

COMMITTEE AGENDA REFERENCE: 5B

APPLICATION REF:	RU.23/0510
LOCATION	Padd Farm, Hurst Lane, Egham, Surrey, TW20 8QJ
PROPOSAL	Change of use of the land to a corporate headquarters for a scaffolding and access company (Sui Generis) including an office, training centre, fabrication bay, workshop, and employee accommodation, following the demolition of all but 3 of the existing buildings on site and the erection of 2 new buildings. The removal of existing hardstanding and the re-use of existing hardstanding for storage and parking. The returning of the remainder of the site to greenspace. (Part Retrospective)
TYPE	Full Planning Permission
EXPIRY DATE	03/07/2023
WARD	Thorpe Virginia Water
CASE OFFICER	Adam Jackson
REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION	Major Development recommended for approval
<i>If you have questions about this report please contact Ashley Smith, Victoria Gibson or the case officer.</i>	

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the Planning Committee authorises the HoP:	
A.	To grant planning permission subject to the submission of an updated Preliminary Ecological Assessment report and Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys which confirm the likely absence of bats on site, the submission of the relevant Community Infrastructure Levy forms, and the completion of a Section106 legal agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure i) the decontamination and restoration of the site, ii) the necessary demolition and removal of hardstanding and iii) the necessary environmental improvements which constitute the case of very special circumstances.
B.	Or to refuse planning permission at the discretion of the Head of Planning should the s106 Agreement not progress to their satisfaction and/or should the necessary bat report and surveys not be submitted within 3 months of the date of the committee, or should the updated information find evidence of bats on site that cannot be overcome

	through the submission of suitable mitigation details, or the necessary S106 is not completed.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. DETAILS OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is 12.5ha. The northwest corner of the site contains a cluster of buildings mostly made up of agricultural buildings, but also a residential bungalow (building 19) and buildings incidental to this dwelling (buildings 17, 18, 30 & 32), and two buildings which have lawful use for light industrial purposes (buildings 8 & 9 which are connected). There is also a second bungalow on site (building 16), however this building has unlawful extensions, and the residential use of the building is also unlawful. This part of the site also contains the main access which leads from the north corner of the site down to this cluster of buildings. There is a second access within this area off Hurst Lane which is positioned adjacent to the residential bungalow (building 19).
- 2.2 There are areas of lawful hardstanding within this area used for parking and open storage. The northeast corner of the site also includes large areas of hardstanding, although most of this is unlawful. The triangular shape of the northern part of the site means it does not have a distinct north boundary, rather the eastern and western boundaries converge at an apex where the main access is positioned. A 3m tall manmade earth bund separates the north of the site from the rest of the site to the south. The southern part of the site, which covers approximately two thirds of the site, comprises of open agricultural grass land. The western boundary of the site runs parallel with Hurst Lane and is enclosed by trees and shrubs. The eastern boundary is bound by an area of woodland which separates the site from Longside Lake. Apart from the raised bund described above, the topography of the site is generally flat.
- 2.3 The application site lies within the Green Belt, part of the site is within flood zone 2 (between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of fluvial flooding), and the site is within the 5km buffer of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and a SSSI Impact Risk Zone. The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. The site was formerly part of a gravel extraction site.
- 2.4 The surrounding area comprises of a mix of residential properties, which run along the western side of Hurst Lane, and some commercial uses to the north. Immediately to the north is Green Landscape Nursery which has a agricultural/horticulture use and Bellbourne Nursery, which is used for storage and distribution, although also has permission for residential use. Further afield, the site is located between Virginia Water to the southwest, Egham to the north and Thorpe to the east. The site is also close to the M25 which runs parallel to the site to the east on the other side of Longside Lake. Virginia Water railway station is 2.3km away and there are two bus stops on Stroude Road approximately 350m from the site. Local services and amenities are available at Virginia Water.

3. APPLICATION DETAILS

- 3.1 The application proposes to redevelop the site for use as a company headquarters for a scaffolding and access provider. The operation of the site will include storage and distribution of scaffolding equipment as well as use for training, industry certification, and apprenticeship courses. It is proposed to demolish the majority of the existing buildings on

site, with the exception of buildings 2, 8 & 9 which will be converted for use as a workshop and metalwork fabrication building (buildings I & H on the proposed site plans). A new office and training hall are also to be erected (Buildings K & J on the proposed site plan).

- 3.2 The new buildings are both 7.5m tall and are 305sqm and 380sqm respectively. The scaffolding HQ will use the existing access within the northern corner of the site. The existing lawful bungalow on site (building 19) is also proposed to be retained for use by employees and trainees visiting the site. The dwelling will be accessed via a separate access, utilising the existing Hurst Lane entrance. New and existing areas of hardstanding are proposed to be used for storage, parking and unloading. The vast majority of the existing unlawful hardstanding on site is to be removed. It is proposed to retain the majority of the trees on site, including those along the western boundary with Hurst Lane and new soft landscaping will be provided, including around the eastern and north eastern perimeter of the commercial part of the site to keep this separate and restrict views from the east and from the rest of the site which is proposed to be remediated and kept as open grassland.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 The following history is considered relevant to this application:

Reference	Details	Decision and date
EGH.55/3495	Use of land for pig and chicken raising	Granted – 24/11/1955
EGH.60/6405	Erection of deep litter house and rearing house	Granted – 19/07/1960
EGH.63/8664	Poultry house	Granted – 04/10/1963
EGH.65/10608	Development of land as site for agricultural dwelling	Refused – 24/03/1966
EGH.65/10324	Erection of bulk food bin and replacement of poultry house store	Granted – 22/09/1965
RU.73/16289	Use of land for the parking and storage of touring caravans and boats on trailers (maximum 60) for a temporary period of 5 years	Refused – 02/11/1973
RU.75/0075	The extraction of bulk filling materials for use in connection with the construction of the Thorpe-Egham section of the M25 and restoration of agriculture	Granted – 11/08/1975
RU.79/0916	Erection of a bungalow for occupation in connection with management of poultry farm	Refused – 30/11/1979
RU.81/0863	Stationing of a mobile home and siting of a box trailer for storing applicants' furniture (retrospective) for a temporary period of one year	Granted – 08/11/1982
RU.82/0540	Use of part of land and buildings for storage of applicant's personal property and vehicles and	Refused – 05/11/1982

