

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 16 June 2021 at Surrey County Council, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

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

Members Present:

Tim Hall (Chairman)
Ernest Mallett MBE
Penny Rivers
Jeffrey Gray
Jonathan Hulley
Victor Lewanski
David Lewis
Scott Lewis
Catherine Powell
Richard Tear
Jeremy Webster (Vice-Chairman)

11/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

None received.

12/21 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

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

13/21 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

14/21 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

15/21 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

Two questions were received from Mr Ernest Mallet. The questions and responses were published in a supplementary agenda on 15 June 2021.

1. As a supplementary question to Question 1, Mr Mallet thanked officers for the response and asked whether paper copies of the National Planning Policy Framework and Minerals and Waste Policy documents could be made available to Members. Officers confirmed that a Members' library of key documents would be available following the end of COVID-19 restrictions.
2. As a supplementary question to Question 2, Mr Mallet stated that he was grateful for the progress and asked whether details around car parking and visitor access were included in the process. Officers

confirmed that the draft management plan should be formally submitted in Summer 2021 and officers expected details on visitor access to be included.

16/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

Catherine Powell declared a non-pecuniary interest for Items 7 & 8 as she had previously lived in the Seale and Sands Parish and had supported the Parish Council in the restoration of landfill and quarry sites. Catherine Powell further stated that she no longer lived in the area and was not personally affected by the Landfill.

17/21 MINERALS/WASTE WA/2021/0004 - LAND AT HOMEFIELD SANDPIT, GUILDFORD ROAD, RUNFOLD, FARNHAM, SURREY GU10 1PG [Item 7]

The Chairman agreed to consider Item 7 and Item 8 under one item.

Officers:

Jessica Darvill, Planning Officer
 Caroline Smith, Interim Planning Group Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Interim Planning Development Manager
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
 Helen Forbes, Senior Solicitor
 Joss Butler, Committee Manager

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the items and noted that Item 7 proposed the continued use of the workshop for use in repairing onsite plant, machinery and lorries without compliance with Conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref: WA11/0009 dated 7 April 2011 (as amended by planning application ref: WA/2020/1753 dated 11 December 2020) to extend the period of development. Furthermore, Members noted Item 8 proposed continued use of two storey extension to side of workshop to provide welfare facilities without compliance with Conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref: WA10/2109 dated 17 February 2011 (as amended by planning application ref: WA/2020/1754 dated 14 December 2020) to extend the period of development. Members went on to note details related to the location and planning history of the site.
2. A Member of the Committee stated that the original planning consent was granted on the basis that the facilities were ancillary and fundamental to the ongoing work of the site but there had been little evidence on site that this was the case. Further to this, The Member stated that there was some evidence that the inert waste recycling facility and the ancillary facilities were preventing and reversing the restoration which had already occurred. The Member then asked officers to undertake additional work to understand whether the facilities outlined were fundamental to the site's restoration. Officers explained that officers had taken these points into account when

monitoring the site however the applications before committee were not concerning the restoration of the site. The Member went on to request that a condition was in place to ensure the facilities outlined in the application were fundamental to the filling and restoration of the site. The officer stated that it was their opinion that the workshop was an appropriate facility to be had on site to ensure the maintenance of machinery was undertaken without causing further impact to the surrounding area.

3. A Member asked whether officers were clear that the site was no longer used for sand extractions and waste recycling. Officers confirmed that they had visited the site for routine site monitoring and that there was evidence that the activities had ceased. There was however a Review of Old Mineral Permissions (ROMP) application in progress which would consider the restoration process and whether it could be completed in a shorted time period.
4. A Member requested that a condition be included to ensure an annual report was created to detail what maintenance was undertaken in the facility and why it was essential to the restoration of the site. Officers confirmed that the conditions were already clear that the workshop would only be used in connection to activities on the site and for no other purpose.
5. A Member stated that the local community had requested a Community Liaison Group (CLG) to allow detail of the monitoring of the site to be shared. Officers confirmed they would support a Liaison Group and would approach the site's operator with the suggestion. Following discussion, Members agreed to include the following informative:
The Planning and Regulatory Committee strongly recommend that the operator engage with the local community via a liaison group.
6. Members noted that there were six total applications on the site for Members to consider.
7. Members stated that they were concerned with the history of incompliance with planning rules on the site and asked whether Condition 3 could be strengthened to ensure the machinery was used only for landfilling and restoration. Officers stated that it would be unfair to the applicant to amend conditions without proper consultation.
8. Members noted that the hours of operations outlined in Condition 5 had been carried over from a previous application.

Actions / further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to PERMIT planning permission WA/2021/0004 subject to the conditions from page 29 of the agenda.

18/21 MINERALS/WASTE WA/2021/0005 - LAND AT HOMEFIELD SANDPIT, GUILDFORD ROAD, RUNFOLD, FARNHAM, SURREY GU10 1PG [Item 8]

Officers:

Jessica Darvill, Planning Officer
 Caroline Smith, Interim Planning Group Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Interim Planning Development Manager
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer

Helen Forbes, Senior Solicitor
Joss Butler, Committee Manager

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

Discussion was held under Item 7.

Actions / further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

It was agreed to PERMIT planning permission WA/2021/0005 subject to the conditions from page 63 of the agenda.

19/21 WASTE MANAGEMENT APPLICATION REF. MO/2020/1804 - LAND AT ROLLS FARMHOUSE, PARTRIDGE LANE, NEWDIGATE, SURREY RH5 5BW [Item 9]

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Interim Planning Group Manager
Stephen Jenkins, Interim Planning Development Manager
Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
Joss Butler, Committee Manager

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced that the application which was for the change of use of land, existing storage bays and existing building for the storage and sorting of green waste and erection of roof on the storage barn and retaining bund. Members noted details related to the history of the site which were outlined in the report.
2. A Member asked whether applicants were supported to amend their refused application to allow for approval. Officers explained that the applicant may wish to amend the application during appeal to meet the very special circumstances.

Actions / further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to REFUSE planning application Ref. MO/2020/1804 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development does not comply with the locational criteria for waste management development as set out in Policies 2 and 10 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2019.
2. The industrial nature and scale of the development would not preserve or enhance local landscape character or the visual amenities of the local landscape contrary to Policies 13 and 14 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2019, Policies ENV4, ENV22, and RUD19 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000, and Policies CS13 and CS15 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy 2009.
3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate factors that amount to very special circumstances which clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other identified harm to the local landscape character and visual amenities of the rural countryside contrary to Policy 9 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2019 and Policy RUD19 of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000.

20/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

The date of the next meeting was noted as 7 July 2021.

Meeting closed at 11.25 am

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank