

ITEM 5.1

Application: 2021/186

Location: Land At Rookery Farm, Tandridge Lane, Lingfield RH7 6LW,

Proposal: 30m x 25m Farmyard Manure Store and a 25m x 8m Silage Clamp together with all Associated Engineering Operations

Ward: Oxted North and Tandridge

Decision: Planning Committee

Constraints – ASAC, AWOOD, BOA, EA FLOOD ZONE 2 and 3, Risk of Surface Water Flooding, Gatwick Birdstrike Zone, GB, SPA, Gatwick Safeguarding

RECOMMENDATION:

PERMIT subject to conditions

This application is reported to Committee as a referral from Councillor Wren has been received.

Summary

1. The proposal is stated in the application to be for agricultural purposes. The site has an established agricultural use and the intentions of the proposed development are stated to be for this purpose. It is not considered that the proposals would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and it is considered that the agricultural need for the proposals has been satisfactorily demonstrated. The proposal would not cause significant harm to the amenities of adjoining/nearby occupiers or the character and appearance of the area. Planning permission is recommended subject to conditions.

Site Description

2. The site comprises agricultural land located on the eastern side of Tandridge Lane. The proposal is located within a grassland field which is currently used for grazing and growing grass for haylage, hay and silage. The field site also incorporates two farm buildings together with a farmyard. To the south lies an additional 45.2 acres of land owned by the applicant.
3. The site is relatively level and there is some screening to the south and east. The area is predominantly rural with sporadic housing.

Relevant History

4. 2019/626: Erection of a new hay/haylage/straw/machinery barn and a new cattle barn with associated hardstanding and access. Granted on 12/07/2019.

Key Issues

5. The key issue is whether the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt or comprise development/works for the purposes of agriculture which would be acceptable in principle. Other key considerations are appearance and siting, the impact of the proposals on the character of the area, any impact on residential amenity, highways issues, and biodiversity.

Proposal

6. It is proposed to erect a 30m x 25m Farmyard Manure (FYM) Store and a 25m x 8m Silage Clamp together with all associated engineering operations.
7. With regards to the engineering operations, the existing topsoil from the footprint will be excavated and used for the outside and top of the banks. All works would be carried out using clean 'as dug' soil and the banks will be seeded with grass and graded. During construction inert material will be required to be imported (the equates to 16,000m³). The site would accommodate between 30-40 movements a day with a build time of 3 to 4 months.

Development Plan Policy

8. Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 – Policies CSP1, CSP12, CSP18, CSP21
9. Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP10, DP13, DP22
10. Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – Not applicable
11. Limsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – Not applicable
12. Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan — Post Referendum June 2021 – Not applicable
13. Emerging Tandridge Local Plan 2033 – Policies TLP01, TPL03, TLP18

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) and non-statutory guidance

14. Tandridge Trees and Soft Landscaping SPD (2017)
15. Surrey Design Guide (2002)

National Advice

16. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)
17. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
18. National Design Guide (2019)

Statutory Consultation Responses

19. Environment Agency- Following additional information from the applicant we are satisfied that the current design will meet the SSAFO (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) regulations. Based on this, we have no objection to this application.
20. Surrey County Council Archaeological Officer- no objection subject to conditions.

21. Lead Local Flood Authority- as there is no change to the drainage strategy or surface water system we would have no further comments.
22. Gatwick Safeguarding- No objection.
23. Biggin Hill- No comment received.
24. County Highway Authority – it is not one where we would need to be consulted as there are no highway matters to be considered.
25. Countryside Access Officer – No comment received.
26. Natural England- No comment received
27. Tandridge Parish Council – No objection but query the size of the store.
28. Lingfield Parish Council- No comment received.
29. HSE- No comment received.
30. Surrey County Council- Mineral and Waste Team- No comment received.

Non-statutory Advice Received

31. None.

TDC advice

32. Chief Community Services Officer (Environmental Health) –No objection subject to a condition on construction hours.
33. The Environmental Health Officer also assessed the representations in particular with regards to odours and states:

Its agricultural land and there will be odours arising from the site which is part of agricultural practices. Therefore, my comments remain the same I have no objections to this application

34. Land Contamination Officer- leave with the EA to comment on the protection of local water courses.
35. Senior Tree Officer- has no objection to the proposal. The nearest parcel of ancient woodland is over 160m away. As such, provided the development does not affect the watercourse that runs along the eastern boundary and connects to the ancient woodland to the SE, it is highly unlikely that there would be any adverse effects either directly or indirectly.

Other Representations

36. Third Party Comments
 - Not full notification [Officer comment: A site and press notice have been erected, notification is in line with statutory requirements]
 - Incremental way of gaining permission [Officer comment: Each application is assessed on the planning merits]

- Size of store seems excessive and could be a commercial operation [This is considered in paragraphs 40 to 54]
- Extra traffic, danger, dirt, mud etc during construction and subsequent bringing materials in [This is considered in paragraph 64]
- Very close to a stream and would exacerbate flooding [This is considered in paragraphs 19, 21, 76 and 77]
- Pollutants could seep into the groundwater [This is considered in paragraphs 19, 21, 67 to 70]
- The Environment Agency have objected [Officer comment: Further information has been submitted and the EA have not objected and suggested conditions]
- Leakage in water courses [This is considered in paragraphs 19, 65-68]
- Little consideration of odour from silage and manure stores and being spread [This is considered in paragraphs 62 to 70]
- Failure to address the odour issues in a credible way [This is considered in paragraphs 62 to 70]
- Detrimental to residents with regards to sight, sound, smelling distance, toxic gasses, fumes and air pollution [This is considered in paragraphs 62 to 70]
- Large scale facilities on Green Belt Land [This is considered in paragraphs 36 to 54]
- House depreciation [Officer comment: this is not a planning consideration]
- Safety of children in particular around slurry lagoons [Officer comment: This is not a slurry lagoon, it is a silage clamp. In any event a landscaping condition which includes fencing is suggested]
- Failure to submit plans in compliance with the Health and Safety Executive document “Managing slurry on farms” in respect of: safe drainage that prevents the unsafe mixture of silage and manure effluents; approved safety fencing around both the silage clamp and the manure store; and safety barriers on any ‘scraping ramps’ [This is considered in paragraphs 62 to 70]
- Wish to have time to comment on any further information submitted. [Officer comment: The applicant has sought to address the Environment Agency’s concerns. Further technical information was submitted during the course of the application. The Environment Agency have confirmed they now have no objections to the scheme. The information does not materially change the proposal and therefore no re-consultation was undertaken or required]
- Wish for the matter to be heard at planning committee [Officer comment: The application is being heard at planning committee]
- Risk of nitrate pollution [This is considered in paragraphs 62 to 70]
- Details on manure and slurry spreading should be submitted. [This is considered in paragraphs 62 to 70]
- Conditioning the number of cows [Officer comment: This does not form part of this application and the agricultural barn was subject to planning application-2019/626- this is outside the remit of these application]
- Requirement for drainage to link to the neighbouring field [Officer comment: This application is based on the current submission and assessed by the EA and LLFA]
- Does not address the Ancient Woodland [This is considered in paragraphs 35 and 75]

Assessment

Green Belt

37. The site is located in the Green Belt and policies DP10 and DP13, in line with the NPPF (2019), state the construction of new buildings will be regarded as

inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within one of the listed exceptions.

38. Para.143 of the NPPF (2019) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Para.145 sets out a number of exceptions to this, including as section A, buildings for agriculture and forestry.
39. Local Plan Policy DP10 states that within the Green Belt, planning permission for any inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, will normally be refused. Proposals involving inappropriate development in the Green Belt will only be permitted where very special circumstances exist, to the extent that other considerations clearly outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm.
40. Policy DP13 states that unless very special circumstances can be clearly demonstrated, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Policy DP13 sets out the exceptions to this, one of which (Part A) is the construction of new non-residential buildings directly related to agriculture.

Need and directly related to agriculture

41. The Council's agricultural advisers (Reading Agricultural Consultancy) have been consulted on the proposals and have commented as follows:
42. *Rookery Farm, located three miles to the north of Lingfield, is the main base for the applicant's agricultural business which extends to 144.8 hectares (357.7 acres) of land in total. 82.2ha is owned across two separate holdings in the local area, Rookery Farm and Kingswood Farm; and 62.6ha of land is rented from three separate holdings in the area, Comforts Place Farm, Crowhurst Place and Millstone.*
43. *The farming business has been established since 1987 and now comprises a family-run pedigree Sussex beef herd alongside a hay and haylage enterprise.*
44. *The beef herd comprises 22 pedigree Sussex cattle (8 suckler cows with calves and 7 yearlings). The applicants intend to increase the size of the suckler herd to 30 breeding cattle. The yearlings will be kept at Rookery Farm until they are 18-24 months old when they will be used as replacement suckler cows or sold as breeding stock. Steers are to be sold through local markets or direct to butchers. In addition to the suckler herd, the business produces 500 tonnes of hay and straw each year and 200 bales of silage used to feed the cattle during the winter months.*
45. *The applicants previously rented 36 hectares of land, 1,565m² of buildings and 2,000m² of hardstanding from Blackgrove Farm, where the beef herd was based, but were served with a Notice to Quit in 2019, which terminated the tenancy of the land and buildings.*
46. *The applicants submitted a planning application to Tandridge District Council in 2019 (2019/626) for the construction of cattle, hay, machinery and storage barns at Rookery Farm. The application was permitted in July 2019, however due to the bad winter weather in 2019/2020 and the delays in completing construction of the new buildings due to Covid-19 restrictions, the applicants were granted a licence to continue to occupy the buildings at Blackgrove Farm*