	re-positioning of garage	
RU.82/0705	Change of use of agricultural buildings to private stabling with ancillary storage facilities	Granted – 26/01/1983
RU.83/0467	Renewal of RU.81/0863 for stationing of mobile home and siting of a box trailer to store applicant's furniture for a temporary period of six months	Granted – 15/08/1983
RU.84/0828	Erection of a cattle shed of some 1,350sq.ft. (125.4 sq.m)	Granted – 01/02/1985
RU.84/0846	Improvement of land for agricultural purposes by the tipping of imported overburden and topsoil	Granted – 30/01/1987
RU.84/0906	Siting of mobile home for use in connection with agricultural holding	Refused – 09/04/1985
RU.86/0535	Stationing of mobile home for a temporary period of 3 years (revised plans indicating a revised siting) (amended by letter dated 7.7.86 and plan received 8.7.86)	Refused – 04/08/1986
RU.87/0983	Improvement of land for agricultural purposes by the tipping of imported over burden and topsoil (amended by letter dated 5.10.87 received 12.10.87 and revised plan received 12.10.87).	No objection – 24/12/1987
RU.89/0099	Mobile home for agricultural worker	Granted – 09/03/1990
RU.90/0012	Proposed bungalow for agricultural occupation, with double garage, replacing existing mobile home	Refused – 09/03/1990
RU.91/0106	Change of use of Building B from agricultural barn to use in connection with the storage, distribution and sale of animal feed (as amplified by letter dated 20.3.91)	Refused – 09/05/1991
RU.91/0107	Proposed bungalow for agricultural occupation, with double garage, replacing existing mobile home	Refused – 09/05/1991
RU.91/0108	Change of use of Building 'A' from agricultural storage for retail sales of craft goods (as amended by Plan No. RBC/91/66/1 received 2.9.91)	Granted – 18/09/1991
RU.91/0109	Renewal of planning permission for mobile home for agricultural worker	Granted – 09/05/1991
RU.91/1028	Retention of land for grading and mixing of top soil and sand, the retention of a storage	Granted – 22/04/1992

	compound and use of mobile screening plant 2 year period	
RU.92/1006	Resting of portacabin for office use of land for planting of trees and shrubs, use of barn for storage of vehicles and equipment, provision of operational land, parking and access	Refused – 11/01/1993
RU.92/0553	Renewal of temporary permission for a mobile home for an agricultural worker and for a further period of 1 year.	Granted – 07/10/1992
RU.92/0554	Construction of detached three bedroom bungalow for agricultural occupation, with double garage to replace the currently used mobile home.	Granted – 28/07/1993
RU.93/0509	Continued use of land for the grading & mixing of soil, retention of storage compound and operation of mobile screening plant. Consultation from Surrey County Council.	Object – 16/08/1993
RU.93/0406	Change of use of farm building for use as retail shop for sale of pet animals and ancillary goods (amplified by letter and plan received 20.7.93, 29.7.93 and 3.8.93).	Refused – 03/09/1993
RU.94/0257	Change of use of redundant farm building to part B1 use (Saddlers workshop & Farriers workshop) with ancillary A1 use	Refused – 03/06/1994
RU.94/0428	The erection of an enclosure for swimming pool incorporating approved double garage	Refused – 13/07/1994
RU.94/0805	Single storey extension to house boiler and oil tank.	Granted – 24/11/1994
RU.95/0269	Parking for 5 goods vehicles; storage of hardcore, topsoil and demolition materials; and retention of two portacabin offices, ancillary store and w.c. amounting to 225 sq m all on a site of about 0.8 ha.	Object – 24/05/1995
RU.95/0447	Retention of concrete hardstanding	Refused – 04/09/1995
RU.95/1065	Erection of free-standing poultry house	Refused – 30/04/1997
RU.96/0024	Use of site as a civil engineering contractor's yard for the storage of plant equipment, portacabins and materials for a 12-month period plus retention of security fencing and lighting (retrospective)	Refused – 28/02/1996
RU.97/0222	Continued use of two agricultural buildings for commercial storage of film and stone for a temporary period plus demolition of other	Granted – 30/04/1997

	buildings.	
RU.98/0284	Reuse of building A for storage and light industrial purposes for a temporary 12-month period	Refused – 07/04/1999
RU.98/0285	Continued use of building B for the commercial storage of film	Granted – 07/04/1999
RU.98/0286	Use of building G for storage and light industrial purposes and conversion of lean-to to ancillary office, plus rebuilding of sewage pump housing	Refused – 07/04/1999
RU.98/1232	Temporary use of land for the storage of landscaping materials and stationing of portacabin with B & P landscape contractors operations (2 years)	Refused – 07/04/1999
RU.99/0174	Use of agricultural building for storage of building materials and plant	Refused – 14/09/1999
RU.99/0797	Use of building G for storage with minor fabrication ancillary to the storage use	Granted – 14/09/1999
RU.04/0954	Variation of clause 3 of the legal agreement under RU.92/0554 for the southern part of the site to be sold off as a separate unit	Refused – 13/12/2004
RU.08/1087	Certificate of existing lawful use for change of use of building to a single self-contained dwelling (Class C3)	Refused – 25/06/2009
RU.09/0194	Lawful use certificate for existing hardstanding and service roads	Granted – 16/10/2009
RU.09/0936	Certificate of existing lawful use for change of use of building to a single self-contained dwelling (Class C3)	Refused – 23/06/2011
RU.09/0547	Application for discharge of obligations contained in S106 legal agreement. dated 28 th July 1993 relating to all the land and premises at Padd Farm	Refused – 14/07/2011
RU.10/0016	Certificate of existing lawful use for stationing of caravans in residential use	Refused – 23/06/2011
RU.17/0412	Application to dispose of part of the site with reference to a s106 obligation (planning)	Refused – 08/03/2017
RU.18/1552	EIA SCREENING OPINION RELATING TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON LAND AT PADD FARM, HURST LANE, EGHAM FOR THE BELOW SCHEME: Demolition of existing buildings and site decontamination, the erection of up to 130 new residential dwellings (areas A	Environmental Statement Required – 16/11/2018

	& B) and provision of public open space on the southern part (area C) of the site under PART 2 (6) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2017	
RU.19/0066	EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed development at Padd Farm	Scoping Agreed – 22/02/2019
RU.21/0695	The demolition of existing buildings and structures, and removal of hardstanding; the decontamination of land; the erection of 38 affordable dwellings with associated access, parking, landscaping, and infrastructure works; and the change of use of land to paddocks.	Refused – 15/02/2022
RU.21/1167	The erection of 2 new buildings, the retention of 1 x residential dwelling, and the refurbishment of 2 existing buildings to be used as offices, a training centre and fabrication bays as part of the applicant's corporate headquarters following the demolition of all remaining buildings on site. Refurbishment and decontamination of existing site and the creation of open grassed area with an area of landscaped open space.	Refused – 19/12/2022

4.2 The most recent application on this site (RU.21/1167) was submitted by the same applicant for use as their corporate headquarters. This application was refused for the following reason:

- *The proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore by definition harmful. There are no “Very Special Circumstances” to outweigh this harm which is given substantial weight. The proposal is contrary to paragraphs 147, 148, 149 and 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy EE19 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.*

4.3 This application has been submitted to try and address this reason for refusal.

Enforcement History

4.4 It should be noted that there is a separation of control between the ‘use’ of a building and its physical presence/fabric, and a lawful building can have been occupied by uses that that were unlawful. All existing and historic buildings on the site are labelled between 1 and 32, this ties in with the numbering used in the enforcement history/investigations across the site. The majority of the existing buildings on site are lawful, however have been subject to one of more unlawful uses. All of the current physical buildings are considered lawful with the exception of building 16 which has been unlawfully extended. The residential use of the building is also not lawful. All other unlawful buildings have been removed from the site. The lawful use of most of the site is agricultural with commercial uses permitted within buildings 8 and 9 and residential use permitted within building 19, although this is subject to a legal agreement which requires the building to be tied to an agricultural use of the land. Buildings 17, 18, 30 and 32 are considered to be

incidental to the use of building 19. As of 15/06/2018 all businesses trading from the site have left as confirmed by The Enforcement Receiver. The site is also now currently vacant, and all buildings are unoccupied.

