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0.0 **Introduction**

0.1 This statement has been prepared by DPDS Consulting Group (DPDS) on behalf of SMECH Management Company Ltd. It sets out the response to the questions included in Matter 3 of the Hearings Programme. This matter is in relation to the Legal Requirements, the Duty-to Co-operate and the Plan Period.

0.2 DPDS has acted on behalf of SMECH Management Company Ltd since February 2013. DPDS has engaged in the Waste Local Plan since the Regulation 18 Consultation which took place in February 2018. DPDS has also made various representations in respect of both the Runnymede Core Strategy, and more recently, the Runnymede 2030 Draft Local Plan which is also currently undergoing examination.

0.3 Our previous representations have demonstrated that the plan does not comply with the requirements identified at section 20(5)(a) and (c) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and that it is not sound.

0.4 This statement should be read in conjunction with previous representations made to the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033. Hearing Statements have also been submitted on behalf of SMECH Management Company Ltd for Matters 1-2 and 4-8 of the Local Plan Examination.

0.5 DPDS welcome the invitation to appear at the Hearing Sessions to expand on the comments included in this statement and confirm that representatives from DPDS and associated consultants our company have worked with will be attending the Hearing Sessions.

0.6 The Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033 was submitted on the 12th April 2019 and is therefore subject to policies under the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) adopted in February 2019.
1.0 Response to Matter 3

Q48. To be effective, positively prepared and for clarity, is it necessary for Policy 2 to clearly identify the proposed specific allocation under Policy 11b for a household waste MRF, to process dry mixed recyclable (DMR) wastes?

1.1 Policy 2 outlines the importance of Recycling and Recovery facilities, it is considered that this Policy applies to: “any development associated with a CRC, including ancillary development, that promotes sustainable waste management or improves the effectiveness and efficiency with which the site operates.” The allocation of the Land adjacent to Trumps Farm fits into this bracket and is also the only allocated waste site which is being promoted for a specified use.

1.2 As is outlined in the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Report (December 2018): “The majority of the allocated sites would be expected to accommodate large scale waste facilities, with the capacity to handle more than a single waste stream, with the exception of the site located to the north of the Trumps Farm landfill near Longcross, which it is proposed could host a household waste dry recycling facility with a capacity of around 50,000 tonnes per year.” Given that Trumps Farm is the only specific use the site should be specifically referenced in this Policy as any development on the site of a DMR facility must comply with Policy 2.

1.3 Further to this, the supporting text clarifies that: “the county council is supportive of recycling and recovery operations where it can be demonstrated that facilities will not have adverse effects on amenity, communities or the environment.” It is anticipated that the allocation at Trumps Farm will have adverse effects on amenity, communities and the environment given the numerous constraints on the site, which we have outlined in other representations and our responses to other matters. Therefore, whilst it is believed that the specific allocation under Policy 11b should be referred to in Policy 2, we are also of the belief that the allocation will not be in compliance with Policy 2 given the likely impact of developing the site on the surrounding communities and environment.

1.4 DPDS overall believe the policy should be changed to specifically refer to the allocation under Policy 11b given that it is the only site specific allocation to ensure the plan is ‘positively prepared.’ However, DPDS do not believe the allocation under Policy 11b meets the requirements of Policy 2 as well as other policies within the plan and should therefore be removed from the plan on this basis.

Q57. In Policy 7, is the phrase ‘in proximity to’ sufficiently precise? How is proximity defined? Is this clearly set out within the SWLP? Is the wording of the second part of the policy sufficiently clear, that it will only be necessary for the proposal to meet one of the specified criteria?

1.5 It is considered that the wording of Policy 7 fails to provide an appropriate level of clarity as to what is meant by the phrase ‘in proximity to.’ No further indications as to what is meant by this phrase are made in the supporting text nor are any similar definitions explained in National Policy which the SWLP should be consistent with. It is believed that clarity should be provided as to what is meant by this phrase.
1.6 As we have made clear in our previous presentations and other Hearing Statements, the allocation of Land adjacent to Trumps Farm is located in extremely close proximity to Local Plan allocations in the emerging Runnymede Local Plan 2030 at Longcross Garden Village and Virginia Water South. These allocations are also anticipated to exacerbate the existing highways issues on the nearby A320 Corridor and Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is anticipated that the operation of the Land adjacent to Trumps Farm would almost certainly be impacted by the development of Longcross Garden Village and other surrounding allocations. The Runnymede Local Plan Examination is currently suspended pending further information regarding highways mitigation. Should Longcross Garden Village come forward it is clear that this will have an impact on the operations of any future waste facility at Trumps Farm.

1.7 Given that there is no definition or explanation as to what is meant by the phrase *in proximity to* it is unclear whether Policy 11b and the allocation of Trumps Farm will be compliant with Policy 7. Given the distance from the site at Trumps Farm to major housing allocations such as Longcross Garden Village, it is believed by DPDS that the operations of housing sites could prejudice future operations of the waste site at Trumps Farm, particularly with regards to highways impacts.

1.8 DPDS therefore believe that Policy 7 is not ‘justified’ as there is no clarity as to what is meant by the phrase *in proximity to* nor is it explained how the safeguarding of sites will relate to sites allocated in adopted/emerging local plans which might be *in proximity to* allocated waste sites. This is particularly relevant to those which could have implications on the operations of waste sites.

Q58. Given the spatial strategy, Policies 1 and 2, and the hierarchy of preference for the location of new waste management proposals, is the safeguarding of existing, permitted and allocated sites justified?

1.9 The SWLP allocates six sites for potential waste development in the plan, of these sites, a number are located within the Green Belt, and have not been removed by the relevant LPA despite their allocation in the SWLP. The fact some of these allocated sites are located in the Green Belt automatically moves them down the Waste Hierarchy as *Sites and Areas outside the Green Belt* are preferred to those within the Green Belt, shown in Figure 5. Sites such as the Land adjacent to Trumps Farm are therefore considered to be further down the waste hierarchy than sites not allocated in the plan located outside the Green Belt. This therefore means sites which are safeguarded are preferred to sites which are not, but are located outside the Green Belt.

1.10 The waste hierarchy in conjunction with Policies 1 and 2 and other policies within the plan defines the criteria for waste sites and makes it clear that sites located outside the Green Belt will always be preferred. It is therefore believed it is not justified to safeguard waste sites, particularly those which are not at the top of the waste hierarchy.

1.11 Further to our belief that the site safeguarding is not justified, we are also under the impression that it will not be effective. As we have mentioned in our previous response we are concerned that the WPA has not fully considered the proposed housing allocations in the Runnymede Local Plan and how these will impact on the deliverability of the site at Trumps Farm, taking into account the requirements of policy 7.
1.12 Although we have objected, on behalf of our client, to the proposed housing allocation at Longcross Garden Village in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, there is a risk that if the Local Plan is found sound and subsequently adopted that the Longcross Garden Village site could jeopardise the deliverability of the proposed allocation at Land adjacent to Trumps Farm. It therefore begs the question of whether the Trumps Farm allocation will indeed be safeguarded in conjunction with Paragraph 5.2.7.5 which notes that:

“Existing waste operations should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of new development in proximity that may be sensitive to their operation that could be deemed a statutory nuisance (e.g. noise). Applicants seeking permission for new and potentially sensitive non-waste development (‘agents of change’) in proximity to waste sites will be required to demonstrate that their proposed development will not prejudice the waste operation, including through incorporating measures into the design and orientation of buildings and other structures, to mitigate potential effects and sensitivity.”

1.13 It is plausible that the potential housing allocation at Longcross Garden Village (as allocated in the Submission Runnymede 2030 Local Plan) depending on its proposed phasing and delivery could be impacted by the potential allocation of Land adjacent to Trumps Farm. It is believed that this has not been fully considered by SCC. As we have also highlighted in this Hearing Statement, the development of Longcross Garden Village could also hamper the operation of any future waste development at Trumps Farm.

1.14 Paragraph 5.2.7.4 notes: “the presumption is that existing and planned waste development should be safeguarded. This includes from proximate development that may adversely affect the operation of the site.” Although the impact of the Longcross Garden Village on the operations of any future waste site is Trumps Farm is at present unknown, due to the ongoing Local Plan Examination at Runnymede. However, it is anticipated that the effect on the SRN and the surrounding roads will be significant. Thus, having an adverse effect on the operations of Trumps Farm, the impacts the development of Trumps Farm might have on the possible future development of Trumps Farm should also be noted.

1.15 Given this, DPDS believe that the safeguarding of waste sites on top of all the other protection measures proposed is not “justified”. Furthermore, if we consider the nature of the proposals at Longcross and other surrounding sites, it is highly likely that this policy will not be ‘effective’ as development in the surrounding area of Trumps Farm is likely to have an adverse effect on the operations of the site. It is therefore considered that the safeguarding of sites should not be included in the plan for the reasons given above. Overall, enough measures are in place that it is considered unnecessary to include the safeguarding of waste sites within the plan.