



**SURREY**

# **Surrey Waste Local Plan**

## **Post-Adoption Environmental Statement**

**Prepared under Regulation 16 of the Environmental  
Assessment of Plans & Programmes Regulations 2004  
(Statutory Instrument 2004 No.1633)**

**December 2020**

If you have any questions about this Post-Adoption Environmental Statement or wish to request a copy of any of the documents referred to within this Statement, please contact Surrey County Council:



Phone: 03456 009 009



Email: [wasteplan@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:wasteplan@surreycc.gov.uk)



Letter: Planning and Development Service,  
Room 385 County Hall, Penrhyn Road,  
Kingston upon Thames, KT1 2DW

# Contents

		Page
Section 1	Introduction & Legal Context	1
Section 2	How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan	2
Section 3	How the environmental report has been taken into account	5
Section 4	How consultation responses on the Plan & accompanying environmental report have been taken into account	6
Section 5	How consultations with other EU Member States on trans-boundary impacts have been taken into account	7
Section 6	Reasons for choosing the Plan as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives	7
Section 7	Measures to monitor the significant environmental effects of the plan	11

## Schedule of Key Abbreviations

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EiP	Examination in Public
ESR	Environmental & Sustainability Report
EU	European Union
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEWPAG	South East Waste Planning Advisory Group
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
WDA	Waste Disposal Authority
WLP	Waste Local Plan
WPA	Waste Planning Authority

# Surrey Waste Local Plan

## Post-Adoption Environmental Statement

### 1. Introduction & Legal Context

- 1.1 Regulation 16 (Information as to adoption of plan or programme) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans & Programmes Regulations 2004 (Statutory Instrument 2004 No.1633) (the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) Regulations) obliges responsible authorities (including local planning authorities) to prepare and publish a statement providing information about the way in which environmental considerations were taken into account in the decision making process ‘...as soon as reasonably practicable after the adoption of a plan or programme for which an environmental assessment has been carried out...’.
- 1.2 Paragraph 4 of Regulation 16 specifies six categories of information, that should be supplied (where relevant) in the post-adoption environmental statement for a plan or programme.
- An explanation of how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme (as required by Regulation 16, paragraph 4(a)).
  - An explanation of how the environmental report has been taken into account (as required by Regulation 16, paragraph 4(b)).
  - An explanation of how any opinions expressed in response to consultation on the plan documents and the accompanying environmental report (carried out under Regulation 13(2)(d) and Regulation 13(4) of the SEA Regulations) have been taken into account (as required by Regulation 16, paragraph 4(c)).
  - An explanation of how the results of any consultations with other EU Member States on trans-boundary impacts (entered into under Regulation 14(4) of the SEA Regulations) have been taken into account (as required by Regulation 16, paragraph 4(d)).
  - An account of the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with (as required by Regulation 16, paragraph 4(e)).
  - An explanation of the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme (as required by Regulation 16, paragraph 4(f)).
- 1.3 The post-adoption environmental statement for the adopted Surrey Waste Local Plan (the Surrey WLP or the Plan) is set out in this report.

## 2. How environmental considerations have been integrated into the Plan

2.1 The requirement set out in paragraph 4(a) of Regulation 16 of the SEA Regulations can be interpreted in two ways.

- As seeking information about the provisions made within the plan to protect the environment and communities from the risks of harmful effects arising from the implementation of the proposals set out in the plan; and/or
- As requiring that information is provided about the process by which environmental considerations were taken into account during the preparation of the plan.

### 2.A Provisions within the Plan for environmental & community protection

2.2 The Surrey WLP is fundamentally concerned with providing a policy framework that supports and enables the sustainable management of waste materials, in the interests of reducing demand for non-renewable natural resources and protecting the environment and communities from the adverse impacts of waste management and disposal. In addition to those policies primarily concerned with the use of land for waste management purposes, the strategic policy framework set out in the Surrey WLP includes a number of policies that take specific account of the need to safeguard the environment and protect communities from the potentially harmful effects of waste related development.

