The subsoil and topsoil shall be spread over the restoration area at an even depth to follow the final contours. This soil shall be ripped or deeply cultivated so that any compacted layers are effectively broken up.

**Reason:** To secure restoration to the required standard and return the site back to the local landscape in accordance with Policies MC14, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 15. Removal of Permitted Development Rights (Buildings, Plant and Machinery)

Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary under Parts 4 or 17 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any subsequent order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification)

- (a) no plant, building or machinery whether fixed or moveable other than those permitted by this application shall be located on the site of the development hereby permitted;
- (b) no fencing other than that hereby permitted shall be erected; and
- (c) no external lighting shall be installed at the site.

Reason: To safeguard the environment, protect the amenities of the wider landscape and preserve the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policies MC3, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

16. Buildings, fixed plant and machinery

All buildings, plant, conveyor belts, machinery both fixed plant and otherwise, and any engineering works connected therewith on or related to the application site (including hard surfaces constructed for any purpose) shall be removed from the land and the site restored to a condition suitable for agriculture in accordance with the approved restoration plan (ref: DOC3-19224 dated 19 February 2024).

**Reason:** To safeguard the environment, protect the amenities of the wider landscape and preserve the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policies MC3, MC17 and MC18 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

17. Hours of Operation

The development hereby permitted shall only take place during the following hours:-

- 07:00 – 17:30 hours Monday to Friday
- 08:00 – 13:00 Saturday

There shall be no working on Sunday, Bank, Public and National Holidays.

The only exception to these hours shall be during operational emergencies to maintain safe on site activities, or where essential maintenance services are required.

The County Planning Authority shall be notified, in writing, as soon as reasonably practicable when testing of mobile plant and other essential maintenance works are to be carried out, outside of the above hours.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the local residents and in accordance with Policies MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

18. Site Preparation and Restoration

Site preparation and restoration operations including the formation of the screen mounds around the site and their subsequent removal when required for restoration shall only be carried out between the following times:-

- 08.00 and 17.00 Mondays to Fridays.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the local residents and in accordance with Policies MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

#### 19. Access

The surfacing of the access road shall be maintained in a good state of repair and kept clean and free of mud and other debris at all times.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy SD4 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030 and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 20. Highway

The average accumulative number of HGV movements to and from the site shall not exceed 200 per day (on a 5 day average). Records of HGV movements to and from the site shall be maintained for up to 1 year at any one time and shall be made available to the County Planning Authority on request.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy SD4 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030 and Policy MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011.

#### 21. Dust

At all times during the carrying out of operations authorised or required by this permission, water bowsers, sprayers, whether mobile or fixed, or other similar equipment, shall be used to minimise the emission of dust from the site. Loaded vehicles importing inert material shall be sheeted or covered to minimise dust.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the locality and in accordance with Policies MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

#### 22. Dust

No operation authorised or required by this permission shall cause visible dust beyond the site. Should visible dust be caused beyond the site, work shall be suspended until it can be resumed without causing visible dust as a result of different methods of working, the addition of further dust suppression measures or changed weather conditions.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the locality in accordance with Policies MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

#### 23. Noise

Short-term operations (permitted hours of operation set out in Condition 18) - noise levels from short-term operations to facilitate essential site preparation and restoration works and the construction of baffle mounds shall be allowed up to 70 dB(A) LAeq, 1h (freefield) at specified noise sensitive properties (set out in condition 24) for a period of up to eight weeks in any one year.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the locality and avoid noise nuisance in accordance with Policies MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

#### 24. Noise

Normal Operations (permitted hours of operation set out in Condition 17) - noise levels from normal operations at specified noise sensitive properties (see details below) shall not exceed the existing/pre-works representative background noise level (LA90,1h,

freefield) by more than 10 dB(A), or as near this level as practicable, up to a maximum noise level of 55 dB LAeq, 1h (free field).

The existing representative, daytime LA90 background noise level shall be determined by measurement that shall be sufficient to characterise the environment and the recommended level should be justified following guidance contained within British Standard BS4142:2014.

*Noise Sensitive Properties include:-*

Coxes Mill, Bourneside Road, KT15 2JX  
14 Wey Meadows, Weybridge, KT13 8XY  
Westfield Court, Byfleet Road, New Haw, KT15 3LG  
20 Birch Close, New Haw, KT15 3 JT  
1 Kashmir Close, New Haw, KT15 3JD  
35 Bates Walk, Addlestone, KT15 2 DQ  
Iver Cottage, Canal Bank, Addlestone, KT15 2SH  
Kildare, Canal Bank, Addlestone, KT15 2SH  
Wey Manor Cottage, Wey Manor Road, New Haw, KT15 3JR  
Wey Manor Farm, Addlestone, KT15 3JR

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the locality and avoid noise nuisance in accordance with Policies MC14 of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

#### 25. Oil Storage Tank

Oil storage tanks shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by oil-tight bund walls; the bunded areas must be capable of containing 110% of the tank's volume and should enclose all fill and draw pipes.

**Reason:** To safeguard the groundwater and in accordance with Policy MC14 and Policy EE13 of the Runnymede Local Plan 2030.

---

**Contact Janine Wright**

**Tel. no. 020 8541 9897**

---

### 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 Runnymede Borough Council planning register entry for this application can be found under application reference RU.21/0115.

### Other documents

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

## Government Guidance

[National Planning Policy Framework](#)  
[Planning Practice Guidance](#)

7

## The Development Plan

[Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020](#)  
[Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document \(DPD\) 2011](#)  
[Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document \(DPD\) 2011](#)  
[Surrey Minerals Plan Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document \(SPD\) 2011](#)  
<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/land-planning-and-development/minerals-and-waste/minerals-core-strategy-development-plan/aggregates-recycling-joint-development-plan>

District/borough council development plan documents

The Runnymede Local Plan 2030

## Other Documents

---