

*Application Number:* 17/01166/CPO  
*Date Registered:* 6 March 2017  
*Parish:* Yeovilton  
*District:* South Somerset  
*Member Division:* Caste Cary  
*Local Member:* Cllr Michael Lewis  
*Case Officer:* Clive Conroy  
*Contact Details:* [cjconroy@somerset.gov.uk](mailto:cjconroy@somerset.gov.uk)  
(01604 771123)

*Description of Application:* **CONSTRUCTION OF WASTE TRANSFER STATION, RNAS YEOVILTON, YEOVIL, BA22 8HL**  
*Grid Reference:* 355625 - 124380  
*Applicant:* Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
*Location:* RNAS Yeovilton is located between the A303 at Podimore and Yeovilton village. The application site is on the north-eastern edge of the airbase close to Stockwitch Cross and accessed off the B3151.

## **1 Summary of Key Issues and Recommendation**

**1.1 The proposed development relates to the construction of a waste transfer station to serve RNAS Yeovilton. The main issues for consideration relate to:**

- The Principle of Development;**
- Flood Risk;**
- Ground Conditions/Contamination;**
- Transport;**
- Archaeology;**
- Amenity, and**
- Ecology.**

**1.2 It is recommended that planning permission is GRANTED subject to the conditions set out in section 11 of this report and that authority to undertake any minor non-material editing which may be necessary to the wording of those conditions be delegated to the Service Manager, Planning Control Enforcement & Compliance.**

## **2 Background**

**2.1 This is a resubmission of a previous application (15/05029/CPO) that was refused on the 11th April 2016 for the following reasons:**

- The proposed development site is within Flood Zone 3 where Flood Compensation Storage is necessary to ensure that flood risk is not increased overall as a result of the proposed development. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that such mitigation is feasible within the land ownership of the applicant. It is therefore contrary to SSLP policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) and SWCS policies DM7 (Water Resources) and DM1 (Basic Location Principles).
- The NPPF states that development should not contribute to water pollution. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development site is not contaminated and the proposed development would be appropriate in this location and not pose an unacceptable risk to the water environment. The proposal is therefore regarded as contrary to SSLP policy EQ7 (Pollution Control) and SWCS policy DM7 (Water Resources).

**2.2 Under this new application, the red line boundary has been amended to allow for the provision of compensatory flood storage. The location of the building and hard standing and the proposed waste transfer operations remain unchanged.**

**2.3 The new application submission also now includes a Contaminated Land Risk Assessment (Phase I and Phase II), which provides a detailed assessment of the potential contamination issues on site.**

### **3 Site Description**

- 3.1 RNAS Yeovilton air base is located to the south of the A303 between Podimore and Yeovilton. Ilchester is approximately 1km (¾ mile) to the west and the hamlets of Bridgehampton and Speckington are located to the east of the air base.
- 3.2 The air base is located in the east of the “The Central Plain, Moors and River Basins” (Visual Character Region 7 of the ‘Landscape of South Somerset’, SSDC, 1993). The region consists of a large area of low lying clay land framed between the escarpments of surrounding hills. The air base appears largely flat but actually varies between approximately 15m and 22m AOD.
- 3.3 RNAS Yeovilton is an extensive facility including runways, hangars, logistic support and military transport areas, offices, medical facilities, sports and leisure facilities, accommodation for military personnel and parking areas. It is divided by the B3151 with the larger element (approximately 85%) to the south of the road. The site extends to approximately 270 ha (665 acres) with additional Defence Infrastructure Organisation areas alongside the air base. The facility is the parent base for various helicopter squadrons and is manned by several thousand military and civilian personnel.
- 3.4 The River Cam flows along the southeast boundary of the air base and joins the River Yeo to the south. The River Yeo then continues to the south of Yeovilton and southwest of the air base. Identified floodable areas alongside the River Cam (Flood Zones 2 and 3) extend into the eastern edges of the air base and along the highway at Bridgehampton to Stockwitch Cross and beyond, including onto the application site. Flood zones also encroach onto an extensive area on the western side of the air base.
- 3.5 Stockwitch Cross crossroads is on the B3151 to the east of the air base, with Stockwitch Farm, Court and Lodge immediately to its north.
- 3.6 The application site is on the north side of the B3151 within a field that extends to Stockwitch Cross. Fuel compounds are located to the west of the application field.

### **4 Site History**

- 4.1 On 1 July 1939, the Admiralty Air Division commandeered 169 ha (417 acres) of land from its owners, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of the Church of England. Work began on the construction of an air base, and the runways were completed in 1941 despite problems with poor drainage. A main runway of 1,111m (3,645ft) and three subsidiary runways each of 914m (3,000ft) were constructed. A centre for Air Direction Radar was established at Speckington Manor on the edge of the airfield. However, because of pressure on space at the airfield, satellite sites were set up at Charlton Horethorne and Henstridge in 1942. RNAS Charlton Horethorne closed in 1948 and has since been returned to agricultural use. The MOD sold the Henstridge airfield in 1957. Today it is mainly used for general aviation and the base for the Dorset and Somerset Air Ambulance.

- 4.2 At the end of WW2 Yeovilton became one of the main demobilisation centres for the Royal Navy, with many of the men helping to refurbish the runways while they stayed at the base. The runways were extended in 1952 and 1957 to cope with jet aircraft.
- 4.3 During the 1960s the School of Fighter Direction returned to the site, and the 1970s saw the Flag Officer, Naval Air Command (FONAC) and the fixed wing Fleet Requirements and Aircraft Direction Unit (FRADU) transferred to Yeovilton. It also became the main shore base for the Navy's fleet of Sea Harriers (until 2006). A 'ski-jump' (now removed) was installed to enable practice of assisted take-offs.
- 4.4 In the mid-1980s Defence Estates announced that the Royal Navy ratings married quarters at RNAS Yeovilton was surplus to requirements. As a result, two estates of apartments (in Hermes Place and Lyster Close, Ilchester) were sold.
- 4.5 RNAS Yeovilton is currently home to the Royal Navy Lynx Helicopter Force and Commando Helicopter Force. It is also the location for the RN Fighter Controller School, training surface-based aircraft controllers. RNAS Yeovilton operates over 100 aircraft of four different types and training of aircrew and engineers of the resident aircraft types is also undertaken.
- 4.6 The air base has grown to become one of the busiest military airfields in the UK. During busy periods, pressure on the Yeovilton base is relieved by the use of RNAS Merryfield, near Ilton.
- 4.7 The air base also contains the Fleet Air Arm Museum which is close to the application site to the south of the B3151. It also holds an annual air show when the airfield is open to the public, with both flying and static aircraft displays.
- 4.8 The buildings/infrastructure at RNAS Yeovilton have been developed piecemeal over many years and are currently the subject of further developments. The air base has an extensive planning history with over 350 planning applications made over the last 60 years (or thereabouts), the vast majority of which were successful. Nearly one quarter of the applications applied to that part of the site to the north of the B3151.
- 4.9 Development was recently undertaken in respect of Project WINFRA to enable the air base to become the new home for the Army's Wildcat Attack Helicopter Force.
- 4.10 In 2013 permission was granted by South Somerset District Council (SSDC) to form an access approximately 90m east of Stockwitch Cross and use of the application field as a temporary parking area for contractors' vehicles (13/04257/FUL). However, the permission has not been implemented.
- 4.11 In 2015 an application was lodged for a waste transfer station on a smaller site (Application Reference Number 15/05029/CPO) and was refused on 11th April 2016 for the following reasons:

- The proposed development site is within Flood Zone 3 where Flood Compensation Storage is necessary to ensure that flood risk is not increased overall as a result of the proposed development. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that such mitigation is feasible within the land ownership of the applicant. It is therefore contrary to SSLP policy EQ1 (Addressing Climate Change in South Somerset) and SWCS policies DM7 (Water Resources) and DM1 (Basic Location Principles).
- The NPPF states that development should not contribute to water pollution. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development site is not contaminated and the proposed development would be appropriate in this location and not pose an unacceptable risk to the water environment. The proposal is therefore regarded as contrary to SSLP policy EQ7 (Pollution Control) and SWCS policy DM7 (Water Resources).