until Spring 2021 when the buildings are due to be completed. Photos in the Planning Statement demonstrate that the buildings are almost complete.

47. *The current application seeks permission for the construction of a silage clamp, measuring 25m long x 8m wide x 3.5m high. The application also proposes the construction of a Farm Yard Manure (FYM) store which will have a concrete base and clay lining, with earth bunding banks. Due to the way in which FYM is stored, in a rounded heap, the store will provide a storage capacity of 1,500m³.*

Silage Clamp

48. *The proposed silage clamp will have a storage capacity of 700m³ or 500 tonnes of grass silage. Properly constructed silage clamps are vital to producing good quality silage within the Silage Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil (SSAFO) regulations. The construction of the silage clamp means that the applicants can produce and store silage more easily on site, without which they would need to make or purchase enough wrapped silage bales to last 7 months. This would be an expensive and inefficient way of feeding the cattle.*
49. *The Planning Statement calculates that the proposed numbers of housed cattle will consume between 400 – 490 tonnes of silage over a 7 month period. The cattle will be housed for approximately 7 months of the year and will consume approximately 440 tonnes of silage during each housing period. Industry standards show demonstrate that a suckler cow will eat an average of 1.25 tonnes of silage per month with followers eating between 0.9 – 1 tonne per month.*
50. *The silage clamp is an appropriate size to meet the demands of the business, providing around 50-100m³ of contingency space.*

Farmyard Manure (FYM) Store

51. *To comply with the law, the applicants must take into account the SSAFO regulations. There are additional rules that must be adhered to as the farm is in a Nitrogen Vulnerable Zone (NVZ). The law sets out that a farm must be able to store the slurry and manure produced in a yard or building from 1st October – 1st March inclusive. In addition, the farm must make an allowance for rainfall and other liquids (for example yard washings) that enter the store during the storage period.*
52. *As FYM from the 'current' season cannot be spread as soon as the spreading season opens, the farm will essentially require storage for two seasons (or 14 months based on the cattle being housed for 7 months of the year). The calculations provided in the Planning Statement are correct and in line with the standard values provided by DEFRA and John Nix and will provide sufficient storage space, with some additional space (approximately 197m³) available for contingencies.*
53. *In summary, the proposed silage clamp and the FYM store are required for the proper functioning of the farm business within the SSAFO regulations and the NVZ regulations. The silage clamp and the FYM store are of an appropriate size and design for the intended purpose.*
54. *In light of these comments and following an officer assessment, it is considered that the applicants have demonstrated a clear agricultural need for the proposed buildings and development associated with the proposal. The proposal would be directly related to agriculture and therefore would not*

constitute an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt. As such, there is no requirement for very special circumstances to be demonstrated.

