




Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR5	<p>The council is of the view that the existing Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 and Policy 7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 provides a robust and, importantly, flexible approach to safeguarding, based on effective consultation. In this regard, option 1 under safeguarding mineral resources is supported: an approach broadly consistent with existing policies.</p>	 A large rectangular area in the response column is completely redacted with a solid green color.



Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR23	<p>In addition to safeguarding the land suitable for such uses, option 2 acknowledges that there is a broad suite of minerals infrastructure types that should be safeguarded. This approach should also reflect the ‘agent of change’ principle. The reference in option 2 to the need to protect the viability of existing minerals development is supported. This builds on Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 Policy MC6 which seeks to prevent the effective operation of sites currently in or permitted for minerals development use from being prejudiced. In the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011, the mineral safeguarding areas are coterminous with the mineral consultation areas and the latter extend beyond the site boundaries of safeguarded facilities. Guidance on Surrey County Council’s approach to safeguarding is provided in their Standing Advice Note and Consultation Protocol 2016. It is noted the Protocol is being reviewed and we may have comments on any proposed changes to it.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>
WR40	<p>Support option 2 to safeguard the county’s remaining reserved of potential exploitable mineral resources as these are finite resources and should be safeguarded for the future.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
CR50	<p>Did not select either option for safeguarding mineral resources, as considers that neither option fully complies with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. Option 1 current Mineral Safeguardin ( th)3.996 ( e)-8.996 ( N)TETQq143.18 91.224 291.7</p>	

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
CR57	Note that fuller's earth would no longer be of commercial significance in Surrey with the end of extraction at the plant in Redhill. Clarification is sought.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.
WR16	In respect of safeguarding mineral resources, neither of the two proposed options are appropriate or consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 or National Planning Practice Guidance. Current Mineral Safeguarding Areas, as defined on the interactive map, do not provide safeguarding of remaining resources of minerals of local and National importance (National Planning Policy Framework 2021 paragraph 210c) and so option 1 is not appropriate. Option 2 proposes defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas on resources defined by the British Geological Survey but then proposes that areas within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are not included. Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that safeguarding mineral resources should be defined in designated areas and urban areas where necessary to do so (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 27-004-20140306). There are known resources, particularly of soft sand, within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty that should be included within the Mineral Safeguarding Area. While the risk of sterilising development occurring in the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is lower as applications and proposals for development will be fewer, so too would be the potential implications for workload and scrutiny of such applications. In the absence of Mineral Safeguarding Area coverage, should potentially sterilising applications come forward there is no mechanism to alert the local planning authority and applicant to the presence of resources and to trigger the safeguarding process. Option 2, but without the exclusion of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, therefore, would be the appropriate option to pursue.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR22	<p>Considers that minerals resources should be safeguarded in a manner which is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and associated guidance, and that it is not clear that either of the options presented are consistent with these.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>
WR23	<p>Regarding safeguarding minerals reserves does not select an option but states that the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 makes clear that known resources of local and National importance should be safeguarded from non-mineral development that would sterilise those resources, whilst not creating a presumption that the resources defined will be worked (paragraph 201 (c)). The Issues and Options Spatial Strategy, acknowledges that much soft sand within the county lies within or close to the Surrey Hills Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whilst these designations have their own rigorous specific policy development criteria which must be met, the British Geological Survey Mineral Safeguarding in England: good practice advice says that safeguarding should not be precluded by the presence of National and international environmental designations on the basis that sterilising development does not take place in these areas. British Geological Survey data provides the starting point for identifying Mineral Safeguarding Areas. See Sm9.18 (ie 18 1</p>	

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR33	Neither option should not be taken as they do not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. They also do not recognise the National importance of the industrial mineral found here (albeit this has been highlighted in the text regarding silica sand). Arbitrary boxes appear to have been drawn on the interactive map. These should be extended to match the outcrop of the lower greensand as detailed in published British Geological Survey data.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.





Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR5	<p>The council is of the view that the existing Policy MC6 of the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 and Policy 7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 provides a robust and, importantly, flexible approach to safeguarding, based on effective consultation. In this regard, Option 1 under safeguarding minerals development is supported: an approach broadly consistent with existing policies.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>
WR52	<p>Preference would be to safeguard areas outside of sensitive landscapes i.e., the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, it is noted that the Area of Search relating to the Surrey Hills boundary review is extensive, but that significant further work needs to be undertaken before a final boundary is put forward. This has the potential to present a risk from a mineral resource perspective in that this could mean that none of the identified soft sand resources within Tandridge would be safeguarded. Considers that overall option 1 in each instance (minerals and waste) is the better option, in that it would maximise on existing knowledge and would prevent uncertainty and disruption for communities. However, it is also raised that their needs to be clarity as to whether safeguarded</p>	







Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR21	<p>Wish to see the Woking Aggregates Rail Depot site continue to be identified and safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan on the same basis as the existing. In terms of safeguarding this should ensure an appropriate consultation area is maintained around the site as is currently the case. Whilst potential relocation of the operation is not objected to in principle – it is considered that there is little prospect of finding an alternative site. Even if a site could be found it will take time to bring that forward and the safeguarding of the existing site must be maintained.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR42	Review the merits of progressing further site investigations on that part of the current Mineral Safeguarding Area to the west of Addlestone Quarry, potentially including borehole and/or trial pit sampling with analysis of the underlying strata in order to assess the quality any potential mineral, then submitting the results as part of an updated Minerals Resource Assessment to the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
CR43	Considers that existing policy 7 covers the two important aspects of waste site safeguarding.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.
CR57	Considers that this option would seem a more responsible approach as there is a risk that introducing viability woul	

---

**Unique ID  
Reference**

**Summary of Issue**

**Response**

---

**Unique ID  
Reference**

**Summary of Issue**

**Response**



**Unique ID  
Reference**

**Summary of Issue**

**R&A**

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR15	The National Planning Policy for Waste 2014 (paragraph 8) requires that the likely impact of non-waste development on waste management facilities is 'acceptable'. Implicitly, National policy therefore recognises that non-waste development can have some impact on waste management facilities and that the extent to which this impact is acceptable, rather than whether there is an impact at all, should be considered when determining planning applications.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.
WR15	It is important that the emerging plan does not impose any tighter constraints on non-waste development than are set out in National policy. Policy in the emerging plan should therefore focus on not prejudicing the efficient operation of waste management sites in accordance with relevant Environmental Permits whilst also allowing non-waste development on or nearby sites where the waste capacity and/or safeguarded site is not required; the need for the non-waste development overrides the need for safeguarding; equivalent, suitable and appropriate replacement capacity can be provided elsewhere in advance of the non-waste development; and the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable. This is essential to avoid sites being unnecessarily sterilised.	Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.
WR21	In terms of specific policy requirements, would welcome wording that is akin to that now found in the recently adopted Surrey Waste Local Plan (2020), Policy 7 - Safeguarding, Part B - which is very much in li	



Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR15	<p>With regard to not prejudicing the efficient operation of facilities, this should be considered only in the context of how a facility is permitted to operate, in respect of the grant of planning permissions including any planning conditions imposed, Environmental Permits and other requirements. Whether or not a non-waste development will prejudice effective operations should be assessed within this context. For example, existing facilities in operation in proximity to existing residential areas, such as Patteson Court, have controls in place which the operators must adhere to ensure impacts on the surrounding area are acceptable. Therefore, new development should not be seen to prejudice the continuing efficient operation of the facility. It is acknowledged that new development may introduce new receptors to an area; however, this does not mean that the efficient operation of the facility will be prejudiced as the agreed requirements for operation, including liaising with surrounding residents, will continue to apply.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>
WR17	<p>Surrey County Council should ensure that any safeguarded land that has become exhausted is restored at the earliest opportunity, in line with part h) of paragraph 210 within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. This would help to create opportunities for new habitats and to increase biodiversity on exhausted sites. For example, Clockhouse Brickworks has lain dormant for some time, and should it be decided that this site, or even part of the site, is no longer required, then the site or part of the site should be restored as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Comment(s) noted. Any issue(s) raised will be considered further and addressed as appropriate by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority in preparing the Regulation 19 Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan to be published in 2023.</p>

Unique ID Reference	Summary of Issue	Response
WR18	For the key requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 in terms of safeguarding and 'agent of change' to be met it is imperative that policies in the Local Plan are robust and explicit in te9.006 ( ex1363(i)5 (es83.7186.02 48.4	