- **Policy 13 – Sustainable Design:** The policy makes provision for the incorporation of sustainable principles and practices into the design of new waste related development, covering energy supply and carbon emissions, biodiversity net gain, landscape and townscape enhancement, and the efficient management of water resources.
- **Policy 14 – Protecting Communities & the Environment:** The policy makes provision for the permitting of waste related development only where it can be demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable impacts on the environment and nearby communities.
- **Policy 15 – Transport & Connectivity:** The policy requires that the implications of transporting waste by road (where alternative modes are not feasible) be fully assessed before waste related development is permitted.
- **Policy 16 – Community Engagement:** The policy requires that developers take appropriate and proportionate steps to engage constructively with local communities at an early stage of the development process.

2.3 The policy framework set out in the Surrey WLP in combination with the arrangements made for the monitoring of the effects of implementation of the proposals set out in the Plan (see section 7 of this report for further information), provides for the protection of the environment and local communities from unacceptable impacts that may arise as a consequence of waste related development.

## 2.B Environmental & other evidence used to inform the preparation of the Plan

2.4 The development of the Surrey WLP has been informed by an extensive body of evidence and assessment, the former mainly focussing on the need for waste related development, and the latter on the likely implications of such development for a range of environmental and community receptors. The development of the Plan was a long-running and iterative process, with much of the supporting evidence gathering and assessment work being reviewed and updated as preparation of the Plan progressed.

2.5 The evolution of the policies in the Surrey WLP was informed by the information and evidence contained in a number of background reports. Those reports listed below document the evidence that was compiled on the likely future need for waste related development and the options for siting that development on land within the county.

- **Waste Needs Assessment**, dated April 2019 and prepared by the County Council’s Minerals & Waste Policy Team – the report provides a baseline estimate for waste arisings from a range of sources and forecasts future waste arisings in Surrey over the new Plan period. An earlier version of the report, dated October 2017, was published alongside the draft version of the Plan.
- **Site Identification & Evaluation Report**, dated April 2019 and prepared by the County Council’s Minerals & Waste Policy Team – the report provides an account of the site identification and evaluation process that informed the selection of the sites allocated under Policy 11a and assisted in the identification of the site allocated under Policy 11b of the Submission version of the Plan. An earlier version of the report, dated November 2017, was published alongside the draft version of the Plan.
- **Industrial Land Areas of Search Identification Report**, dated December 2018 and prepared by the County Council’s Minerals & Waste Policy Team – the report provides an account of the process by which the Industrial Land Areas of Search (ILAS) were chosen that are identified with reference to Policy 10 of the Submission version of the Plan.
- **Delivery of Waste Management Capacity in Surrey 2008 to 2017 Report**, dated October 2017 and prepared by the County Council’s Minerals & Waste Policy Team – the report provided a review of the extent to which the policies and spatial strategy of the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09) had been effective in delivering new waste management capacity.
- **Report on Delivering the Spatial Strategy**, dated April 2019 and prepared by the County Council’s Minerals & Waste Policy Team – the report provides an account of the approach that has been adopted in the new Surrey WLP to ensure that sufficient land will come forward over the Plan period to meet projected future need for waste management capacity.

- **Trumps Farm – Waste Local Plan WDA Supporting Information**, dated June 2019 and prepared by RPS Group Ltd for the County Council in its capacity as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) – the report provides evidence of the need for a dry mixed recycling facility to manage household waste, and evidence in support of the allocation of land at Trumps Farm near Longcross as the most appropriate site for such a facility.

2.6 The development of the strategy and policies set out in the Surrey WLP, and the process of identifying sites and other areas of land potentially suitable for waste related development was informed by a range of assessment work, which was documented in the reports listed below. The SEA/SA process drew on much of the work set out in the topic or issue specific assessments, where the information provided in those reports was relevant to the SEA/SA (see Appendix E to the revised Environmental & Sustainability Report dated January 2020).

- **Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report**, prepared by the County Council’s Natural Environment & Assessment Team, the original version dated January 2019 accompanied the Submission version of the Plan. An updated version dated January 2020 which incorporated the Statement of Common Ground agreed between Natural England and the County Council in August 2019 was published when consultation commenced on the proposed Main Modifications.
- **Air Quality Impact Assessment**, dated April 2018 and prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd – the reports covered the nine sites proposed for allocation under Policy 10 of the draft Surrey WLP.
- **Landscape & Visual Sensitivity Study of Potential Waste Sites**, dated May 2018 and prepared by Land Use Consultants – the reports covered the nine sites proposed for allocation under Policy 10 of the draft Surrey WLP.
- **Landscape & Visual Options Study: Lambs Business Park**, dated October 2018 and prepared by Land Use Consultants – the reports covered the nine sites proposed for allocation under Policy 10 of the draft Surrey WLP.
- **Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2)**, dated May 2018 and prepared by Peter Brett Associates – the reports covered the nine sites proposed for allocation under Policy 10 of the draft Surrey WLP.
- **Transport Study – Sites Assessments**, dated July 2018 and compiled by the County Council’s Transport Studies Team – the reports covered the nine sites proposed for allocation under Policy 10 of the draft Surrey WLP.
- **Background Ecological Data Searches**, dated July 2018 and compiled by the Surrey Biodiversity Information Centre – the reports covered the nine sites proposed for allocation under Policy 10 of the draft Surrey WLP.

### **3. How the environmental report has been taken into account**

- 3.1 The requirement as set out in paragraph 4(b) of Regulation 16 can be interpreted as being concerned with documenting any changes that have been made to the plan as a consequence of the findings of, and any recommendations made within, the environmental report.
- 3.2 The way in which the SEA/SA process, as documented in the environmental and sustainability reports (ESR) prepared over the course of the development of the Surrey WLP, has fed into the preparation of the Plan is briefly reviewed below. It should be noted that the purpose of the SEA/SA process is to inform the plan making process, not to determine which policies and proposals are ultimately included in the plan. However, the SEA/SA process does have a role in documenting the decision making process that led to the final version of the plan.
- 3.3 The draft version of the Plan which was subject to consultation between November 2017 and February 2018 had been subject to SEA/SA during its preparation. The outcomes of the assessment of the draft Plan were reported in the Environmental & Sustainability Report (Preliminary Draft) (dated December 2017) and its supporting appendices. The recommendations made in respect of the proposed policies, set out in Appendix B to the preliminary draft ESR, were taken into account in the redrafting work that led to the production of the Submission version of the Plan, helping to improve the clarity and precision of the proposed policies and to address weaknesses that could have restricted the Plan's ability to address the potentially harmful effects of waste related development.
- 3.4 The Submission version of the Plan was subject to further assessment as part of the SEA/SA process, as were the proposed Main Modifications that are required to render the Plan sufficiently sound in planning terms for it to proceed to adoption. At the Submission stage no major changes to the proposed policies were recommended through the SEA/SA process, and the alterations to policy made by the Main Modifications also do not alter the intent of the policies to an extent that would change the conclusions of the earlier assessment with reference to the likely effects of their implementation on the environment.
- 3.5 In summary the SEA/SA process has contributed to the evolution of the approach set out by the policies in the new Surrey WLP by providing a structured critique that has enabled the identification of potential inconsistencies within and between the different aspects of the policy framework. By highlighting those issues the SEA/SA process has enabled those responsible for the preparation of the Plan to make appropriate changes to policy wording and the supporting text to address potential weaknesses and conflicts within the Plan.

## 4. How consultation responses on the Plan & accompanying environmental report have been taken into account

4.1 The requirement set out in paragraph 4(c) of Regulation 16 is concerned with demonstrating how the decision making process has taken account of consultees opinions on the plan documents and the accompanying environmental report.

4.2 An extensive programme of consultation supported the preparation of the new Surrey WLP, commencing at the initial issues and options stage in 2016 and culminating in the Examination in Public (EiP) in 2019. Throughout the preparation of the Plan the county council has sought to address issues raised through the consultation exercises, and to reflect those concerns in the wording of policies and, so far as is practicable, in the identification of sites and areas of land for future development. Changes to the Plan and the supporting evidence base to take account of issues and concerns raised by consultees have been made up to, during and following the Examination in Public. The Main Modifications to the policies and supporting text of the submission version of the Plan proposed by the Council to address issues and concerns raised through the consultation process have been endorsed, and where appropriate amended, by the Inspector following further consultation. The adoption version of the Plan will incorporate all of the Main Modifications listed in the Annex to the Inspectors Report (dated 11 May 2020). The Inspector concluded in their formal report that subject to implementation of the recommended Main Modifications the Plan met the criteria for soundness.

4.3 A full account of the consultation that has informed the preparation of the Plan can be found in the documents listed below.

- Consultation on a series of Issues & Options stage reports was undertaken between September 2016 and November 2016. The accompanying SEA/SA Scoping Report was published for consultation in October 2016. The outcomes of the Issues & Options consultation and the actions that the County Council proposed to take in response to the issues raised are recorded in the *Issues & Options Summary of Responses Report*, dated December 2016.
- Consultation on a draft version of the Surrey WLP and its accompanying Environmental & Sustainability Report (Preliminary Draft) (dated December 2017) was undertaken between 1 November 2017 and 7 February 2018. The outcomes of that consultation and the actions that the County Council proposed to take in response to the issues raised are recorded in the *Draft Plan Consultation Summary Report*, dated November 2018.
- Consultation on the Submission version of the Surrey WLP and its accompanying Environmental & Sustainability Report (dated December 2018) was undertaken between 14 January 2019 and 10 March 2019. The outcomes of that consultation were passed on to the appointed Inspector for consideration alongside the submitted Plan. A summary of the consultation responses is recorded in the *Summary of Public Representations on the Submission Surrey Waste Local Plan, 14 January 2019 to 10 March 2019*, dated April 2019.

- The public hearing phase of the Examination in Public of the Submission version of the Surrey WLP was undertaken between 17 September 2019 and 26 September 2019. The hearings were directed by the appointed Inspector and Hearing Statements were submitted by the main participants on each matter.
- Consultation on the Main Modifications proposed to the Submission version of the Surrey WLP and the accompanying revised Environmental & Sustainability Report (dated January 2020) were undertaken between 13 January 2020 and 23 February 2020. A summary of the representations received to that consultation and the County Council's responses are documented in the report 'Consultation on Proposed Modifications, Updated Environmental and Sustainability Report and Proposed Changes to Policies Maps: Summary of representations and county council responses', dated May 2020. Those representations were passed on to the appointed Inspector, who took the views submitted and the Council's responses into account in the preparation of their formal report on the soundness of the Plan.

## **5. How consultations with other EU Member States on trans-boundary impacts have been taken into account**

- 5.1 The requirement set out in paragraph 4(d) of Regulation 16, to provide an explanation of how the results of any consultations entered into with other EU Member States on trans-boundary impacts have been taken into account in the Plan is not relevant to the post-adoption environmental statement for the Surrey Waste Local Plan.
- 5.2 The geography of Surrey, which is a land-locked county in the south east of England, combined with the nature of the activities proposed in the Surrey WLP (the impacts of which would be local in nature and would not extend beyond the borders of England), meant that consultation with other EU Member States was not necessary during the preparation of the Plan.

## **6. Reasons for choosing the Plan as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives**

- 6.1 The requirement set out in paragraph 4(e) in Regulation 16, is concerned with providing a summary of the reasons why the adopted Plan was chosen, when compared with the other reasonable alternatives considered during its development. A detailed account of the different alternatives considered for each component of the Plan, and the reasons for selecting the options and approaches progressed in the submitted version of the Plan is provided in Chapter 2 of the revised Environmental & Sustainability Report (ESR) (dated January 2020).

- 6.2 **Strategy** – The overarching strategy for the Plan is to make provision for net self-sufficiency in the county with reference to waste management capacity. The SEA/SA (Appendix A to the ESR dated January 2020) considered two alternatives to the preferred option of net self-sufficiency (see section 2.B.1 of Chapter 2 of the ESR for further details and discussion). The preferred approach was chosen on the basis of it being the option likely to give rise to the least significant impacts on the environment and communities, and on grounds of consistency with Article 16 of the Waste Framework Directive (self-sufficiency), paragraph 3 of the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW), and the approach agreed by Waste Planning Authorities across the south east of England in the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) Memorandum of Understanding.
- 6.3 **Vision** – The overarching direction for the Plan, in terms of the preferred strategy option of net-self-sufficiency, is articulated in the vision statement. The vision for the Surrey WLP was defined and refined during the earliest stages of Plan development. The vision statement was not subject to assessment, as it is too broad to enable meaningful assessment. No alternatives were considered as the direction of travel was defined by the agreed strategy.
- 6.4 **Strategic Objectives** – The vision for the Plan is expanded on and given further definition through a suite of strategic objectives. The SEA/SA (see section 2.B.2 of Chapter 2 of the ESR dated January 2020 for further details and discussion and Appendix A to the ESR dated January 2020 for a full account) considered the two different versions of the strategic objectives proposed at the Draft and Submission stages of Plan development. The later version of the objectives, which were incorporated into the submission version of the Plan, was favoured over the earlier version on grounds of greater clarity and precision.
- 6.5 **Spatial Strategy** – The spatial strategy for the Plan provides guidance as to the locations in which waste related development could be appropriately located. The SEA/SA (see section 2.B.3 of Chapter 2 of the ESR for further details and discussion Appendix A to the ESR for a full account) considered the proposed spatial strategy, an earlier version and three alternative approaches to the distribution of waste related development across the county. The submission version of the spatial strategy was preferred over the earlier version on grounds of its better clarity and precision. The three alternatives were rejected on grounds of the lack of available suitable land outside the Green Belt, on grounds of a lack of suitable land and limited need for waste facilities to be distributed across all parts of the county, and on grounds of the areas in which existing facilities are located not necessarily being the most suitable locations for future waste related development.
- 6.6 **Policies** – The submission version of the Plan includes 17 separate policies (Policy 11 is split into part (a) and part (b)) that provide a framework within which decisions can be made in respect of specific proposals for waste related development. The SEA/SA (see section 2.B.4 of Chapter 2 of the ESR for further details and discussion, and Appendix B to the ESR for a full account) considered the proposed policies, earlier versions of those policies, and the equivalent or relevant extant policies of the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09), the latter two categories constituting the ‘reasonable alternatives’ to the proposed policies.

Amendments to 11 of the policies were identified in the Main Modifications to the Plan and were reviewed to ascertain the need for further assessment (see Appendix F to the ESR).

- 6.7 The majority of the policies proposed in the new Surrey WLP do not represent a major change in approach from the equivalent policies of the adopted Surrey Waste Plan (2008/09). For those policies the main reasons for selecting the versions of the policies found in the adoption version of the new Surrey WLP were concerned with consistency with national and higher level policy and current understanding of likely future demand for waste related development. For those few policies in the new Surrey WLP where the approach has been changed from that of the previous plan the main reasons for those changes were concerned with improving flexibility (i.e. new Policy 2, new Policy 10, and new Policy 11a), reducing uncertainty (i.e. new Policy 3, new Policy 10, new Policy 11b) and ensuring that appropriate weight is given to matters of concern for local communities (i.e. new Policy 15 and new Policy 16).
- 6.8 **Sites for Allocation** – Six sites are allocated for future waste related development under Policy 11a (five sites) and Policy 11b (one site) of the Plan. Those allocated under Policy 11a would accommodate large scale waste facilities, with the capacity to handle more than a single waste stream. The single site allocated under Policy 11b (land at Trumps Farm near Longcross) would host a household waste dry recycling facility with a capacity of up to 120,000 tonnes per year.
- 6.9 The allocated sites were identified through the site selection process, which started with a long list of some 200 sites (see the *Site Identification & Evaluation Report*, November 2017 and April 2019 for details). The long list of potential candidate sites was reduced through a structured sieving exercise, which systematically applied six separate sieves (covering scale, established industrial land use, established sewage treatment works use, established community recycling centre use, established or proposed minerals use, and established or proposed commercial or residential use) to the identified sites. The results of the preliminary site sieving exercise are recorded in Appendix 1 to the *Site Identification & Evaluation Report* (November 2017 and April 2019). Some 54 candidate sites remained at the end of the sieving process and were subject to further detailed assessment through the site selection process and through the complementary SEA/SA process.
- 6.10 The main reasons given by the Plan making team for the rejection of 45 of the 54 candidate sites that had been identified through the preliminary site identification sieving process from inclusion in the Surrey WLP are recorded in the *Site Identification & Evaluation Report* (April 2019, and earlier version dated 2017), and summarised in Table 2-5 in Chapter 2 of the revised ESR (January 2020). The rejected sites were discounted for a variety of reasons, including poor accessibility, proximity to sensitive community or environmental receptors, lack of landowner interest in waste development, and sterilisation (i.e. land already occupied by other forms of development).
- 6.11 Nines sites were identified for allocation under Policy 10 (subsequently renumbered as Policy 11a) as strategic waste sites in the draft version of the Plan (see Table 2-6 in the Chapter 2 of

the revised ESR, January 2020), of which four were subsequently removed from that list, principally on the grounds of their being greenfield or undeveloped sites situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt (see Table 2-7 in Chapter 2 of the revised ESR, January 2020). The five sites ultimately allocated under Policy 11a of the new Plan were selected for a variety of reasons, including their proximity to sources of waste arisings and their accessibility (see Table 2-8 in Chapter 2 of the revised ESR, January 2020).

- 6.12 The need for a dedicated dry mixed recycling facility for household waste to be located in an area that would service the north west of the county was identified relatively late in the Plan preparation process. The 45 sites rejected prior to the publication of the draft version of the Surrey WLP were not revisited as part of the site identification process for Policy 11(b), as the reasons that rendered them unsuitable for allocation as strategic sites would also preclude their development as household waste materials recycling facilities. Consideration was given to the five sites allocated under Policy 11a, all of which were rejected on grounds of location (i.e. being outside the catchment area specified by the Waste Disposal Authority), suitability or cost (see paragraph 2.43, pp.66-67 in Chapter 2 of the revised ESR, January 2020). Consideration was also given to the four sites previously rejected for allocation under Policy 11a on greenfield and Green Belt grounds. Of those four sites only the land at Trumps Farm near Longcross was considered to be a viable option for the development of the required dry mixed recycling facility for household waste. The reasons for selecting that site were its location within the county, its access to the strategic road network, its proximity to other waste related development, and the fact that the land is owned by the County Council which provides certainty in terms of availability and deliverability (see paragraph 2.44, pp.67-68 in Chapter 2 of the revised ESR, January 2020).
- 6.13 **Areas of Search** – The new Plan identifies 22 areas of search situated within existing or proposed industrial land that are classed as suitable locations for some form of waste related development. Those areas of land were identified through discussion with the district and borough councils, and were drawn from a long list of 110 sites identified as existing and future employment sites (B2 and B8 use classes) by the local planning authorities as part of their Local Plan processes (see the *Industrial Land Areas of Search Identification Report*, December 2018). The process of shortlisting the ILAS for inclusion in the Plan involved the exclusion of all industrial sites of less than 5 hectares in size, of land occupied by high value uses (typically B1 class uses), of land subject to a single established long-term use, and land with dwellings in very close proximity. An exception to those decision making rules was made for those industrial areas already known to host waste uses.
- 6.14 Paragraphs 27 and 28, and paragraph 30 (p.8) of the Inspectors Report on the Examination of the Surrey WLP considered the extent to which alternatives had been considered and assessed over the course of the development of the Plan. The Inspector concluded that the preparation of the Plan had included the consideration of reasonable alternatives, that the reasons for the selection of alternatives were set out clearly in the ESR, and that the approach proposed by the Plan was justified.