## **5 The Proposal**

- 5.1 This is an application for full planning permission for a Waste Transfer Station (WTS) at RNAS Yeovilton for the Ministry of Defence (MoD). The applicant is the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) which is part of the MoD. The DIO supports the armed forces by building, maintaining and servicing the infrastructure needed at the defence bases.
- 5.2 The application is a re-submission of a similar proposal which was submitted in 2015 and subsequently refused planning permission in April 2016 (15/05029/CPO). The red line boundary for the site has been amended by the applicant to address the issue of compensatory flood storage. All other aspects of the proposal remain unchanged from the 2015 application.
- 5.3 The existing Recycling and Waste Management Centre (RWMC) at the air base, known as the "Buffers Compound", is on an old car park area off Vixen Close to the north of the B3151. It is an enclosed area of hard standing on which skips are placed, providing no welfare facilities or separation between personnel and refuse collection vehicles. The existing RWMC stores waste that may include some soil-based waste, metal, furniture and waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE). The existing RWMC will be redeveloped for accommodation blocks (440 rooms) and car parking.
- 5.4 Over time, increases in the number of personnel based at RNAS Yeovilton and a requirement for waste to be recovered / recycled has led to the existing waste facility becoming increasingly unable to cope with demand. The facility and arrangements are stated as inadequate for the purposes of managing the waste generated at the station. It is also deemed to be non-compliant with existing waste legislation because the waste is not properly stored or segregated.
- 5.5 The proposed waste transfer station (WTS) would be located immediately outside the currently secured operational area to the east of the air base and it would provide the capability to receive, segregate, store and enable onward

movement of recyclates and general waste generated by the air base in a manner that is secure and enables controlled access.

- 5.6 It is proposed that the waste managed would only be waste arising from RNAS Yeovilton. No waste from outside RNAS Yeovilton will be transported by road to the site. Only waste that has been properly segregated or bulked up for onwards transportation will leave the site. The site would not be open to members of the public or other unauthorised personnel. The proposed WTS would be managed by two members of staff. These staff would oversee any vehicles entering or exiting the site; and would also be the same personnel collecting waste from other areas of the base to be stored and managed at the proposed WTS.
- 5.7 Collections from the WTS would be on an ad-hoc, infrequent basis when the skips become full. There will be no additional impacts on the local road network over and above those that already occur due to the existing RWMC.
- 5.8 The proposed development would comprise a new building measuring approximately 21.7m x 37.3m x 9m (high) and associated infrastructure. The proposal would incorporate a single storey 'L' shaped building of 360 m<sup>2</sup>.
- 5.9 The proposed facility would comprise:
- General Waste Refuse Skip - 1 No. 8yrd<sup>3</sup> (6.1m<sup>3</sup>) refuse skip to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - Metal Recycling Skip - 1 No. 40yrd<sup>3</sup> (30.6m<sup>3</sup>) Roll on-Roll off (Ro Ro) to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - WEEE Recycling Skip - 1 No. 40yrd<sup>3</sup> (30.6m<sup>3</sup>) refuse skip for all WEEE to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - Mattress Covered Area - A 20m<sup>2</sup> covered area for the storage of mattresses prior to their collection from site and disposal.
  - Furniture and tyres - A 25m<sup>2</sup> covered area for the storage of furniture and tyres prior to their collection from site and disposal.
  - Plastics Recycling Skip - 1 No. 8yrd<sup>3</sup> (6.1m<sup>3</sup>) refuse skip to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - Wood Recycling Skip - 1 No. 40yrd<sup>3</sup> (30.6m<sup>3</sup>) refuse skip to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - Cardboard Recycling Skip - 1 No. 8yrd<sup>3</sup> (6.1m<sup>3</sup>) refuse skip to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - Tin Recycling Skip - A single 8yrd<sup>3</sup> (6.1m<sup>3</sup>) refuse skip to be collected on an ad hoc basis when required.
  - Hazardous Waste and Batteries Covered Area - A 25m<sup>2</sup> covered area for the storage of hazardous waste prior to collection from site and disposal.
  - 1 x Staff Toilet/Shower room and changing area - to be provided for use by personnel based at the Waste Transfer Station.
  - 1 x ancillary office for 1 x single person incorporating a 'brew bay/tea station' and workstation
- 5.10 The proposed facility would provide office and welfare accommodation for the station manager in addition to covered areas for the storage of mattresses, hazardous waste and batteries, furniture and tyres prior to collection from the station.

- 5.11 For health and safety reasons the site office is segregated from the waste bays.
- 5.12 The building would be built from non-combustible material with external blockwork walls and steel composite roof. The applicant has confirmed that they have developed the design based on traditional pad/raft foundations, due to the lightweight nature of the building. As a result, no piling is required.
- 5.13 It should also be noted that many elements of the works fall under Part 19 (Development by the Crown or for national security purposes) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, notably the proposed hard standing and fencing arrangements. However, following discussions with Somerset County Council officers in January 2015, it was considered that the WTS would require planning permission.
- 5.14 The applicant has confirmed that no hedgerows would be removed to install security fencing.

## **6 The Application**

6.1 Plans and documents submitted with the planning application, including those which are still relevant from the 2015 submission are set out below:

- Application forms and Notices
- Documents:
  - Covering Letter dated 24 January 2017;
  - Planning Statement (24 January 2017);
  - Flood Risk Assessment (October 2015) Flood Risk Assessment Addendum; Compensatory Storage (December 2016);
  - Heritage Assessment Update (January 2017) and Heritage Assets within Search Area Plan: 320898CH11-HIST-001 Rev P2 Jan 17;
  - Phase I and Phase II Contaminated Risk Assessment (January 2017);
  - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (May 2015);
  - Detailed Gradiometer Survey and Watching Brief Report (August 2015);
  - Appendix 1-5 and Figures of Detailed Gradiometer Survey and Watching Brief Report, and
  - Options Assessment Scoring Table (July 2014).

### Drawings:

- Site Location Plan: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0001 Rev P3 (not dated);
- MOD Ownership Plan: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0002 Rev P3 (not dated)
- Site Block Plan: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0003 Rev P3 (not dated);
- Levels Drawing: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0004 Rev P1 28/05/2015;

- General Arrangement (Planning): MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0005 Rev P3 (not dated);
- Sections: SBR-32098-A-DR-SW\_WTS-00-0003 Rev 4 08/02/2016;
- Elevations: SBR-32098-A-DR-SW\_WTS-00-0002 Rev 5 10/02/2016;
- Proposed Access Layout: MMD-320898-C-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0700 Rev P1 03/08/15;
- 3 Dimensional Views: SBR-32098-A-DR-SW\_WTS-00-0004 Rev 3 04/08/2015, and
- Internal View: SBR-32098-A-DR-SW\_WTS-00-0005 Rev 3 04/06/2015.

## **7 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

- 7.1 The Town and Country (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 refers to various types of development in Schedules 1 and 2. Development proposals falling within Schedule 1 are regarded as “EIA development” and trigger EIA procedures. Consideration must be given to Schedule 2 developments to determine whether it is likely to have a significant effect on the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location in deciding whether or not the proposed development should be regarded as EIA development.
- 7.2 A screening opinion has been adopted and concludes that the nature, scale and characteristics of the development are not considered likely to give rise to significant effects. The proposed location of the development does not impact upon any environmentally sensitive areas or geographic areas of importance.
- 7.3 There are no likely significant effects that would trigger the need for EIA

## **8 Consultation Responses Received**

- 8.1 **South Somerset District Council:** No objection subject to the following conditions

1 – The development hereby permitted shall not begin until a scheme to deal with contamination of land, controlled waters and/or ground gas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include all of the following measures, unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing:

- A Phase I site investigation report carried out by a competent person to include a desk study, site walkover, the production of a site conceptual model and a human health and environmental risk assessment, undertaken in accordance with BS 10175 : 2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice.
- A Phase II intrusive investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, undertaken in accordance with BS 10175:2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice. The report should include a detailed quantitative human health and environmental risk assessment.
- A remediation scheme detailing how the remediation will be undertaken, what methods will be used and what is to be achieved. A clear end point of



the remediation should be stated, such as site contaminant levels or a risk management action, and how this will be validated. Any ongoing monitoring should also be outlined.

- If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- A validation report detailing the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show that the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included, together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.

Reason: To protect the health of future occupiers of the site from any possible effects of contaminated land, in accordance with Policy EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

## 8.2 **Yeovilton Parish Council:** Objection

The Parish Council strongly object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

- Visual & noise impact on the adjacent residential properties at Stockwitch Cross, the properties are approximately 10 metres from the boundary of the site. This is extremely close to their properties and is an ugly modern sided building. It was noted that any planting scheme would take time to establish and would reduce their light.
- Although this application has tried to address the potential flooding issues, there are currently unresolved flooding and confirmed contamination by County Highways issues in the Stockwitch Cross / Bridgehampton area, giving the Parish Council, no confidence that should there be any accidental contamination from this site, that this would be addressed swiftly and correctly by the MOD. The flooding issues raised at the meeting of the SCC Regulation Committee & causing concern when considering the former application appear to have been resolved purely by extending the area of the proposed application. This in the view of the Parish Council is unsatisfactory.
- The Council are not convinced that there is not a more suitable area on the Base, which could be used for this WT Station, which would not impact on the local residents. Surely from a Security point of view, it is not ideal to have vehicles leaving the Base with waste and then re-entering to dispose of the waste. This site is close to the MOD Fuel Station, hence contamination concerns, and could be just the place, which could be targeted, by those wishing to disrupt our daily lives with maximum effect. The Council would wish that the hours of use are regulated.