5 SUMMARY OF MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance:

- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4 – Decision-making
- Section 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt land
- Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

5.2 The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan was adopted on 16 July 2020 and the policies have to be read as a whole. Any specific key policies will be referred to in the planning considerations.

5.3 Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

- Runnymede Design Supplementary Planning Document
- Runnymede Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation Supplementary Planning Document
- Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document
- Car Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance
- Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows Supplementary Planning Guidance

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Consultees responses

Consultee	Comments
Environment Agency	<p>No objections to the proposed development, subject to conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission of a scheme for the provision and management of a buffer zone to the Hurst Ditch. Submission of a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site. 2. Submission of remediation strategy dealing with land contamination.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. A verification report for the demonstrating completion of the remediation strategy 4. No further development in the event of contamination being found that was not previously identified. 5. No infiltration of surface water into the ground 6. Submission of a scheme for managing any boreholes installed for the investigation of soils, groundwater or geotechnical purposes. 7. No use of piling using penetrative methods
Natural England	Natural England has not commented on this application, however advised under the previous similar application (Ru.21/1167) that they had no objections.
Lead Local Flood Authority	<p>Objects to the proposed surface water drainage scheme, however, considers that an updated drainage strategy can be secured via conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission of a surface water drainage strategy to meet the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS as well as the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance 2. Submission of a verification report which demonstrates that the surface water drainage scheme has been constructed as agreed.
County Highway Authority	<p>Recommends the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision and maintaining of visibility zones at the vehicular accesses. 2. Submission of a scheme for car parking and turning areas on site 3. Submission of a con 4. struction transport management plan. 5. Provision of electric vehicle charging points 6. Closing of existing access and re-instatement of kerbs/verges <i>(Officer comment: not required as both existing accesses are being retained.)</i>
SCC Minerals & Waste	<p>No objection subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submission of a waste management plan 2. Provision of sufficient and appropriate facilities for waste storage and recycling <i>(Officer comment this has been incorporated into the hard and soft landscaping condition.)</i>
SCC Archaeology	Advises that any archaeological remains will have been destroyed by the previous quarrying.
RBC Tree Officer	<p>Recommends the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission of a landscape design that includes replacement semi-

	<p>mature tree planting.</p> <p>2. Submission of an Arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan</p>
RBC Drainage Office	<p>Objects as no drainage or flood risk related information has been submitted.</p> <p><i>(Officer Comment: A Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy has since been submitted, and although RBC drainage have not commented on this the Lead Local Flood Authority have provided comments.)</i></p>
RBC Contaminated Land Officer	<p>No objections subject to a condition which secures an assessment of contamination on site and a remediation scheme if necessary, and which sets out that what to do in the event of unexpected contamination being found.</p>
RBC Environmental Health	<p>Recommends the dwelling on site is only used in connection with the commercial use and not as an independent dwelling as it has not been demonstrated that the dwelling would provide an acceptable residential environment and level of amenity as a permanent residence. (Officer comment – this will be controlled by planning condition)</p>
Surrey Wildlife Trust	<p>No comments received at the time of writing.</p>

Representations and comments from interested parties

6.2 81 neighbouring properties were consulted in addition to being advertised on the Council's website and 4 letters of representation have been received, which can be summarised as follows:

Concerns

- Considers the development to be inappropriate in the Green Belt.
- Considers over the appearance of the site.
- Concerns with noise and disturbance.
- Concerns over the loss of vegetation and the impact on streams.
- Concerns over flooding impacts.
- Concerns with HGV usage of the site and Hurst Lane.
- Concerns regarding the industrialisation and changing character of Hurst Lane.
- Considers the application should be considered at Planning Committee.
- Considers that the lane should be viewed as a singular site and policies implemented/enforced to maintain its residential character and protect the Green Belt.

Other Comments Raised

- Considers that the owners have sought to engage with local residents and appear supportive of a good long-term relationship with the community.
- Considers that the most objectionable aspects of the plans have been amended/removed.

- Supports returning the site into planning control in a manner which does not materially increase the legal footprint.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 In the determination of this application regard must be had to the Development Plan and National policy within the NPPF. The application site is located within the Green Belt where only certain forms of development are considered appropriate. This must be considered in light of the presumption in favour of sustainable development advocated by the NPPF. The key planning matters are:

- Whether the development constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on residential amenity
- Traffic implications and the impact on highway safety
- The impact on contaminated land
- The impact on biodiversity
- The impact of the development on flood risk
- The impact on archaeology
- The impact on minerals
- Energy and sustainability

Whether the development constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt

7.2 The application site is in the Green Belt where the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that the change of use and construction of new buildings should be considered as inappropriate development unless one of the exceptions in paragraphs 149 or 150 applies.

7.3 It has previously been established that the site can be classed as previously development land (PDL). This position was set out under the previous application which was supported by a PDL Statement and legal opinion from Essex Chambers. PDL is defined as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. In this case the land constitutes the entirety of Padd Farm as a single planning unit of 12.8ha, including 26 permanent buildings and their associated areas of hardstanding, and two primary uses (Agricultural and Light Industrial) constituting a mixed use. As such, the planning unit would constitute PDL. Paragraph 149 (g) of the NPPF allows for the partial or complete redevelopment of PDL provided there would not be a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. The assessment of whether the redevelopment of this land would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and therefore constitutes appropriate development is set out below.

7.4 Once the extent of the PDL has been established, the next part of the definition of PDL can be applied. In terms of whether the redevelopment of the land will have a greater impact on

the openness of the Green Belt, the volume of the existing buildings (excluding the agricultural buildings) is 6,734cbm. Building 2 is also included within this figure, as although an agricultural building, the re-use of this building is appropriate under paragraph 150 (d). (There is a slight discrepancy when compared with the figures quoted in the report for the previous application (RU.21/1167) as those figures mistakenly omitted building 32). There is also 3789cbm of agricultural buildings being removed too, however the removal of these buildings can only be attributed limited weight given that they constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt.

