

**TO:** PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**DATE:** 20 March 2019

**BY:** PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**DISTRICT(S)** WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**ELECTORAL DIVISION(S):**

Godalming North  
Penny Rivers

**CASE OFFICER:** Dustin Lees,  
Principal Planning Officer,  
020 8541 7673

**PURPOSE:** FOR DECISION

**GRID REF:** 498160 145102

**TITLE:** WASTE APPLICATION REF. WA/2018/0097

## SUMMARY REPORT

### **Broadwater Park Golf Club, Meadow, Godalming, Surrey GU7 3BU**

**Capping of historic 8ha landfill; remodelling and enhancement of existing driving range and 9-hole par 3 golf course with associated ecological and public access improvements; provision of new 490m<sup>2</sup> driving range building, adventure golf facility, practice putting green, 17 additional car parking spaces and rainwater harvesting scheme; involving the use of 342,578 tonnes (214,111m<sup>3</sup>) of inert waste material and 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) per working day over a period of 18-24 months.**

Broadwater Park Golf Club (the golf club) is situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt abutting Farncombe to the west, with Godalming and Catteshall further beyond to the south-west. To the south is the A3100 Guildford Road (Meadow). Along the southern side of the A3100, opposite the golf club, are a row of residential properties, a restaurant and bar, and a hotel.

The 8ha golf club forms a part of the wider 29ha award-winning Broadwater Park complex which comprises Broadwater Lake; woodland and open grass areas, enclosed play areas; multi-use games area; a court suitable for playing a variety of ball games; football and cricket pitches; tennis courts; public toilets; and a network of permissive paths. The complex also includes Godalming Leisure Centre; Broadwater Lake; Godalming Angling Society; Godalming Lawn Tennis Club; Guildford Rugby Club; Farncombe Wanderers Cricket Club; and Farncombe Cricket Club.

The golf club, which is a public facility, offers a classic 9-hole par-3 golf course and covered floodlit 16-bay driving range and includes an existing club-house with bar, café and lounge facilities; two storage outbuildings; and a large informal car park for about 70 to 80 vehicles. Apart from its built development, the golf club primarily comprises intensively managed amenity grass interspersed with young and semi mature stands of trees. The edges of the golf course comprise broader bands of more mature, partly native, woodland blocks.

The golf club is not subject to any landscape or nature conservation designations. However, the Wey Valley Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is some 250m to the south beyond the A3100, and the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is some 0.53km and 0.55km to the west and south respectively. There are also 14 Grade II Listed Buildings and 1 Grade I Listed Building located within 500 metres of the golf club. The majority of the golf club is located within Flood Zone 1 (lowest probability of flood risk) whilst the same is not at significant risk of surface water flooding.

The golf club was established in 1993 after the land which it occupies was used as a landfill for mixed-waste material including household, commercial and industrial waste. In 2013 the applicant, who is the leaseholder, became aware of rising levels of waste migrating to the surface of the golf course including asphalt, metal, concrete and plastic. Additionally, the surface of the golf course continued to settle (as a result of waste decomposition) unevenly to the extent that maintenance and drainage was significantly hampered. In the wetter months the golfing facility is often closed for long periods owing to poor ground conditions. The applicant has provided financial records for 2004 and 2014 to 2017 showing what appears to be a consistent decline in annual revenue since 2004 by some 40%. The applicant has also provided evidence to demonstrate that its insurance broker is concerned about the condition of the golf course and the risk it poses to the public.

Accordingly, between 2013 and 2015 the landowner (Waverley Borough Council) and the applicant commissioned various environmental assessments relating to the landfill underlying the golf club. These assessments explored the risk factors pertaining to the landfill and a remedial capping operation in the context of the golf course and nearby receptors including humans and controlled waters. The result of these assessments, amongst other matters, is the development proposed which is the subject of this report.

The primary purpose of the proposed development is to 'cap' the mixed-waste landfill that lies beneath the existing golf course and driving range facility. This engineering operation seeks to remedy the damaging 'corrugated' landform that is developing as the landfill continues to settle and expose previously landfilled waste at the ground surface.

However, the development would also necessarily involve the complete re-design of the existing 9-hole golf course facility following 'capping' operations. In this regard the applicant intends establishing a 9-hole 'Academy Course' featuring high-quality tee, fairway and green surfaces as well as bunkers, swales, mounds, native planting, streams and water features that are exciting and maintainable to a high standard. Remodelling works would include realignment of the existing golf holes to solve identified safety issues at the boundaries with public areas; and introduction of a winter 'rainwater harvesting scheme' to the golf course so as to sever the facility's reliance on summer mains water supply for irrigation purposes. The latter would require the engineering of positive land-drainage falls, installation of an underground drainage network, and creation of a water storage lagoon above the surface of the landfill.

Following 'capping' works to the area occupied by the existing driving range facility the applicant also proposes to remodel, realign and engineer the driving range outfield to improve safety, ground conditions, ease of maintenance, and customer experience. The enhanced driving range would include 7 new low impact 'Berm' lighting fixtures which would replace and improve the existing lighting for enhanced customer experience and to mitigate existing light spillage. Replacement of the existing 248m<sup>2</sup> driving range building with a new 490m<sup>2</sup> building with an additional 6 covered range bays is also proposed, along with new 5m to 15m high safety netting around the range facility to replace similar netting.

The development also includes the provision of a family orientated 'adventure golf' facility to the west of the existing club house and car park. The 'adventure golf' facility's theme will incorporate Godalming and the history of Waverley and seeks to broaden the attraction of the golf club within the local community. It would comprise 18 artificially surfaced putting areas edged with a mixture of natural and faux rock and timber. The holes would be linked with a series of paved pathways. The remaining areas will be mulched planting beds and water features interspersed with hard and soft landscaping and themed props. This facility would be lit by 5 lights mounted on 8m high masts around its perimeter which would be secured by a 2m high palisade fence.

The development would include an extensive native planting programme in keeping with the existing parkland character with some ornamental or specimen tree species. This planting would take place within the golf course proper and along the boundaries of the same primarily around the remodelled driving range facility. It would comprise six woodland blocks totalling 1.5ha;

wildflower grassland amounting to some 0.7ha; 75 ornamental/specimen trees; and 0.3ha of wetland planting. As well as the water storage lagoon, the development would also provide for a new wetland pond, two new amphibian ponds, and a network of ecological-friendly drainage ditches. Further, the applicant has committed to the creation of flora areas associated with the water storage lagoon embankments and marginal areas; creation of open water habitat within the water storage lagoon; retention of suitable tree features; erection of bat and bird boxes in suitable locations; creation of log pile refugia for invertebrates, reptiles and amphibians; and 'planting' of semi-buried wood for invertebrates such as stag beetle.

A new permissive path through the golf club would also be provided as part of the development. This path would offer members of the public with a dedicated access through the golf course from the A3100 in the south to the woodland north of the Godalming Town Football Club ground and south of the Nursery Road car park. Outwith the proposed development and planning application the applicant has committed to continue discussions with Waverley Borough Council about the provision of further permissive paths in and around the golf course facility. Additionally, a new 2m high dark green weldmesh perimeter fence would also be installed around the golf course facility as part of the development. This would seek to mitigate safety concerns of people walking across the golf course and prevent unauthorised access to the facility after hours.

Some 342,578 tonnes (214,111m<sup>3</sup>) of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste material would be imported to the application site in order to facilitate the proposed development. This would involve approximately 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) per working day (Monday to Friday). The existing vehicular access to the golfing facility will need to be temporarily modified to safely accommodate access and egress of HGVs associated with the proposed development.

The duration of the development would be dependent upon a range of factors including weather conditions and the availability of suitable inert waste material. However, the applicant does not envisage that the works would take longer than 24 months to complete. During this time works are proposed to be undertaken during the hours of 0730 to 1830 Monday to Friday with no working on Saturdays, Sundays, bank/public or national holidays. Further, construction traffic would be restricted to accessing the application site between the hours of 0730 and 1630 hours only.

The development would require the benefit of an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency (EA) before it could proceed.

Nine letters of representation from interested parties have been received by the County Planning Authority (CPA). Of these, 2 are in support of the proposal whilst the remaining 7 raise objection to or concerns about the scheme. In respect of the latter interested parties have raised concerns about the scheme's impact upon nature conservation, landscape, visual impact, public access, air quality, noise, traffic, and the Green Belt.

However, neither statutory nor non-statutory consultees have objected to the proposed development subject to a range of planning conditions. Indeed Waverley Borough Council (Environmental Pollution Control) supports the proposed development and in this regard has explained that it would "*provide a long term solution to the issues at the site with respect to its former use as a landfill. The capping will reduce infiltration of water through the landfill and prevent members of the public from contact with waste at the surface. Overall the proposals will provide significant environmental betterment...*" Similarly, Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) supports the proposed development subject to a range of practical matters which could be satisfactorily addressed by way of planning conditions.

The statutory development plan for consideration of the proposed development consists of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018, and the saved policies of the Waverley Local Plan 2002. In assessing the application against development plan policy Officers have considered planning issues relating to sustainable

waste management; highways, traffic and access; air quality and noise; flood risk; landscape and visual impact; ecology; Heritage Assets; and the Metropolitan Green Belt.

The proposed development, which appears to be the only practicable and sustainable option available, seeks to remedy the environmental, health and safety, and business problems resulting from the settling landfill by capping the same and remodelling the golf course as a consequence. Additionally, a range of existing golf course infrastructure would be necessarily enhanced and replaced including the driving range building and a new adventure golf facility.

A relatively moderate volume of inert waste materials generated in Surrey and elsewhere would be imported to the application site over a two-year period to facilitate the development. Officers consider that the use of inert waste as proposed would be for beneficial purposes and as a result for the purposes of 'recovery' in the context of land-use planning and sustainable waste management. The recovery of waste is favoured above its disposal to landfill. The proposal would therefore provide Surrey with additional and sustainable waste management capacity.

The proposed ground levels of the remodelled golf course have been designed to take account of the minimum depth of landfill cap required, necessary positive drainage falls so as to direct surface water away from Broadwater Lake, to the proposed water storage lagoon and soakaways situated beyond the landfill. The proposal includes significant tree planting and the depth of soil material to be deposited across the application site has taken account of the rooting and landfill cap requirements in this respect.

The concerns raised by interested parties have not been borne out by the investigations and assessments undertaken by the applicant, statutory consultees, and the CPA's technical consultees. Officers have concluded that any potential harm in this respect can be mitigated to acceptable levels or otherwise avoided by the imposition of planning conditions and therefore, in relation to the environment and local amenity, assess the development to be in compliance with all relevant Development Plan policies.

Moreover, Officers have concluded that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that there is a presumption against the grant of consent for the same except where very special circumstances are demonstrated. In this regard Officers consider that there is a clear need to provide additional sustainable waste management facilities in Surrey and that the proposal would facilitate the sustainable management of waste in a way that it achieves a substantial improvement in the quality of the application site. Officers consider that this substantial improvement would bring about qualitative and operational benefits at an existing outdoor and public sport and leisure facility and wider environmental and economic benefits. Officers have therefore concluded that the harm arising out of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the grant of planning permission subject to conditions.

Accordingly, the recommendation is to **PERMIT** planning application Ref. WA/2018/0097 subject to conditions.

---

## **APPLICATION DETAILS**

### ***Applicant***

Broadwater Park Golf Club Ltd.

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

10 January 2018

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

### **Amending Documents**

Cora IHT Technical Note 1 dated 7 March 2018 including Drawing Ref. 001 Proposed Construction Site Access dated 7 March 2018  
 Broadwater Golf Club Ltd. letter dated 7 October 2018  
 Hydro-logic correspondence with Thames Water as prefaced by an email from Hydro-logic dated 3 October 2018  
 Email from Hydro-logic dated 3 October 2018 together with 3x Excel spreadsheets showing results of calculations (2 year; 30 year; and 100 year models)  
 Email from Hydro-logic dated 3 October 2018 concerning leachate  
 Broadwater Golf Club Ltd. letter dated 21 January 2019 regarding permissive paths  
 Drawing Ref. 811.12 Rev C Covered Bays Building dated 5 October 2017 (with legible date)  
 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 7 January 2019 (including Appendix 1 (figures), 2 (data search), and 3 (walkover assessment and protected species survey))

### **SUMMARY OF PLANNING ISSUES**

This section identifies the main planning issues in the report. The full text should be considered before the meeting.

<b>Planning considerations</b>	<b>Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed</b>
Sustainable Waste Management	89 - 118
Highways, Traffic and Access	134 - 145
Air Quality	190 - 195
Noise	196 - 199
Flood Risk	200 - 211
Landscape and Visual Impact	212 - 227
Ecology	228 - 240
Heritage Assets	241 - 247
Metropolitan Green Belt	256 - 273

### **ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL**

#### **Site Plans/Drawings**

Drawing Ref. 811.01 Rev B Existing Site Plan dated 5 October 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.03 Rev B Landscape Plan dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.04 Rev C Cross Sections dated 22 December 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.06 Rev B Rainwater Harvesting Plan dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.12 Rev C Covered Bays Building dated 5 October 2017

#### **Aerial Photographs**

Aerial 1 – Broadwater Park Golf Club, Godalming  
 Aerial 2 – Broadwater Park Golf Club, Godalming

#### **Site Photographs**

Figure 1 – Existing Vehicular Access  
 Figure 2 – Existing Car Park and Club House  
 Figure 3 – Existing Driving Range Building  
 Figure 4 – Existing Driving Range Outfield and Netting  
 Figure 5 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste



Figure 6 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 7 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 8 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 9 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 10 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 11 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 12 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 13 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 14 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 15 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste  
 Figure 16 – Example of Uneven Settlement and Protruding Waste

## BACKGROUND

### *Application Site Description*

1. Broadwater Park Golf Club (the golf club) lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt in the Borough of Waverley. It abuts Farncombe to the west and is located to the north-east of Godalming and Catteshall respectively. Immediately west of the golf club is Godalming Town Football Club and a number of residential properties<sup>1</sup>; to the north are playing fields and playgrounds; to the north-east is the Godalming Leisure Centre; and to the east is Broadwater Lake beyond which are the Broadwater School and Guildford Rugby Club. To the south is the A3100 Guildford Road (Meadow). Along the southern side of the A3100, opposite the golf club, are a row of residential properties, a restaurant and bar<sup>2</sup>, and a hotel<sup>3</sup>.
2. As described the golf course forms a part of the wider Broadwater Park complex. The 29ha park is a Green Flag award winning facility comprising a Broadwater Lake, woodland and open grass areas; an enclosed play area and sandpit for under-fives, as well as a zip wire, climbing frame and other equipment for older children; multi-use games area; a court suitable for playing a variety of ball games; football and cricket pitches; tennis courts; public toilets; and a network of permissive paths. The wider complex also includes Godalming Angling Society; Godalming Lawn Tennis Club; Godalming Leisure Centre; Guildford Rugby Club; Farncombe Wanderers Cricket Club; and Farncombe Cricket Club.
3. The golf club, which is a public facility, offers a classic 9-hole par-3 golf course and covered floodlit 16-bay driving range and includes an existing club-house with bar, café and lounge facilities; two storage outbuildings; and a large informal car park which comprises hardstanding and loose gravel surface and which can accommodate about 70 to 80 vehicles. Professional Golfers' Association (PGA) coaching lessons are offered by the golf club. Part of the existing car park is used for car washing activities.
4. The application site<sup>4</sup>, which measures some 8ha, is entirely within the confines of the golf club. The limits of its boundaries are largely defined by the extent of the golf club and the permissive footpaths to the north<sup>5</sup> and east<sup>6</sup>, by woodland blocks and the A3100 to the south, and woodland blocks and the football ground to the west.
5. Apart from its built-development the golf course primarily comprises intensively managed amenity grass interspersed with young and semi mature stands of trees<sup>7</sup>. The edges of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Pondfield Road

<sup>2</sup> Beefeater Manor Inn

<sup>3</sup> Premier Inn Godalming (Manor Inn public house SCC Historic Environment Record No. 16031)

<sup>4</sup> As shown on Drawing Ref. 811.01 Existing Site Plan Rev B dated 5 October 2017

<sup>5</sup> Between the park playground and the golf club

<sup>6</sup> Between Broadwater Lake and the golf club with an intervening woodland block

<sup>7</sup> Between 7m - 10m in height

golf course comprise broader bands of more mature, partly native, woodland blocks including oak, pine, silver birch, alder, willow, London plane and sycamore.

6. The application site is to be accessed from the south via the A3100<sup>8</sup> and the existing access to the golf club facility which leads into the large informal car park with loose gravel surface.
7. As explained above, given its proximity to Farncombe, there are a number of dwellings and other sensitive receptors in close proximity to the application site with the nearest being to the west<sup>9</sup> and south<sup>10</sup>.
8. The application site is also located about 0.24km to the north of the Wey Valley Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and some 0.53km to the west and 0.55km to the south of the closest boundaries of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
9. There are fourteen Grade II Listed Buildings<sup>11</sup> and one Grade I Listed Building<sup>12</sup> located within 500 metres of the application site. The nearest Conservation Area to the same is the 'River Wey & Godalming Navigations' Conservation Area, some 120 metres to the south beyond the A3100.
10. The majority of the application site is located within Flood Zone 1<sup>13</sup>, whereas a small area within the south-western corner of the golf club is classed as Flood Zone 2. Similarly, the application site is subject to a combination of 'very low', 'low', and 'medium' risk of surface water flooding. With the exception of a very small ornamental pond<sup>14</sup> adjacent to the one of the golfing greens there are no existing water features within the application site.
11. The Godalming Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), which was declared for nitrogen dioxide concentrations, is situated within Godalming proper<sup>15</sup> about 1.75km to the south-west of the application site.
12. The River Wey (Tilford to Shalford), a low, medium, siliceous and unmodified surface watercourse that currently exhibits 'poor' ecological status and 'good' chemical quality, lies some 0.12km to the south of the application site beyond the A3100 and the properties that front the same. Moreover, the application site is underlain by the Godalming Lower Greensand, which exhibits 'poor' quantitative and 'poor' chemical quality.