## 8.3 **West Camel Parish Council:** No objection

In this case councillors support a response of No Objection to this application as it replaces a similar facility and should, therefore, result in minimal impact to the parish of West Camel.

#### 8.4 **Environment Agency:** No objection

We have no objection to the proposed development subject to the following conditions and informatives being included in any planning permission granted.

##### **Groundwater Protection**

In relation to risks to controlled waters we concur with the recommendations within Mott MacDonald report "Phase 1 and Phase 2 Contaminated Land Risk Assessment" dated January 2017. These recommendations include provision for further site investigation, risk assessment and the generation of remedial strategies and foundation risk assessments.

We expect 'foundation' risk assessments to be prepared for any areas where substantive earth works are proposed that may encounter contaminated soils or groundwater - and not just for areas in which foundations are due to be constructed.

In light of the above, the proposed development will be acceptable if a planning condition is included requiring the submission of a remediation strategy, carried out by a competent person in line with paragraph 121<sup>1</sup> of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Without these conditions we would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

##### **CONDITION**

No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This strategy will include the following components:

- A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
  - all previous uses;
  - potential contaminants associated with those uses;
  - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
  - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
- A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
- The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation

---

<sup>1</sup> The EA Consultation response references paragraphs from the 2012 NPPF which is superseded by the revised NPPF, July 2018

strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

- A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

#### REASON

To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### CONDITION

Piling and significant earthworks below existing ground levels shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

#### REASON

To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### CONDITION

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

#### REASON

To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Contaminated / Hazardous Waste INFORMATIVE

If any waste is to be removed from the site then the applicant needs to ensure that sufficient testing has been undertaken in line with Waste classification technical guidance WM3. This is to ensure all waste on the site is correctly classified and disposed of accordingly to a suitably authorised facility.

If any hazardous waste is to be removed off-site the site operator must ensure that consignment notes are completed correctly in accordance with the

legislation. If the applicant requires more specific guidance it is available on our website <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hazardous-waste-consignment-note>.

## **Flood Risk**

We have reviewed the submitted flood risk assessment and flood plain compensation document against the new draft detailed model outlines for the River Yeo and the River Cam. We can confirm that this new model reduces the flood risk to the site, with it now mostly now located within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk), although there is some Flood Zone 3 (high risk) winding their way up through the southern part of the site.

This therefore has implications on the amount of floodplain compensation that they have demonstrated in the supporting document. Therefore, the applicant can undertake the works that they have proposed which would be a conservative estimate on local flood risk. Alternatively, the applicant **can reassess the floodplain compensation scheme based on the new flood model under a condition**. Please re-consult with us if you require help with wording for this condition.

## **Pollution Prevention**

### INFORMATIVE

Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution from the development. Such safeguards should cover:

- the use of plant and machinery
- wheel washing and vehicle wash-down
- oils/chemicals and materials
- the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles
- the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds
- the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

### INFORMATIVE

The site must be drained on a separate system with all clean roof and surface water being kept separate from foul drainage. Manure/dung heaps must be sited in an area where it/they will not cause pollution of any watercourse or water source by the release of contaminated run-off.

There must be no discharge of foul or contaminated drainage from the site into either groundwater or any surface waters, whether direct to watercourses, ponds or lakes, or via soakaways/ditches.

### INFORMATIVE

This activity may require a Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 (as amended). The Environment Agency is required to consider all forms of pollution when issuing an Environmental Permit. If a

permit is issued for this site, it will require the operator to take all appropriate measures to prevent or minimise the emission from the activity.

In response to a query from the Waste Planning Authority a follow up letter was received from the Environment Agency on 18 August 2017:

**CONDITIONS QUERY - CONSTRUCTION OF A 360 SQ.M WASTE TRANSFER STATION (SUI GENERIS) AT RNAS YEOVILTON TO REPLACE EXISTING RECYCLING AND WASTE MANAGEMENT CENTRE RNAS YEOVILTON, YEOVIL**

Thank you for your email to Mike Holm dated the 31 July 2017 relating to the conditions we suggested in our previous response dated the 27 April 2017 for the above site.

**Land Contamination**

Your email states that two of the three conditions that we recommended that relate to land contamination cannot be applied to the planning consent, if it is issued.

Firstly we assume that the standard four-part planning condition requiring the applicant to fully investigate, risk assess, remediate (if necessary) and validate these works was acceptable, as this was not mentioned in the email that we received. Please do however let us know if that condition is considered unsuitable for any reason.

You mentioned in your email that the standard piling/foundation works risk assessment condition that we have recommended cannot be included because "*significant earth works will be required to create a flood alleviation pond which whilst not as extensive is still 360m<sup>3</sup> within the red line area. This would be required as part of any development*". The condition does not seek to prevent works from taking place. The condition only requires that "the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details", i.e. that details are submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) showing that the risks are understood and that the foundation choice and earthworks methodology are based on a proper assessment of risk. The preamble to this condition explains that a "foundation risk assessment should be prepared". Provided that a scheme is presented that considers the risks present and that the works are undertaken in accordance with that scheme then we would not object. Without a condition requiring a risk assessment for earthworks and piling we are unable to agree that the development can proceed and would be concerned, in the absence of the recommended condition, that the risk will not be assessed. In the absence of this, or a similar condition, we will have to object until such a time that the information has been supplied demonstrating that piling and earthworks would not pose a risk to controlled waters.

The other condition that you refer to that you mention also cannot be included relates to unsuspected contamination. You state that the condition cannot be used because contamination can be reasonably foreseen. We agree that contamination will likely be encountered, we do not dispute this. However,

this condition is a 'catch all' condition that relates to any unsuspected contamination not identified, assessed or remediated via the four-part condition mentioned above. It only requires the developer to identify, assess and report contamination that they encounter during construction that they did not expect to find. It is essentially a way of ensuring that there is some form of watching brief and that if something is discovered it is reported to the LPA. This condition is widely used.

### **Flood Alleviation Pond**

Within your email you mention a "flood alleviation pond", we would ask whether you are referring to a pond associated to surface water drainage? If so, then this should be referred to the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), which is Somerset County Council, as they now deal with all surface water drainage issues (both current and historical applications). If it is a surface water drainage pond, then the LLFA will need to decide if the drainage scheme and pond are viable if there is contaminated land on-site.

If you are referring to a "flood alleviation pond" meaning the floodplain compensation (as mentioned in the flood risk section of Mike Holm's letter (dated 27 April 2017), then the applicant is now providing a compensation area larger than is necessarily required as the majority of the site is now located within Flood Zone 2. If the compensation area is a concern relating to contaminated land, then if the applicant re-calculates the floodplain compensation area, they may be able to have a smaller area within a section where there is not a contaminated land issue.

We apologise if we have misunderstood anything in your email and we would be happy to have further discussion with you about this if required.

8.5 **Wessex Water:** no objection subject to informatives:

### **Water Supply Connections**

New Water supply connections will be required from Wessex Water to serve this proposed development. Application forms and guidance information is available from the Developer Services web-pages at our website.

### **Building near to a Water Main**

No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 5m from the pipeline without agreement from Wessex Water.

8.6 **South West Heritage Trust (Archaeology):** No objection subject to conditions:

The initial response from South West Heritage Trust, dated 17 March 2017 was as follows:

The Heritage Statement submitted by the applicant describes the requirement for archaeological investigation of the site prior to development. This is due to the relatively significant Romano-British period archaeology within the

immediate area. It is very likely archaeology representing settlement of that period will be impacted by this proposal.

For this reason I recommend that the developer be required to archaeologically excavate the heritage asset and provide a report on any discoveries made as indicated in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 141)<sup>2</sup>. This should be secured by the use of model condition 55 attached to any permission granted.

"No development hereby approved shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority."

A subsequent addendum to the above was received from SWHT on 17 August 2017 in respect of the re-submitted application:

The archaeology will therefore be encountered at between 0.2 and 0.4m deep and will be cut into the river terrace deposits. This is clearly the zone where contaminants are located and looking at table 10 in the contamination report odours of hydrocarbons were encountered at 0.5m-1m which is likely to be where much of the archaeology is located.

The way I view this is that there may be two options:

- 1) That a method for dealing with the archaeology and protecting archaeologists from the contaminants should be submitted by the applicant prior to permission being granted.

Or if this is not possible:

- 2) Because the presence of contaminants makes investigation, recording and publishing of the archaeology on the site impossible the application should be refused as it is contrary to paragraph 141 of the NPPF which, directs LPAs to require the recording of heritage assets that are to be impacted.

## 8.7 **Ecological Advisor:** No objection

A Preliminary Ecological Assessment of the application site was carried out by Mott MacDonald and reported in May 2015 from surveys carried out in the previous March. This may be considered 'out-of-date' as generally the valid period for ecological surveys is two years and in the case of some species less. At the time of the survey the habitat within the proposed Waste Transfer Station application site consisted of improved grassland with scrub and species poor blackthorn / hawthorn hedgerows at the north eastern and

---

<sup>2</sup> The response references the 2012 NPPF which is superseded by the revised NPPF July 2018.

northern boundaries. The southern and western boundaries consisted of fencing. There were three areas of scattered trees within the site: two mature horse chestnuts on the south eastern boundary of the field; semi-mature ash trees on the north eastern boundary; and several young willows in the western corner of the site.

It was considered that there was suitable habitat present for several species including breeding birds, badgers, bats and reptiles. Although no specific surveys were carried out mitigation was recommended to prevent adverse impacts from the development potentially affecting these features. The ecology report suggests that the hedgerows would be replaced with security fencing but this is not shown in other documents accounting the application.

Please could you ask the applicant if that is so?

I would also request a letter from the ecological consultants confirming that site conditions for ecology have not changed in the interim.

#### **8.8 Transport Development:** No objection subject to conditions

Referring to the above-mentioned planning application received on 13 March 2017 and after carrying out a site visit on 15 March 2017 have the following observations on the highway and transportation aspects of this proposal:-

I am aware that this application has been submitted previously and commented on by my colleagues Mr Purkiss and Mr Jones, where the Highway Authority did not raise an objection. However, I am also aware that the application was subsequently refused at committee.

Currently RNAS Yeovilton has a Recycling and Waste Management Centre (RWMC), it can therefore be assumed that with the closure of the existing RWMC and the operation of the proposed RWMC the application will not represent an increase of vehicle movements on the highway. Ergo, it would be unreasonable to object to this application on traffic generation grounds.

The proposal would need to have a fully consolidated surface at the access to prevent any loose material from being deposited onto the Highway. This will help to avoid any potential highway safety concerns. The applicant should also ensure that there is no obstruction higher than 900mm as shown within the visibility splays as show on Drawing Number MMD-320898-C-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0700.

The entrance gates as shown on drawing number MMD-320898-C-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0700 would need to be set back a minimum of 10 metres from the edge of the carriageway to allow vehicles to wait off the highway, which would prevent the obstruction of the free flow of traffic.

The applicant must ensure that under no circumstances should water be discharged onto the highway. Assumption should not be made that connection to any highway drains can be automatically achieved.



Taking the above into account, the Highway Authority does not wish to raise an objection and should planning permission be granted then I would recommend the following conditions are imposed:

- Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted the proposed access over at least the first 10 metres of its length, as measured from the edge of the adjoining carriageway, shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once constructed the access shall thereafter be maintained in that condition at all times.
- Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards, shall be set back a minimum distance of 10 metres from the carriageway edge and shall thereafter be maintained in that condition at all times.
- Before the access hereby permitted is first brought into use the turning space shown on the submitted plan shall be properly consolidated and surfaced in accordance with the submitted plans. Such turning space shall be kept free of obstruction at all times and not used other than for the turning of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.
- At the proposed access there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900 millimetres above adjoining road level within the visibility splays shown on the submitted plan, Drawing Number MMD-320898-C-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0700. Such visibility splays shall be constructed prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained at all times.
- The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Somerset County Council). The plan shall include construction vehicle movements, construction operation hours, construction vehicular routes to and from site, construction delivery hours, expected number of construction vehicles per day, car parking for contractors, specific measures to be adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of the Environmental Code of Construction Practice and a scheme to encourage the use of public transport amongst contractors. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall be installed before the site is first brought into use and thereafter maintained at all times.

Note: Having regards to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that the creation of the new access will require a Section 184 Permit. This must be obtained from the Highway Service Manager for the South Somerset Area at The Highways Depot, Mead Avenue, Houndstone Business Park, Yeovil, Somerset, BA22 8RT, Tel No 0845 345 9155. Application for such a permit should be made at least four weeks before access works are intended to commence.

## 8.9 **Acoustics Advisor:** No objection, subject to conditions

The initial response from the acoustic advisor is set out as follows:

It would appear that there have been no significant changes with respect to the operations undertaken, or the design and orientation of the building enclosure at this site. However it is not clear what operating hours are desired by the applicant and I note that the application form 'hours of operation' indicated not known.

I first responded to the previous application in an email of 9/12/15 and then undertook some follow-up measurements to this, that were reported in an email dated 9/3/16, and confirmed my initial assumptions on the existing noise environment.

My expectation would be for daytime noise to be limited and worst during sporadic movement of skips. The estimated level at the closest properties at 22m from the building assuming 15dB insertion loss for the enclosure was 46dB (A). My measurements indicated distant local traffic noise to be at levels of 47-48dB(A) and I expected traffic noise from the more distant sections of the A303, that would be audible during brief lulls in other noise, to be equivalent to the minimum noise levels observed at 44dB (A). In my view this level of noise impact could therefore be classified within the NPPF guidance on noise as noticeable but not intrusive in that *"Noise can be heard but does not cause any change in behaviour or attitude. Can slightly affect the acoustic character of the area but not such that there is a perceived change in quality of life"*.

The outcome of my consideration at this time would therefore remain unchanged in that:

*Based on the consideration above I do not anticipate that the development would have an adverse noise impact sufficient to oppose the application or require planning conditions. As with all waste operations it may be prudent to provide conditions that prevent unexpected escalation of mechanisation, waste reception or hours of operation beyond the reasonable expectations of this application.*

The Acoustic Adviser has amended his original response by the following emails dated 18 August 2018 and 21 August 2018, as follows:

While the conclusion of the 2017 email remains valid I would agree with you that the separation distance of the nearest property from the proposed development is not 22m and is 60m-65m. I therefore appear to have misrepresented this detail from my earlier report sent on 9/12/15 and I apologise for the confusion caused. The 2015 report more clearly indicated that it was the assessment of source noise (skip rollout) that was at 22m and that house separation was 60m. The source noise considered was corrected for the 60m separation from property and a further 15dB insertion loss was added to account for the presence and screening provided by the sorting building. (18 August)

It may be worth stating that comments in my noise reports were made prior to, but remain in accordance with the revised NPPF July 2018.

The environmental objective of the revised NPPF requires the planning system to minimise pollution and in para 180 specifies that decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development. With this in mind I suggest the following to address two potential adverse impacts:

I think it would be prudent to include the following condition to safeguard against any audible intrusion arise from the repeated use of distinctive tonal reverse warning alarms on site based plant:

All reverse warning devices to be used on site based plant shall be broadband devices or similar and designed to minimise noise disturbance.

Reason: In the interests of minimising disturbance to residential and public amenity.

I also think the following condition would be appropriate to provide clarity on operational noise reduction and the opportunity for the planning authority to address any instances of unreasonable handling practice or machinery noise should they arise:

All waste management activities and plant operation on site shall be undertaken in a manner to minimise noise emissions. All plant used on site shall be effectively silenced to manufacturer's specifications with all noise control measures maintained to their design specification for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding residential and public amenity. (21 August)

#### 8.10 **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA):** No objection

#### 8.11 **Public Comments**

The following representations have been received in respect of the proposal:

- 2 representations objecting to the proposal.

The representations objecting to the proposal raise the following issues:

- Proposal should not be passed until the issues with contamination of the ground have been addressed;
- The development will cause the flooding of Stockwitch Lane to worsen;
- Noise from lorries and fork lift trucks beeping;
- Close proximity (6m) of the proposed development to residential properties;
- Odour, Vermin and fly control;
- Facility should be sited elsewhere on the Base; and
- Base cannot cope with additional electricity demand.