- 7.5 The proposed buildings have a volume of 10,958cbm, which is an increase of 4,224cbm (not including the agricultural buildings) and results in a clear spatial impact on the openness of the Green Belt. In addition, the bulk manifests itself in a way which results in a greater visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt compared to the existing development due to the additional mass and bulk of the two new buildings (Buildings K & J on the proposed site plan), resulting from the increased height, high eaves and flat roof design.
- 7.6 However, importantly there is a reduction in the number of buildings on site and a reduction in spread of development, including a further reduction when compared to the previous scheme, with the proposed buildings being moved closer together and closer to the retained buildings, creating a smaller overall envelope of built development. Furthermore, new planting/landscaping is proposed to the east of the developed area which would limit views of the development from the east. All these changes result in a reduction in the impact of the development on the visual openness of the Green Belt.
- 7.7 In addition, whilst there is an increase in hardstanding when compared to the previous scheme (1,560sqm) and an increase over the existing lawful hardstanding (1,119sqm) there has been a significant reduction in its spread, with all the unlawful hardstanding to the east of the site now completely removed from the proposal. As above, this will result in a much more contained development which, especially given the planting/landscaping proposed around the eastern edge, will reduce views of the development and thereby its impact on visual openness. Amended plans have also been received during the course of the application which remove the hardstanding on the western boundary of the site which is to the rear of building H and I, reducing the impact of the development when viewed from Hurst Lane.
- 7.8 However, notwithstanding the improvements made as a result of the consolidation of the development and the benefits this has on visual openness, the development would still have a greater impact on both the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt and would have a moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal does not therefore fall within the exception set out in paragraph 149 (g) of the NPPF, and is therefore inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful. Substantial weight is attached to this harm and as per paragraph 147 of the NPPF, which states inappropriate development will not be approved except in very special circumstances. Whether very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh the harm arising from the inappropriate nature of the development and any other harm identified, is considered at the end of this report.

The impact on the character and appearance of the area

- 7.9 Policy EE1 of the Local Plan sets out that all development proposals, whether within the Green Belt or within the urban area, will be expected to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds to the local context including the built, natural and historic character of the area. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF also places importance on the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable places, and paragraph 134 sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused. Paragraph 130 sets out a number of considerations

which decision makers should take account of when determining planning applications.

- 7.10 The proposal consists of the erection of 2 x new light industrial buildings, the conversion of 2 x existing buildings for light industrial use, retention of the existing dwelling and the demolition of all the remaining existing buildings. The new buildings are approximately 7.5m tall and utilitarian in design, which is considered appropriate for the site which currently consists of existing agricultural and light industrial buildings. The retained existing buildings will be made good and will be similar in design to the proposed new buildings. The proposed buildings are considered to be appropriate in scale and design in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the area, and clearly there will be benefits as a result of the removal of the existing dilapidated buildings and general site clearance.
- 7.11 Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the importance of trees in contributing to the character and appearance of an area. The application has been supported by an arboricultural report and a tree protection plan which sets out that 31 trees within the site will be removed, however this does not include any of the trees along the western boundary adjacent to Hurst Lane. It is considered that replacement planting can be provided to offset the loss of trees elsewhere on the site, and that this can be secured via a detailed soft landscaping plan. The southern part of the site is proposed to be kept as open land and full details of the soft landscaping within this area could also be secured by this condition.

The impact on residential amenity

- 7.12 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF sets out that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers, and policy EE1 of the Local Plan sets out that development proposals will be supported where they ensure no adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers. Policy EE2 also sets out that development proposals resulting in external noise impacts will be expected to implement measures to mitigate and reduce noise impacts to a minimum.
- 7.13 In terms of the impact on existing residents, the separation distances between the proposed new buildings and the neighbouring properties are sufficient to ensure existing residents would not experience any material loss of light or privacy. A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted which sets out the results of existing background noise monitoring and the measurements of various noise producing activities proposed to be carried out across the site. The average existing background noise level was recorded to be 48dB (LA90) with a range of between 42dB and 57dB (LA90) over 15-minute intervals, with the main source of existing noise found to be the M25. Measurements of proposed operations such as HGV movements, tele lifter loading and unloading, and the sorting of scaffolding materials were then recorded with the average noise levels for each activity ranging between 62dB and 89dB. Taking into account the distance to noise sensitive receptors and other mitigation factors such as certain activities being carried out indoors, the predicted noise levels are 50dB, which is just an increase of 2dB over the existing background levels. The type of noise, in terms of pitch and frequency will inevitably be different to the existing background noise from the M25 and therefore potentially more noticeable, however it should be noted that the existing lawful agricultural and light industrial uses could potentially also increase noise above the existing background levels were they to be re-instated. Given the conclusions of the report, and the existing lawful use of the site, it is considered that the development is therefore unlikely to materially impact the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 7.14 It is also proposed to re-use the existing agricultural workers dwelling for employee accommodation. Provided the dwelling is to be used as employee accommodation on a short-term basis then the noise impact on this dwelling is considered to be acceptable. It is

not clear from the information submitted what the predicted internal noise levels are for these dwellings and what measures are required in terms of glazing and ventilation in order to achieve this. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the use of the dwelling as independent dwelling would be acceptable in terms of providing a high level of amenity and suitable residential environment for the future occupiers. The use of this dwelling has therefore been conditioned.

Traffic implications and the impact on highway safety

- 7.15 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts of the road network would be severe. Policy SD4 sets out that development proposals which generate significant traffic movements must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement which considers the impact of the proposal on the highway network. The application is supported by a Transport Statement which concludes that the proposed development will result in a minimal increase in vehicular movements, with trip generation analysis undertaken at the site predicting a total net increase of 34 vehicle movements in the AM peak and 29 vehicle movements in the PM peak.
- 7.16 The Transport Statement sets out that this has been calculated based on an overall office floorspace of 1,274sqm in order to predict a worst-case scenario due to office space, in general, generating a greater number of vehicle movements than light industrial. It is not clear how this figure of 1,274sqm has been reached, as the total proposed floorspace (not including residential) is 1,526sqm, with only 680sqm of this being office space. The applicant also clarified within the previous application that the predicted net increase in trip generation represents a worst-case scenario based on only the existing 461sqm of lawful light industrial floorspace on the site, whereas in reality the lawful use which includes agricultural buildings would generate more traffic. The trip generation of the dwelling on site has not been calculated or reported, however as this dwelling is existing, there is unlikely to be any material change.
- 7.17 The total actual vehicle movements are therefore likely to be comparable or more likely lower than the predicted vehicle movements as these have been calculated on worst case scenarios. Even with the worst case scenarios it is not considered that the impact on the road network from vehicle movements associated with the development would be severe, nor would there be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- 7.18 In addition to the above, the Transport Statement considers that the proposed use of the site will generate 4 daily two-way movements of HGV. Hurst Lane, in general, varies between 5m and 7m in width which is sufficient to allow for HGV associated with the use to pass, and where the lane isn't wide enough there are plenty of wider spots for a HGV to wait. This is considered acceptable given the low number of HGV movements predicted. 4 x Lorry bays are proposed on site to accommodate HGV associated with the use.
- 7.19 It is proposed for the development to utilise the existing access in the northern corner of the site, which achieves visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m in both directions and is therefore suitable for a Hurst Lane and the proposed development. The existing secondary access onto Hurst Lane, which is adjacent to the existing bungalow on the western boundary will be closed to main site traffic and used for the employee dwelling only.
- 7.20 31 car parking spaces will be provided on the site (although the transport statement incorrectly states 55 spaces which was the amount proposed under the previous scheme). The Planning Statement also confirms that at least 40% of the parking spaces on site will