---

<sup>8</sup> Guildford Road/Meadrow

<sup>9</sup> Wey Court; Pondfield Road; and Nursery Road

<sup>10</sup> Watts Close; and Guildford Road

<sup>11</sup> 'Mead' (Historic England List ID 1190568) 70m south;

'Wall to the front of the Almshouses' (Historic England List ID 1378335) 80m south;

'River Mist Cottage' (Historic England List ID 1044507) 80m south;

'Former dairy opposite Nos. 1 & 2 Stable Cottages' (Historic England List ID 1352720) 90m north-east;

'Former kitchen garden wall' (Historic England List ID 1293456) 120m north;

'Meadow House' (Historic England List ID 1044506) 160m south-west;

'Unitarian Chapel & Cottage' (Historic England List ID 1044505) 220m south-west;

'The Cottage (adjoining chapel on west)' (Historic England List ID 1293773) 230m south-west;

'2 & 3 Summersby Close' (Historic England List ID 1293773) 290m north-west;

'Summersby Close' (Historic England List ID 1044486) 280m north-west;

'66 & 70 Meadow (Godalming)' (Historic England List ID 1378334) 360m south-west;

'Farncombe Railway Station with attached footbridge/former railway station building' (Historic England List ID 1293480) 370m north-west;

'62 & 64 Meadow (Godalming)' (Historic England List ID 1293794) 380m south-west;

'Willow Cottage' (Historic England List ID 1044504) 470m south-west

<sup>12</sup> 'The Almshouses' (Historic England List ID 1293743)

<sup>13</sup> Land with the lowest probability of fluvial flooding

<sup>14</sup> 43m<sup>2</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Along Ockford Road

13. The former Godalming Council landfill at Broadwater closed in the late 60s early 70s. The landfill covered approximately 8ha and was located in the area now covered by existing golf course facility and may have extended to the adjacent football ground area<sup>16</sup>. It is estimated that the landfill contained approximately 232,000m<sup>3</sup> of waste to a depth of about 6 metres. There appear to be no records regarding the type of waste deposited in the landfill but contemporary evidence suggests that it comprised mixed-waste materials including household, commercial and industrial waste. Correspondence from 1964 indicates that a 150ft “safety area” was established between Broadwater Lake and the eastern edge of the landfill<sup>17</sup>.
14. Following closure of the landfill and restoration of the land the existing golf course facility was established. This was opened in 1993 and since this time there has been no significant reshaping, earth movement, or landscaping activities except for creation of a handful of sand bunkers, a pond, and a raised grassed obstacle within the northern part of the site. Consequently, it is assumed that the application site’s existing landform is essentially that created after landfilling operations and before golfing activities.
15. In 2013 the applicant, who is the leaseholder, became aware of rising levels of waste migrating to the surface of the golf course including asphalt, metal, concrete and plastic. Additionally, the surface of the golf course continued to settle unevenly to the extent that maintenance and drainage was significantly hampered. In the wetter months the golfing facility is often closed for long periods owing to poor ground conditions. The applicant has provided financial records<sup>18</sup> for 2004 and 2014 to 2017 showing what appears to be a consistent decline in annual revenue since 2004 by some 40%.
16. In the context of these circumstances and having been informed of various incidences at the adjacent football ground involving sharp objects migrating to the surface of the pitch, the applicant became increasingly concerned for the health and safety of golf club customers and how this may affect the golf club’s public liability both from a personal injury perspective and in terms of damage to golf equipment, damage to maintenance equipment and injury to staff.
17. Consequently, in September 2013 the matters discussed in the preceding paragraphs were brought to the attention of the landowner, Waverley Borough Council, resulting in the commissioning of a Preliminary Risk Assessment undertaken by Parsons Brinckerhoff<sup>19</sup>. This report concluded that:
- Contact with an increasing amount of exposed landfill waste on the application site would increase the risk to human health;
  - Exposed waste, especially metal rods, pose a possible safety risk;
  - There is no evidence of a gas nuisance at the site and no reported off-site nuisance, however 2013 guidance would indicate a high potential for gas generation;
  - A linkage between gassing-waste and humans on and off-site cannot be ruled out and is a moderate risk;
  - Risk to the underlying aquifer is moderate to low; and
  - There is a moderate to low risk of a significant contaminant linkage to surface waters being present.

<sup>16</sup> See Drawing Ref. 811.10 Extent of previous landfill dated 10 December 2015

<sup>17</sup> This was likely to be some form of natural or artificial geological barrier to prevent leachate from entering the lake

<sup>18</sup> Carew and Co. Chartered Accountants letter dated 1 May 2017

<sup>19</sup> Broadwater Park Golf Course, Godalming – Preliminary Risk Assessment Final Ref. FSE96666K dated October 2013, Parsons Brinckerhoff



18. Shortly thereafter Waverley Borough Council commissioned Parsons Brinckerhoff to carry out a Phase 2 Risk Assessment<sup>20</sup> so as to evaluate the site more closely. This assessment including intrusive investigations comprising installation of monitoring boreholes, excavations, soil analysis, gas monitoring etc. It concluded that:

- The top 100mm of soil at the site does not indicate a significant risk is posed to users of the golf course;
- Unknown contamination hotspots could be present in the top 100mm of soil but the majority of the site is covered with grass minimising risk of contact;
- If waste material continues to be exposed at the surface of the application site contamination hot spots could be exposed at the surface requiring additional risk assessment;
- Information available indicates historical concerns with regards the quality of the Broadwater Lake;
- Gas data indicates that the landfill is not producing high volumes or flows of methane or VOCs<sup>21</sup>;
- There is some indication of carbon dioxide generation which is usual for older landfills; and
- It is likely that the gas detected in the centre of the site is venting to the atmosphere.

19. Considering the conclusions of these assessments and having taken advice the applicant decided to deal with the issues highlighted. Ground and Water were therefore commissioned in 2014 to conduct an assessment<sup>22</sup> into the risk factors pertaining to a remedial capping operation in the context of the underlying landfill, the golf course and surrounding receptors (humans, controlled waters, buildings, building materials and services). This assessment identified that:

- A rise in ground level across the landfill by 1m to 2m on average would sever the majority of plausible pollutant linkages with respect to soil contamination;
- A rainwater harvesting system would significantly reduce leachate production within the landfill therefore mitigating its impact upon groundwater/controlled waters;
- That an additional soil load on the landfill may force additional bio-gas or leachate out of the landfill which may in turn affect the site and neighbours; and
- A range of further environmental (landfill gas, groundwater etc.) investigations be undertaken to support and inform any such development.

20. In April 2015 the applicant received a letter<sup>23</sup> from golfing facility's insurance broker who explained that following an annual review of the facility it was *"a little concerned about the deterioration of the course's condition. Whilst it is at present still playable, the settlement of the underlying "refuse site" is clearly having an increasing detrimental effect on the course and it appears likely that the risk to members and public of injury will increase without remedial action."*<sup>24</sup>

21. In August 2015 the applicant also commissioned WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff to undertake a Hydrogeological and Engineering Assessment<sup>25</sup> to assess the feasibility and benefits of a remedial capping development in the context of the underlying landfill. In this regard it noted:

<sup>20</sup> Broadwater Park Golf Course, Godalming – Phase 2 Risk Assessment Final Ref. 96666M dated June 2014, Parsons Brinckerhoff

<sup>21</sup> Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are compounds that easily become vapours or gases.

<sup>22</sup> Desk Study Report Ref. GWP935/DS dated October 2014, Ground and Water

<sup>23</sup> Miles Smith Insurance Solutions letter dated 8 April 2015

<sup>24</sup> The applicant has also provided an undated letter from a longstanding member of the golf club which expresses concern about *"unplayable"* and *"dangerous"* ground conditions and finding *"glass & other rubbish"* on the course

<sup>25</sup> Hydrogeological and Engineering Assessment Ref. 70010607-020 dated August 2015, WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff

- Thin topsoil with evidence of previous landfill materials coming through (physical and potentially a chemical hazard);
  - Significant undulations and ground level changes due to waste decomposition and settlement (affecting playability and maintenance);
  - Water logging in low areas as well as raised dry areas with brown grass;
  - Poor soil affecting quality of trees on site and shallow root system result in potential for trees to fall over in windy conditions.
22. As with the Ground and Water report, the WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff assessment concluded that the addition of a soil layer of between 1m and 2m would provide improvement in environmental risk management by separating humans from waste deposits, slowing the generation of leachate from unsaturated wastes, and preventing gas emissions directly to atmosphere. In relation to the latter it recommended that the development include a landfill gas management regime.
23. Further, between August 2015 and October 2017 the applicant sought an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion from Surrey County Council<sup>26</sup>, engaged in pre-application discussions with the County Planning Authority, and obtained written support from Waverley Borough Council (Estates and Valuation Manager) in respect of the proposed development.
24. This series of events has resulted in the planning application and proposed development which are the subjects of this report.

## THE PROPOSAL

25. The applicant describes the proposed development as *“capping of historic 8ha landfill; remodelling and enhancement of existing driving range and 9-hole par 3 golf course with associated ecological and public access improvements; provision of new 490m2 driving range building, adventure golf facility, practice putting green, 17 additional car parking spaces and rainwater harvesting scheme; involving the use of 342,578 tonnes (214,111m3) of inert waste material and 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) per working day over a period of 18-24 months.”*
26. The primary purpose of the development is to ‘cap’ the mixed-waste landfill that lies beneath the existing golf course and driving range facility. This engineering operation seeks to remedy the damaging ‘corrugated’ landform that is developing as the landfill continues to settle and expose previously landfilled waste at the ground surface.
27. However, the development would also necessarily involve the complete re-design of the existing 9-hole golf course facility following ‘capping’ operations. In this regard the applicant intends establishing a 9-hole ‘Academy Course’ featuring high-quality tee, fairway and green surfaces as well as bunkers, swales, mounds, native planting, streams and water features that are exciting and maintainable to a high standard. Remodelling works would include realignment of the existing golf holes to solve identified safety issues<sup>27</sup> at the boundaries with public areas i.e. playground on northern boundary of application site and surrounding permissive paths.
28. These operations would also include the introduction of a winter ‘rainwater harvesting scheme’ to the golf course so as to sever the facility’s reliance on summer mains water

---

<sup>26</sup> In accordance with Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, the County Planning Authority considered the proposed development in the context of Schedule 2, and based on the information submitted, was of the opinion that the proposal would not result in significant environmental impacts. The proposal was not considered to be ‘EIA development’.

<sup>27</sup> Physical injury and property damage risk posed by ball strike

supply for irrigation purposes. This would require the engineering of positive land-drainage falls, installation of an underground drainage network, and creation of a water storage lagoon. The applicant has provided Thames Water records to demonstrate that annual expenditure for use of water on the golf course has increased from £1,674 in 2013 to £4,851 in 2017. Moreover, these records also show that over 2,500m<sup>3</sup> of water is used by the golf course annually. Drawings Ref. 811.13 Rev C Control of Surface Water Runoff and 811.06 Rev B Rainwater Harvesting Plan dated 29 July 2017 provide further detail in these respects.

29. Following 'capping' works to the area occupied by the existing driving range facility the applicant proposes to remodel, realign and engineer the driving range outfield to improve safety, ground conditions, ease of maintenance, and customer experience. The enhanced driving range would include 7 new low impact 'Berm' lighting fixtures which would replace<sup>28</sup> and improve the existing lighting for enhanced customer experience and to mitigate existing light spillage. Replacement of the existing 248m<sup>2</sup> driving range building with a new 490m<sup>2</sup> building<sup>29</sup> with an additional 6<sup>30</sup> covered range bays is also proposed, along with new 5m to 15m high safety netting around the range facility to replace similar netting.
30. As can be expected the depth of material to be deposited and engineered across the former landfill varies. Drawing Ref. 811.04 Rev C Cross Sections dated 22 December 2017 shows the proposed levels across various sections of the final landform. A 'cap' of about 1.3m in depth will be the starting point across the extent of the landfill. This would then be extended in most areas by between 2m and 3m of additional soil<sup>31</sup> and in limited areas by some 4m of additional soil<sup>32</sup>. The reasons for the proposed increase in soil levels over and above the landfill 'cap' are because there is very little soil in situ that could be reused; there is a need to engineer positive surface water drainage flows of between 5% and 10% for rainwater harvesting and surface water management<sup>33</sup> including subsoil drainage infrastructure; the creation of a water storage lagoon above the surface of the landfill; and to provide golf course interest including significant specimen and native tree planting. Drawing Ref. 811.02 Rev B Grading Plan dated 29 July 2017 provides further detail about the proposed land contours following completion of the development.
31. The development also includes the provision of a family orientated 'adventure golf' facility<sup>34</sup> to the south-west of the existing driving range building and west of the existing club house and car park. The 'adventure golf' facility's theme will incorporate Godalming and the history of Waverley and seeks to broaden the attraction of the golf club within the local community. It would comprise 18 artificially surfaced putting areas edged with a mixture of natural and faux rock and faux timber. The holes would be linked with a series of paved pathways. The remaining areas will be mulched planting beds and water features interspersed with hard and soft landscaping and themed props. This facility would be lit by 5 lights mounted on 8m high masts around its perimeter which would be secured by a 2m high palisade fence.
32. Construction of a new 200m<sup>2</sup> practice putting green/short game area to the west of the existing club house is also proposed as a replacement to a similar artificial practice facility.

<sup>28</sup> Four old and inefficient flood light lamps attached to the current driving range building

<sup>29</sup> Steel framed structure clad with shiplap timber stained dark brown and a Platisol coated steel grey coloured flat roof – See Drawing Ref. 811.12 Rev C Covered Bays Building dated 5 April 2017

<sup>30</sup> 22 bays in total

<sup>31</sup> See sections A, B, D, and E

<sup>32</sup> See section C1 to C2

<sup>33</sup> To be specifically directed away from Broadwater Lake to the east and to the storage lagoon in the centre of the site

<sup>34</sup> See Drawing Ref. 811.9 Rev B Adventure Golf Course dated 5 October 2017

33. The development would include an extensive native planting programme<sup>35</sup> in keeping with the existing parkland character with some ornamental or specimen tree species. This planting would take place within the golf course proper and along the boundaries of the same primarily around the remodelled driving range facility. It would comprise six woodland blocks totalling 15,552m<sup>2</sup> (1.5ha); wildflower grassland amounting to some 7,824m<sup>2</sup> (0.7ha); 75 ornamental/specimen trees; and 3,819m<sup>2</sup> (0.3ha) of wetland planting. As well as the water storage lagoon, the development would also provide for a new wetland pond, two new amphibian ponds, and a network of ecological-friendly drainage ditches.
34. Moreover, the applicant has committed to the creation of flora areas associated with the water storage lagoon embankments and marginal areas; creation of open water habitat within the water storage lagoon; retention of suitable tree features; erection of bat and bird boxes in suitable locations; creation of log pile refugia or hibernacula<sup>36</sup> for invertebrates, reptiles and amphibians; and 'planting' of semi-buried wood for invertebrates such as stag beetle and other saproxylic<sup>37</sup> species.
35. Some 342,578 tonnes (214,111m<sup>3</sup>) of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste material would be imported to the application site in order to facilitate the proposed development. This would involve approximately 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) per working day (Monday to Friday) for 18-24 months.
36. It is proposed that construction traffic enters the area from the north off the A3 using the B3000, New Pond Road. Vehicles would travel along the B3000 to the roundabout with the A3100 where they would turn right onto the A3100 to reach the access to the golf club. Construction traffic would make a right turn into the site. When leaving the site, vehicles would turn left out onto the A3100 and retrace the route back to the A3 along the B3000.
37. The existing vehicular access to the golfing facility will need to be temporarily modified to safely accommodate access and egress of HGVs associated with the proposed development<sup>38</sup>. The details of this modification are provided on Drawing Ref. 001 Proposed Construction Site Access dated 7 March 2018 and Drawing Ref. G20371/101 Rev. A Visibility Splay dated January 2016.
38. The proposed development is intended to be phased as per the table below:

Phase No.	Primary Activity	Approximate Duration	Inert Material Requirement	HGV Trips <sup>39</sup>
Phase 1	Site Setup	2 Weeks	0	0
Phase 2	Surface Water Management Features	4 Weeks	12,417m <sup>3</sup>	1,380
Phase 3	Remodelling of Range Outfield <sup>40</sup>	35 Weeks	110,665m <sup>3</sup>	12,296
Phase 4	Remodelling of Southern Section of Golf Course	13 Weeks	41,961m <sup>3</sup>	4,662
Phase 5	Remodelling of Central Section	14 Weeks	42,983m <sup>3</sup>	4,776

<sup>35</sup> See Drawing Ref. 811.03 Rev B Landscape Plan dated 29 July 2017

<sup>36</sup> A place in which a creature seeks refuge

<sup>37</sup> Invertebrates that are dependent on dead or decaying wood or other organisms that are themselves dependent on dead wood

<sup>38</sup> Radius of the eastern side of the site access junction with Medrow to be increased by 2m, and inclusion of measures to ensure pedestrians can continue to safely cross the site access junction with Medrow

<sup>39</sup> Based on some 9m<sup>3</sup> capacity per HGV

<sup>40</sup> Including foundation for new range building

	of Golf Course <sup>41</sup>			
<b>Phase 6</b>	Construction of Adventure Golf Course	6 Weeks	6,085m <sup>3</sup>	676
<b>Total</b>		<b>74 Weeks</b>	<b>214,111m<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>23,790</b>

39. A temporary secure contractors' compound<sup>42</sup> would be established between the existing driving range building and the woodland copse on the northern side of the A3100 for the duration of the development. The secure compound would comprise 6 car parking spaces; a bunded fuel storage area; storage area for incidental waste materials to be removed from the site; a storage area for plant and materials; and a container to be used for secure storage. Site operatives would make use of the existing club house facilities for welfare purposes during the course of the development.
40. A wheelwash facility together with a single soil screener<sup>43</sup> and an administration office would be provided at the access to the development proper that leads from the golf course car park. No crushing plant would be used as part of the development. The soil screener would be used to grade incoming inert material prior to placement for engineering purposes. A road sweeper would also be made available to supplement the intended wheelwashing facility.
41. There would be 4 principal stockpiles of inert waste material on the application site during the course of the development. Each stockpile would measure some 36m long x 36m wide x 2m high. The locations of these stockpiles are shown on Drawing Ref. 811.05 Rev D Contractors Works Plan dated 22 December 2017.
42. The development would also involve the use of 2 x 360-excavators; 1 x bulldozer; 1 x dump-truck; 1 x tractor; and 1 x crane, and there would be up to 6 construction operatives working on the application site at any one time.
43. Following completion of the development an additional 17 parking spaces would be provided by extending the existing car park to the north adjacent to the existing club house. The materials used for the extended car park would match the existing.
44. The new lights proposed for the driving range and adventure golf facilities would be used from dusk up until 2200 hours throughout the year, when needed. The lights would be activated by use of a photo cell sensor. The lights will be turned off by a pre-set timer clock.
45. A new 2m high dark green weldmesh perimeter fence<sup>44</sup> would also be installed around the golf course facility as part of the development. This would seek to mitigate safety concerns of people walking across the golf course and prevent unauthorised access to the facility after hours which has in the past lead to incidences of vandalism. Further, during the course of the development, temporary tree protection Heras-style fencing<sup>45</sup> would be installed in and around the application site in accordance with BS 5837<sup>46</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> Including range building construction

<sup>42</sup> See Drawings Ref. 811.05 Rev D Contractors Works Plan dated 22 December 2017 and 811.14 Contractors Works Plan Further Details dated 19 July 2017

<sup>43</sup> A soil screener is proposed with a view to manufacturing suitable top soil to be used as part of the development. Some 10,236m<sup>3</sup> of topsoil is required for soiling about 6.8ha to 150mm. Resulting stones and concrete of a suitable size would be used on site as a base for new paths etc.

<sup>44</sup> See Drawing Ref. 811.08 Hard Landscape Features Rev B dated 29 July 2017

<sup>45</sup> See Drawing Ref. TPP-CC/403 AR2848 Tree Protection Plan Rev 0 dated 8 March 2016

<sup>46</sup> BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations



46. In support of the proposal the applicant surveyed a total number of 13 individual trees and 9 tree groups on and around the application site. The proposed scheme provides for the retention and protection of all the trees surveyed with the exception of part of Tree Group 11, Tree Group 19, Tree 20 and part of Tree Group 21 which are largely located on golf course proper (where capping and engineering works are to take place) or to the east of the driving range facility. All of these trees are deemed to be no more than of moderate quality and value. The relevant details are presented in the applicant's Arboricultural Tree Assessment and Method Statement dated March 2016 and Drawing Ref. TPP-CC/403 AR2848 Tree Protection Plan Rev 0 dated 8 March 2016.
47. A new permissive path through the facility would also be provided as part of the development. This path would provide members of the public with a dedicated access through the golf course from the A3100 (just to the west of where Public Footpath 24 ends/starts to the south of the A3100) in the south to the woodland north of the Godalming Town Football Club ground and south of the Nursery Road car park<sup>47</sup>. Outwith the proposed development and planning application the applicant has committed to continue discussions with Waverley Borough Council about the provision of further permissive paths in and around the golf course facility.
48. The duration of the development would be dependent upon a range of factors including weather conditions and the availability of suitable inert waste material. However, the applicant does not envisage that the works would take longer than 24 months to complete. During this time works are proposed to be undertaken during the hours of 0730 to 1830 Monday to Friday with no working on Saturdays, Sundays, bank/public or national holidays. Further, construction traffic would be restricted to accessing the application site between the hours of 0730 and 1630 hours only.
49. The development would require the benefit of an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency (EA) before it could proceed.

## CONSULTATIONS AND PUBLICITY

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

- |  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 50. Waverley Borough Council (Planning)              | - No objection.                       |
| 51. Waverley Borough Council (Pollution Control)     | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 52. Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 53. The Environment Agency                           | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 54. Natural England                                  | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 55. County Highway Authority                         | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 56. English Heritage                                 | - No objection.                       |
| 57. Surrey Hills AONB Board                          | No objection.                         |

---

<sup>47</sup> See Drawing Ref. 811.03 Landscape Plan Rev B dated 29 July 2017

- |   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 58. Lead Local Flood Authority                              | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 59. SCC Historic Buildings Officer                          | - No objection.                       |
| 60. SCC Arboriculturalist                                   | - No views received.                  |
| 61. SCC Environmental Noise Consultant                      | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 62. SCC Air Quality Consultant (Dust and Vehicle Emissions) | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 63. SCC Visual Impact and Landscape Consultant              | - No objection.                       |
| 64. SCC Hydrogeological Consultant                          | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 65. SCC Lighting Consultant                                 | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 66. SCC Ecologist   | - No objection subject to conditions. |
| 67. SCC Rights of Way                                       | - No views received.                  |
| 68. Thames Water  | - No views received.                  |

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

- |                            |                      |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 69. Godalming Town Council | - No views received. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|

**SUMMARY OF PUBLICITY UNDERTAKEN AND KEY ISSUES RAISED BY PUBLIC**

70. The application was publicised by the posting of four site notices around the application site and within the Broadwater Park complex and an advert was placed in the Surrey Advertiser on Friday 26 February 2017. Additionally, a total of 107 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. A further round of consultation and publicity (direct letter and email) was undertaken 29 January 2019 concerning the receipt of amending and amplifying information including an updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 7 January 2019.
71. Nine letters of representation have been received by the County Planning Authority (CPA). Of these, 2 are in support<sup>48</sup> of the proposal whilst the remaining 7 raise objection to or concerns about the scheme. A summary of the issues raised by the representations is provided below:

***General Comments***

- This is a much needed facility which should be supported by the local council.
- I like this scheme and so do many others; please support it and enable a rapid start to the work.

---

<sup>48</sup> One of these letters is from England Golf dated 10 August 2018

### ***Principle of the Development***

- This scheme seeks to cap rubbish of the past and reinvigorate the site.
- This site can still be used for existing purposes and I am not convinced that topsoil is eroding away to such an extent that drainage is hampered.
- We think the 2 year period for the proposed development and its impacts is unbearable and totally unacceptable for daily life.
- The investment proposed would be likely to bring benefits to other courses and clubs in the area by fostering interest and increasing participation in golf.
- We support the proposed development and consider that it would provide Broadwater Park Golf Club with a clear USP and would appeal to a more diverse audience in the local area, who maybe aren't currently considering golf, or aren't attracted to the current playing offer. The variety of golfing options the proposed development would provide, will benefit the local community and will enable the facility to target families more effectively – golf is one of the few sports that all ages and all members of a family unit can participate in together.

### ***Metropolitan Green Belt***

- The proposed development would be extremely damaging to the Green Belt.

### ***Surrey Hills AONB***

- The proposed development would be extremely damaging to the AONB 0.55km away.

### ***Visual and Landscape Impact***

- A well planned and executed golf course will be a benefit to the landscape.
- The new intrusive 2 metre high fence around the perimeter of the site would have a negative impact on the park's landscape and connectivity and would not comply with the management plan for the park.

### ***Nature Conservation***

- The proposed development would be extremely damaging to the SSSI 0.24km south.
- The impact of the proposed fencing on wildlife and habitat has not been assessed.

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

- The number of HGV trips over a two year period would amount to over 35,000 trips which would cause: an increase in pollution; and increase in traffic; serious road safety concerns; an increase in noise pollution; an increased risk to pedestrians.
- The movement of 140 loads per day using Guildford Road would be a nightmare.
- We have already suffered from the lorries servicing Flambards Way and Catteshall Road developments for over 3 years.
- The flood prevention works by the EA to the Wey Canal are due to start and that will undoubtedly mean yet more lorries.
- The roadway gullies along Meadow and Guildford Road must be partially blocked as they flood after rain creating verge water collection areas and the proposed development will only make it worse.
- Wheel washing systems appear not to work or not to be used.
- The 18-24 months of 140 HGV traffic movements will be damaging to the A3100, noise and dirt pollution will be irreversible to the local countryside.
- Object on the grounds of absolute non-suitability for the access of the heavy HGVs to the site.

- We already have difficulty exiting our property due to the volume of regular vehicles along the A31000, before adding 70 HGV vehicles on a daily basis trying to get in and out of this site for a two year period.
- There will also be huge amounts of dirt dropped from these vehicles onto the road just in front of our home and they also cause us great concern for our safety and health.
- Will the applicant or land owner be making provisions for repairs to the A3100 including road surface surveys before and after the proposed development?

### ***Public Access***

- Any planning gain in the way of consolidating and widening the existing permissive footpath within the application site would be most desirable.
- It is hoped that Surrey County Council will consider providing additional public access as part of the proposal to support the desire and need of people to move about their community in a safe and environmentally pleasant way as possible.
- While supporting the many improvements that the applicants propose for the golfing area at Broadwater Park, I strongly object to the enclosure of the area with a high, steel-mesh fence that will exclude the public both visually and physically.

### ***Noise***

- We are concerned about the huge noise levels for the re-building of the golf course using very heavy machinery.

### ***Air Quality***

- The environmental impact of HGVs in volume on a daily basis will stop our right to enjoy our property and our daily life and there will be a huge increase in pollution of the air.

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Introduction**

72. 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.
73. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the [Surrey Waste Plan 2008 \(SWP\)](#), the [Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 \(WLP\)](#), and the [saved policies of the Waverley Local Plan 2002 \(SWLP\)](#).
74. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations.
75. In assessing the application against development plan policy it will be necessary to determine whether the proposed measures for mitigating any environmental impact of the development are satisfactory. In this case the main planning considerations are: sustainable waste management; highways, traffic and access; air quality and noise; flood risk; landscape and visual impact; ecology; Heritage Assets; and the Metropolitan Green Belt.

## **SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT**

### **Development Plan Policies** Surrey Waste Plan 2008

*Policy CW4 – Waste Management Capacity*

*Policy CW5 – Location of Waste Facilities*

*Policy WD2 – Materials Recovery*

*Policy WD7 – Land raising and Engineering Operations*

*Policy WD8 – Land raising and Engineering Operations*

### *Policy Context*

76. In England, the Waste Hierarchy is both a guide to sustainable waste management and a legal requirement, enshrined in law<sup>49</sup>. The hierarchy gives top priority to waste prevention, followed by preparing for re-use, then recycling, other types of recovery<sup>50</sup> and last of all disposal.
77. The [National Planning Policy Framework 2019 \(the Framework\)](#) does not contain policies relating to waste management. Instead national waste management policies are contained within the [Waste Management Plan for England 2013 \(WMP\)](#) and set out by the [National Planning Policy for Waste 2014 \(NPW\)](#).
78. The WMP advocates that the dividends of applying the waste hierarchy will not just be environmental but explains that we can save money by making products with fewer natural resources, and we can reduce the costs of waste treatment and disposal. It envisages that the resulting benefits of sustainable waste management will be realised in a healthier natural environment and reduced impacts on climate change as well as in the competitiveness of our businesses through better resource efficiency and innovation – a truly sustainable economy. Similarly, the NPW sets out the Government’s ambition of working towards a more sustainable and efficient approaches to waste management by driving waste up the waste hierarchy.
79. In this context paragraph 80 of the Framework explains that planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future.
80. The NPW states that when determining planning applications the County Planning Authority (CPA) should: (a) consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B of the NPW and the location implications of any advice on health from the relevant health bodies but that the CPA should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessments in these respects; (b) ensure that waste management facilities in themselves are well-designed so that they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located; and (c) concern themselves with implementing the planning strategy in the Local Plan and not with the control of processes which are a matter for the pollution control authorities<sup>51</sup>. The CPA should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced.
81. The SWP explains<sup>52</sup> that the SCC remains committed to achieving net self-sufficiency, enabling appropriate development that implements the waste hierarchy and ensuring that the County delivers its contribution to regional waste management. In this context it goes

---

<sup>49</sup> [The Waste \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2011](#)

<sup>50</sup> Including energy recovery and other beneficial uses

<sup>51</sup> In this case the Environment Agency and Waverley Borough Council

<sup>52</sup> Paragraph B30



on to state<sup>53</sup> that a range of facilities, type, size and mix will be required, located on a range of sites to provide sustainable waste management infrastructure in Surrey.

82. Consequently, policy CW4 of the SWP requires planning permissions to be granted to enable sufficient waste management capacity to be provided to manage the equivalent of the waste arising in Surrey, together with a contribution to meeting the declining landfill needs of residual wastes arising in and exported from London, by ensuring a range of facilities are permitted.
83. Policy CW5 of the SWP sets out the approach that should be taken in respect of the location of waste management facilities. Generally, waste management facilities should be suited to development on industrial sites and in urban areas giving priority over greenfield land to previously developed land<sup>54</sup>. However, it recognises that opportunities for waste management facilities in urban areas are limited, so land beyond needs to be considered.
84. The development is not a ‘facility’ per se but rather a waste management ‘activity’ which primarily comprises an engineering operation involving land-raising. In this respect policy WD2 of the SWP states that permission for development involving the recovery and processing of waste will be granted at existing or proposed waste management sites, subject in the case of land raising sites or other temporary facilities, to the waste use being limited to the life of the land raising or other temporary facility.
85. Landfill is commonly used to fill voids left by mineral working so as to achieve restoration of the land and an appropriate after-use. Land raising developments are not as common. Whilst land raising activities are often considered inappropriate, such development can be beneficial. Examples include re-grading a steep slope to bring land into agricultural use. Land raising activities can also restore previously derelict and disturbed land to enable a more positive and beneficial use<sup>55</sup>. Inert wastes are often used in engineering operations such as the construction of landscape or noise mitigation bunds. Such land raising activities might be linked to new development and so may make good use of the resultant spoil. In these circumstances these are likely to be sustainable benefits gained from using the spoil in a project close by, rather than transporting it to a more distant facility<sup>56</sup>. However, it is important that mineral workings are properly restored within the County and this should not be prejudiced by the lack of suitable material<sup>57</sup>. The SWP requires land raising schemes to result in not just small changes but that the activity makes a fully beneficial contribution with substantial improvement to the quality of the land. Proposals will also be expected to limit the quantity of deposited waste to the minimum necessary<sup>58</sup>.
86. In light of this policy WD7 of the SWP is clear that planning permission will only be granted for engineering operations provided: (a) the waste to be disposed of cannot practicably and reasonably be reused, recycled or processed<sup>59</sup> or may otherwise be required for the restoration of mineral workings; and (b) the proposed development is both essential for and involves the minimum quantity of waste necessary<sup>60</sup>; and (c) the proposed

---

<sup>53</sup> Paragraph B32

<sup>54</sup> Where there is an absence of landscape, and international and national nature conservation designations; and where the site is well served by the strategic road network or accessible by alternative means of transport

<sup>55</sup> Paragraph C29 of the SWP

<sup>56</sup> Paragraph C35 of the SWP

<sup>57</sup> Paragraph C36 of the SWP

<sup>58</sup> Paragraph C30 of the SWP

<sup>59</sup> To recover materials - produce compost, soil conditioner, inert residues etc.

<sup>60</sup> For the purpose of restoring current or former mineral workings sites; or facilitating a substantial improvement in the quality of the land; or facilitating an appropriate after use; or improving land damaged or disturbed as a result of previous or existing uses and where no other satisfactory means exists to secure the necessary improvement; or the engineering or other operations

development does not prejudice the satisfactory restoration of mineral working sites in the locality, having regard to the supply and availability of appropriate waste materials.

87. Notwithstanding the above, to ensure that the potential benefits of engineering works are maximised such proposals must include consideration of the final use of land including proposals for a high quality of restoration and long term management plans for the restored site. The finished levels of a restored site may be higher than adjoining land. However, they will still be expected to incorporate high quality standards of restoration of the site that are appropriate to the surrounding landscape<sup>61</sup>.
88. Consequently, policy WD8 of the SWP requires proposals for engineering operations were appropriate, should: (a) incorporate finished levels that are compatible with the surrounding area and any likely settlement. The finished levels should be the minimum required to ensure the satisfactory restoration of the land for an agreed after use; (b) include proposals for aftercare; and (c) make provision where practical for appropriate habitat creation for biodiversity benefit.

### *The Development*

89. The annual volume of construction, demolition and excavation (CD&E) waste generated in Surrey over recent years has increased from about 1.4 million tonnes (mt) in 2009 to over 2mt in 2014. However, between 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 this trend dipped slightly as some 1.97mt<sup>62</sup> and 1.86mt<sup>63</sup> of CD&E waste arose in Surrey respectively. Despite this recent downturn Officers consider its overall upward trajectory is likely to continue beyond the period of the SWP in line with construction activity in the County, South East, and London. This consideration is borne out by Surrey County Council's [2017/2018 monitoring report](#) which records that the County produced an estimated 2.49mt of CD&E waste in that year.
90. Paragraph 6.2.20 of the 2017/2018 monitoring report explains that the 2017/2018 estimate for CD&E waste is high due to an increase in the amount of the same being used for the production of recycled aggregate. Recycled aggregate sales are used as a factor in the steps for calculating the CD&E waste arisings. Further work is being done on the CD&E waste used for recycled aggregates by Surrey County Council and the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group.
91. In addition to CD&E waste arising in Surrey, a significant volume of CD&E waste is imported to the County each year from elsewhere. For instance, in 2014/2015 over 1mt of CD&E waste was imported to the County<sup>64</sup>. There appear to be no import figures for the succeeding years. However, given the County's location relative to London and its urban environs, including road networks through Surrey, it is reasonable to assume that for 2015/2016 onwards the volumes of CD&E waste imported are likely to be at a similar ratio i.e. 2:1.
92. The 2017/2018 Annual Monitoring Report explains<sup>65</sup> that *"generally there is sufficient capacity overall to deal with the equivalent amount of waste arising in Surrey, however, a significant proportion of this capacity is landfill. While landfill is recognised as an alternative the [Waste Planning Authority] should plan for, it is considered the least desirable method of managing our waste. Therefore, Surrey needs to continue to promote facilities for preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery of waste."*

---

<sup>61</sup> Paragraph C38 of the SWP

<sup>62</sup> [Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2015/2016](#), paragraph 6.1

<sup>63</sup> [Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2016/2017](#), Paragraph 6.1

<sup>64</sup> [Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2014/2015](#), Paragraph 5.2.22

<sup>65</sup> Paragraph 6.3.11

93. It should also be recognised that although the County has sufficient capacity to manage its own CD&E waste, albeit mostly in the least desirable way, CD&E waste imported to the County from elsewhere also needs to be taken into account and managed appropriately.
94. The proposed development seeks to utilise approximately 342,578 tonnes of CD&E waste and would therefore provide the County with an equivalent amount of additional waste management capacity over the two-year period in which the development is to take place. This represents about 18% and 14% of the total volume of CD&E waste generated in Surrey in the years 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 respectively. These percentage figures would be materially lower if one were also to take account of CD&E waste imported to the County and consider that the development would take place over a period of 24-months. However, the proposal would nevertheless provide the County with moderate yet significant additional waste management capacity for the duration of the development. Consequently, Officers consider the development compliant with policy CW4 of the SWP.
95. Setting aside any adverse implications of importing 342,578 tonnes of CD&E waste to the application site as proposed, from a waste management perspective it is recognised by Officers that the engineering aspects of the development seek to utilise waste for beneficial purposes.
96. The applicant has explained that the primary purpose of the development, capping of the landfill, would remedy the damaging 'corrugated' landform that is developing as it continues to settle and expose waste at the ground surface and therefore the adverse implications settlement has on the golf course and its users. The proposed development would also bring about other benefits. For instance it would reduce the volume of leachate generated by the landfill as a result of bespoke surface water management arrangement - this is likely to benefit the local water environment over the long-term. Capping of the landfill would also sever contact between people and landfill waste protruding through the ground surface, and is likely to mitigate landfill gas emissions directly to atmosphere<sup>66</sup> through a formal landfill gas management regime and associated infrastructure.
97. Capping of the landfill would also provide the applicant with an opportunity to remodel and re-align the golf course and practice ground outfield for improved safety, maintenance and golf course interest; introduce a rainwater harvesting system so as to sever the golf club's reliance on Summer mains water supply thereby reducing pressure the wider domestic supply; create a family-friendly adventure golf facility; provide for dedicated public access; create a mosaic of differing habitats including panting of 1.5ha of woodland, 0.7ha of wildflower grassland, 75 ornamental/specimen trees, and 0.3ha of wetland habitat; and renew and modernise a number of existing features of the golf course including the driving range building, lighting, boundary treatment<sup>67</sup>, short-game practice area, car park etc.
98. These aspects of the proposed development are vital to the club's ambitions to raise the quality of the golf course to a level commensurate with facilities within the wider Broadwater Park complex and to create a 'Golfing Academy' with a strong emphasis on the local community including schools. It is also projected that the development would result in an increased use of the golf course thereby providing additional revenue to an existing local business and public facility.
99. In this context Officers consider that the use of waste to facilitate the development proposed as an alternative to the use of primary materials to achieve the same would, for planning purposes, amount to the 'recovery' of waste managed in Surrey. From a sustainable waste management perspective the recovery of waste is preferred over its use for landfill.

