Please note:
- All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the hearing statements (and any additional evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
- Most references to questions refer to those posed by the Inspector in the schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions.
- The discussion will focus on those questions highlighted in **bold**.
- The hearing will run until around 17:00, with breaks mid-morning, mid-afternoon and for lunch.

Inspector’s opening

Council’s opening statement

Matter 5: Allocations and ILAS (continued)
(Policies 10, 11a, 11b, 12)

**Issue: Whether the Industrial Land Areas of Search (ILAS) and the allocations are soundly based and provide sufficient flexibility to meet the identified needs of the area for the management of waste?**

*Site B(ii) – Land adjoining Leatherhead Sewage Treatment Works, Randalls Road, Leatherhead (Part 2 Allocation 5.3)*

96. The key development issues for the site, identified within Part 2 of the SWLP, include European sites (Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation), Sites of Special Scientific Interest, a site of nature conservation importance, a national nature reserve, and a local nature reserve. How have the impacts of the proposed allocation on these sites been assessed? Are the findings of this assessment clear and robust? Do they support the allocation of the site?

97. How has the proposed allocation considered the potential for cumulative impacts, including in relation to traffic movements and air quality,
associated with the proposed development of the waste management facility?

- **Is it considered reasonably likely that potential adverse cumulative impacts would be capable of being satisfactorily addressed?**

98. How have the potential transport impacts of the proposed allocation been assessed, including cumulative impacts of this proposal and other proposed development nearby? Would the development of the proposed allocation have a significant adverse impact on the safety and capacity of the local and strategic highway network? What improvements to the highway network would be required to support a medium-large sized facility?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification AM34 satisfactorily address this issue?**
- **Could the required transport mitigation works be delivered? Are they feasible and viable?**

99. Is the Council confident that the development of the site would be able to meet the requirements of Policy 14 of the SWLP, including in relation to potential impacts on the environment and local communities, such as those relating to noise, odour and dust? How has this been assessed?

- **Does the Council’s document Management of Impacts on Human Communities Arising from Waste Management (ED-01) satisfactorily demonstrate that issues such as noise, odour and dust would be reasonably likely to be addressed?**

100. A number of potential constraints have been identified for the proposed allocation in Part 2 of the SWLP. Is there a reasonable prospect that these constraints are capable of resolution?

- **Does the SWLP identify how the potential constraints may be overcome?**
- **Does the evidence base justify the allocation of the site?**

_Site B(iii) – Oakleaf Farm, Horton Lane, Stanwell Moor (Part 2 Allocation 5.4)_

101. Does the site description and indicative area shown in Part 2 accurately reflect the current extent and characteristics of the site, including the existing MRF building and the bund around the wider site? For clarity and effectiveness, should the description and indicative site area be amended to include these elements?

- **Would the Council’s proposed modification MM19 satisfactorily address this issue?**
- **To be effective, should the key development issues, identified in Part 2 of the SWLP, make specific reference to**
the requirement for waste operations to take place within the existing bund?

102. The key development issues for the site, identified within Part 2 of the SWLP, include European sites (Special Protection Area, Ramsar site, Special Area of Conservation), Sites of Special Scientific Interest, and two sites of nature conservation importance. How have the impacts of the proposed allocation on these sites been assessed? Are the findings of this assessment clear and robust? Do they support the allocation of the site?

- Do the findings of the Air Quality Impact Assessment (SWLP 15) justify the Council’s identification of the site as suitable for a full range of potential waste management facilities, particularly as regards the potential impact of certain types of facilities on the South West London Waterbodies SPA?
- Does the evidence base satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed site would be likely to be suitable for thermal treatment, in relation to the potential impacts of such development on all identified European, national and local sites of biodiversity importance?

103. How has the proposed allocation considered the potential for cumulative impacts, including in relation to traffic movements and air quality, associated with the proposed development of the waste management facility, together with other development nearby?

- What cumulative effect would the proposed allocation be likely to have on air quality, including in relation to the Air Quality Management Area, nearby sites of biodiversity importance and local communities?

104. How have the potential transport impacts of the proposed allocation been assessed, including cumulative impacts of this proposal and other proposed development nearby? Would the development of the proposed allocation have a significant adverse impact on the safety and capacity of the local and strategic highway network? What improvements to the highway network would be required to support a medium - large sized facility?

- Would the Council’s proposed modification MM19 satisfactorily address potential impacts on highway safety and capacity?

105. Is the Council confident that the development of the site would be able to meet the requirements of Policy 14 of the SWLP, including in relation to potential impacts on the environment, aerodrome safeguarding, and local communities, such as those relating to visual impact, public rights of way, noise, dust, and fumes? How has this been assessed?

- Does the Council’s document Management of Impacts on Human Communities Arising from Waste Management (ED-
01) satisfactorily demonstrate that issues such as noise, dust and fumes would be reasonably likely to be addressed?

106. A number of potential constraints have been identified for the proposed allocation in Part 2 of the SWLP. Is there a reasonable prospect that these constraints are capable of resolution?
   - **Does the SWLP identify how the potential constraints may be overcome?**
   - **Does the evidence base justify the allocation of the site?**

*Site C(i) – Land at Lambs Business Park, Terra Cotta Road, South Godstone (Part 2 Allocation 5.5)*

107. The key development issues for the site, identified within Part 2 of the SWLP, include a European site (Special Area of Conservation), a Site of Special Scientific Interest, two sites of nature conservation importance, areas of ancient woodland and the potential presence of protected species (Great Crested Newts). How have the impacts of the proposed allocation on these sites and protected species been assessed? Are the findings of this assessment clear and robust? Do they support the allocation of the site?
   - **Would proposed Policy 14 of the SWLP enable the effective mitigation of potential adverse impacts on habitats and species? Would the extent of mitigation likely to be required be feasible and viable?**

108. How has the proposed allocation considered the potential for cumulative impacts, including in relation to traffic movements and air quality, associated with the proposed development of the waste management facility, together with other development nearby?
   - **The Transport Study (SWLP 19), paragraphs 9.3.5-9.3.6, indicates that the site is suitable, on highway grounds, for larger facility types, but that the length of the preferred SRN route and the size of the proposed Garden Village nearby limit the recommended size of the facilities for the site to medium sized (50,000 to 120,000 tpa). Does this conclusion take into account the characteristics of the preferred SRN route and the potential mitigation required for the proposed Garden Village?**

109. How have the likely landscape and visual impacts of the potential development options of the proposed allocation been assessed, including in relation to the historic landscape? Are the findings of this assessment clear and robust? Do they support the allocation of the site?

110. How have the potential transport impacts of the proposed allocation been assessed, including cumulative impacts of this proposal and other
proposed development nearby? Would the development proposed have a significant adverse impact on the safety and capacity of the local and strategic highway network? What improvements to the highway network would be required to support a small, medium or large sized facility? Does the evidence demonstrate that the use of rail sidings to support the proposed development of the site is feasible and reasonably likely?

- **Would the identified mitigation of junction redesign for the A22 Eastbourne Road and Tilburstow Hill Road be required to support the delivery of a medium sized facility? If so, should this be included as a ‘key development issue’ within the SWLP Part 2?**

- **With highway mitigation, would the delivery of a large sized facility on the site be feasible without use of the rail network? If so, would the Council’s proposed modification MM20 be necessary?**

111. Is the Council confident that the development of the site would be able to meet the requirements of Policy 14 of the SWLP, including in relation to potential impacts on the environment and local communities, such as those relating to flood risk, public rights of way, contamination, water resources, noise, illumination, fumes and odour? How has this been assessed?

- **Does the Council’s document *Management of Impacts on Human Communities Arising from Waste Management* (ED-01) satisfactorily demonstrate that issues such as contamination, noise and vibration would be reasonably likely to be addressed?**

112. A number of potential constraints have been identified for the proposed allocation in Part 2 of the SWLP. Is there a reasonable prospect that these constraints are capable of resolution?

- **The detail provided in relation to aerodrome safeguarding is not as extensive for this proposed allocation as for others. For consistency, should a similar level of detail be included in relation to the identified key development issues?**

- **Could the site be designed to allow for the effects on foraging and commuting bats to be avoided?**

- **Could the transport mitigation works required be delivered? Are they feasible and viable?**

- **Does the SWLP identify how the potential constraints may be overcome?**

- **Does the evidence base justify the allocation of the site?**
Policy 12 – Wastewater Treatment Works

123. Policy 12 (ii) refers to the use of biogas as an energy source. The policy wording indicates the biogas will be recovered ‘as appropriate’. This is not referred to within the supporting text. Is the policy wording sufficiently precise? To be justified and effective, should the policy specify when such recovery would be expected?

- Would the Council’s proposed modification MM10 satisfactorily address this issue?