## **7. Measures to monitor the significant environmental effects of the Plan**

- 7.1 The requirement set out in paragraph 4(f) in Regulation 16, is concerned with the provision of a description and explanation of the measures by which the significant environmental effects of the plan would be monitored.
- 7.2 The Surrey WLP includes a monitoring framework, which identifies the indicators that will be used to track and report on the performance of the Plan in terms of the delivery of waste management capacity and the avoidance or mitigation of unacceptable effects of on the environment and communities.
- 7.3 The implications for the environment and communities of the development of the sites allocated or land otherwise identified in the Surrey WLP, as well as of any other sites brought forward for waste related development under the other policies of the Plan, will be subject to further detailed investigation and assessment at the planning application stage. For each allocated site and identified ILAS key information about the environmental and community sensitivity of the land in question is set out in Part 2 of the Plan, and prospective applicants are also directed to refer to the background information for each site contained in the revised ESR (January 2020), the HRA Report and other supporting technical assessments.
- 7.4 The environmental impact assessment (EIA) regime and the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) with respect to the safeguarding of sites of European or international nature conservation importance provide for detailed scrutiny of the likely significant environmental effects of waste related development prior to the determination of applications for planning permission. Additional guidance on the information that would need to be provided in support of applications for waste related development with reference to impacts on the environment and communities is set out in the County Council's local validation checklist for waste development. That guidance is reviewed and updated every 2 years and all applicants are expected to take account of the contents of that guidance when submitting applications.
- 7.5 Progress with the implementation of the Plan will be reported on an annual basis in the County Council's Annual Monitoring Report. That monitoring will report on the extent to which the policies set out in the Plan are being successfully implemented or otherwise applied, including those policies (see section 2.A of this report) that are concerned with the addressing the likely effects of waste related development on communities and the environment. A summary of the monitoring framework for Policies 13, 15 and 16 of the new Surrey WLP can be found in Table 7-A of this statement. A summary of the monitoring framework for Policy 14 of the new Surrey WLP can be found in Table 7-B of this statement.

**Table 7-A: Monitoring Framework for Policies 13, 15 and 16 of the Surrey WLP**

Measure/Indicator	Data Source(s)	Key Organisation(s)	Target(s)	Trigger(s)
<b>Policy 13: Sustainable Design</b>				
Number of planning applications which are permitted for new or enhanced waste management facilities is contrary to Policy 13	Planning Applications & Decisions. Appeal Decisions.	Waste Planning Authority. Waste Industry.	No planning applications permitted where design of new or enhanced waste management facilities is contrary to Policy 13.	Significant number of planning applications permitted where facilities are considered to be poorly designed.
<b>Policy 15: Transport &amp; Connectivity</b>				
New or existing waste sites in relation to waste sources. Average waste miles.	Surrey County Council Development Management. Surrey County Council Transport Development Planning.	Surrey County Council.	100% of proposals include assessment of ability to transport waste via sustainable modes. Main waste sources well connected to facilities.	Significant source(s) of waste is/are not well connected to waste development.
<b>Policy 16: Community Engagement</b>				
Number of relevant applications which are supported by a Statement of Community Involvement produced by the applicant.	Planning Applications and Decisions. Appeal Decisions.	Waste Planning Authority. Waste Industry.	100% of relevant applications which are supported by a Statement of Community Involvement produced by the applicant.	Low numbers of relevant applications are supported by a Statement of Community Involvement produced by the applicant.