have electric vehicle charging points. However, the Runnymede Parking Guidance Supplementary Planning Document suggests 48 parking spaces for an office/light industrial use of this size. Although this is a flexible rather than minimum/maximum standard, the proposed parking provision falls significantly short of the suggested number. Hurst Lane is narrow in places and any overspill parking could therefore block the road or make it unsafe for people visiting the site and for the residents of Hurst Lane. It is important therefore that sufficient parking space is provided on site. It is noted that the Transport Statement commits to operating a minibus service between the site and Egham railway station. This will likely reduce the reliance on cars being able to park on site, however this is unlikely to overcome all of the shortfall. As such, the applicant has been asked to provide, via condition, an updated parking layout which provides an acceptable number of parking spaces without extending the proposed hardstanding.

The impact on contaminated land

- 7.21 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land where appropriate. A phase 1 geo-environmental assessment has been carried out across the site and the results of this have been submitted in support of the application. This assessment confirms that the site was formerly a gravel pit and that former landfilling and commercial operations have occurred at the site, which have caused pollution. Given the identified sources of contamination and the presence of sensitive receptors at the site, the report concludes that a moderate to high risk is present for future and adjacent site users. Further works, including detailed ground investigation, are therefore required to identify the extent of the contamination in order to establish the necessary remediation works; this can be conditioned to be carried out prior to the commencement of development. The condition also sets out what should be done in the event of unexpected contamination.
- 7.22 Discussions have previously been held with the Environment Agency as to whether the site could be remediated outside of planning. They advise that should contamination reach the main river they could use the Water Resources Act to require the site owner to decontaminate the site, however they are not aware of any impact on nearby water courses. The other way in which the site could be remediated is via Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act, however the site would need to be designated as contaminated land first before the Environment Agency could get involved. The Environment Agency have advised that as contamination is likely to be just in the gravel aquifer, the site could not be designated as a special site and passed to Environment Agency control. Therefore, redevelopment through the planning regime offers the best chance of remedial works being undertaken.

The impact on biodiversity

- 7.23 Policy EE9 of the Local Plan sets out that development on sites including or adjacent to priority habitats and species will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the impact of the proposals will not result in significant adverse effects. This is in line with the hierarchy set out in paragraph 180 of the NPPF which sets out that if significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Policy EE9 of the Local Plan also sets out that the Council will seek net gains in biodiversity, through creation/expansion, restoration and enhancement of habitats and features to improve the status of priority habitats and species. The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roosts Assessment report (PEA report).

- 7.24 The PEA report assesses several of the buildings on site to have low habitat value to support roosting bats (Buildings B1, B5 and B9 – Note: The building numbering used in the PEA report differs to the numbering used within the rest of the submission) and therefore requiring further surveys to be carried out. It is understood that bat emergence/re-entry surveys have previously been carried out on the site which confirm the likely absence of bats roosts, however, these surveys are now out of date. It is also not clear from the PEA report whether the trees on site have been surveyed and therefore whether any of the trees to be removed offer roosting opportunities for bats, as this appears to have been removed from the report since the previous application (RU.21/1167). However, the applicant submitted with the previous application a letter from their ecologist which advised that, although the bat emergence/re-entry surveys are out of date, given the breadth of survey work previously undertaken on the site previously and the likely absence of bats, it would be acceptable to secure the required surveys by condition rather than prior to determination. This approach has been accepted on both the previous application and the application prior to that (RU.21/0695). Whilst, it is considered that bats are likely absent from the site, given the shortcomings of the PEA report and the lack of up to date surveys, it is suggested that the committee defer the application back to the CHDMBC to approve, only subject to the submission of this information and subject to no harm to bats of the habitats, which cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated for, being found.
- 7.25 In terms of other species on site, the PEA concludes that the development, due to being predominantly over the existing buildings, hardstanding and bare ground, is unlikely to impact on reptiles, amphibians, badgers or hedgehogs and that further surveys are therefore not required. Instead, a precautionary working method can be implemented, to be secured via condition and the submission of a construction environmental management plan, however the wording of this conditions will need to be agreed following the submission of the outstanding ecological information and consultation with Surrey Wildlife Trust. It should be noted that a similar approach was taken under the previous application on site.
- 7.26 No details of Biodiversity Net Gain have been submitted, however it is noted that the previous application did submit this information and was able to demonstrate that a biodiversity net gain of 10.98% could be achieved. Given this and the scale of the site, it is considered that a net gain in biodiversity is achievable and therefore the details of how this will be achieved can be left to condition.
- 7.27 The Habitats Regulation Assessment report submitted with the previous application has also not been re-submitted, however it was considered, based on the findings of that report and the scale and nature of the development, plus the distance from the development site to nearby SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites, that the development would not have a negative impact on these sites either alone or in combination with other projects.

The impact of the development on flood risk

- 7.28 Paragraph 167 of the NPPF sets out that when determining any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere, and where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA). Policy EE13 of the Local Plan is consistent with this and sets out that the FRA should be proportionate to the scale of development and demonstrate that all forms of flood risk have been taken into account. Part of the site within the northwest corner is within flood zone 2, and as such an FRA has been submitted in support of the application which sets out proposed mitigation measures, including the raising of internal floor levels to reduce the risk from flooding for the future users of the site. It should also be noted that both of the new buildings are outside of flood zone 2 and as such it is considered in line with advice contained within the NPPF, that in this instance a pragmatic approach can be taken and the sequential test is not required as no new buildings are proposed within the flood plain, there

is no change in the vulnerability classification of the site (Annex 3 of the NPPF) and in flooding terms there would also be a betterment as set out in the following paragraph.. Furthermore, the new buildings and the employee dwelling would have a dry escape route via the north of the site.