Character and Appearance

55. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy requires that new development is of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Development 'must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained'.
56. Policy CSP21 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy refers to the Landscape and Countryside and sets out that the character and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes and countryside will be protected for their own sake and new development will be required to conserve and enhance the landscape character. The site is not located in an area of greater landscape value and is outside the AONB.
57. Policy DP7 requires new development to respect and contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located, and it seeks to ensure that a proposal is in keeping with the prevailing landscape and streetscape, reflecting the variety of building types, and does not result in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing density and design.
58. The site currently comprises a grassland area used for the grazing of cattle and the production of forage crops for silage, hay and haylage. It is in clear agricultural use. The proposal would be for the storage of farmyard manure and silage. The remaining area of surrounding field would be engineered to provide a gradual sloped area of grassland. The applicant has provided examples of similar grassed earth banks for a FYM store and silage clamp.
59. The appearance is typical of farm works and areas. The applicant has submitted a Landscape Visual Assessment (LVA) together with plans and sections. The conclusion states that the proposal would have minor significance (adverse) at completion and minor significance (low beneficial) after planting has established. With the seven viewpoints, it was judged that five would experience not significant (negligible adverse) impact and two would experience not significant (slight adverse) impact and all viewpoints would experience no change and not significant impact after planting would have been established.
60. The proposal includes a proposed landscaping plan including wildflower and pollen rich grass and proposed indigenous mixed plantings scheme. Further details would be secured via planning condition. It is also important to note that the proposal would be partially screened by the existing farm buildings on site which dominate the views in any case as a backdrop to a farm landscape. The end result of the development provides a gentle, grazable grassed bank from the top of the FYM store/silage clamp down to the existing field level. The entrance to the clamp and FYM store are on the westerly elevation, which will be completely screened by the existing farm buildings. This will not be visible from any public viewpoint. Views from the footpath to the south would be of a sloped grass bank.
61. The proposal would be visible within the surrounding Low Weald landscape but since they would be agricultural landforms, they would not appear intrusive or

harmful within the wider Green Belt – being a type of building/structure commonly found in agricultural areas. However, it would not result in a significantly adverse impact upon character and appearance of the site or surrounding area given the existing buildings on site, the proposed planting and the nature of the proposal. The proposal would not appear out of place or significantly harm the character and appearance of the rural surrounding area and would respect landscape character. As such, there is no objection raised on character grounds in respect of the NPPF (2019), Policies CSP18 and CSP21 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy or Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014).

Residential Amenity

62. Policy CSP18 states that new development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any other adverse effect. Policy DP7 part (6) states that proposals should not significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of pollution (noise, air or light), traffic, or other general disturbance. Part (7) of Policy DP7 states that proposals should not significantly harm the amenities and privacy of occupiers of neighbouring properties (including their private amenity space) by reason of overlooking or its overshadowing or overbearing effect.
63. The nearest residential properties to the site are located on the opposite side of Tandridge Lane to the north and south (not directly opposite), at least 150m from the actual site of the proposed agricultural buildings. With the intervening road and mature vegetation between the site and neighbouring properties, the proposals would be unlikely to have an adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of their physical presence.
64. The Council's Environmental Health Team were consulted on the proposal in relation to potential noise, odour and disturbance given the potential to impact on the amenities of nearby residential properties. Subsequently, no objections from this internal consultee have been raised subject to conditions in relation to construction having been suggested. These address concerns raised by representations in relation to the imported materials and construction traffic associated with this. This is also for a limited period of 3 to 4 months. Due to the scale of the proposed works and the associated HGV movements it is considered that there is the potential for an adverse impact to the neighbouring properties in terms of noise, air and light pollution during the construction period. It should be noted, however, that as the proposed works are temporary and that the compliance with a construction management plan can be conditioned to mitigate this harm, it is considered that the harm identified would not be significant enough to warrant the refusal of the application as it would not be long-term. Once the facility is in operation there will be further traffic movements during both silage making and muck/slurry spreading but this is typical of farm activities and clearly different to construction impact.
65. Representations have raised the issue of the FYM, slurry and the spreading of on the farmland and the odour associated with these features and activities. Whilst this activity does not require planning permission and can take on farmland at any time without permission, it is worth noting this is commonplace in farms and must be carried out in strict accordance with DEFRA's Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) policy. One of the functions of the proposal is keep a firm separation of FYM and silage from surrounding grassland and watercourses. The proposal cannot increase the risk of water contamination.