---

<sup>66</sup> See paragraph 22 above

<sup>67</sup> Existing arrangements include change in ground levels between golf course and surrounding land and woodland blocks

100. The development is to set to be completed within a temporary period of up to 24 months. The application site is not covered by any landscape designations or national or higher-level nature conservation designations which Natural England's consultation response confirms. The Surrey Hills AONB Board and the CPA's Visual Impact and Landscape Consultant has confirmed that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the Surrey Hills AONB some 0.53km to the west and 0.55km to the south. Engineering and land raising activities are to take place within the confines of the existing golf course and once completed would enable continuation of the same land-use. The development would therefore not result in the loss of undeveloped or greenfield land.
101. In respect of access to the strategic road network and the scale of the development the County Highway Authority has not objected to the development, including the proposed HGV haulage route to and from the A3, subject to a range of conditions to secure the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant and to improve the site access. For the reasons given in this and the preceding paragraphs Officers consider that the development satisfies policies WD2 and CW5 of the SWP.
102. On the basis of Officers' experience it is considered that the CD&E waste material to be used to facilitate the development is likely to arise from construction, demolition and excavation sites within a 30 mile radius of the application site including London. Considering the strong emphasis on the application of the Waste Hierarchy in the development industry and the economics of reuse, recycling or recovery of waste over its disposal to landfill, Officers share the applicant's contention that a significant proportion of the waste material to be deposited on the application site is unlikely to be suitable for reuse or recycling for various reasons<sup>68</sup>.
103. Reuse, recycling or recovery of inert waste on or off-site is generally much cheaper than disposal which attracts a penalty in the form of a financial tax. Consequently, Officers consider that the development would attract inert waste that is unlikely to be otherwise recycled or reused. As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, large volumes of CD&E waste are managed in Surrey and the development proposed would provide additional capacity over a two-year period to manage a proportion of the same in a sustainable and beneficial way. Accordingly, Officers consider that any impact the proposal may have on the restoration of mineral workings in the locality<sup>69</sup> is unlikely to be significant. Officers accept that the scale of the development is likely to impact on the 'waste market' within Surrey but Officers do not consider that it would prejudice the timely restoration of mineral workings in the locality over the 2-year development period. In this regard it is notable that the CPA has not received any objection to the proposal from mineral operators in Surrey, and that in 2016/2017<sup>70</sup> and 2017/2018<sup>71</sup> no mineral workings were subject to a request for an extended time-period for restoration as a result of a lack of suitable inert restoration material.
104. In these respects Officers consider that the development complies with parts (a) and (c) of policy WD7 of the SWP. However, in order to be fully compliant with policy WD7 the applicant is also required to demonstrate that the land raising proposed is both essential and involves the minimum quantity of waste requisite.
105. The environmental and engineering assessments undertaken on behalf of the applicant demonstrate that a capping layer of between 1m and 2m would provide improvement in environmental risk management by separating humans from waste deposits, slowing the

<sup>68</sup> Including its provenance and proximity to sites where these activities are undertaken; physical characteristics; and composition

<sup>69</sup> Stanwell Quarry, Shepperton; Addlestone Quarry, Addlestone; Runfold South Quarry, Runfold; Land West of Queen Mary Reservoir, Laleham; Homers Farm, Ashford; Reigate Road Quarry, Brockham; Homefield Sandpit, Runfold

<sup>70</sup> See Appendix 1 of Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2016/2017

<sup>71</sup> See Appendix 1 of Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2017/2018

generation of leachate from unsaturated wastes, and preventing gas emissions directly to atmosphere. The applicant is proposing a cap of about 1.3m deep across the extent of the landfill. The 'cap' would then be extended predominately by an additional layer of soil between 2m and 3m deep<sup>72</sup> and in limited areas by some 4m of additional soil<sup>73</sup>. The reasons for the proposed increase in soil levels over and above the landfill 'cap' are because there is very little soil in situ which could be reused; there is a need to engineer positive surface water drainage flows of between 5% and 10% for rainwater harvesting and surface water management<sup>74</sup> aided by subsoil drainage infrastructure; the storage water lagoon is to be constructed above the landfill, and for the purposes of golf course interest including significant tree planting.

106. Officers consider that it would be clear to any reasonable observer who visits the golf course that the same is in a poor state of repair primarily because of continuing ground settlement, waste materials protruding through the ground surface, and poor drainage. These problems have a wide range of obvious adverse and ongoing implications on the quality and functionality of the golf course including undulating land-form, water pooling and parching, disrupted maintenance regimes, and unstable trees. These implications plainly increase risk to the public and affiliates of the golf course including staff. These matters, which are evidenced by the applicant's supporting documentation<sup>75</sup>, are not conducive to a long-standing local business or indeed an outdoor public leisure facility within an award winning park.
107. Waverley Borough Council (Environmental Pollution Control) supports the proposed development and in this regard has explained that it would "...provide a long term solution to the issues at the site with respect to its former use as a landfill. The capping will reduce infiltration of water through the landfill and prevent members of the public from contact with waste at the surface. Overall the proposals will provide significant environmental betterment..." Similarly, Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) supports the proposed development subject to a range of practical matters which could be satisfactorily addressed by way of planning conditions.
108. The applicant has explained that the grading design of the landform proposed has been through a lengthy and iterative process whereby the minimum depth of the 'cap' has been established by environmental consultants (between some 1m and 2m) followed by new levels of the golf course (between some 2m and 4m) that ensure surface water is managed in a way that controls and directs runoff away from Broadwater Lake to the east, to the proposed water storage lagoon (which is to be constructed above the landfill cap level), and otherwise to soakaways in areas away from the underlying landfill (primarily to the south and west). Surface water management is discussed in more detail in paragraphs 200 to 211 below.
109. In addition to capping and drainage requirements the depth of CD&EW to be deposited across the application site needs to be considered in light of the significant tree planting proposed (six woodland blocks totalling 15,552m<sup>2</sup> (1.5ha)). In this respect Officers have had regard to the Department for Communities and Local Government 2008 publication '[Woodland Establishment on Landfill Sites - Ten Years of Research](#)'. Amongst other matters this study explains that at least 1m of soil cover is required to enable sustainable growth to be maintained for trees of age up to 10 years; a greater soil cover depth is likely to be required to support the moisture demands of mature trees; and the provision of 1.5m of soil or soil-forming material overlying a 'cap' will ensure that trees can be established on landfills without posing a significant threat to cap integrity up to their 16<sup>th</sup> year.

---

<sup>72</sup> See sections A, B, D, and E

<sup>73</sup> See section C1 to C2

<sup>74</sup> To be specifically directed away from Broadwater Lake to the east and to soakaways away from landfill waste

<sup>75</sup> Discussed in paragraphs 15 to 23 above.



110. Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) have queried whether the composition of soils to be deposited on the application site would be suitable for the tree planting proposed. The nature of the soil material imported to the application site would be determined by the Environmental Permit required for the development to proceed. However, so as to ensure that suitable soils are provided in the context of the tree species to be planted a planning condition could be imposed on any consent issued. Such a condition would require the applicant to provide a landscape specification for tree planting which includes provision of suitable topsoils and tree nursery stock in accordance with BS 3882 and BS 3936-1 respectively.
111. Similarly, Surrey County Council's Ecologist considers that the proposal would provide for positive ecological enhancements subject to range of practicalities that could be adequately addressed by way of planning conditions. Ecological matters are discussed in more detail in paragraphs 228 to 240 below.
112. The CPA's Visual Impact and Landscape Consultant has assessed the proposal and explained that the zone of visual influence of the proposed development would be extremely limited in all seasons. Crucially, regarding the landscape character of the local area, the proposal would not materially alter the existing characteristics of the application site, that of a golf course, with existing features being enhanced and so (when complete) these would not be uncharacteristic when set within the context of the existing landscape. As such the Consultant considers that the remodelling and enhancement proposed would have no significant or lasting effect upon the Peasmarsh River Valley Floor Landscape Character Area, or the Surrey Hills AONB; with any potentially adverse effects limited to a very local and contained area in and locally adjoining the application site.
113. Officers recognise that a 'do nothing' scenario or otherwise relocating the existing golf course to some unidentified suitable alternative site would not solve the identified problems with the underlying landfill. It is reasonable to assume that settlement of the landfill and protrusion of waste through the ground surface and all resulting adverse implications will continue for the foreseeable future in the absence of a practical solution. Officers also recognise that 'cut and fill operations', to supplement the required volume of engineering and soil material, thereby reducing the volume of waste required to be imported to the application site, is not a viable option given the general absence of existing top soil and the underlying landfill i.e. there are no viable 'borrow' areas. Other than the capping operations proposed Officers are not aware of any alternative practical and satisfactory solution to the identified problems.
114. Consequently, Officers consider that capping of the landfill as proposed is the only sustainable method of ensuring the existing public outdoor leisure facility remains functional and fit for purpose in the context of the wider Broadwater Park complex. In these circumstances Officers also consider the approach adopted by the applicant in seeking to remodel the golf course (a necessary consequence of capping operations) as proposed including with a view to sustainable surface water management and golf course interest to be reasonable and proportionate.
115. Considering the reasons and justifications given for the proposed development and taking into account the implications on the local landscape Officers consider that land raising proposed is both essential and involves the minimum quantity of waste requisite. Additionally Officers consider that the development, as a whole, has been well-designed so that upon completion it would bring about a substantial improvement to the quality of the golf course and in turn contribute positively to the character and quality of the wider Broadwater Park complex.
116. Accordingly, having regard to paragraphs 104 to 115 above, Officers contend that the development, subject to conditions, satisfies part (b) of policy WD7 of the SWP. For the same reasons and having regard to the additional habitat and ecological improvements to

be provided for by the development<sup>76</sup> Officers consider that the development, subject to conditions, satisfies policy WD8 of the SWP.

117. Interested parties have raised various questions about the suitability of the waste to be deposited and pollution that may arise as a result. Concerns have also been voiced about the profits to be made by applicant in respect of the waste to be received. These are not matters that should or could be taken into account in determining the proposal with former being a matter for the pollution control authorities whom the CPA should assume would be effective and the latter not a material planning consideration. The Environment Agency has advised that the development would require the benefit of an Environmental Permit and the CPA should assume that this regulatory regime would operate effectively.

#### *Sustainable Waste Management Conclusion*

118. Having regard to paragraphs 89 to 117 above, Officers consider that the development satisfies Policies CW4, CW5, WD2, WD7, and WD8 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.

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

#### **Development Plan Policies**

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP)

*Policy DC3 – General Considerations*

Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 (WLP)

*Policy ST1 - Sustainable Transport*

Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (SWLP)

*Policy M1 – Location of Development*

*Policy M2 – Movement Implications of Development*

*Policy M13 – Heavy Goods Vehicles*

*Policy MC14 – Car Parking Standards*

#### *Policy Context*

119. Paragraph 102 of the Framework advises that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals, so that: (a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed; (b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated; (c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued; (d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and (e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

120. At paragraph 103 the Framework explains that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of the above listed objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

121. In considering development proposals paragraph 108 of the Framework advocates that it should be ensured that: (a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

---

<sup>76</sup> As discussed in paragraphs 227 to 239 below

(b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and (c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

122. Paragraph 109 of the Framework then goes on to state that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
123. Within this context, the Framework explains<sup>77</sup> that applications for development should: (a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use; (b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; (c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards; (d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and (e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.
124. Paragraph 111 of the Framework states that all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.
125. Appendix B of the NPW states that in testing the suitability of sites for waste management the CPA should bear in mind the envisaged waste management facility in terms of its nature and scale and consider the suitability of the road network and the extent to which access would require reliance on local roads.
126. In this regard policy DC3 of the SWP requires that applicants demonstrate, by the provision of adequate supporting information, that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. The policy goes on to state that the supporting information should include, where appropriate, an assessment of traffic generation, access and suitability of the highway network, and mitigation measures to minimise or avoid material adverse impact and compensate for any loss.
127. The Local Transport Plan covering Waverley is the [Surrey Transport Plan \(2011-2026\)](#). This seeks to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey; in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment and improve the quality of life. The Borough Council will work with Surrey County Council to ensure that the Borough's needs are reflected in future transport plans. As part of this work, the Borough Council will, where appropriate, require the use of Travel Plans by new development and promote their use within other areas.
128. Policy ST1 of the SWLP explains that the Borough Council will work in partnership with Surrey County Council, neighbouring authorities, transport providers and other key stakeholders to ensure that development schemes: (a) are located where opportunities for sustainable transport modes can be maximised, reflecting the amount of movement generated, the nature and location of the site and recognising that solutions and measures will vary from urban to rural locations; (b) make the necessary contributions to the improvement of existing, and provision of new, transport schemes that lead to

---

<sup>77</sup> At paragraph 110

improvements in accessibility and give priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, users of public transport, car sharers and users of low and ultra-low emission vehicles; (c) include measures to encourage non-car use such as on-site cycle parking; (d) ensure development proposals are consistent with, and contribute to the implementation of the Surrey Local Transport Plan; (e) require the submission of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans and other appropriate measures in new developments that generate significant traffic volumes or have significant impact on the Strategic Road Network; (f) contribute to transport infrastructure improvements, where appropriate and viable; (g) are consistent with the objectives and actions within the Air Quality Action Plan; (h) encourage the provision of new and improved footpaths, bridleways and cycleways, provided there would be no significant effect on Special Protection Areas and other areas of importance for nature conservation; and (i) make appropriate provision for car parking<sup>78</sup>, having regard to the type of development and its location, in accordance with local standards.

129. Waverley Borough Council's parking guidelines set out the level of car parking expected for new development. The guidelines are divided into two main sections, one dealing with non-residential development, and one dealing with residential development. In addition to this, the document sets out guidelines for cycle parking provision, disabled parking and school parking requirements. In respect of golf clubs and driving ranges the guidelines suggest 1 car space per 0.3 holes or per driving bay or individual assessment/justification. In addition they require an additional 5% of total parking spaces be allocated for disabled users or a minimum of 1 space per 750m<sup>2</sup> (whichever is the greater) to meet demand. Further design guidance is also provided by the guidelines.
130. Policy M1 of the SWLP states that the Council will seek to ensure that development is located so as to reduce the need to travel, especially by private car, and to encourage a higher proportion of travel by walking, cycling and public transport. In particular, the Council will seek to: (a) locate major trip generating developments in locations in Farnham, Godalming, Haslemere and Cranleigh which are highly accessible by public transport, cycling and walking; and (b) resist major trip generating developments in peripheral or rural locations where access would be predominantly by private car and where accessibility by other modes is poor.
131. Policy M2 of the SWLP requires that all development proposals should provide safe access for pedestrians and road users, including cyclists, designed to a standard appropriate for the highway network in the vicinity and the level of traffic likely to be generated by the development.
132. Policy M13 of the SWLP states that the Council will seek to minimise the adverse impact of lorry traffic within the Borough. In particular the Council will seek to locate development which are likely to generate heavy goods vehicle movements where the highway infrastructure is capable of accommodating those movements.
133. Policy M14 of the SWLP states that the level of car parking provision appropriate for individual development proposals will be required to make appropriate provision for motor vehicle parking space, having regard to the developer's own requirements, subject to road safety and traffic management implications, and the accessibility of the location to means of travel other than the private car assessed according to the location and type of development.

### *The Development*

134. Some 342,578 tonnes (214,111m<sup>3</sup>) of inert waste material would be imported to the application site in order to facilitate the proposed development. This would involve approximately 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) per working day (Monday to Friday) for

---

<sup>78</sup> [Waverley Borough Council Parking Guidelines - October 2013](#)

18-24 months. Operational hours of the development is proposed between 0730 to 1830 hours Monday to Friday with no working on Saturdays, Sundays, bank/public or national holidays. Within these constraints construction traffic will only access and egress the application between 0730 and 1630 hours.