## 9 Comments of the Service Manager

- 9.1 The planning application relates to the construction of a waste transfer station (WTS) to serve RNAS Yeovilton.
- 9.2 **Development Plan:** Regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of this determination, which must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant policies may be found in the Somerset Waste Core Strategy (SWCS, adopted February 2013) and the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 (SSLP, adopted March 2015)). Also taken into account are the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW), which seeks to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment.
- 9.3 The revised NPPF (July 2018) advises that Local Planning Authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and reiterates that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 9.4 **Principle of Development:** The role of the existing Recycling and Waste Management Centre (RWMC) is meant to provide the capability to receive, segregate, store and enable onward movement of material for recycling and general waste generated by the RNAS Yeovilton.
- 9.5 The existing RWMC is non-compliant with existing waste legislation as the waste is not properly segregated. The future intention is to enclose the waste management activities in a purpose designed building at a new location, rather than in the open on hard standing as is currently the case. The collection of segregated waste will support re-use and recycling of waste at RNAS Yeovilton.
- 9.6 Within the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) the proposal would be classified as a non-strategic site, for small-scale recycling and waste transfer (as a guide processing up to 50,000 tonnes per year) (paragraph 9.19).
- 9.7 Proposals for non-strategic facilities are assessed using the WCS Development Management policies.
- 9.8 In this regard, WCS Policy DM1 (Basic Location Principles) states that:
- Planning permission will be granted for waste management development at locations that are well connected to the strategic transport network which adhere to the principles of sustainable development and which support delivery of strategic policies WCS 2-5.*
- 9.9 Under WCS Policy DM1 waste management development will normally be located on existing, permitted or allocated waste management sites, existing or allocated general industrial use (B2 use class) land, or in existing storage and distribution use (B8 use class) land, or previously developed land. The

use of unallocated greenfield land will be strictly controlled and limited in accordance with the Development Plan.

- 9.10 Policy WCS2 aims to 'facilitate source-separation of waste'. This proposal allows for the allocation of adequate space for waste separation in a purpose-built building and therefore complies with Policy WCS2. Policies WC3, 4 and 5 are not relevant to the proposal.
- 9.11 In this case, the proposed WTS is close to the A303 (a National Freight Route) and the A37 (a Regional Freight Route), but would be located on an unallocated greenfield site in a potentially floodable area. However, the site is within the general development area of RNAS Yeovilton and is a replacement for the existing waste management centre, serving the air base, which has approximately 2,500 military personnel and 1500 civilian personnel on base.
- 9.12 National Planning Policy for Waste (dated 16 October 2014) states that while priority should be given to the re-use of previously developed land, there is a need to consider a range of land uses given the locational requirements of some waste management facilities.
- 9.13 Members are also reminded that this is not a commercial waste operation for profit as it will only serve the air base and in this sense represents a "community" facility.
- 9.14 The applicant has advised that an assessment was undertaken that considered 11 sites for the WTS. The assessment evaluated (i) project costs, (ii) impacts on station infrastructure, (iii) how to progress the development, (iv) options taking into account the wider development, and (v) impacts and disruption to the WTS during construction. However, the other sites considered have not been identified and only 5 of the site assessments have been outlined. The proposed site (option 9) was considered to have good access, the shortest construction programme and minimal disruption to station activities during construction. It was also stated as the only practicable location within the air base.
- 9.15 The applicant's site option assessment has to be taken at face value because it cannot be made public due to reasons of national security. Therefore, subject to overcoming flood risk and ground contamination issues (addressed below), the location of the site is considered to be acceptable in principle and compliant with WCS Policy DM1, which does not rule out development on greenfield sites.
- 9.16 Policy SS2 of the SSLP states that development in rural settlements will be limited to that which:
- Provides employment opportunities appropriate to the scale of the settlement; and/or
  - Creates or enhances community facilities and services to serve the settlement; and/or
  - Meets identified housing need, particularly for affordable housing.

9.17 In addition, the Policy adds:

*Development will be permitted where it is commensurate with the scale and character of the settlement, provides for one or more of the types of development above, and increases the sustainability of a settlement in general.*

9.18 The proposal will be commensurate with the scale and character of the air base, which is of itself a community, and increases sustainability in the sense that it would be a vast improvement on the current WTS. It is considered that the locational requirements of the WTS in proximity to the air base and in MoD ownership warrants relocation to the application site. It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with Policy SS2 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

9.19 **Flood Risk:** The relevant policies relating to flood risk are Policy DM7 (Water Resources) of the Waste Core Strategy and Policy EQ1 (Climate Change) of the South Somerset Local Plan.

9.20 In addition, Paragraph 155 of the revised NPPF (July 2018) states that:

*Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.*

9.21 The Environment Agency flood mapping indicates that the proposed waste transfer station would be within Flood Zone 2, and the South Somerset strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA) identifies the site as within Zone 3b (Functional Floodplain). The EA has confirmed that the site, is now mostly located within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk), although there is some Flood Zone 3 (high risk) winding their way up through the southern part of the site.

9.22 The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has indicated that whilst flooding at the air base has occurred on several occasions since 1979, it has not affected the application site. Nevertheless, local objectors have indicated that the field floods every winter and the highway through Bridgehampton to Stockwitch Cross also floods and floodwaters regularly get close to entering residential properties.

9.23 The application of the exception test should be informed by a strategic or site-specific flood risk assessment, depending on whether it is being applied during plan production or at the application stage. For the exception test to be passed it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

9.24 The situation has clearly changed since the SFRA was carried out. The EA and LLFA have looked at the site-specific FRA submitted with the application

and do not object, suggesting that the sequential/exception test has been passed.

- 9.25 In this case, the proposed development site is at approximately 19.79m AOD, and the anticipated 1 in 100 year flood depth at the application site is stated as up to 0.23m (approximately 9 inches). However, it is indicated that the proposed development would be raised above the 1 in 100 year flood level to 20.17m AOD to provide a freeboard of 0.15m.
- 9.26 While raising the proposed waste transfer station above the 1 in 100 year flood level should ensure the safety of the site, there would be a potential loss in floodplain storage.
- 9.27 In October 2015, a FRA for the WTS was submitted to support the development's planning application. On 21st March 2016, the Environment Agency (EA) requested further clarification on the amount of flood compensation and the location for this on the site.
- 9.28 *In the FRA, floodplain compensation was provided on a "volume-for volume" basis (i.e. the volume lost by the proposed development was compensated for by providing the same volume elsewhere). The EA advised that "the only available land to accommodate the required compensation area is to the Eastern side of the Site Area and may be subject to other landscape issues or constraints. If this location is deemed acceptable.... then this would need to be secured through an approximately worded (Grampian) condition for floodplain compensation".*
- 9.29 The FRA Addendum presents an initial assessment of the viability of providing "level for level" compensatory storage to provide mitigation for the proposed development. The FRA addendum demonstrates that it is feasible to provide level for level compensatory storage for lost floodplain volume as a result of the construction of a new WTS on the site.
- 9.30 For example, at a level of 19.8m AOD an area of 521m<sup>2</sup> will be lost due to land raising by the proposed WTS. To compensate for this, to the east of the proposed development the ground level is proposed to be lowered to below 19.8m AOD. The total area lowered below 19.8m AOD for the floodplain compensatory storage is 803m<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, for a level of 19.8m AOD there is a level for level gain in available storage. This is likely to provide some betterment in the form of reduced flood depths in the nearby vicinity of the potential compensatory storage.
- 9.31 Following receipt of the FRA Addendum, the EA has now withdrawn its objection to the proposal subject to further site investigations which will be secured through planning conditions, should Members be minded to approve the application.
- 9.32 Furthermore, by including additional storage volume, the compensatory storage may result in betterment in flood depths in the nearby vicinity.

9.33 It is therefore considered that flood risk to the proposed development site and wider area is acceptable, and complies with Policy DM7 (Water Resources) of the Waste Core Strategy and Policy EQ1 (Climate Change) of the South Somerset Local Plan.

9.34 **Water Contamination:** The relevant policies in relation to water contamination are Policy DM7 of the Waste Core Strategy and Policy EQ7 (Pollution Control) of the South Somerset Local Plan.

9.35 In addition, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides guidance on the implementation of contaminated land and pollution management requirements to address contamination risks associated with future site uses through the planning system. Paragraphs 179 and 180 of the NPPF state the following:

*179. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.*

*180. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment...*

9.36 South Somerset District Council Local Plan Policy EQ7 states that:

*“Development that, on its own or cumulatively, would result in air, light, noise, water quality or other environmental pollution or harm to amenity, health or safety will only be permitted if the potential adverse effects would be mitigated to an acceptable level by other environmental controls, or by measures included in the proposals”*

9.37 The Contaminated Land Risk Assessment submitted with application confirms that a review of available records and resources has been undertaken to gain understanding of the local environmental baseline conditions. It concludes that “further work is required to better understand the extent of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination identified on the site and the associated risks to groundwater receptors”. It is anticipated that this would comprise:

- Additional ground investigation to delineate the extent of contamination;
- Detailed quantitative risk assessment where appropriate, and
- The development of a Remediation Strategy to remove risks to groundwater receptors.