**Table 7-B: Monitoring Framework for Policy 14 of the Surrey WLP**

Indicator	Target/Trigger	Actions	Relevant P14 Clauses
<b>Policy 14 Part A: Key Environmental Assets (e.g. AONB, Ramsar Site, SPA, SAC, SSSI, NNR, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Registered Park &amp; Garden)</b>			
14A.1 All applications for waste related development determined during the monitoring year where the proposal has the potential to affect one or more of the categories of sensitive environmental assets referred to in Part A of Policy 14	Trigger: Any applications refused during the monitoring year, where the reasons for refusal include unacceptable impacts on one or more of the categories of sensitive environmental assets referred to in Part A of Policy 14	Review reasons for refusal to establish what measures could be taken to reduce the incidence of refusals on grounds of unacceptable impacts. Establish what corrective action needs to be taken (e.g. does the Council need to provide further guidance to applicants).	Part A (i) National Landscapes; Part A (ii) Supranational / National Natural Assets; Part A (iii) National Heritage Assets
14A.2 All applications for waste related development determined during the monitoring year where the proposal has the potential to affect one or more of the categories of sensitive environmental assets referred to in Part A of Policy 14	Trigger: Any applications granted permission during the monitoring year, with conditions attached in respect of the protection of the categories of sensitive environmental assets referred to in Part A of Policy 14  Target: 100% applications granted permission include conditions to manage identified impacts	If target not met, review permissions granted to establish why relevant conditions were not attached at the point of determination, and whether the Councils approach needs to be amended.	

Indicator	Target/Trigger	Actions	Relevant P14 Clauses
<b>Policy 14 Part B: Impacts on the Wider Environment</b>			
14B.1 All applications for waste related development determined during the monitoring year where the proposal would give rise to impacts on one or more of the environmental receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	Trigger: Any applications refused during the monitoring year, for which the reasons for refusal make reference to unacceptable impacts on one or more of the categories of environmental receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	Review reasons for refusal to establish what measures could be taken to reduce the incidence of refusals on grounds of impacts. Establish what corrective action needs to be taken (e.g. does the Council need to provide further guidance to applicants).	Part B (iii) Air Quality; (iv) Water Environment; (v) Landscape; (vi) Natural Environment; (vii) Historic Environment; (viii) Land & Soil Resources
14B.2 All applications for waste related development determined during the monitoring year where the proposal would give rise to impacts on one or more of the community receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	Trigger: Any application granted permission during the monitoring year. Target: 100% applications granted permission include conditions to manage the identified impacts on one or more of the categories of environmental receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	If target not met, review permissions granted to establish why relevant conditions were not attached at the point of determination, and whether the Councils approach needs to be amended.	
<b>Policy 14 Part B: Impacts on Local Communities</b>			
14B.3 All applications for waste related development determined during the monitoring year where the proposal would give rise to impacts on one or more of the community receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	Trigger: Any applications refused for which the reasons for refusal make reference to unacceptable impacts on one or more of the categories of community receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	Review reasons for refusal to establish what measures could be taken to reduce the incidence of refusals on grounds of impacts on one or more of the categories of community receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14. Establish what corrective action needs to be taken (e.g. does the Council need to provide further guidance to applicants).	Part B (i) Public Amenity & Safety; (ii) Aerodrome & Airport Safeguarding
14B.4 All applications for waste related development determined during the monitoring year where the proposal would give rise to impacts on one or more of the community receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	Trigger: Any application granted permission during the monitoring year. Target: 100% applications granted permission include conditions to manage the identified impacts on one or more of the categories of community receptors referred to in Part B of Policy 14	If target not met, review permissions granted to establish why relevant conditions were not attached at the point of determination, and whether the Councils approach needs to be amended.	