135. It is proposed that construction traffic enters the area from the north off the A3 using the B3000, New Pond Road. Vehicles would travel along the B3000 to the roundabout with the A3100<sup>79</sup> where they would turn right onto the A3100 to reach the access to the golf club and make a right turn into the site. When leaving the site, vehicles would turn left out onto the A3100 and retrace the route back to the A3 along the B3000. The applicant submits that the alternative routes available<sup>80</sup> are unsuitable for HGV traffic and any significant increase in HGV traffic for reasons of road safety.
136. The speed limit at the golf course access is 40mph. This access benefits from good visibility in both directions along the A3100. The A3100 has an average width of 7.5m in the vicinity of the access and a 1m wide southbound cycle lane. A northbound cycle lane is located on the northern footway. There are pedestrian footpaths on both sides of the A3100 on the approaches to the application site access. These are well lit and in good condition. The golf course is served by several bus routes<sup>81</sup> which have stops in both directions within 200m walking distance on each side of its access. There are also several on and off-road cycle routes close to the golf course.
137. The existing vehicular access to the golfing facility will need to be modified to safely accommodate access and egress of HGVs associated with the proposed development. These modifications would comprise an increased radius of the eastern side of the site access junction with the A3100 by 2m and inclusion of measures to ensure pedestrians can continue to safely cross the site access junction. The detail of these modifications are provided on Drawing Ref. 001 Proposed Construction Site Access dated 7 March 2018 and Drawing Ref. G20371/101 Rev. A Visibility Splay dated January 2016.
138. The applicant has committed to providing a wheelwash facility to ensure mud is not deposited on the public highway as a result of HGVs leaving the application site and a road sweeper to ensure that any mud or debris that is so deposited is cleaned up at the applicant's expense.
139. Officers understand that the golf course facility will be closed to members of the public over the development period. Following completion of the development an additional 17 parking spaces would be provided by extending the existing car park to some 90 vehicle spaces. The applicant anticipates that following completion of the development the new facility would generate a total number of 93 vehicle trips per day (worst case scenario which is unlikely).
140. The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement and Construction Access Report in support of the proposed development. These were supplemented by the submission of a Technical Note in March 2018 to address matters raised by the County Highway Authority (CHA) during their consideration of the proposed development. These assessments modelled and identified the transport implications<sup>82</sup> of the proposed 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) over the working day, and the peak hour and off peak conditions. Similarly, they assessed the implications of 93 vehicle trips to be generated by the golf course facility per day following completion of the development. They conclude that the impact of both phases of the development (construction phase and operational phase) would be very limited in terms of the junction capacity at the A3100/B3000 roundabout, and well within capacity of the site access/A3100 junction with significant capacity to spare;

<sup>79</sup> About 1km to the north of the golf course access

<sup>80</sup> To the north of the A3100/B3000 roundabout, and to the south towards Godalming

<sup>81</sup> Routes 523 (Milford Hospital); 503 (Milford - Guildford); and 70/71/72 (Haslemere – Midhurst)

<sup>82</sup> Specifically on the A3100/B3000 roundabout junction and the site access junction with the A3100



and in any case such impact would be limited to a temporary period of no more than 24 months. They also identify that the impact of the new facility would be at a level where it would not be noticeable within day to day variations in traffic flow and queue lengths at the roundabout.

141. The CHA has assessed the proposed development in terms of the net additional traffic generation resulting from the proposed development, access arrangement and parking provision and are satisfied that it would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. This response is subject to a range of planning conditions including provision of the improved site access prior to commencement of the development, a Construction Transport Management Plan<sup>83</sup>, and a plan to encourage the use of sustainable transport to and from the golf course.
142. Interested parties have raised concerns regarding an increase in traffic congestion; increased risk to pedestrians; blocked drains and mud on the road; and damage to the road surface as a result of the proposed development. Concerns have also been raised in respect of the cumulative transport implications of the proposed development (in the context of works to the River Way).
143. However, the assessments undertaken on behalf of the applicant and the views of the CHA do not corroborate the concerns raised in respect of congestion, safety and cumulative impact. The proposal would lead to a modest and temporary increase in traffic at the site access junction and the A3100/B3000 junction which both have adequate capacity to deal with such an increase. This is equally true in respect of the golf course facility once the development has been completed. The proposal would not have a material impact on the operation of the highway. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that additional vehicles will adversely affect highway safety. For these reasons Officers do not consider that the development will give rise to any material cumulative transport related impacts.
144. Any impact from the passage of HGVs will be of an amenity and/or environmental nature and will be transient and temporary. These aspects of the development are discussed below in the relevant sections of this report and, as with the highway mitigation measures discussed in the preceding paragraphs, can be suitably mitigated by measures to be secured by planning conditions. Such conditions would include measures to prevent mud being deposited on the highway and cleaning of the highway in such an event. Given the scale and temporary nature of the proposed development and its likely transport implications as discussed above, Officers consider it reasonable and necessary to require the applicant to provide for repairs to the public highway following completion of the development. In this regard the applicant has agreed to undertake before and after surveys of the highway and fund any repairs necessary. An appropriate condition could be imposed on any consent granted to secure such measures.

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

145. Subject to a range of conditions therefore Officers conclude that the proposed development satisfies Policy DC3 of the SWP, Policy ST1 of the WLP, and Policies M1, M2, M3, M13, M14 of the SWLP.

### **Environment and Amenity**

#### **Development Plan Policies**

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP)

*Policy DC2 – Planning Designations*

---

<sup>83</sup> To control matters secure a range of mitigation measures relating to wheel cleaning, road sweeping, hours of deliveries, parking, (un)loading, vehicle routing, storage of plant and materials etc.

*Policy DC3 – General Considerations*

Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 (WLP)

*Policy SP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**Policy SP2 – Spatial Strategy**Policy LRC - Leisure and Recreation Facilities**Policy RE3 - Landscape Character**Policy HA1 - Protection of Heritage Assets**Policy NE1 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation**Policy CC1 - Climate Change**Policy CC2 - Sustainable Construction and Design**Policy CC4 - Flood Risk Management*

Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (SWLP)

*Policy D1 – Environmental Implications of Development**Policy D2 – Compatibility of Uses**Policy D3 - Resources**Policy D5 – Nature Conservation**National Guidance*

146. Paragraph 91 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) expects planning decisions to realise healthy, inclusive and safe places which: (a) promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other<sup>84</sup>; (b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion<sup>85</sup>; and (c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs<sup>86</sup>.

147. Similarly, paragraph 92 of the Framework advocates that in order to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning decisions should: (a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities<sup>87</sup> and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; (b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community; (c) guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs; (d) ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community; and (e) ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.

148. The Framework also explains<sup>88</sup> that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: (a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or (b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or (c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use. It goes on to advocate that planning decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and

---

<sup>84</sup> For example through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections within and between neighbourhoods, and active street frontages

<sup>85</sup> For example through the use of clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas

<sup>86</sup> For example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling

<sup>87</sup> Such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship

<sup>88</sup> Paragraph 97

access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails<sup>89</sup>.

149. When it comes to design the Framework emphasises<sup>90</sup> that creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
150. To this end it requires that planning decisions ensure that developments: (a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; (b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; (c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change; (d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; (e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development and support local facilities and transport networks; and (f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience<sup>91</sup>.
151. In respect of planning and flood risk, the Framework provides helpful guidance<sup>92</sup>. It states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk<sup>93</sup>. Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. It goes on to explain that when determining any planning applications, the CPA should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
152. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment<sup>94</sup> it can be demonstrated that: (a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; (b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient; (c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate; (d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and (e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.
153. Major developments, as is the case with the proposal, should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should: (a) take account of advice from the lead local flood authority; (b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards; (c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and (d) where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.
154. In more general terms, paragraph 170 of the Framework advocates that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: (a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils; (b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits

---

<sup>89</sup> Paragraph 98

<sup>90</sup> Paragraph 124

<sup>91</sup> Paragraph 127

<sup>92</sup> Paragraphs 155; 163; and 165

<sup>93</sup> Whether existing or future

<sup>94</sup> And the sequential and exception tests, as applicable

from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of trees and woodland; (c) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; (e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality; and (f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

155. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents<sup>95</sup>. Great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings<sup>96</sup>.
156. Paragraph 172 of the Framework also explains that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
157. In relation to biodiversity paragraph 175 of the Framework clarifies that when determining planning applications, the CPA should apply the following principles: (a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided<sup>97</sup>, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; (b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it<sup>98</sup>, should not normally be permitted; (c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats<sup>99</sup> should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and (d) opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.
158. Additionally, the law<sup>100</sup> places a duty on Surrey County Council (SCC) to consider biodiversity in the full range of their activities including determining planning applications.
159. Turning to the matter of pollution, paragraph 178 of the Framework explains that planning decisions should ensure that: (a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation<sup>101</sup>; (b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and (c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments. The Framework is clear that where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner<sup>102</sup>.

---

<sup>95</sup> Paragraph 130

<sup>96</sup> Paragraph 131

<sup>97</sup> Through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts

<sup>98</sup> Either individually or in combination with other developments

<sup>99</sup> Such as Semi-natural Ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees

<sup>100</sup> Section 40 of the [Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006](#)

<sup>101</sup> As well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation

<sup>102</sup> Paragraph 179

160. Moreover, paragraph 180 of the Framework advocates that planning decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects<sup>103</sup> of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so it should: (a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life; (b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and (c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.
161. In respect of air quality, paragraph 181 of the Framework requires planning decisions to sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement.
162. Further, planning decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities<sup>104</sup>. Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development in its vicinity, the ‘agent of change’ should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed<sup>105</sup>.
163. Paragraph 183 of the Framework requires that the focus of planning decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of 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 issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities.
164. Lastly, the Framework explains at paragraph 184 that Heritage Assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
165. Accordingly, applicants should describe the significance of any Heritage Assets affected by the proposal, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the Heritage Assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, Heritage Assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation<sup>106</sup>.

---

<sup>103</sup> Including cumulative effects

<sup>104</sup> Such as places of worship, pubs, music-venues and sports clubs

<sup>105</sup> Paragraph 182

<sup>106</sup> Paragraph 189



166. Additionally, the CPA should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal<sup>107</sup> taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal<sup>108</sup>.
167. Paragraph 193 of the Framework is clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation<sup>109</sup>. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
168. Paragraph 194 goes on to explain that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset<sup>110</sup>, should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed buildings should be exceptional; (b) assets of the highest significance<sup>111</sup> should be wholly exceptional.
169. Paragraph 195 of the Framework states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to<sup>112</sup> a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.
170. Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
171. Over and above the guidance provided by the Framework in respect of Heritage Assets, s66 and s72 of the [Planning \(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#) are material to the determination of the subject planning application. In respect of listed buildings s66 requires that Surrey County Council, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In respect of Conservation Areas s72 requires that SCC, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
172. Annex B of the NPW explains that in determining planning applications, The CPA should consider the following factors and also bear in mind the envisaged waste management facility in terms of type and scale:
- (a) Protection of water quality and resources and flood risk management including proximity of vulnerable surface and groundwater or aquifers. For landfill or land-raising, geological conditions and the behaviour of surface water and groundwater should be assessed both for the site under consideration and the surrounding area. The suitability of locations subject to flooding, with consequent issues relating to the management of potential risk posed to water quality from waste contamination, will also need particular care;

---

<sup>107</sup> Including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset

<sup>108</sup> Paragraph 190

<sup>109</sup> The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be

<sup>110</sup> From its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting

<sup>111</sup> Scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites

<sup>112</sup> Or total loss of significance of

- (b) Land instability including the locations, and/or the environs of locations, that are liable to be affected by land instability, will not normally be suitable for waste management facilities;
- (c) Landscape and visual impacts including (i) the potential for design-led solutions to produce acceptable development which respects landscape character, (ii) the need to protect landscapes or designated areas of national importance, (iii) and localised height restrictions;
- (d) Nature conservation including any adverse effect on a site of international importance, a site with a nationally recognised designation, Nature Improvement Areas and ecological networks and protected species;
- (e) Conserving the historic environment including potential effects on the significance of Heritage Assets, whether designated or not, including any contribution made by their setting;
- (f) Air emissions, including dust and the proximity of sensitive receptors, including ecological as well as human receptors, and the extent to which adverse emissions can be controlled through the use of appropriate and well-maintained and managed equipment and vehicles;
- (g) Odours including the proximity of sensitive receptors and the extent to which adverse odours can be controlled through the use of appropriate and well-maintained and managed equipment;
- (h) Vermin and birds including the proximity of sensitive receptors.
- (i) Noise, light and vibration including the proximity of sensitive receptors. The operation of large waste management facilities in particular can produce noise affecting both the inside and outside of buildings, including noise and vibration from goods vehicle traffic movements to and from a site. Intermittent and sustained operating noise may be a problem if not properly managed particularly if night-time working is involved. Potential light pollution aspects will also need to be considered;
- (j) Litter which can be a concern at some waste management facilities; and
- (k) Potential land use conflict. Likely proposed development in the vicinity of the location under consideration should be taken into account in considering site suitability and the envisaged waste management facility.

### *Development Plan Policy*

173. Policy DC2 of the SWP is clear that planning permission will not be granted for waste related development where this would endanger, or have a significant adverse impact, on the setting of Listed Buildings; Conservation Areas; groundwater; land liable to flood; priority habitat and species; AONBs; and SSSIs. This policy goes on to explain that in assessing each development proposal, due regard will be paid to prevailing national policy and guidance appropriate both to the areas and features of acknowledged importance and the proposed means of dealing with waste, and that this assessment will also take into account whether any significant adverse impact identified could be controlled to acceptable levels.

174. Further, policy DC3 of the SWP explains that planning permission for waste related development will be granted provided it can be demonstrated by the provision of appropriate information to support a planning application that any impacts of the development can be controlled to achieve levels that will not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources.

175. In this regard the information supporting the proposed development must include assessment of the following matters and where necessary, appropriate mitigation should be identified so as to minimise or avoid any material adverse impact and compensate for any loss: (a) the release of polluting substances to the atmosphere or land arising from facilities and transport; (b) the contamination of ground and surface water; (c) the drainage of the site and adjoining land and the risk of flooding; (d) water consumption requirements and consideration of water management within operational plant; (e) groundwater

conditions and the hydrogeology of the locality; (f) the visual and landscape impact of the development on the site and surrounding land; (g) in the case of buildings, demonstration of high quality of design; (h) adverse effects on neighbouring amenity including noise, fumes, vibration, glare, dust, litter, odour, and vermin; (i) adverse effects on open spaces, settlements, woodland, or existing or potential outdoor recreation uses, including Public Rights of Way; (j) the loss or damage to flora and fauna and their respective habitats at the site or on adjoining land including linear or other features which facilitate the dispersal of species; (k) the loss or damage to archaeological resources; (l) potential danger to aircraft from birdstrike and structures; (m) scope for limiting the duration of use; (n) any health impacts; and (o) the management arrangements for residues arising from any waste management facility.

176. Policy SP1 of the WLP explains that when considering development proposals, the CPA will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants to find solutions so proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Planning applications that accord with the policies in Development Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
177. Policy SP2 of the WLP sets out the spatial strategy for the Borough. It states that in order to maintain Waverley's character whilst ensuring that development needs are met in a sustainable manner, where relevant the Spatial Strategy to 2032 is to: (a) avoid major development on land of the highest amenity and landscape value, such as the AONB and to safeguard the Green Belt; (b) focus development at the four main settlements including Godalming; and (c) maximise opportunities for the redevelopment of suitable brownfield sites for housing, business or mixed use.
178. Policy LRC1 of the WLP states that the CPA will seek to retain, enhance and increase the quantity and quality of open space, leisure and recreation facilities and to improve access to them.
179. Policy RE3 of the WLP explains that new development must respect and where appropriate, enhance the distinctive character of the landscape in which it is located. The protection and enhancement of the character and qualities of the AONB that is of national importance will be a priority and will include the application of national planning policies together with the AONB Management Plan. The setting of the AONB will be protected where development outside its boundaries harm public views from or into the AONB. The same principles for protecting the AONB will apply in the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), which will be retained for its own sake and as a buffer to the AONB, until there is a review of the Surrey Hills AONB boundary, whilst recognising that the protection of the AGLV is commensurate with its status as a local landscape designation.
180. In respect of Heritage Assets Policy HA1 of the WLP states that the CPA will ensure that the significance of the Heritage Assets within the Borough are conserved or enhanced to ensure the continued protection and enjoyment of the historic environment by: (a) safeguarding and managing Waverley's rich and diverse heritage. This includes all Heritage Assets, archaeological sites and historic landscapes, designated and non-designated assets, and their setting in accordance with legislation and national policy; and (b) understanding and respecting the significance of the assets.
181. Policy NE1 of the WLP concerns biodiversity and geological conservation. It states that the CPA will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity within Waverley. Development will be permitted provided that it: (a) retains, protects and enhances features of biodiversity and geological interest and ensures appropriate management of those features; and (b) ensures any adverse impacts are avoided, or if unavoidable, are appropriately mitigated.

182. Policy CC1 of the WLP explains that development will be supported where it contributes to mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, including measures that: (a) use renewable and low carbon energy supply systems; (b) provide appropriate flood storage capacity; (c) address issues of flood risk through the application of Policy CC4; (d) provide high standards of sustainable design and construction with built-in resilience to climate change, or use green infrastructure and SuDS to help absorb heat, reduce surface water runoff and support habitat networks.
183. Similarly, Policy CC2 states that the CPA will seek to promote sustainable patterns of development and reduce the level of greenhouse gas emissions by: (a) ensuring all new development, including residential extensions, include measures to minimise energy and water use through its design, layout, landscape and orientation; (b) encouraging the use of natural lighting and ventilation; (c) being designed to encourage walking, cycling and access to sustainable forms of transport; (d) building at higher densities where appropriate and supporting mixed-use development; (e) incorporating measures that protect and, where possible, enhance the biodiversity value of the development; and (f) minimising construction and demolition waste and promoting the reuse and recycling of building materials.
184. Policy CC4 of the WLP advocates that in order to reduce the overall and local risk of flooding in the Borough: (a) development must be located, designed and laid out to ensure that it is safe; (b) that the risk from flooding is minimised whilst not increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere; and (c) that residual risks are safely managed. Additionally, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be required on major developments and encouraged for smaller schemes. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required for sites within or adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding as identified in the SFRA. There should be no increase in either the volume or rate of surface water runoff leaving the site. Proposed development on brownfield sites should aim to reduce run off rates to those on greenfield sites where feasible. There should be no property or highway flooding, off site, for up to the 1 in 100 year storm return period, including an allowance for climate change.
185. Policy D1 of the SWLP states that the CPA will have regard to the environmental implications of development and will promote and encourage enhancement of the environment. Development will not be permitted where it would result in material detriment to the environment by virtue of: (a) loss or damage to important environmental assets, such as buildings of historical or architectural interest, local watercourses, important archaeological sites and monuments and areas of conservation, ecological or landscape value; (b) harm to the visual character and distinctiveness of a locality, particularly in respect of the design and scale of the development and its relationship to its surroundings; (c) loss of general amenity, including material loss of natural light and privacy enjoyed by neighbours and disturbance resulting from the emission of noise, light or vibration; (d) levels of traffic which are incompatible with the local highway network or cause significant environmental harm by virtue of noise and disturbance; or (e) potential pollution of air, land or water, including that arising from light pollution and from the storage and use of hazardous substances.
186. This policy goes on to explain that the Council will seek, as part of a development proposal, to resolve or limit environmental impacts. This may include the submission of a flood-risk/run-off assessment to determine the potential flood risk to the development, the likely effects of the development on flood risk to others, whether mitigation is necessary, and if so, whether it is likely to be effective and acceptable.
187. Policy D2 of the WBLP states that the Council will seek to ensure that proposed and existing land uses are compatible. In particular: (a) development which may have a materially detrimental impact on sensitive uses with regard to environmental disturbance or pollution will not be permitted; (b) uses such as housing or schools which are sensitive to

disturbance or pollution will not be permitted near existing premises which generate significant disturbance or pollution, or which handle hazardous substances; (c) the Council will encourage redevelopment of a site with a more appropriate use where an existing permitted or lawful use is causing material detriment to the character and amenities of the area and its loss or relocation is acceptable having regard to other policies of the Development Plan.