- 7.29 In terms of risk to flooding elsewhere and to neighbouring properties, there is a reduction in the number of buildings within flood zone 2, and as such the development represents a betterment. The development will not therefore reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store water and will not therefore increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
- 7.30 As the site is over 1ha it is also necessary for a sustainable urban drainage strategy to be implemented. The strategy for dealing with surface water drainage has been set out in the FRA which includes a proposal to pump surface water, however the applicant has not demonstrated that the surface water will be managed and discharged in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, and no details have been submitted to establish whether infiltration or other more sustainable way of draining surface water are feasible. It is noted that the Environment Agency have advised against the infiltration of surface water drainage due to the risks this could pose to ground water and the spread of contaminants, however an updated drainage strategy which demonstrates that other more sustainable methods of drainage are not possible as well as provide maintenance details for the chosen drainage system will need to be submitted. This can be secured via condition.

Impact on archaeology

- 7.31 Policy EE7 of the Local Plan sets out that an archaeological assessment is required for proposals on sites which exceed 0.4ha. This is consistent with paragraph 194 of the NPPF which sets out that where a site includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developments to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. No such assessment has been undertaken or submitted with this application, however archaeological potential at the site will have been lost when the site was previously queried and used for landfill, and the proposal will not therefore have any impact on archaeological remains.

The impact on minerals

- 7.32 The application site forms part of a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA). Paragraph 211 of the NPPF sets out that great weight should be given to the benefit of mineral extraction and policies MC6 and MC7 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development sets out that where feasible, minerals should be worked before the development takes place. However, as the site makes up only a small section of the MSA and is alongside residential dwellings, and as the northern part of the site has previously been the subject of mineral extraction, the site is unlikely to form part of any future scheme to work minerals within the wider MSA. No objections are therefore raised to the development although it is recommended that the applicant undertake a mineral resource assessment to assess the viability of minerals being extracted prior to development. It is also considered necessary to impose a condition which secures the submission of a Waste Management Plan demonstrating that Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste generated by the development will be limited to the minimum quantity necessary in accordance with policy 4 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan and policy SD7 of the Runnymede Local Plan.

Energy and sustainability

- 7.33 An Energy Statement has been submitted in support of the application which sets out climate change mitigation measures to comply with the Council's Energy Hierarchy of:

- 1) Be lean; use less energy

- 2) Be clean; supply energy efficiently
- 3) Be green; use renewable energy

The measures proposed are predicted to result in energy savings of 13.48%. A condition is recommended which will ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with this statement.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

- 7.34 It has been demonstrated that in accordance with national policies the proposal results in inappropriate development which would also cause moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This harm needs to be afforded substantial weight in accordance with the NPPF. This development can therefore only be approved if there is a case of very special circumstances which would clearly overcome this identified harm. No other harm has been identified as a result of the proposal.
- 7.35 Officers have reviewed the case of very special circumstances put forward by the applicant and consider that the following weight can be attributed to the relevant material considerations.

Benefits	Weight afforded
<p>Employment – The application is supported by an economic statement which sets out that the proposal will contribute towards reducing the Council’s industrial floorspace deficit and will provide jobs for over 50 employees and 10 apprenticeships each year. Additionally, temporary jobs would be created during the construction and demolition works, and construction workers as well as future staff and visitors will have a positive impact through direct and indirect expenditure in the local economy.</p>	<p>Limited Weight – The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan sets out the Council will aim to encourage new businesses to the Borough. Policy IE3 sets out that the Council will encourage a range of types and sizes of new employment floorspace and will seek the retention/re-use of small warehousing units. Policy IE3 also supports small scale rural offices or other small-scale rural employment development through the conversion or redevelopment of existing buildings, however the policy is clear that this is on the provision they accord with the Council’s Green Belt policies.</p> <p>However, the Local Plan does not set out any specific shortfall in industrial floorspace to be met, and whilst jobs created and money brought into the economy from future staff and visitors would have an economic benefit, for a development of this size, the benefits would be fairly minor. It is also not clear whether alternative sites outside of the Green Belt have been considered, and if so why these were discounted. Finally, it is considered that the same economic benefits could be achieved by locating the development elsewhere.</p>
<p>Sustainability & Energy Efficiency – The</p>	<p>Limited weight – The Energy Statement</p>

<p>applicant states that the development activities onsite will produce solar panel clean-energy equipment for its own use and develop emerging products for market use which will deliver energy-saving benefits to the local economy and the wider construction industry generally. The Green Belt Statement mentions that a Sustainability Note (May 2022) explains how the proposed new facility will allow for research and development activities, including into a lightweight sectional steel structures using low carbon production methods and the integration of solar panels systems into their scaffolding.</p>	<p>sets out that solar panels could be installed on the main roof of each building and suggests that this in combination with a low energy demand heating system would achieve the 10% energy demand reduction for this site to be met. However, no additional information has been provided on the research and development activities that will be carried out other than a few lines within the Design & Access Statement and the Planning Statement. The Energy Statement sets out that in following the energy hierarchy a total energy saving of 13.48% will be achieved, which is a benefit of the scheme, however as this is a policy requirement only limited weight can be afforded.</p>
<p>Open Space and Recreation – The southern part of the site is to be remediated and landscaped for use by staff and the public. This application has not been supported by an open space management strategy as the previous application (RU.21/1167) was, however, a management and a maintenance regime for the open space could be secured via condition.</p>	<p>Limited weight – The NPPF sets out the importance to high quality open spaces in contributing to the health and well-being of communities, and as new open space is normally only a policy requirement for housing development, the creation of open space in this instance is an added benefit.</p> <p>However, there is no identified need for open space in this specific location and as such any benefit would not outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by development elsewhere on the site.</p>
<p>Biodiversity – The area to the south of the site is to be provided as an area of open greenspace. A preliminary ecological assessment has been submitted which concludes that the development, due to being predominantly over the existing buildings, hardstanding and bare ground, is unlikely to impact on reptiles, amphibians, badgers and hedgehogs and that further surveys are therefore not required. Further surveys are required in relation to Bats, however given the survey work previously undertaken it is considered that bats are likely to be absent from the site. No details relating to biodiversity net gain have been submitted, however it is considered that a biodiversity net gain is possible on site and these details can therefore be conditioned.</p>	<p>Limited weight – Providing net gains in biodiversity is a policy requirement, only limited weight can be afforded to this benefit.</p>
<p>Remediation and Restoration – The Green Belt statement sets out that the applicant is</p>	<p>Significant weight – The phase 1 geo-environmental assessment submitted with</p>

<p>committed to undertaking full ground conditions investigations and remediating the site where necessary.</p>	<p>the application identifies contamination on site, which poses a risk to existing and future residents as well as the ground water and surface water environment. The Environment Agency confirmed during the previous application (RU.21/1167) that it would be difficult to enforce the decontamination of the site outside of the planning process. Therefore, redevelopment through the planning regime offers the best chance of remedial works being undertaken.</p>
<p>Flood Risk – The Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that there will be a reduction of building footprint and hardstanding within flood zone 2.</p>	<p>Significant weight – Several of the existing buildings are within flood zone 2, the removal of which will provide a betterment in flood plain storage and reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere and to existing residents. The proposed buildings are located within flood zone 1.</p>

- 7.34 The significant benefits derived from the remediation and restoration of the site, which realistically can only be achieved through its redevelopment, along with the betterment in terms of flood risk, the economic benefits and the overall other environmental improvements listed above are considered when taken as a whole to constitute a case of very special circumstances which clearly outweighs the harm to the Green Belt.
- 7.35 The proposal therefore complies with paragraphs 147 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This is on the assumption that no harm is identified to biodiversity following the submission of the necessary bat surveys. Should further harm be identified following the submission of these surveys, then this would tip the balance in favour of refusing the application.

8. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS/COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 8.1 The office development is CIL liable and attracts a fee of £50 per sqm. No CIL forms have been submitted with the application. Form 1 (Additional Information) should be submitted with every application which is CIL liable. As such, should members be minded to approve the application this should be subject to the relevant forms being received first.

9. EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 Consideration has been given to Articles 1 and 8 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights. It is not considered that the decision would result in a violation of any person's rights under the Convention.

Consideration has been given to s149 of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended), which has imposes a public sector equality duty that requires a public authority in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to:

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited

by the Act

- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

It is considered that the decision would have regard to this duty.

10. CONCLUSIONS

- 10.1 The application proposes to redevelop the site for use as a company headquarters for a scaffolding and access provider. The site will be used for training, industry certification, and apprenticeship courses. It is proposed to demolish the majority of the existing buildings on site, with the remaining buildings retained for light industrial use apart from building 19 which will be retained as an independent dwelling. A new office and a training hall are also to be erected. The development represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt, however, subject to no additional harm being identified following the submission of an updated Preliminary Ecological Assessment and the necessary Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys, it is considered that very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm identified (No additional harm has been identified in this instance).
- 10.2 The development has been assessed against the following Development Plan policies – SD3, SD4, SD7, SD8, SL1, SL19, SL26, EE1, EE2, EE7, EE9, EE11, EE12, EE13, EE15, EE17, EE19 and IE3 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, the policies of the NPPF, guidance in the PPG, and other material considerations including third party representations. It has been concluded that the development would not result in any harm that would justify refusal in the public interest. The decision has been taken in compliance with the requirement of the NPPF to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

11. FORMAL OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

A) The HoP be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the necessary remediation and restoration of the site, necessary demolition including removal of hardstanding and the necessary environmental improvements which constitute the case of very special circumstances; and

The submission of an updated Preliminary Ecological Assessment report and Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys which confirm the likely absence of bats on site, and the submission of the relevant Community Infrastructure Levy forms, and the subject to the following planning conditions, and any additional necessary conditions following the submission of the additional Ecological Information.

1.	List of approved plans
	<p>The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwg. 487 (Rev F) – Site Arrangement: Showing Proposed New and Retained Buildings and Reused Hardstanding Context with Blue and Yellow reference Area • Dwg. 488 (Rev F) – Site Arrangement: Showing Proposed New and Retained Buildings and Reused Hardstanding • Dwg. 489 (Rev F) – Site Arrangement: Showing Whole Site layout • Dwg. 490 (Rev F) – Site Arrangement: Showing Proposed Operational Development • Dwg. 511 – Site Location: Showing Existing Use • Dwg. 512 – Site Arrangement: Block Plan as Existing Partial View • Dwg. 521 – Building K: Main Office: Floor Plans • Dwg. 522 – Building J: Training Building: Floor Plans • Dwg. 523 – Building K: Main Office: Elevations • Dwg. 524 – Building J: Training Building: Elevations • Dwg. 525 – Building H: Fabrication Workshop: Existing Building Reduced Footprint Refurbished Floor Plans and Elevations • Dwg. 526 – Building I: H&M Workshop: Existing Building Reduced Footprint Refurbished Floor Plan and Elevations <p>Reason: To ensure high quality design and to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance in the NPPF</p>
2.	External materials (details required)
	<p>Before the above ground construction of the development hereby permitted is commenced, details of the materials to be used in the external elevations shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and no variations in such materials when approved. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure high quality design and to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
3.	No Infiltration
	<p>No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. All drainage features should be such that drainage is sealed at base. Any proposals for such systems must be supported by an assessment of the risks to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p>

	Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution caused by mobilised contaminants in accordance with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4.	Piling
	<p>Piling using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the proposed development, does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
5.	Use of the dwelling
	<p>The existing/retained dwelling on site shall only be used by those connected to the commercial use of the site and not as an independent residential unit.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of the dwelling with regards to noise and to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
6.	Commercial Activity
	<p>There shall be no commercial activity or storage of materials and vehicles associated with the commercial use of the site outside of those areas indicated on drawing 490, Rev F (Site Arrangement: Showing Proposed Operation Management Activities Arrangement) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to ensure an acceptable form of development within the Green Belt. To comply with policies EE1, EE15, EE17 and EE19 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
7.	Energy Efficiency
	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be built in accordance with the approved Energy Statement prepared by Doherty Energy, dated 23rd November 2022 and thereafter retained, maintained and kept operational for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure sustainable design and to comply with Policies SD7 and SD8 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
8.	Levels
	<p>Prior to the above ground works of the development hereby permitted, details of the existing and proposed levels of the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In order to obtain a satisfactory form and scale of development in the</p>

	interests of the visual amenities of the area and the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policy EE1, EE17 and EE19 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.
9.	Timing of Improvements necessary to make the application acceptable (VSC)
	<p>Within 12 weeks of the date of this decision a timetable schedule shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing when the remediation and restoration works, environmental and highway improvements and demolition shall all be carried out and completed. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timetable.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the terms of the application and the case of Very Special Circumstances required to make the application acceptable in Green Belt terms. NPPF Paragraph 148.</p>
10.	Biodiversity
	<p>Prior to the above ground works of the development hereby permitted, measures to improve and enhance biodiversity at the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details as shall be approved shall be fully implemented prior to the first use or occupation of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To enhance the biodiversity of the site and to comply with Policies EE9, EE11 and EE12 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
11.	Landscaping
	<p>a. Prior to the above ground works of the development hereby permitted, details of both hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard and soft landscaping scheme shall include details of changes to levels, hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, minor structures, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out, details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development, and specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement trees and planting, including some semi-mature trees to replace those required to be removed, • Trees, planting and any change in levels proposed around the perimeter of the hardstanding/commercial area in order to restrict views of the development from the east and from the rest of the site. • A Management and Maintenance regime for the open space within the southern part of the site, and • Waste and recycling storage facilities <p>These works shall be carried out as approved prior to the first occupation of the development.</p>