9.38 In their formal consultation response, the EA have advised that:

“In relation to risks to controlled waters we concur with the recommendations within Mott MacDonald report "Phase 1 and Phase 2 Contaminated Land Risk Assessment" dated January 2017. These recommendations include provision for further site investigation, risk assessment and the generation of remedial strategies and foundation risk assessments.



We expect 'foundation' risk assessments to be prepared for any areas where substantive earth works are proposed that may encounter contaminated soils or groundwater - and not just for areas in which foundations are due to be constructed.

In light of the above, the proposed development will be acceptable if a planning condition is included requiring the submission of a remediation strategy, carried out by a competent person in line with paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework”.

- 9.39 The EA's proposed conditions are worded to protect groundwater.
- 9.40 SSDC has recommended similar conditions in respect of public health and as a result there is some overlapping of the conditions. After further discussion with EA, amalgamated conditions are recommended.
- 9.41 Subject to the imposition of the conditions recommended by the EA and SSDC it is therefore considered that the development complies with the NPPF and Policy EQ7 (Pollution Control) of the South Somerset Local Plan.
- 9.42 **Transport:** The relevant policies in relation to transport and highways are Policy DM6 (Waste Transport) of the Waste Core Strategy Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan. Policy DM6 requires the applicant to demonstrate that:
- the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on Somerset's local and strategic transport network;
  - that a suitable access can be delivered, and
  - alternatives have been adequately explored and have not been demonstrated to be practicable and beneficial
- 9.43 The intention is to construct a new vehicular access onto the B3151. This has already been previously approved by SSDC on 6th January 2014 (SSDC Application Reference Number: 13/04257/FUL). This application was submitted for vehicular access only as the site was originally proposed to be used for contractor parking on a temporary basis. The Highways Authority did not raise any objections to this application and it has been established that the access in this location is safe and adequate visibility is available at this location.
- 9.44 The waste that will be managed at the proposed WTS will only be waste arising from RNAS Yeovilton. No waste from outside RNAS Yeovilton will be transported by road to the site. Only waste that has been segregated or bulked up for onwards transportation will leave the site. The site will not be open to members of the public or other unauthorised personnel at RNAS Yeovilton and will be managed by two members of staff. These staff will operate any vehicles entering or exiting the site and will be collecting waste from other areas of the base to be stored at the proposed WTS.

- 9.45 Collections will be on an ad hoc, infrequent basis when the skips/bays in the WTS become full. There will be no additional impacts on the local road network over and above those that already occur due to the existing RWMC.
- 9.46 The Highways Authority has raised no objection to the application subject to imposition of conditions relating to construction of the new access, submission of a construction traffic management plan and disposal of surface water. It is considered that these conditions are appropriate and should be imposed on the planning permission should Members be minded to approve the application.
- 9.47 It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policy TA5 of the South Somerset Local Plan as the nature and volume of traffic generated by the development will not have a detrimental impact on, or compromise the safety and/or function of, the local or strategic road networks.
- 9.48 It is also considered that the proposed development complies with Policy DM6 (Waste Transport) of the Waste Core Strategy as the proposal meets the three criteria set out.
- 9.49 **Heritage and Archaeology:** The relevant policies in relation to heritage/archaeology are South Somerset LP Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment) and Waste Core Strategy Policy DM3 (part I)
- 9.50 In addition, the revised NPPF (paragraph 199), states that local authorities:  
*...should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible...*
- 9.51 SSLP Policy EQ3 (Historic Environment) states that:  
*Heritage assets will be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place.*  
*All new development will be expected to (among other things) safeguard or where appropriate enhance the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of heritage assets.*
- 9.52 The proposed development area lies within a landscape which is known to be part of an Iron Age and Romano British farmstead. Remains of this settlement, as well as earlier Bronze Age remains, are likely to extend into the proposed development area. The development area is known to contain ridge and furrow earthworks, which may have truncated the Iron Age remains. Previous excavation in a similarly affected field, adjacent to the proposed development site, has shown that remnants of the Iron Age features were preserved in situ beneath the ridges and it is likely a similar scenario will occur within the development site. Overall, the remains likely to be encountered

during the works at the proposed development site are likely to be of medium value.

- 9.53 To evaluate the potential risk of the development impacting archaeological remains it is proposed that a geophysical survey will be carried out to identify whether archaeological features are present at the proposed development area, and whether mitigation measures will be required in advance of, or during construction of the proposed scheme.
- 9.54 The Heritage advisor has recommended that the developer be required to archaeologically excavate the heritage asset and provide a report on any discoveries made as indicated in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Heritage advisor has also requested that a method for dealing with the archaeology and protecting archaeologists from the contaminants should be submitted by the applicant prior to permission being granted. It is not considered necessary to request such a scheme prior to permission being granted as the competent authorities on this matter (the EA and SSDC) have not objected and recommend a similar condition requiring investigation prior to commencement of development. It is therefore recommended that an appropriate condition is imposed if Members are minded to grant planning permission.
- 9.55 Subject to those conditions being imposed and implemented the proposal would meet the requirements of the NPPF and accord with SSLP Policy EQ3.
- 9.56 **Ecology:** The relevant policy in relation to ecology is South Somerset Local Plan policy EQ4 (Biodiversity).
- 9.57 The habitat within the proposed Waste Transfer Station site consists of improved grassland with scrub and hedge at the north eastern and northern boundaries. There is suitable habitat on site for several species including breeding birds, badgers, bats and reptiles. Due to the potential presence of these species the following actions have been recommended by the applicant's ecological team that have been advising on this project:
- any vegetation requiring removal during bird breeding season (March to August inclusive) should be checked by a suitably experienced ecologist for breeding birds prior to removal; and
  - If scrub is to be removed, a reptile toolbox talk should be provided to the site team and vegetation should be removed in a phased manner.
- 9.58 There are no non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site; however, there are five Biodiversity (BAP) habitats. There is also a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) located approximately 1km north of the site but it is not considered that this proposal will affect this LNR.
- 9.59 The County Council's Ecological Advisor has provided a response to the planning application, in which they have highlighted the possibility that the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) (dated May 2015) is now outdated. In response the applicant has stated that from an ecological viewpoint, it is considered that there have not been any considerable changes to the

conditions on site; and that there were no issues raised in the previous applications for the proposed development with regards to ecology or the PEA. As the principle of the development has not changed in this time, it is considered that the assessment included in the PEA is still of relevance. Although no specific surveys were carried out, mitigation was recommended to prevent adverse impacts from the development potentially affecting suitable habitats for some protected species.

9.60 It is considered that the original conclusions on ecology for the 2015 application still applies and there is a need to impose a condition requiring that the development be carried out with respect to legally protected species on the site, if Members are minded to grant planning permission.

9.61 **Impact on Amenity:** The relevant policy is respect of impact on local amenity is Waste Core Strategy Policy DM3.

9.62 Apart from a change to the red line boundary to accommodate the flood compensation works, nothing has changed from the application that was refused in 2016. The reasons for refusal specifically related to flood risk and contamination. It therefore follows that all other issues, were considered to be acceptable. For completeness, the conclusions of the 2016 Committee Report in respect of those issues are repeated where appropriate. Where additional issues have been raised they are also addressed below.

9.63 In respect of impact on the environment and local communities, WCS Policy DM3 (General Considerations) states that:

*Planning Permission will be granted for waste management development subject to applicants demonstrating that the proposed development will not generate:*

*a) significant adverse impacts from noise, dust, vibration, odour, emissions, illumination, visual intrusion or traffic to adjoining land uses and users and those in close proximity to the development;*

*b) significant adverse impacts on a public right of way or visual amenity; and*

*c) unacceptable cumulative impacts.*

*When determining a waste planning application, the level of protection afforded to an environmental or heritage asset will be proportional to its significance including, but not limited to, its statutory designation.*

9.64 **Proximity to Residential Properties:** Yeovilton Parish Council and Local residents believe that the proposed building is now nearer to properties and have cited a distance of 6m-10m. However, the footprint of the building has not altered and the nearest property is approximately 60m from the proposed structure.

9.65 The discrepancy may have arisen because residents and the Parish Council assumed that the red line boundary would be the actual limit of development.

This is not the case. The red line area has been extended because of the incorporation of the proposed flood attenuation works.