66. Representations have also raised the issue of gases and odours from the silage clamp and the applicant has stated that silage is the preservation of valuable green crops to be fed to cattle, to achieve this shredded green grass or maize is tipped into a horizontal concrete structure with walls (the silage clamp). Oxygen within the silage is excluded by compaction with tractors then covering with a plastic sheet to prevent air re-entering the silage. It is important to eliminate the oxygen as it stops the growth of bacteria which breaks silage down. Silage does not smell in the clamps or release any gasses unless very poorly made, any odours caused would be as a result of oxygen entering the silage and causing the growth of bacteria and wasting silage, which is totally against the farmer's best interest. Even then with bad silage, the smell is mild and not noticeable unless very close.
67. The applicant has also stated that the proposal would be for the storage of solid manure, on a permanent impermeable base. This would be in accordance with DEFRA advice. The applicant is not, therefore, proposing a slurry store, to which the HSE information highlighted by representations received. The effluent which is generated from rainfall on the solid manure store is contained at the base of the impermeable store and disposed of as if slurry.
68. The SSAFO (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) regulations require compliance with very detailed specification for both the silage and manure store. This ensures all silage effluent is drained to, and stored within, within a suitably sized storage tank. This is underground and the applicant has stated there are no gases which are generated in the tank which require venting. FYM would not mix with silage effluent. The applicant understands that the EA inspects the site before, during and after construction and will only authorise its use, once it is satisfied that it has been built to the correct standard. It is important to note that the EA are satisfied that the current design will meet the SSAFO regulations and have no objection to this application.
69. The Council's Environmental Health Team raised no objections on environmental health grounds and furthermore they also raised no objection in relation to smells and odours. It is also worth noting that the FYM store would be replacing temporary dung area on site and the silage clamp would be replacing wrapped silage bails on site. Given the location of the site within a rural location, odour emission from farms is not considered out of the ordinary. The additional storage is not considered so excessive as to warrant concern for neighbouring amenity. This is also comparable with other applications in separate Local Authorities which have been approved and similar conclusions on odours have been reached. This is including:
- New House Farm, Twineham (Mid Sussex Council): For a proposed 30 x 30 metres earth bunded farmyard manure store, concrete access apron and creation of a cross fall for drainage improvements (Ref: DM20/0876- approved in November 2020)
 - Merrion Farm, Partridge Green (Horsham Council): 36 x 50m clay lined earth walled slurry lagoon together with associated surrounding engineering works (Ref: DC/20/1769- approved December 2020)
 - Stocks Farm, Ditchling (South Downs National Park): 91.5m x 18.3m cattle building; two earth bounded silage clamps and a FYM store totally 66m x 55m and a dirty water settlement pond systems and associated engineering work- (Ref: SDNP/17/01024 -approved August 2017)

70. These stores are common in the countryside and there are very strict requirements for their construction, use and operation under separate regulations. A condition on fencing and landscaping is proposed. The proposal would not result in significant harm to residential amenities. As such no objection is raised in relation to Core Strategy CSP18 or Local Plan Policy DP7 and DP22.

Highway Matters

71. Policy CSP12 of the Core Strategy advises that new development proposals should have regard to adopted highway design standards and vehicle/other parking standards. Criterion 3 of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan also requires new development to have regard to adopted parking standards and Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that development does not impact highway safety.
72. The County Highway Authority was consulted on the proposal and raised no objection to the proposal given there an existing access (granted under application 2019/626) for the farm. It is necessary for a Construction Transport Management Plan to be put in place and this would be subject to conditions. It is also worth noting that the facility will be used purely for the use of the Rookery Farm, no third party FYM will be imported and none will be sold on commercially. This also subject to condition. As such no objections are raised in relation to Core Strategy Policy CSP18 and Local Plan Policy DP5.

Biodiversity and Ancient Woodland

73. Policy CSP17 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to protect biodiversity and provide for the maintenance, enhancement, restoration and, if possible, expansion of biodiversity, by aiming to restore or create suitable semi-natural habitats and ecological networks to sustain wildlife in accordance with the aims of the Surrey Biodiversity Action Plan.
74. Policy DP19 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies advises that planning permission for development directly or indirectly affecting protected or Priority species will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the species involved will not be harmed or appropriate mitigation measures can be put in place. It also states that where a proposal is likely to result in direct or indirect harm to an irreplaceable environmental asset of the highest designation, such as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), ancient woodland or veteran trees, the granting of planning permission will be wholly exceptional.
75. The development is proposed over an intense farmed grassfield. A full LVIA has been submitted which provides quantified confirmation that there will not be a significant visual impact and the planting and landscaping proposed, will provide a biodiversity net gain over and above the existing improved grassland on the site. In relation to ancient woodland, the Council's Senior Tree Officer has stated that there is no objection. He states that: *The nearest parcel of ancient woodland is over 160m away. As such, provided the development does not affect the watercourse that runs along the eastern boundary and connects to the ancient woodland to the SE, it is highly unlikely that there would be any adverse effects either directly or indirectly.* As stated in the paragraphs above, farming practices are monitored, assessed, inspected and regulated by other organisations and therefore watercourses are protected. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CSP17 and Local Plan Policy DP19.