	<p>b. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Arboricultural work to existing trees shall be carried out prior to the commencement of any other development; otherwise all remaining landscaping work and new planting shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance to the timetable agreed with the LPA. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of the commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the LPA, unless the LPA gives written consent to any variation.</p> <p>Reason: To preserve and enhance the character and appearance and biodiversity of the surrounding area and to comply with Policies EE1, EE9 and EE11 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
12.	Surface Water Drainage Scheme
	<p>Before the above ground construction of the development hereby permitted is commenced, details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority and implemented. 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 required drainage details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels. b) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 (+35% allowance for climate change) & 1 in 100 (+45% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate equivalent to the pre-development Greenfield run-off. c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.). Confirmation is required of a 1m unsaturated zone from the base of any proposed soakaway to the seasonal high groundwater level and confirmation of half-drain times. d) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk. e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system. f) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during

	<p>construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.</p> <p>Reason: 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.</p>
13.	Waste Management Plan
	<p>Before any demolition is commenced, a Waste Management Plan (WMP) demonstrating that construction, demolition & excavation (CD&E) waste arising from the development will be limited to the minimum quantity necessary and opportunities for re-use and recycling of CD&E waste and residues will be maximised, has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In order to minimise waste and to comply with Policy 4 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan, Policy SD7 of the Runnymede 2020 Local Plan, Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy for Waste.</p>
14.	Construction Transport Management Plan
	<p>Within 12 weeks of the date of this decision notice a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors b) loading and unloading of plant and materials c) storage of plant and materials d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management) e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones f) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway g) on-site turning for construction vehicles <p>has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.</p> <p>Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway user and to comply with policy SD4 of the Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
15.	Tree Protection
	<p>No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to the site, until an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval and subsequently approved in writing.</p> <p>The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved protection plan</p>

	<p>and method statement. The protective measures shall remain in place until all works are complete and all machinery and materials have finally left site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition, nor shall any fires be started, no tipping, refuelling, disposal of solvents or cement mixing carried out and ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation or vehicular access, other than that detailed within the approved plans, be made without the written consent of the LPA.</p> <p>There shall be no burning within six metres of the canopy of any retained tree(s). Where the approved protective measures and methods are not employed or are inadequately employed or any other requirements of this condition are not adhered to, remediation measures, to a specification agreed in writing by the LPA, shall take place prior to first occupation of the development, unless the LPA gives written consent to any variation.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the trees to be retained, enhance the appearance and biodiversity of the surrounding area and to comply with Policies EE1, EE9 and EE11 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.</p>
16.	Hurst Ditch Buffer
	<p>In accordance with the timetable agreed under condition 9 a scheme for the provision and management of an 8-metre wide buffer zone alongside the Hurst Ditch shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. Any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority, in which case the development shall be carried out in accordance with the amended scheme. The buffer zone scheme shall be free from built development including lighting and formal landscaping and not be used to store plant/equipment.</p> <p>The scheme shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone. These should clearly mark areas where incursion into the buffer zone already exists or is required temporarily (i.e. to facilitate the re-profiling works) • details of any proposed planting scheme (native species of UK genetic provenance only). • details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected during development. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The measures to be used to physically protect the buffer zone during construction, e.g. fencing ○ Any necessary pollution protection methods, particularly for dust, silt/sediment and other harmful substances such as oil that could pollute the watercourse. ○ Any necessary mitigation for protected/priority species ○ Information on the persons/bodies responsible for particular activities associated with the method statement that

	<p>demonstrate they are qualified for the activity they are undertaking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • details of how the buffer will be managed over the longer term including adequate financial provision and named body responsible for management plus production of detailed management plan. • details of any proposed footpaths, fencing, lighting, surface water outfalls, SuDS features, etc. The buffer zone shall be free from lighting and any fencing should allow for the safe passage of mammals (e.g. hedgehogs). SuDS features should be above ground where possible and designed/managed to provide biodiversity benefit. • measures to prevent the spread of and control the non-native invasive species. Please refer here for further guidance: http://www.nonnativespecies.org/checkcleandry/index.cfm <p>Reason: Land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. This condition is required as a pre-commencement condition to ensure the buffer zone is protected during the construction phase of the development and thereafter. This approach is supported by paragraphs 174 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which recognise that the planning system should conserve and enhance the environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort compensated for, planning permission should be refused. The condition is also required in order to comply with policies SD7 and EE12 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.</p>
17.	Contaminated Land
	<p>In accordance with the timetable agreed under condition 9 a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy will include the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A site investigation scheme, based on the Phase I desk study's preliminary risk assessment, to provide information for an updated detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site. As a former landfill site the scheme should cover groundwater and gas monitoring, and be extremely thorough in spatial and temporal monitoring. Observation boreholes should be installed according to technical guidelines, and must not bridge waste and aquifer units. 2. The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (1) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. 3. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (2) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term

	<p>monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.</p> <p>Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The remediation strategy should be carried out by a competent person in line with paragraph 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
18.	Verification report
	<p>In accordance with the timetable agreed under condition 9 a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
19.	Unexpected Contamination
	<p>If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
20.	Borehole Management
	<p>In accordance with the timetable agreed under condition 9 a scheme for managing any borehole installed for the investigation of soils, groundwater or geotechnical purposes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall provide details of how redundant boreholes are to be decommissioned and how any boreholes that need to be retained, post-development, for monitoring purposes will be secured, protected and inspected. The scheme as approved shall be implemented prior to the occupation of any part of the permitted development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that redundant boreholes are safe and secure, and do not cause groundwater pollution or loss of water supplies in line with paragraph</p>

	174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
21.	Verification Report
	<p>In accordance with the timetable agreed under condition 9 a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is designed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.</p>
22.	Visibility Zones
	<p>Prior to the demolition of any of existing building or hardstanding, or any works related to the remediation and restoration works agreed under condition 17 the modified vehicular access to Hurst Lane shall be constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 1000mm high.</p> <p>Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with policy SD4 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
23.	Parking
	<p>Prior to the occupation of the buildings hereby approved, space shall be laid out within the site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for vehicles and cycles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. All cycle parking shall be secure, covered and lit. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.</p> <p>Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with policy SD4 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
24.	Electric Vehicle Charging
	<p>Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, at least 20% of available parking spaces shall be provided and fitted with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) and another 20% of spaces shall be provided with the power supply to provide additional fast charge sockets and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.</p>

	Reason: To ensure sustainable design and to comply with Policy SD7 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance in the NPPF.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- B.** Or to refuse planning permission at the discretion of the Head of Planning should the s106 Agreement not progress to their satisfaction and/or should the necessary bat report and surveys not be submitted within 3 months of the date of the committee, or should the updated information find evidence of bats on site that cannot be overcome through the submission of suitable mitigation details.