188. Policy D3 of the WBLP explains that where a development is acceptable in principle, the Council will encourage environmentally innovative schemes which: (a) conserve energy and water through appropriate location, design, layout, landscaping and materials; and (b) minimise the use of non-renewable resources through the re-use or recycling of previously developed land, buildings and materials.

189. Policy D5 of the WBLP explains that development in both urban and rural areas should take account of nature conservation issues. The Council will: (a) seek to retain within a site any significant features of nature conservation value; (b) not permit development that would materially harm a protected species of animal or plant, or its habitat; and (c) encourage the enhancement of existing areas or features of nature conservation value and the creation and management of new wildlife habitats.

### *Air Quality*

190. Given the nature and scale of the development proposed the potential air quality impacts arising can be expected to be dust impacts (construction phase) and emissions to air (nitrogen dioxide and PM10 particulate matter) from construction and operational traffic. Interested parties have raised a number of concerns in these respects.

191. The applicant has submitted an Air Quality Assessment<sup>113</sup> in relation to both dust and vehicle emissions in the context of residential and ecological receptors. The CPA's Air Quality Consultant (AQC) has reviewed this assessment and agrees that it has identified the potentially significant effects of the proposal using the appropriate guidance<sup>114</sup>.

192. The AQC considers the applicant's assessment relating to dust emissions to be robust. The assessment concludes that the risk of impacts for earthworks, construction and vehicle track out is high in terms of dust soiling but that these impacts could be mitigated to acceptable levels by the implementation of a number of measures as set out in Section 8 of the document. These measures<sup>115</sup> (to be contained in a site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan) could be secured by planning condition should consent be granted. In respect of human and ecological receptors the risk is considered to be low. However, in this regard Natural England has advised that any such CEMP should explain how construction activities will be undertaken to avoid any detrimental impact on the nearby SSSI from dust, spillages and polluted run-off.

193. In respect of vehicle emissions<sup>116</sup> arising from construction traffic, modelled concentrations have been compared with monitored concentrations at 3 locations<sup>117</sup> for the construction phase of the development. This to establish the potential impact on human receptors located along the proposed construction traffic route. It has been concluded that the impact of construction related traffic at each of the 11 selected representative sensitive

<sup>113</sup> Ref. VC-170613-AQ-RP-0001 R01 dated 25 July 2017

<sup>114</sup> [Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction, Institute of Air Quality Management, 2014](#); and [Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, Institute of Air Quality Management and Environmental Protection UK, 2017](#)

<sup>115</sup> Practical measures to be put in place in respect of earthworks; construction; and vehicle track out

<sup>116</sup> Nitrogen Dioxide, PM10 particulates and PM2.5 particulates

<sup>117</sup> Godalming 8 (Godalming AQMA); Godalming 3 (Bridge Street); and Godalming 11 (Catteshall Lane)



receptors<sup>118</sup> would be negligible and temporary in nature. The assessment demonstrates that no exceedances of any of the Air Quality Objectives would be expected. The emission impacts arising from the proposed development would therefore not be significant. The AQC consultant agrees with this conclusion.

194. The applicant's assessment also predicted that the operational phase of the development (at worst 93 vehicle movements per day) would be below the relevant threshold for an impact assessment and it would therefore have a negligible impact on local air quality concentrations or the Godalming AQMA.
195. Although interested parties have raised concerns in respect of dust and vehicle emissions, the assessments undertaken on behalf of the applicant and the CPA demonstrate that dust emissions can be controlled and mitigated to acceptable levels and that impacts arising from vehicle emissions for both the construction and operational phase of the development would not be significant. For these reasons Officers conclude that the proposed development is, subject to conditions, compliant with Development Plan policies relating to air quality.

### Noise

196. The proposal will give rise to noise as a result of the operation of plant and machinery<sup>119</sup> and the coming and going of HGVs including a mobile road sweeper. Accordingly, the applicant has submitted a Construction Noise Assessment in accordance with BS 5228:2014<sup>120</sup> in support of the same.
197. This assessment has been reviewed by the CPA's Noise Consultant (NC). The NC consultant considers that the applicant's assessment has adopted the appropriate methodology necessary to evaluate the noise impacts that may arise from the development, and that the assumptions contained within the assessment are reasonable. Similarly, the relevant survey locations<sup>121</sup> are considered representative of the nearest noise sensitive receptors. The assessment has predicted that construction noise levels at the identified receptors during each phase of the development would be below noise level thresholds at which significant effects are likely. The NC agrees with this prediction subject to the imposition of planning conditions to control operational noise and the time in which HGV deliveries can take place.
198. Although interested parties have raised concerns about the potential impact of construction noise, the applicant's quantitative assessment demonstrates that the proposed development can be undertaken without causing significant harm to local amenity. However, should planning permission be granted Officers would recommend that certain measures are secured by way of planning conditions to ensure that local amenity is not adversely affected. Such conditions to include measures to ensure that the development is undertaken within a period of no more than 24-months; restricting operational hours to between 0700 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday with no working on Saturdays, Sundays,

---

<sup>118</sup> C3 Diffusion Tube Location (X495509; Y147024); C5 Diffusion Tube Location (X495498; Y147097); C6 Diffusion Tube Location (X495453; Y147206); Guildford Crematorium; Residential property adjacent to Freeborn Guildford; Residential property off Guildford Road; Residential property off Guildford Road; Beefeater Public House; Residential property off New Pond Road; Residential Property at Loseley Park; Compton Village Hall

<sup>119</sup> A single 3-way soil screening plant, Extec 5000 or similar; Bulldozer, Cat D6 or similar; 2 x 14t tracked excavator; 10t dump truck; and tractor (Table 3, Part 4, Construction Noise Assessment Ref. VC-102480-EA-RP-0001, 2 August 2017)

<sup>120</sup> Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites

<sup>121</sup> Houses on Pondfield Road to the west of the application site; Houses on Summers Road to the north of the application site (east of the tennis courts); and Hotel and houses to the southeast of the application site

Public, National and Bank Holidays; restricting construction traffic to between 0700 and 1630 hours Monday to Friday; and limiting the number of HGVs on any working day<sup>122</sup>.

199. Accordingly, Officers conclude that the proposed development satisfies Development Plan policies relating to noise.

### *Flood Risk*

200. Although the proposed development is 'water compatible', a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment<sup>123</sup> has been submitted in support of the proposed development on the basis that the application site area is greater than 1ha. The purpose of this assessment was to evaluate flood risk at the site and in relation to the proposed development, and devise measures to ensure that the development does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

201. The applicant's assessment establishes that there are no formal surface water drainage arrangements for the golf course and that half of the course drains towards Broadwater Lake to the east. The other half of the golf course contributes directly to the River Wey catchment which is beyond the A3100 to the south of the application site. Local variations in topography, particularly undulations caused by the subsiding landfill waste means that drainage paths are not clearly defined. The application site is at low risk of flooding from any sources.

202. However, the proposed capping and remodelling works (which will raise ground levels within the application site) is likely to increase the percentage surface water runoff thereby increasing the risk from surface water flooding. Accordingly, the remodelling of the golf course has been designed to direct the majority of surface water inwards towards the proposed water storage lagoon whilst runoff from the peripheral banks would be intercepted by a system of swales, infiltration trenches and an infiltration basin.

203. Runoff from the banks in the south-west and west will be intercepted by a swale and trench system then infiltrated via an infiltration trench<sup>124</sup> beyond the edge of the landfill at hole 6. Runoff from the banks to the south east will be intercepted by a swale and trench system then infiltrated via an infiltration trench<sup>125</sup> and basin beyond the edge of the landfill south-east and east of hole 1. Runoff from the driving range on the northern margins of the application site would be intercepted by an infiltration trench<sup>126</sup> located beyond the edge of the landfill to the north and east thereby preventing runoff into Broadwater Lake.

204. Details of the proposed surface water management arrangements are provided on Drawing Ref. 811.13 Rev C Control of Surface Water Runoff dated 29 July 2017. The applicant's assessment has provided estimated surface water runoff peak rates and volumes post capping and remodelling.

205. It is expected that irrigation of the golf course will use at least 2,800m<sup>3</sup> of harvested rainfall each year, predominantly during 20 weeks in the summer. This irrigation will drawdown the proposed water storage lagoon below the outflow control thereby providing additional storage capacity for the winter months. It would also mitigate the business and environmental costs of using the potable water supply (i.e. drinking water) for golf course irrigation.

206. There is a requirement for the proposed water storage lagoon to outflow to a nearby water body. The nearest water body to the application site is Broadwater Lake to the east. However, Broadwater Angling Club, who manage the lake, object to such an outflow. The

---

<sup>122</sup> To be secured by way of a Construction Transport Management Plan

<sup>123</sup> Flood Risk Assessment Ref. K0692/1 Rev2 dated January 2017

<sup>124</sup> 0.42m in depth

<sup>125</sup> 0.7m in depth

<sup>126</sup> 0.51m in depth

angling club are concerned that any new outfall to the lake would disturb contaminated silt currently at the bottom of the lake. The next nearest water body to the application site is the ordinary watercourse flowing through the garden of Wey Bank Cottage (beyond the A3100 to the south) eventually discharging to the River Wey. Accordingly, the water storage lagoon could be discharged to this watercourse via a Thames Water manhole at the edge of the golf course. Thames Water have confirmed that such a connection can be made and specified a 100mm pipe.

207. During capping and remodelling operations there will be bare soils on the application site prior to seeding. This may increase the rate of surface water runoff from the application site and delivery sediment off site. It is therefore proposed that the swales are constructed prior to major groundworks so as to intercept the increased runoff. Further, small temporary soil barriers or berms would be placed along the margins of the application site where landscaping works are taking place in order to trap any eroded sediment.
208. The proposed surface water management arrangements would be inspected regularly by the applicant to ensure that it remains capable of acting as designed.
209. Although no objection has been raised, Natural England have recommended that appropriate sustainable drainage systems be used in relation to the car park associated with the golf course so as to manage surface water and pollution runoff. They also recommend that in areas which are at risk of hydrocarbon contamination, oil interceptors should be used to remove hydrocarbons prior to discharge of runoff into soakaways or other drainage systems; and that any drainage systems should include the provision for controlling any pollutants associated with surface water runoff.
210. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the water surface drainage strategy for the proposed development and assessed it against the requirements under the Framework, its accompanying practice guidance and technical standards. The LLFA is satisfied that the proposed development meets the requirements set out in the aforementioned guidance documents. Accordingly, no objection to the proposal has been raised subject to planning conditions to ensure that the proposed surface water management arrangements are properly implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development. Officers will ensure that any such conditions include the car park and provision for oil interceptors as per Natural England's advice.
211. For these reasons Officers consider that the proposed development satisfies Development Plan policies relating to flooding, surface water management and sustainable drainage systems.

### *Landscape and Visual Impact*

212. The applicant has explained<sup>127</sup> in the supporting 'visual and landscape character appraisal' that the application site is visually extremely screened from its external surrounds both in summer and winter and exerts no visual impact on the surrounding park as a result. The relevant landscape character is one of a golf facility and the proposal seeks to enhance the same with the only material addition to the landscape being an Adventure Golf Facility adjacent to the existing car park and club house. The proposed landform will be that of a golf course but it will differ from the current landform as a result of the imposed soil cap and remodelling of the golf course. Any areas where higher banks are required will be densely planted and keyed in sensitively (extending existing woodland blocks) to ensure the already limited boundary views are not negatively impacted.
213. The proposed development has been reviewed by the CPA's Visual Impact and Landscape Consultant (VLC). In respect of the effects of the proposed development on

---

<sup>127</sup> Section 8: Appearance, page 78, Design and Access Statement V2 dated 30 September 2017

landscape character the VLC concurs with the applicant. The zone of visual influence of the proposal would be extremely limited both in summer and winter. Crucially, regarding the landscape character of the local area, the proposed development would not materially alter the existing characteristics of the application site, that of a golf course, with existing features being enhanced and so (when complete) these would not be uncharacteristic when set within the context of the existing landscape. As such, the VLC considers the remodelling and enhancement of the existing golf course would have no significant or lasting effect upon the Peasmarsh River Valley Floor Landscape Character Area (LCA RV6), the Surrey Hills AGLV or AONB; with potentially adverse effects limited to a very local and contained area in and locally adjoining the application site.

214. In respect of the construction phase of the development, the VLC considers that a combination of onsite plant, material and vehicle movements would result in potential adverse effects upon a number of visual receptors of varying sensitivity, particularly in close proximity to the application site. With the majority of mature vegetation on the site boundaries retained, the VLC considers that any such visual effects during the construction period would largely be as a result of construction traffic using the B3000 New Pond Road and A3100 Guildford Road (Meadow), and accessing and exiting the application site. This would be the case, particularly for residents living adjacent to these routes, as well as road and footway users. With an estimated construction period of up to 24-months, and the already heavily trafficked nature of these routes, the VLC considers that any potentially adverse visual effects would be temporary and not significant.
215. In relation to the operational phase of the development<sup>128</sup>, the VLC considers that the zone of visual influence of the development would be extremely limited, both in summer and winter, with only glimpsed views at a very local level, due to existing mature woodland blocks, trees and vegetation, particularly along the application site boundaries. As the majority of existing vegetation would be retained and enhanced<sup>129</sup>, it is likely that views to the proposed development would continue to be limited with only very glimpsed views in close proximity to the application site and through natural gaps in the vegetation. Accordingly, the VLC considers that there would be no material change to local views and those from wider surrounds as a result of the proposed development.
216. The VLC has also considered the impact of the proposed development on users of the local rights of way network. In this regard Public Footpath 24 (FP24) is in close proximity to the application site and is accessed off the A3100 to the south-west. There would be potential glimpsed views to the proposed development from this footpath, as it joins the A3100, through existing roadside vegetation directly opposite the footpath entry and exit point. Additionally, with land to the south-west rising towards Bunkers Hill Farm, the VLC considers it reasonable to assume that glimpsed views to the proposed development would be available from parts of FP24. However, there are significant blocks of woodland, along with hedgerow and tree vegetation adjacent to and surrounding much of FP24, effectively screening the proposed development from view. Similarly, there are several other footpaths and bridleways (BW) in the local area<sup>130</sup> along with several footpaths within the urban area of Farncombe. The VLC considers that with the exception of footpaths within Farncombe, these rights of way are located to the south-west of the application site and are similarly surrounded by significant woodland blocks and existing vegetation which would limit views. As the proposal would not materially alter the existing characteristics of the application site, the VLC considers that there would be no significant effect upon views from FP24, or other footpaths and bridleways within the local area as a result of the proposed development.
217. Accordingly, although potential adverse visual effects have been identified for the construction period, these effects would be temporary and limited to a local level and the

<sup>128</sup> Some interested parties have raised concerns about the visual impact of the proposed perimeter fencing

<sup>129</sup> See Drawing Ref. 811.03 Soft Landscape Plan Rev B dated 29 July 2017

<sup>130</sup> FP22; FP470; FP474; BW473; and BW476

VLC does not consider these to be significant. Similarly, the VLC considers that the landscape of the Surrey Hills AGLV and AONB, and LCA RV6 would be unaffected and views from the local rights of way network and other visual receptors in the surrounding landscape would also be unaffected. Consequently, the VLC concurs with the findings of the applicant's assessment and considers that the same is suitable for the nature and scale of the proposed development.

218. Contrary to the view of some interested parties, the Surrey Hills AONB Board has considered the proposed development and concluded, in line with the judgement of the VLC, that the proposal would have no impact upon the setting of the AONB.
219. Further, some interested parties have commented that the new 2 metre high fence around the perimeter of the site would be intrusive and have a negative impact on the park's landscape and connectivity, and as such would not comply with the management plan for the park. Concerns have also been raised about the impact of the fence on existing public access arrangements and local ecology (preventing small mammals passing through the golf course).
220. Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) have not raised objection to the proposed perimeter fence. However, they have requested that both sides of the fence be planted with suitable native hedge species so as to soften its appearance in the context of the wider park and provide for further habitat and an additional source of food. Such planting can be secured by way of planning condition should consent be granted. They have also commented that they would also like to see some re-alignment of the proposed fence line, as the current proposals seem a little out of sync with the north-western boundary of the applicant's leased area. Re-alignment of the fence could also be satisfactorily addressed by the imposition of a planning condition on any consent issued.
221. The applicant has clearly explained the proposed perimeter fence would seek to mitigate safety concerns of people walking across the golf course and to prevent unauthorised access to the facility after hours which has in the past lead to numerous incidences of anti-social behaviour including dog fouling and vandalism. Subject to satisfying Waverley Borough Council of the alignment and screening of the proposed fence, and requiring provision for small mammal migration across the application site, Officers consider that it is a reasonable and proportionate measure in the circumstances.
222. Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) welcomes the addition of an adventure golf area within golf course facility. However, they would favour a theme which incorporates links to local history, sport, and the local area in general. This is another matter that can be satisfactorily addressed by way of planning conditions.
223. Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) has also expressed their approval in respect of the proposed permissive path to be provided as part of the development. In this regard that have confirmed that the same will assist in the overall desire to improve footpath and cycle links around the Broadwater Park complex, and have noted the applicant's intention work with the Borough Council outwith the subject planning application in order to deliver an extension to the proposed permissive path (to the north) and provision of a further permissive path to the east of the golf course.
224. Lastly, Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) have explained that as part of overall improvements to Broadwater Park in general they are currently embarking on a programme of revising site signage by way of a consistent theme and also the rationalisation of all signage. To this end they would like to discuss proposals for revised entrance signage to the golf course so as to ensure that it fits and that there is a move away from the current signage on display. Signage relating to the golf course falls outside the remit of the subject planning application and the County Planning Authority. This is another matter the applicant will need to engage with the Borough Council about in future.