Flooding

76. Local Plan Policy DP21 states that proposals should seek to secure opportunities to reduce both the cause and impact of flooding; for example, through the use of Green Infrastructure for flood storage and, where necessary, the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) suitable to the scale and type of the development, ensuring the discharge of surface run off is restricted to that of the pre-development site.
77. The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and close proximity to Flood Zone 2. The LLFA and Environment Agency have concluded there is no objection to the scheme.

Other

78. Surrey County Council Archaeological Officer has suggested a pre-commencement condition to protect any archaeological remains found on site.

Conclusion

79. The proposed development would not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would not adversely impact upon landscape character, character and appearance, residential amenities, highway safety, trees or ecology and it is considered that the agricultural need for the proposals has been satisfactorily demonstrated. As such the application is recommended for approval.
80. The recommendation is made in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). It is considered that in respect of the assessment of this application significant weight has been given to policies within the Council's Core Strategy 2008 and the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 in accordance with paragraph 213 of the NPPF. Due regard as a material consideration has been given to the NPPF and PPG in reaching this recommendation.
81. All other material considerations, including third party comments, have been considered and taken into account in coming to the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMIT subject to the following conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall start not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. This decision refers to drawings numbered 291020_001, 291020_002, 291020_003, hla 403 01 Rev C, hla 403 02 Rev A. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved drawings. There shall be no variations from these approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme proceeds as set out in the planning application and therefore remains in accordance with the Development Plan.

3. No works above ground level shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:

- proposed finished levels or contours
- means of enclosure including safety features
- landscape and ecological management plan to include ecological compensation and enhancement measure
- surface water drainage measures

Details of soft landscape works shall include all proposed and retained trees, hedges and shrubs; ground preparation, planting specifications and ongoing maintenance, together with details of areas to be grass seeded or turfed. Planting schedules shall include details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

All new planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion or occupation of any part of the development (whichever is the sooner) or otherwise in accordance with a programme to be agreed. Any trees or plants (including those retained as part of the development) which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or, in the opinion of the District Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the District Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. The hard landscape works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To maintain and enhance the visual amenities of the development in accordance with Policies CSP18 and CSP21 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policy DP14 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014).

4. No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work to be conducted in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect archaeological interests on the site in accordance with the NPPF (2019) and Policy DP20 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014).

5. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- (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

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.

Reason: To ensure that the development would not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and protect residential amenity in accordance with Policies CSP12 and CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policies DP5 and DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014).

6. No works relating to the construction/implementation of the development hereby approved shall take place outside of 0730 hours to 18:00 hours Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjacent occupiers in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policies DP7 and DP22 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2- Detailed Policies (2014).

7. The proposal hereby approved shall only be used for purposes associated with the agricultural use of the land and shall only be used for storage and the keeping of livestock associated with the agricultural use of the land.

Reason: To ensure compliance with those policies seeking to protect the Green Belt against inappropriate development in order to preserve the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF (2019) and Policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014).

Informatives:

1. Condition 2 refers to the drawings hereby approved. Non-material amendments can be made under the provisions of Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and you should contact the case officer to discuss whether a proposed amendment is likely to be non-material. Minor material amendments will require an application to vary condition 2 of this permission. Such an application would be made under the provisions of Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Major material amendments will require a new planning application. You should discuss whether your material amendment is minor or major with the case officer. Fees may be payable for non-material and material amendment requests. Details of the current fee can be found on the Council's web site.
2. The SSAFO regulations (The Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) (England) Regulations 2010 (legislation.gov.uk)) provide specific details & requirements on the storage of silage, and in conjunction with the Environment Agency, which monitors the scheme closely and must be informed regularly before, during and after construction and first use.

The SSAFO regulations require the applicant to notify the Environment Agency at least 14 days in advance of commencing construction of a new silage or slurry store. Please email LWMedwayRother@environment-agency.gov.uk

More information is available on the .gov.uk website Storing silage, slurry and agricultural fuel oil - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

3. The applicants are required to adhere to DEFRA's rules on Cross Compliance (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/cross-compliance-2021>), specifically strong organic manures in NVZ (Storing organic manures in nitrate vulnerable zones - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)); using nitrogen fertilisers in NVZ (Using nitrogen fertilisers in nitrate vulnerable zones - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) and the rules for farmers and land managers to prevent water pollution (Rules for farmers and land managers to prevent water pollution - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)).

The development has been assessed against Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 Policies CSP1, CSP12, CSP18, CSP21, Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2: Detailed Policies – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP10, DP13, DP22 and material considerations, including third party representations. It has been concluded that the development, subject to the conditions imposed, would accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to justify a refusal of permission.