- 9.66 Given the nature of the waste operations, which will take place in a building, it is considered that the distance from the building to the nearest property is adequate. As the WTS is not expected to handle food or wet waste the site is not expected to generate fly infestations or attract vermin. There are however already procedures in place for the whole air base to deal with vermin. The building will be inward-facing so that storage bays will not be visible when viewed from nearest residential properties. Members are also reminded that the previous application, which involved a building of the same scale in the same location, was not refused on grounds of impact on local amenity. Furthermore the 2016 Committee stated that "*The nearest property in this instance is approximately 30m from the proposed structure*". This was clearly incorrect as the building is shown to be in the same position for both the 2015 and 2017 applications.
- 9.67 **Visual Impact:** In the event of permission being granted and the development being progressed, it has been indicated that security fencing would be erected around the site; although, no details have been submitted regarding the location of the fencing or whether any landscaping would be provided. However, the applicant has confirmed that no hedgerows would be removed. The building itself would be located in the western part of the field and would be set against the backdrop of the air base and in these circumstances would not represent a significant visual impact, which would warrant refusal of the application.
- 9.68 The RNAS Yeovilton site has been Crown Land since 1940 and has been retained as it is required for operational purposes. Therefore, this site benefits from permitted development rights under Part 19, Class R of the GPDO 2015. Whilst a planning application for the building has been submitted, other works (including the erection of security fencing etc.) can be carried out under these rights.
- 9.69 **Noise:** The County Council's acoustic advisor has indicated that due to the proximity of the A303, the ambient noise level at the residential properties may be expected to feature traffic noise at a level estimated to be 45dB(A) – 50dB(A), with added periods of greater noise from aircraft activities and passing traffic. An on-site noise survey (during light south-westerly winds) assessed the ambient noise from traffic and RNAS activities over a period of 30 minutes. Helicopter movements were found to exceed noise levels of 70dB (A) with a background L90 level of 50dB (A) and a minimum noise level of 44dB (A).
- 9.70 Noise emissions would only be generated at the site during the daytime on weekdays, with movement of replacement skips likely to represent the worst noise arising from the site. However, the WTS structure would provide effective screening of noise breakout toward the nearest housing, so noise from the movement of a 40yd<sup>3</sup> (30.5m<sup>3</sup>) skip is expected to be reduced to approximately 46dB(A).

- 9.71 Noise is not seen as a reason to object to this application given the limited activity at the site, and the screening that the proposed structure would provide to reduce sporadic noise at the closest properties to below the level of existing A303 traffic noise or periods of noise from helicopter activity at RNAS.
- 9.72 Nevertheless, it is agreed with the acoustics officer's suggestion that, if permitted, it would be prudent to condition the waste reception/transfer hours of operation and control of plant and vehicle noise.
- 9.73 **Odour:** Food and general household waste would continue to be collected weekly by municipal collection vehicles and would not be stored at the application site. The various skips are not expected to contain food waste and so will not have the potential to contain biodegradable elements that could generate odour or attract vermin.
- 9.74 **Air Quality:** In this case, limited traffic is likely to be generated by the proposed development and the air quality is not expected to deteriorate to any significant extent as a result of vehicle emissions. Due to the nature of the waste to be stored on site it is not considered that the operations would generate any significant dust emissions.
- 9.75 **Light Pollution:** Given the limited working hours stated it is unlikely that external lighting will be required at the application site and the application does not include any reference to external lighting being installed. However, if permitted, it is considered prudent to include a condition which prevents use of external lighting on the site after specified working hours.
- 9.76 In light of the above it is considered that the proposal would comply with WCS Policy DM3.
- 9.77 **Planning Balance:** The revised NPPF advises that Local Planning Authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and reiterates that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 9.78 The application is a re-submission of an application previously refused in 2016. The reasons for refusal related to flood risk and ground contamination only. It is considered that these have been satisfactorily addressed in the re-submission. The size, scale and siting of the proposed building has not changed and the details of the waste transfer operations also remain the same. There are therefore no conflicts with development plan or the NPPF. It is considered that the scheme is now acceptable and should be supported.

## 10 Conclusion

- 10.1 The planning application relates to the construction of a waste transfer station to serve RNAS Yeovilton. This is a resubmission of a previous application (15/05029/CPO) that was refused on the 11th April 2016. The red line boundary has been amended to address the issue of compensatory flood storage raised by the Environment Agency. The submission also now includes

a Contaminated Land Risk Assessment (Phase I and Phase II), which provides a detailed assessment of the potential contamination issues on site.

- 10.2 The location of the building and hard standing and the proposed waste operations remained unchanged.
- 10.3 The site lies mainly within Flood Zone 2. Compensatory storage would be provided to the east of the proposed development site to account for the floodplain volume lost by raising the development above the 1-in-100-year flood level, thus eliminating any detrimental impact on third parties as a result of the development.
- 10.4 Concerns have been raised over the impacts of the development on local residents, namely visual and noise impacts. With regards to noise impacts, the building has been designed in such a way to ensure that all the openings face away from the nearest residential properties, reducing the impacts from the operation of the proposed waste transfer station to what are considered acceptable levels.
- 10.5 The proposal would also be commensurate with the scale and character of the air base. Concerns have previously been raised by local residents over the height of the building and overlooking /views. There will be no windows on the eastern elevation, which is the nearest to residential properties.
- 10.6 To evaluate the potential risk of the development impacting archaeological remains, it is proposed that a geophysical survey will be carried out to identify whether archaeological features are present at the proposed development area, and whether mitigation measures will be required in advance of, or during construction of the proposed scheme.
- 10.7 A Phase 1 Habitat Survey has been undertaken and no protected species were found on the site. However, in view of the time lapse since the PEA was prepared conditions are proposed to ensure that protected species are not present on site or unduly impacted upon.
- 10.8 There would not be an increase in traffic generated over and above that already visiting RNAS Yeovilton for the purposes of waste management.
- 10.9 No scheduled monuments, listed buildings or conservation areas will be affected by the proposal.
- 10.10 No long-term noise and dust impacts have been identified arising from the proposal.
- 10.11 The proposed development complies with the NPPF and relevant planning policies in the adopted Waste Core Strategy and adopted Local Plan for South Somerset District Council.

## 11 Recommendation

- 11.1 It is recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the imposition of the following conditions and that authority to undertake any minor non-material editing, which may be necessary to the wording of those conditions, be delegated to the Service Manager, Planning Control Enforcement & Compliance:

### 1. Commencement

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years of the date of this permission

Reason: Pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

### 2. Completion in accordance with approved details

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved plans:-

- Site Location Plan: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0001 Rev P3 (not dated);
- MOD Ownership Plan: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0002 Rev P3 (not dated);
- Site Block Plan: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0003 Rev P3 (not dated);
- Levels Drawing: MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0004 Rev P1 28/05/2015;
- General Arrangement (Planning): MMD-320898-PL-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0005 Rev P3 (not dated);
- Sections: SBR-32098-A-DR-SW\_WTS-00-0003 Rev 4 08/02/2016;
- Elevations: SBR-32098-A-DR-SW\_WTS-00-0002 Rev 5 10/02/2016;
- Proposed Access Layout: MMD-320898-C-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0700 Rev P1 03/08/15,

and documents:

- Planning Statement (24 January 2017);
- Flood Risk Assessment (October 2015);
- Flood Risk Assessment Addendum Compensatory Storage (December 2016);
- Heritage Assessment Update (January 2017);
- Phase I and Phase II Contaminated Risk Assessment (January 2017);
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (May 2015);
- E-mail from Agent, dated 28<sup>th</sup> August 2018;
- Detailed Gradiometer Survey and Watching Brief Report (August 2015)



- Appendix 1-5 and Figures of Detailed Gradiometer Survey and  
Watching Brief Report, and  
- E-mail from Agent, dated 28<sup>th</sup> August 2018.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to deal promptly with any development not in accordance with the approved plans.

**3. Waste Transfer Building**

Before the commencement of the construction of the proposed waste management building, details of finished brickwork/blockwork, roof materials and colour scheme of the proposed structure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The building shall be constructed as approved.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

**4. Hours of Operation**

The development hereby permitted shall be operated only within the hours of 08:00 – 18:00 Monday – Friday, and 08.00- 1300 on Saturdays. No waste transfer operations shall be carried out on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays. For the avoidance of doubt, no vehicles shall enter or leave the site outside of these times.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

**5. Artificial Lighting**

No artificial lighting shall be operated outside of the permitted operational hours indicated in Condition 4 above.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and to minimise nuisance and disturbance to neighbours.