225. In respect of the driving range facility BERM outfield lighting, together with floodlights, is proposed to improve upon the existing lighting arrangement and to increase customer experience. Beam floodlights would be installed at low level along the length of the range, thereby avoiding the need for high powered floodlights. On the driving range itself the proposal is to install 2 x 400w metal halide floodlights in 7 ground level locations. Mounted at 4m on the tee stalls of the driving range building, 7 x 400w metal halide floodlights are proposed. In relation to the Adventure Golf Facility, the applicant proposes 5 x 8m high columns with 400w metal halide floodlights. Having considered these proposals the CPA's Lighting Consultant considers that the driving range lighting proposed would be generally contained on the driving range with minimal spill lighting. Similarly, in respect of the Adventure Golf Facility the Lighting Consultant considers that light would be generally contained within the boundary of this facility and the proposals are therefore acceptable subject to floodlights being installed at a tilt angle of less than 15 degrees. Overall, the Lighting Consultant considers the proposals to be acceptable subject to reasonable operational hours which can be secured by way of planning conditions.
226. In respect of the proposed building, Officers acknowledge that it is to replace a similar building, used for the same functional purpose, in a similar location. In this regard Officers do not consider that the proposed building, albeit larger, would be out of character with the nature of the land use as a golf course. Taking into account the considered views of the LVC about the likely visual and landscape impact of the proposed development, and considering the planting proposed to be undertaken as part of the development which is primarily around the driving range facility, Officers do not consider that the physical extension of the building would have an adverse impact on visual amenity or the local landscape. The impacts of the building in the context of the Green Belt is discussed in paragraphs 256 to 273 below.
227. Having regard to the matters discussed through this particular section of the report Officers consider that Development Plan policies relating landscape and visual impact are satisfied by the proposed development subject to conditions.

### *Ecology*

228. The applicant has submitted an Ecological Walkover Assessment and Protected Species Survey in respect of the proposed development. This provides the results of the extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the existing golf course and adjacent areas of woodland. It includes a full presence and absence reptile survey and Great Crested Newt habitat suitability index surveys. It considers the nature conservation value of the habitats identified and the potential for legally protected or notable species to be present at the application site. Potential effects of the proposed development on such species and their habitats are considered and, separately, issues associated with the legal protection afforded to these animals are identified. Opportunities to avoid potential significant effects and mitigation are also discussed. This report was updated in January 2019<sup>131</sup>.
229. The site consists of a 9-hole golf course and a driving range. It has been built on a former landfill site with very thin soil coverage. The ecological survey area focussed on an area comprising high maintenance grassland, scattered trees, scrub and an area of improved grassland to the north.
230. The background ecological data search highlighted the statutory sites Wey Valley Meadows SSSI some 300m to the north and Charterhouse to Eashing SSSI approximately 2km north of the application site. 11 non-statutory designated sites are recorded within 2 km of the site. The proposed development and ongoing management is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on these sites.

---

<sup>131</sup> Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 7 January 2019

231. There are records of protected species including 4x common reptiles, water vole and dormouse, along with red and amber bird species within 2 km of the site. The application site offers suitable habitat for bats, birds, and hedgehog.
232. A Great Crested Newt scoping survey highlighted 1 waterbody within 500 m of the application site boundary (the distance newts travel from their breeding ponds) and 1 within the boundary. Both ponds were subjected to Habitat Suitability Index surveys, both scored poor.
233. Areas of improved grassland and scrub showed low suitable habitat for reptiles. The one building on site showed negligible bat roost potential, several trees were noted with potential roost features and habitats on site offer moderate suitability for foraging and commuting bats, however no trees suitable for bat roosts would be affected by the proposed development.
234. The applicant's report identifies that ongoing management should seek to retain and protect important habitats currently bordering the site. These include the retention of the boundary trees where possible and woodland areas. If this is not possible then appropriate mitigation and compensation measures would be required to ensure the sites biodiversity value is maintained.
235. The report also highlights that the proposed development is an exciting and important opportunity to vastly improve the biodiversity of the area. The carefully designed woodland planting and eco-friendly drainage ditches across the application site, will rapidly be colonised through natural succession. The new layout will also create both habitat corridors and wildlife havens, providing ecological niches and an overall high net biological gain over the present habitats and the wider area.
236. It also explains that any disturbances would be temporary and adequately compensated for with stringent mitigation measures employed and monitored throughout the construction phase of the development and into its operational phase; and emphasises that the applicant has worked closely with Ecologists to vastly improve the ecological value of the application site. The planting of wild areas and thousands of new trees all go towards an important biodiversity gain over the existing situation in compliance with the Framework.
237. The proposed development includes ecological compensatory and enhancement measures relating to woodland; wild areas; wildflower/rough grassland; wetland; new ponds; habitat corridors; and additional habitat<sup>132</sup> as set out in paragraphs 33 and 34 above.
238. SCC's Ecologist has evaluated the proposed development. In this regard it has been explained that there is no objection to the proposal as the applicant's ecological reports are sufficient to conclude that there will be no adverse ecological impacts and no further surveys are required. Moreover, the Ecologist considers that there are positive ecological enhancements that can be achieved through the proposal. The Ecologist points to the mitigation measures to be employed during the construction phase of the development and has recommended that these be secured by planning condition. In relation to the ecological enhancements proposed the Ecologist has recommended that the applicant be required to provide a 10-year Landscape and Ecological Management Plan so as to secure these measures and provide certainty that they will be delivered and managed in the long-term.
239. As discussed in paragraphs 109 and 110 above Waverley Borough Council (Parks and Countryside) have raised concern about the nature of the soil to be deposited on the

---

<sup>132</sup> See paragraphs 5.4.1 to 5.4.7 of Ecological Walkover Assessment and Protected Species Survey dated 7 July 2016

application site. Additionally, they have expressed their dissatisfaction about the applicant's proposal to include Red Oak as a tree species to be planted. The Borough Council would prefer to see this species replaced with Maple. The issues relating to soil has been dealt with in paragraphs 109 and 110. So as to ensure that tree species acceptable to the Borough Council are provided as part of the development Officers could impose a condition requiring the submission of a landscape specification for tree planting in accordance with BS 3926. Interested parties have questioned the effect of the proposed perimeter fencing on wildlife. SCC's Ecologist does not consider that it would adversely affect the same subject to the provision of appropriate gaps within the fence to allow for small mammals to pass through the fence and application site. Such provision could be satisfactorily secured by way of condition.

240. For the reasons set out above Officers consider that the proposal satisfies Development Plan policy in respect of ecological matters subject to a range of conditions.

### *Heritage Assets*

241. The two Listed Buildings<sup>133</sup> that once formed part of Broadwater Park, together with the lake to the east, are all that remain of what was once a small mid-19<sup>th</sup> century estate. Whilst the principal residence and many of the estate buildings have been lost, the area of park remains open land, with little significant housing development, save for the buildings of Broadwater School and those associated with the leisure activities that now occupy much of its grounds. All the historic and Listed Buildings that line the southern side of the A3100 Guildford Road (Meadow) form part of a ribbon development situated along, and facing onto, a significant roadway. This has, in all cases, provided their historic setting since the date of their construction.

242. The applicant has submitted a Heritage Statement<sup>134</sup> in support of the proposed development. This explains that the application site itself is almost entirely overlying a historic landfill site, with the result that little or no buried archaeological remains will survive. The proposed development will not involve the reduction in the existing ground surface. It is therefore not anticipated that there will be any impact upon any buried archaeological remains. Moreover, there are no Heritage Assets within the curtilage of the application site.

243. In respect of the effect of the development upon the setting of Heritage Assets the applicant's assessment explains that it will not lead to any change in the open nature of the application site, with the existing golf course use continuing post development. It acknowledges that the development will lead to a temporary increase in HGV traffic along the road onto which the majority of Heritage Assets face and that this will increase noise, dust and vibration levels for the duration of the development. Such traffic will be arriving at the site from the north-east, thereby impacting upon those Heritage Assets located immediately adjacent to, or north-east of, the application site access.

244. In order to determine whether the proposal will have an impact upon the setting of Heritage Assets, it is first necessary to assess whether and how the setting makes a contribution to their significance. As the applicant's assessment explains, in this case the highlighted Heritage Assets (those along the A3100 to the south of the application site) are, and have always been, located alongside a roadway, with the result that their setting is in fact closely interdependent upon the continued use of that roadway. Indeed the most significant threat to that setting would be either the closure of the roadway or the assets' separation from it.

245. Consequently, the applicant's assessment explains that the increase in noise, dust and vibration, from the increased use of the roadway, while it might impact upon the senses of

<sup>133</sup> 'Former dairy opposite Nos. 1 & 2 Stable Cottages' (Historic England List ID 1352720) 90m north-east; and 'Former kitchen garden wall' (Historic England List ID 1293456) 120m north;

<sup>134</sup> Heritage Statement dated June 2017

individuals in the vicinity, will not impact upon the setting of any Heritage Assets, since that setting is in no way dependent upon an absence of noise, dust and vibration. Indeed it could be argued that it is very much part of that setting.

246. SCC's Historic Buildings Officer (HBO) has evaluated the proposed development and considered the applicant's assessment. In addition the HBO has reviewed the first edition ordnance survey map for the relevant area. This shows that the majority of the area was parkland with a drive through it and the lake with the same outline including its distinctive island. Providing any landraising undertaken has a natural profile in the context of the area the HBO agrees with the applicant's assessment that the setting of nearby Listed Buildings will not be affected from the physical change. Similarly, with regard to temporary impact of HGVs the Officer does not consider that this will have any material impact on the fabric of Listed Buildings.

247. Consequently, Officers consider that the proposal has been assessed in accordance with Framework and that there will be no material impact on the special interest of any Listed Buildings as a result of the proposed development. For these reasons Officers conclude that the proposal satisfies Development Plan policies relating to Heritage Assets.

### *Environment and Amenity Conclusion*

248. In respect of dust, vehicle emissions, noise, flood risk, and landscape and visual impact it has been demonstrated by the provision of appropriate information that the proposed development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts subject to a range of conditions. In relation to Heritage Assets it has been determined by the applicant's assessment and Surrey County Council's Historic Buildings Officer that the proposal would not give rise to material impacts on the special interest of any Listed Buildings or buried archaeological remains. From an ecological perspective the proposal will, subject to a range of conditions, facilitate positive ecological enhancements to the application site and wider Broadwater Park complex without giving rise to any adverse ecological impacts. Officers do not consider that matters pertaining to vermin, odour and stability are relevant to the proposal considering the nature of the same. In this context therefore Officers consider that the development, as a whole, has been well-designed so that upon completion it would, subject to conditions, bring about a substantial improvement to the quality of the golf course and in turn contribute positively to the character and quality of the wider Broadwater Park complex.

249. Accordingly, considering paragraphs 189 to 247 above, Officers conclude that the proposal, subject to a range of conditions, satisfies Policies DC2 and DC3 of the SWP; Policies SP1, SP2, LRC, RE3, HA1, NE1, CC1, CC2, and CC4 of the WLP; and Policies D1, D2, D3, and D5 of the SWLP.

## **Metropolitan Green Belt**

### **Development Plan Policy**

Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP)

*Policy CW6 – Green Belt*

Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 (WLP)

*Policy RE2 – Green Belt*

### *Policy Context*

249. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) explains at paragraph 133 that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

250. In addition to their aim, paragraph 134 of the Framework explains that the Green Belt serves five purposes: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
251. Paragraph 143 of the Framework is clear that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, the CPA should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.<sup>135</sup>
252. Moreover, the CPA should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are: (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry; (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments, as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; (e) limited infilling in villages; and (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land.<sup>136</sup>
253. Moreover, paragraph 146 of the Framework explains that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are: (a) mineral extraction; (b) engineering operations; (c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location; (d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; (e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and (f) development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.
254. Policy CW6 of the SWP states that there is a presumption against inappropriate waste related development in the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The policy outlines that the following considerations may contribute to very special circumstances: (a) the lack of suitable non-Green Belt sites; (b) the need to find locations well related to the source of waste arisings; (c) the characteristics of the site; and (d) the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management including the need for a range of sites.
255. Policy RE2 of WLP explains that the Green Belt will continue to be protected against inappropriate development in accordance with the Framework. In accordance with national planning policy, new development will be considered to be inappropriate and will not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Certain forms of development are considered to be appropriate in the Green Belt. Proposals will be permitted where they do not conflict with the exceptions listed in national planning policy.

---

<sup>135</sup> Paragraph 144

<sup>136</sup> Paragraph 145



## The Development

256. As set out at paragraphs 25 to 49 above, the development proposed comprises an engineering operation (capping and remodelling of the golf course) and built-development in the form of a replacement driving range building, Adventure Golf Facility, and associated golf course infrastructure (perimeter fencing, driving range netting, lighting, extension to the existing car park, and hard landscaping features etc.).
257. It would also involve temporary improvement to the existing vehicular access, establishment of a temporary contractors' compound, siting of a temporary wheelwash facility together with a single soil screener and a temporary administration office, 4 x large stockpiles of inert waste material, the operation of a range of plant and machinery, erection of tree protection fencing, the employment of a road sweeper, and 70 HGV trips (140 HGV movements) per working day, all over a temporary period of 18-24 months.

## Effect on Openness

258. 'Openness' means the absence of 'development'.
259. The applicant submits that *"as an 'engineering operation' is being carried out by virtue of the proposed development, and not new 'buildings, to provide appropriate facilities for 'outdoor sport and recreation' the principle of the proposal is not inappropriate."* Further, the applicant asserts that *"it is also important to note that the proposal is appropriate for outdoor sport and recreation and it is by virtue of its appropriate nature that 'preserves the openness of the Green Belt' and also that there will be no change in the use of the land as it will remain as (a) a golf course and (b) the proposal will not result in the any material intensification in the use of the club. Accordingly, the proposal also 'does not conflict with the purpose of including land within it [the Green Belt]'.<sup>137</sup>*
260. Officers take a different view. The development proposed would introduce structures, works and activities to land where they would adversely impact the openness of the Green Belt. Officers acknowledge that the development seeks to enhance an existing outdoor sport and recreation land use and that the development would be temporary and limited in nature. However, the features described in paragraphs 25 to 49 above would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt for the duration of the construction phase of the development. Similarly, as discussed in paragraphs 212 to 227 above, the construction phase of the development is likely to have a limited, localised and temporary adverse effect on the visual amenity of the Green Belt. Accordingly, Officers consider the engineering aspects of the development to be 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt.
261. Moreover, paragraph 145 of the Framework is unequivocal. New buildings in the Green Belt are 'inappropriate' unless they are: (a) appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation; and (b) they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. This paragraph creates a *prima facie* rule namely that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate. It then goes on to state that there are certain 'exceptions to this'. All of these exceptions need to be met in order for the relevant building to be considered 'not inappropriate'. Although Officers accept that the proposed building would amount to an appropriate facility for outdoor sport and recreation, Officers do not consider that the proposed building preserves the openness of the Green Belt due to its scale in the context of the existing building. Accordingly, Officers also consider that the proposed building is 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt.
262. Given the location and nature of the application site and the site-specific proposal Officers accept that the development proposed would not result in urban sprawl, lead to the

<sup>137</sup> Paragraphs 1.5.171 and 1.5.172 of Planning Statement V2 dated 30 September 2017

merging of neighbouring towns, encroach on the countryside, or undermine the setting and special character of historic towns. Moreover, for the same reasons Officers do not consider that the development would undermine urban regeneration.

263. In respect of the engineering works and the degree of harm to openness, Officers consider that this would be limited to the duration of the engineering works which would last 18 - 24 months following which the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt would be fully restored in the context of the existing land use. In respect of the building and the degree of harm to openness, Officers conclude that the building would result in moderate harm given the nature of the existing use, the location of the building within the golf course, and the scale of the existing building to be replaced. Additionally, any enhancement of the existing golfing facilities leading to an increase in on-site activity following completion of the development should not give rise to any additional loss of openness. Accordingly, although the development proposed would undermine the fundamental aim of the Green Belt this would, in large, be temporary and otherwise moderate, and therefore Officers consider that the proposal as a whole would have a limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

264. Accordingly, there is a presumption against the grant of consent for the proposed development except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances to justify the development in the Green Belt will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

#### *Other Harm*

265. The potential for other harm has been assessed earlier in this report with regard to highways, traffic and access; air quality; noise; flood risk; landscape and visual impact; ecology; and Heritage Assets. Officers have concluded that the development would be beneficial in respect of the sustainable management of waste in the County and would result in a net gain to local biodiversity over the long-term. Otherwise the development would have no adverse effect in respect of flooding; air quality; noise; landscape; and Heritage Assets. During its construction phase the development would have a temporary, limited and localised adverse impact on visual amenity. Officers have concluded that any harm arising from the development can be mitigated to acceptable levels by the imposition of planning conditions.

#### *Very Special Circumstances*

266. Policy CW6 of the SWP outlines that the following considerations, taken individually or cumulatively, may contribute to very special circumstances: (a) the lack of suitable non-Green Belt sites; (b) the need to find locations well related to the source of waste arisings; (c) the characteristics of the site; and (d) the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management including the need for a range of sites. It is not necessary to show that each and every factor in itself amounts to a very special circumstance, but that the combination of circumstances, viewed objectively, is capable of being described as 'very special'. A number of ordinary factors may, when combined together, result in something very special. That is a matter for the planning judgement of the decision-taker.

267. Given the applicant's stance on whether the development is inappropriate or not, specific considerations have not been advanced in the context of 'very special circumstances'. However, the applicant has made reference, in the context of Green Belt, to the need for and benefits to arise from capping the landfill, and the biodiversity enhancements to arise from the development.

268. As discussed in the 'Sustainable Waste Management' section of this report, Officers consider the proposal amounts to a temporary waste management facility concerned with the recovery of inert waste for the purposes of landraising by engineering operations. In

this respect the proposal has been assessed against policies WD2, CW4 and CW5 of the SWP and found to be compliant.

269. It is acknowledged that the principal reason for undertaking the development is to remedy the problems arising from ongoing landfill settlement. A necessary consequence of this remedy would be to remodel the golf course and enhance its existing facilities including the establishment of a rainwater harvesting regime so as to manage surface water and sever the golf club's reliance on mains water supply for irrigation. In these respects Officers have reasonably concluded that the development would result in the substantial improvement in the quality of the application site, that there are no satisfactory alternatives to achieving these improvements, and that the minimum volume of waste requisite would be involved, all in accordance with policy WD7 and WD8 of the SWP. Officers consider that such a substantial improvement should be afforded substantial weight in the context of very special circumstances.
270. Further, Officers have explained that large volumes of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste are managed in Surrey annually and that a majority of this waste is landfilled, which in line with the WMP and NPW is considered to be the least preferable option for waste management. Although a high proportion of Surrey's waste is being managed through reuse, recycling and recovery, a lack of facilities for recycling and recovery within the County means that Surrey is still reliant on landfill capacity to be considered net self-sufficient. Consequently, there is a need to significantly improve the infrastructure provided within Surrey to manage waste without endangering human health or the environment and to enable communities to take responsibility for the waste produced<sup>138</sup>. In this context the development proposed would provide for some 342,578 tonnes (214,111m<sup>3</sup>) of additional sustainable waste management capacity over a two-year period. This is a modest but significant contribution to the County's sustainable waste management capacity. The CPA has not received any objection to the proposal from mineral operators in Surrey and in 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 no mineral workings sought to extend the time-period for restoration as a result of a lack of inert waste material. Accordingly, Officers consider that the development would contribute to the sustainable management of waste materials in Surrey in a proximate location and in accordance with the SWP and NPW albeit for a temporary period and a limited volume of materials. Officers consider that the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management should also be afforded significant weight in the context of very special circumstances.
271. Notwithstanding this, Officers consider that the proposal would result in a substantial improvement in the quality of the application site by way of remedying the problems arising from landfill settlement which cannot be achieved in another satisfactory way; providing for a sustainable rainwater harvesting, storage and irrigation scheme thereby cutting the golf course's reliance on mains water supply and reducing pressure on the wider public supply; securing the future of an existing local business and public outdoor recreation and leisure facility; and providing for a net gain to biodiversity in the local area over the long-term. Officers consider that these qualitative and operational benefits (which would also have wider environmental and economic benefits) in relation to an existing outdoor recreation use in the Green Belt, in the absence of viable and reasonable alternatives to securing these benefits, should be afforded significant weight in relation to very special circumstances.
272. Viewed objectively and taken together, Officers consider that the wider environmental and economic benefits the development would bring about as a result of sustainable waste management and the substantial improvement in the quality of the application do amount to 'very special circumstances' which clearly outweigh the harm arising out of inappropriateness; the limited harm to openness arising from the development as a whole,

<sup>138</sup> Paragraph B3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008

and the limited, localised and temporary adverse harm to visual amenity (including that of the Green Belt) during the construction phase of the development.

### *Green Belt Conclusion*

273. Officers consider that there is a clear need to provide sustainable waste management facilities in Surrey. The proposal would facilitate the sustainable management of waste in Surrey in a way that it achieves a substantial improvement in the quality of the application site. This substantial improvement would bring about qualitative and operational benefits at an existing outdoor sport and recreational facility and wider environmental and economic benefits. Officers attach significant weight to both these factors. Officers therefore conclude that the harm arising out of inappropriateness, the limited impact on openness, and the temporary, limited and localised adverse visual impact of the development, is clearly outweighed by the factors referred to so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the grant of planning permission subject to conditions. In this respect, Officers consider that the development satisfies policy CW6 of the SWP and policy RE2 of WLP.

---

## **HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

274. 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.

275. Officers do not consider that the proposal engages any Convention rights.

---

## **CONCLUSION**

276. The development proposed seeks to address unique circumstances relating to an existing and long-standing golf course developed on a historic mixed-waste landfill. The environmental, health and safety, and business problems resulting from the settling landfill are evident. The proposed development is to take place within the Green Belt. The application site is not subject to any landscape or nature conservation designation and is serviced by the primary road network. There are a number of Heritage Assets within close proximity to the golf course.

277. The proposed development, which appears to be the only practicable and sustainable option available, seeks to remedy these problems by capping the landfill and remodelling the golf course as a consequence. Additionally, a range of existing golf course infrastructure would be necessarily enhanced and replaced including the driving range building. A new adventure golf facility would also be provided.

278. A relatively moderate volume of inert waste materials generated in Surrey and elsewhere would be imported to the application site over a two-year period to facilitate the development. The proposal would therefore provide Surrey with an equivalent amount of additional and sustainable waste management capacity. Officers consider that the use of inert waste as proposed would be for beneficial purposes and as a result for the purposes of 'recovery' in the context of land-use planning.

279. The proposed ground levels have been designed to take account of the minimum depth of landfill cap required, necessary positive drainage falls so as to direct surface water away from Broadwater Lake, to the proposed water storage lagoon and soakaways situated beyond the landfill. The proposal includes significant tree planting and the depth of soil material to be deposited across the application site has taken account of the rooting and landfill cap requirements in this respect.

280. The statutory development plan for consideration of the application comprises the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018, and the saved policies of the Waverley Local Plan 2002. In considering the development Officers have assessed its acceptability against the development plan policies and material considerations in respect of sustainable waste management; highways, traffic and access; air quality; noise; flood risk; landscape and visual impact; ecology; Heritage Assets; and the Metropolitan Green Belt.
281. Statutory and non-statutory consultees have not raised objection to the development subject to a range of conditions. Interested parties have raised concerns about the development in relation to nature conservation; public access; noise; air quality; visual amenity; landscape; the Surrey Hills AONB; and highways, traffic and access. However, as discussed throughout the report these concerns have not been borne out by the investigations and assessments undertaken by the applicant, statutory consultees, and the CPA's technical consultees. Officers have concluded that any potential harm can be mitigated to acceptable levels by the imposition of planning conditions and therefore assess the development to be in compliance with all relevant Development Plan policies.
282. Officers have concluded that the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that there is a presumption against the grant of consent for the same except where very special circumstances are demonstrated. Officers consider that there is a clear need to provide additional sustainable waste management facilities in Surrey and that the proposal would facilitate the sustainable management of waste in a way that it achieves a substantial improvement in the quality of the application site. Officers consider that this substantial improvement would bring about qualitative and operational benefits at an existing outdoor and public sport and leisure facility and wider environmental and economic benefits. Officers have therefore concluded that the harm arising out of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the grant of planning permission subject to conditions.

## RECOMMENDATION

Officers recommend that planning application Ref. WA/2018/0097 be **PERMITTED** subject to conditions:

### Commencement

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. The applicant shall notify the County Planning Authority in writing within 7 days of commencing the development.

### Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following plans:

Drawing Ref. 811.01 Rev B Existing Site Plan dated 5 October 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.02 Rev B Grading Plan dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.03 Rev B Landscape Plan dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.04 Rev C Cross Sections dated 22 December 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.05 Rev D Contractors Works Plan dated 22 December 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.06 Rev B Rainwater Harvesting Plan dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.07 Rev C Application Boundary Plan dated 5 October 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.08 Rev B Hard Landscape Features dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.09 Rev B Adventure Golf Course dated 5 October 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.11 Rev A Phasing Plan dated 29 July 2017



Drawing Ref. 811.12 Rev C Covered Bays Building dated 5 October 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.13 Rev C Control of Surface Water Runoff dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.14 Contractors Works Plan Further Details dated 19 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 811.15 Rational Plan dated 29 July 2017  
 Drawing Ref. 001 Proposed Construction Site Access dated 7 March 2018  
 Drawing Ref. G20371/101 Rev. A Visibility Splay dated January 2016  
 Drawing Ref. TPP-CC/403 AR2848 Tree Protection Plan Rev 0 dated 8 March 2016

#### Duration

3. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects within 24 months from the date that the development is commenced as notified to the County Planning Authority in accordance with condition 1 above. The applicant shall notify the County Planning Authority in writing within 7 days of completion of the development.

#### Volume of Waste

4. No more than 342,578 tonnes (214,111m<sup>3</sup>) of inert waste material shall be deposited on the application site in order to facilitate the development. Accurate daily records of the volumes of inert waste deposited shall be maintained for the duration of the development and made available to the County Planning Authority within 7 days of such request.

#### Hours of Operation

5. During the construction phase of the development no lights shall be illuminated nor shall any operations or activities authorised or required by this permission be carried out except between 0730 to 1830 Monday to Friday. No activities or operations shall be undertaken on Saturdays, Sundays or bank, public or national holidays. This condition shall not prevent working in emergencies to maintain safe site operations. Such emergencies shall be notified to the County Planning Authority in writing as soon as practicable and in any case within 5 working days.
6. Notwithstanding condition 5 above, construction traffic shall only access and egress the application site between 0730 and 1630 hours on Monday to Friday. No construction traffic shall access or egress the application site on Saturdays, Sundays or bank, public or national holidays.
7. Lighting associated with the driving range and adventure golf facility shall be installed at a tilt angle of less than 15 degrees and be switched off at 2200 hours.

#### Highways, Traffic and Access

8. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until the proposed modified vehicular access to Meadow (A3100) and associated visibility splays have been provided in accordance with Drawing Ref. 001 Proposed Construction Site Access dated 7 March 2018 and Drawing Ref. G20371/101 Rev. A Visibility Splay dated January 2016 so as to safely accommodate the movement of construction traffic.
9. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP), in general accordance with Drawing Ref. 811.05 Rev. D Contractors Works Plan dated 22 December 2017 and Drawing Ref. 811.14 Contractors Works Plan Further Details dated 19 July 2017 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CTMP shall include details of:

(a) Parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;

- (b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials, storage of plant and materials, no more than 70 deliveries to the application site per weekday, and no deliveries at weekends, bank, national or public holidays;
- (e) Provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones;
- (f) Measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway;
- (g) Vehicle routing;
- (h) Before and after construction surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damaged caused as a result of the development;
- (i) Deliveries to take place between 0700 to 1630 hours Monday to Friday only;
- (j) No HGVs associated with the development to park and/or wait on Meadow at any time;
- (k) On-site turning for construction vehicles.

Only the approved details shall be implemented and they shall be maintained for the duration of the construction of the development.

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be opened to paying customers unless and until the vehicular access and associated footway have been reinstated to their original width/layout in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.
11. The development hereby permitted shall not be opened for paying customers unless and until space has been laid out within the application site in accordance with the approved plans listed in condition 2 above and for vehicles to be parked and turned so that they enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.
12. The development hereby permitted shall not be opened to paying customers unless and until the following measures have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority:
  - (a) The secure parking of bicycles within the development site;
  - (b) Providing safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists to travel within the site and between the site and Meadrow (A3100); and
  - (c) Information to be provided to staff and visitors regarding the availability and whereabouts of sustainable travel options including bus and cycle routes.

The approved measures shall be provided, retained and maintained for the duration of the development.

#### Landfill Gas

13. No soil, clay or inert waste material shall be deposited on the application site until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority:
  - (a) A landfill gas risk assessment strategy that includes the number and locations of proposed monitoring boreholes (both in the waste and in natural ground around the site perimeter), and the frequency and duration of the baseline gas monitoring period;
  - (b) A Landfill Gas Risk Assessment (LGRA) (to include on-site and off-site sensitive receptors) based upon the approved baseline gas monitoring as per (a) above; and
  - (c) A Landfill Gas Management Plan (LGMP) including (i) a monitoring plan for the construction phase and for 10-year management period; (ii) landfill gas compliance limits for the protection of both on-site and off-site receptors; (iii) a mitigation strategy, contingency action plan, and verification plan to address any exceedances of the compliance limits and/or predicted/potential negative impacts (as described in the approved LGRA).

14. Monitoring and management of landfill gas shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved LGMP (as per condition 13 above) and verification reports shall be submitted to the CPA for approval in writing at the following intervals:

- (a) Within 4-weeks of completion of the construction phase of the development; and
- (b) Every 3-years following completion of the development for the 10-year management period.

#### Ground and Surface Water

15. The development shall not commence until a Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Management Plan (GSWMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The GSWMMP shall incorporate the following details:

- (a) A written scheme of groundwater and surfacewater monitoring, sampling and testing;
- (b) Leachate and groundwater monitoring and sampling network and a programme for baseline monitoring, sampling and laboratory testing;
- (c) Establishment of a surface water monitoring and sampling network and a programme for baseline monitoring, sampling and laboratory testing;
- (d) After initial baseline conditions are established, the preparation of a baseline monitoring report and further assessment to determine the risk to groundwater, surface water and human health from the development;
- (e) Subject to the outcomes of (a) to (d) above and before commencement of any earthworks, the preparation of an Operational Management Plan, Mitigation and/or Remediation Strategy (if necessary), Construction and Post-Construction Phase Monitoring Plan, compliance limits (trigger and action levels) for contaminants of concern, and as necessary a Contingency Action Plan; and
- (f) A programme for regular report submissions to the County Planning Authority for approval including monitoring and review reports during the construction of the development and verification reporting on completion of the development.

The Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Management Plan shall be implemented and maintained as approved.

#### Surface Water Drainage

16. The development shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by 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 surface water drainage scheme shall include:

- (a) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40%) allowance for climate change storm events during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided using maximum Greenfield discharge rates of 12.7 litres/sec 1 in 2 year, 16.2 litres/sec 1 in 30 year and 16.6 litres/sec 1 in 100 year + 40% (as per the SuDS pro-forma or otherwise as agreed by the County Planning Authority);
- (b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include 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, oil interceptors, inspection chambers etc.);
- (c) Details of how the scheme will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site (including the car park) will be managed before the drainage system is operational;
- (d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system; and

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

The approved details shall be implemented and maintained for the duration of the development.

17. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer and demonstrating that the drainage system has been constructed as approved in accordance with condition 16 above must be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.
18. No surface water from the application site shall flow into Broadwater Lake to the east of the application site.

#### Construction Environmental Management Plan

19. Within 6 months of the date of this permission a site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in general accordance with Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.4 and Appendix D of Air Quality Assessment Ref. VC-170613-AQ-RP-0001 R01 dated 25 July 2017 shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval.

The approved CEMP shall be implemented and maintained for the duration of the construction phase of the development.

#### Ecology

20. As per Arboricultural Tree Assessment and Method Statement dated March 2016 and Drawing Ref. TPP-CC/403 AR2848 Tree Protection Plan Rev 0 dated 8 March 2016, all trees to be retained in and around the application site shall be protected from construction activities in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations.
21. Within 6 months of the date of this permission a Landscape Specification for Tree Planting shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. This scheme shall include details of how topsoil and trees are to be provided on the application site in accordance with BS 3882: 2015 Specification for topsoil; and BS 3936-1:1992 Nursery stock, Specification for trees and shrubs. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
22. Within 6 months of the date of this permission a 10-year Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (5-years maintenance and 5-years aftercare shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. The LEMP shall:
  - (a) Demonstrate how new planting is to develop from newly planted to established habitat;
  - (b) Provide for the management of new planting and habitat primarily for ecological benefits;
  - (c) Set out how the landscape will be maintained including tree aftercare and replacement; and
  - (d) Be in general accordance with Drawing Ref. 811.03 Rev B Landscape Plan dated 29 July 2017 and paragraphs 5.41 to 5.4.7 of Ecological Walkover Assessment and Protected Species Survey dated 7 July 2016.

The LEMP shall be implemented and maintained as approved.

## Perimeter Fencing

23. Within 6 months of the date of this permission details of the perimeter fencing to be provided around the application site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. These details shall include:
- (a) The specifications, location, alignment and extent of the perimeter fencing;
  - (b) Native hedge planting specifications for both sides of the fence including maintenance responsibilities and regimes;
  - (c) Provision for 13cm x 13cm gaps every 100m to allow small mammals to pass unhindered.

The details shall be implemented and maintained as approved.

## Adventure Golf

24. Within 6 months of the date of this permission details of the theme for the adventure golf facility shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. The approved details shall be implemented and maintained for the duration of the development.

## Reasons:

1. To comply with Section 91 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
4. So as to comply with the terms of the application and so as to not prejudice the timely restoration of mineral workings in the locality in accordance with Policy WD7 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
5. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
6. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
7. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
8. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
9. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
10. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.



11. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
12. In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
13. In the interests of the environment, local amenity and human health in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
14. In the interests of the environment, local amenity and human health in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
15. In the interests of the environment, local amenity and human health in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
16. To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
17. To ensure that the drainage system is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.
18. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity and the environment in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
19. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity and the environment in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
20. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity and the environment in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
21. To ensure that topsoil to be deposited and tree species to be planted are suitable in the interests of local amenity and the environment in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
22. So as to comply with the terms of the application and in the interests of local amenity and the environment in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
23. In the interests of local amenity and the environment in accordance with Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.
24. So as to comply with the terms of the application and to ensure that the theme of the adventure golf facility is appropriate for its location within the wider Broadwater Park complex and otherwise satisfies the requirements of Waverley Borough Council.

**Informatives:**

1. If the development affects an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written consent. More details are available on Surrey County Council's website.
2. If the development results in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.

3. The import of waste soils associated with this development will require an Environmental Permit, under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, from the Environment Agency, unless an exemption applies. The applicant is advised to contact the Environment Agency on 03708 506 506 for further advice and to discuss issues likely to be raised. The applicant should be aware that there is no guarantee that a permit will be granted. Additional 'Environmental Permitting Guidance' can be found at [www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-check-if-you-need-one](http://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-check-if-you-need-one)
4. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see [www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice).
5. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).
6. The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.
7. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.
8. Attention is drawn to the requirements of Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and to the Code of Practice for Access of the Disabled to Buildings (British Standards Institution Code of Practice BS 8300:2009) or any prescribed document replacing that code.
9. The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (Section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or is being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this Act.

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

10. In determining this application the County Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant by: entering into pre-application discussions; scoping of the application; assessing the proposals against relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework including its associated planning practice guidance and European Regulations, providing feedback to the applicant where appropriate. Further, the County Planning Authority has: identified all material considerations; forwarded consultation responses to the applicant; considered representations from interested parties; liaised with consultees and the applicant to resolve identified issues and determined the application within the timeframe agreed with the applicant. Issues of concern have been raised with the applicant including impacts of and on traffic, flooding, landscape, ecology, visual impact, and public access, and addressed through negotiation and acceptable amendments to the proposals. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions including pre-commencement conditions. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

---

## **CONTACT**

Dustin Lees

## **TEL. NO.**

020 8541 7673

---

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

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

### **Government Guidance**

[National Planning Policy Framework  
Planning Practice Guidance](#)  
[Waste Management Plan for England 2013](#)  
[National Planning Policy for Waste 2014](#)

### **The Development Plan**

[Surrey Waste Plan 2008](#)  
[Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018](#)  
[Saved policies of the Waverley Local Plan 2002](#)

### **Other Documents**

[The Waste \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2011](#)  
[Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2014/2015](#)  
[Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2015/2016](#)  
[Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2016/2017](#)  
[Surrey County Council Annual Monitoring Report 2017/2018](#)  
[‘Woodland Establishment on Landfill Sites - Ten Years of Research’](#)  
[Surrey Transport Plan \(2011-2026\)](#)  
[Waverley Borough Council Parking Guidelines - October 2013](#)  
[Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006](#)  
[Planning \(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#)  
[Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction, Institute of Air Quality Management, 2014](#)

---

[Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, Institute of Air Quality Management and Environmental Protection UK, 2017](#)

BS 5228:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites

BS 3882:2015 Specification for Topsoil

BS 3936-1:1965 Nursery stock. Specification for trees and shrub

---





This page is intentionally left blank