**6. Access**

Before the commencement of all other aspects of the development hereby permitted the proposed access over at least the first 10 metres of its length, as measured from the edge of the adjoining carriageway, shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. Once constructed the access shall thereafter be maintained in that condition for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

**7. Entrance Gates**

Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open inwards, shall be set back a minimum distance of 10 metres from the carriageway edge and shall thereafter be maintained in that condition for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**8. Turning Space**

Before the access hereby permitted is first brought into use the turning space as shown on Drawing No. MMD-320898-C-DR-WTS\_000-XX-0700 shall be properly consolidated and surfaced in accordance with the submitted plans. Such turning space shall be kept free of obstruction at all times and not used other than for the turning of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**9. Visibility Splays**

At the proposed access there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 900 millimetres above adjoining road level within the visibility splays shown on the submitted plan, Drawing Number MMD-320898-C-DR- WTS\_000-XX-0700. Such visibility splays shall be constructed prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained as such for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**10. Construction Traffic Management Plan**

Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The plan shall include construction vehicle movements, construction operation hours, construction vehicular routes to and from site, construction delivery hours, expected number of construction vehicle movements per day, car parking for contractors, specific measures to be adopted to mitigate construction impacts in pursuance of the Environmental Code of Construction Practice and a scheme to encourage the use of public transport amongst contractors. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**11. Vehicle reversing Devices**

All reverse warning devices to be used on site-based plant shall be broadband devices or similar and designed to minimise noise disturbance.

Reason: In the interests of minimising disturbance to residential and public amenity.

## **12. Noise Emissions**

All waste management activities and plant operation on site shall be undertaken in a manner to minimise noise emissions. All plant used on site shall be effectively silenced to manufacturer's specifications with all noise control measures maintained to their design specification for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding residential and public amenity

## **13. Groundwater Protection**

Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Waste Planning Authority. This strategy will include the following components:

- 1) A Phase 1 Site Investigation Report and preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
  - all previous uses;
  - potential contaminants associated with those uses;
  - a conceptual model and human health and environmental risk assessment of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
  - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

and shall be undertaken in accordance with BS 10175:2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice.

- 2) A Phase II intrusive investigation and report based on the requirements of (1) detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of the analysis, undertaken in accordance with BS 10175:2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice. The report shall include a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors including those off-site and a quantitative human health and environmental risk assessment.
- 3) The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
- 4) A validation report providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages,

maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. This shall include quality assurance certificates and the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from site. A clear end point of the remediation should be stated, such as site contaminant levels or a risk management action, and how this will be validated. Any ongoing monitoring should also be outlined.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the Waste Planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to protect the health of future occupiers of the site from any possible effects of contaminated land, in accordance with Policy EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

#### **14. Potential for Contamination**

If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The additional remediation scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to protect the health of future occupiers of the site from any possible effects of contaminated land, in accordance with Policy EQ7 of the South Somerset Local Plan.

#### **15. Flood Compensation**

Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the flood plain compensation, as required by the flood risk assessment, has been submitted to and approved by the Waste Planning Authority. The plan shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details and agreed timetable.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in an increase in flood risk in the locality.

#### **16. Earthworks**

Details of any significant earthworks below existing ground levels shall be submitted for approval by the Waste Planning Authority in advance of such works. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**17. Foul and Surface Water**

Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of foul and surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority and such approved drainage details shall be implemented before the development hereby permitted is first brought into use. Following its installation such approved scheme shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter for the duration of the development hereby permitted

Reason: To ensure that the site is adequately drained and that foul and surface is segregated and will not adversely affect neighbouring sites.

**18. Highway Drainage**

Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water, so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway, details of which shall be submitted to, and approved by the Waste Planning Authority. Such provision shall be installed before the site is first brought in to use and thereafter maintained at all times.

Reason: To ensure that no surface water is discharged onto the highway.

**19. Archaeology**

Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a written scheme of investigation and a programme of archaeological work, which shall include provisions for protection of the archaeologists from any localised potential contaminants on site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The agreed scheme and programme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that any archaeological features on site are recorded and /or removed from the site in accordance with paragraph 199 of the NPPF and to protect the archaeologists during site investigations from any risks associated with contamination.

**20. Protected Species**

Within 28 days prior to the commencement of ground investigations, and any of the following operations: soil stripping, tree-felling or the grubbing up / flailing of hedgerows or scrub, or fence installation a walkover survey shall be carried out by a competent ecologist to check for badger setts and for the presence of slow worm. A report shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority within 14 days of such survey, detailing the findings and actions required and timescale for their implementation. Any actions required shall be carried out in accordance with the report.

Reason: In the interests of a protected species.

## **21. Protection of Birds**

No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests within 24 hours prior to the vegetation being cleared. - If scrub is to be removed, a reptile toolbox talk should be provided to the site team and vegetation should be removed in a phased manner. Written confirmation that no birds have/will be harmed, and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect all nesting bird interest on site, shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority within 14 days from the completion of such Bird Nest surveys.

Reason: In the interest of nesting wild birds.

## **21. Restoration of the Site**

In the event that the waste transfer station is no longer required a scheme for site restoration shall be submitted to the Waste Planning Authority no later than one month after the permanent cessation of the development hereby permitted. Thereafter the site shall be restored in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to secure restoration of the site.

## **Informatives**

1. If any waste is to be removed from the site then the applicant needs to ensure that sufficient testing has been undertaken in line with Waste classification technical guidance WM3. This is to ensure all waste on the site is correctly classified and disposed of accordingly to a suitably authorised facility.
2. If any hazardous waste is to be removed off-site the site operator must ensure that consignment notes are completed correctly in accordance with the legislation. If the applicant requires more specific guidance it is available on:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hazardous-waste-consignment-note>.

3. Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution from the development. Such safeguards should cover:
  - The use of plant and machinery
  - wheel washing and vehicle wash-down
  - oils/chemicals and materials`
  - the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles
  - the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds
  - the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

4. Having regards to the powers of the Highway Authority under the Highways Act 1980 the applicant is advised that the creation of the new access will require a Section 184 Permit. This must be obtained from the Highway Service Manager for the South Somerset Area at The Highways Depot, Mead Avenue, Houndstone Business Park, Yeovil, Somerset, BA22 8RT, Tel No 0845 345 9155. Application for such a permit should be made at least four weeks before access works are intended to commence.
5. New Water supply connections will be required from Wessex Water to serve this proposed development. Application forms and guidance information is available from the Developer Services web-pages at our website.
6. No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 5m from the pipeline without agreement from Wessex Water.
7. This activity may require a Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 (as amended). The Environment Agency is required to consider all forms of pollution when issuing an Environmental Permit. If a permit is issued for this site, it will require the operator to take all appropriate measures to prevent or minimise the emission from the activity.

### **Relevant Development Plan Policies**

1. The following is a summary of the reasons for the County Council's decision to grant planning permission.
2. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the decision on this application should be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. **The decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in:**
  - The Somerset Waste Core Strategy adopted February 2013
  - The South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) adopted March 2015

The policies in those Plans particularly relevant to the proposed development are:

Somerset Waste Core Strategy adopted February 2013:

WCS2 (Recycling and reuse) - The proposal allows for the allocation of adequate space for waste separation in a purpose built building and therefore complies with the policy.

DM1 (Basic location principles - The site is within the general development area of RNAS Yeovilton and is a replacement for the existing waste transfer facility, which serves the air base, as described

above. It also complies with Policy WCS2. The location of the site is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle and compliant with this policy, which does not rule out development on greenfield sites.

DM3 (Impacts on the environment and local communities) - The proposed development is not expected to generate significant adverse impacts from noise, odour, visual intrusion or traffic,

DM7 (Water resources) – Subject to the implementation of the flood attenuation measures, It is considered that flood risk to the proposed development site and wider area is acceptable.

South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028) adopted March 2015

Policy SS2 EQ2 (General development) - The proposal will be commensurate with the scale and character of the air base, which is of itself a community, and increases sustainability in the sense that it would be vast improvement on the current WTS. It is considered that the locational requirements of the WTS in proximity to the air base warrants relocation to the application site and is compliant with this policy.

EQ7 (Pollution control) - The proposed development will not result in unacceptable environmental pollution or harm to amenity, health or safety

3. The County Council has also had regard to all other material considerations.
4. **Statement of Compliance with Article 31 of the Town and Country Development Management Procedure Order 2012.**

In dealing with this planning application the Waste Planning Authority has adopted a positive and proactive manner. The Council offers a pre-application advice service for minor and major applications, and applicants are encouraged to take up this service. This proposal has been assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policies, which have been subject to proactive publicity and consultation prior to their adoption and are referred to in the reason for approval or reason(s) for refusal. The Planning Authority has sought solutions to problems arising by considering the representations received, and liaising with consultees and the applicant/agent as necessary. Where appropriate, changes to the proposal were sought when the statutory determination timescale allowed.

## **Background Papers**

Planning Application file no. 17/01166/CPO  
Development Plan 1 Somerset County Council Waste Core Strategy  
Development Plan 2 South Somerset Local Plan  
National Planning Policy Framework (2018)  
National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)