



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Regulation 19 Representations on the Publication Document in document order

Export: 4 August 2023

www.norfolk.gov.uk

73 representors submitted 382 representations about the Publication version of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

The representations are also available to view online at:

<https://norfolk.oc2.uk/document/51>

Please note: representations listed under the Introduction 1.1 are representations about the document as a whole.

The 21 representations submitted about the background documents are in a separate report.

1. Introduction, 1.1

99270

Comment

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]

Summary:

Anglian Water is the water and water recycling provider for over 6 million customers in the east of England. Our operational area spans between the Humber and Thames estuaries and includes around a fifth of the English coastline. The region is the driest in the UK and the lowest lying, with a quarter of our area below sea level. This makes it particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change including heightened risks of both drought and flooding, including inundation by the sea.

Anglian Water is a statutory consultee under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Anglian Water wants to proactively engage with the local plan process to ensure the plan delivers benefits for residents and visitors to the area, and in doing so protects the environment and natural resources. In the context of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan preparation, we are engaging as a waste operator through the operation and management of our water recycling network and centres. As a purpose-led company, we are committed to seeking positive environmental and social outcomes for our region.

Anglian Water has previously engaged with Norfolk County Council in making representations on earlier iterations of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP). Through our representation on the Publication Version of the MWLP we will positively respond with reference to our previous comments and indicate areas of support and where we have outstanding matters of concern

Conclusion

Anglian Water is supportive of many of the policy areas that guide development associated with our role as a waste operator, and policies that seek to safeguard our existing assets and network. We though continue to have a number of concerns in relation to the soundness of the plan, and a number of these were previously raised in our consultation response to the Preferred Options consultation (Reg. 18) and newly introduced policies/policy tests. Given the matters raised in our response, we would want to engage with Norfolk County Council Minerals and Waste Policy Team to identify areas where we can agree proposed modifications to policy and areas where there are outstanding matters to be addressed through examination process. We would welcome the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground in this respect.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99113

Support

Respondent: Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk (Mr Michael Burton) [21919]**Summary:**

Officer assessment for the soundness of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan - officers are of the opinion that the plan is legally compliant and sound.

Full text: We (Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk) have considered the implications of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan for the Borough, and whether this is legally compliant and sound.

There are only four sites allocated in the Borough (three of which are existing allocated sites):

Aggregate Mineral Extraction Sites

MIN 6 - land off East Winch Road, Mill Drove, Middleton (allocation carried forward from the existing Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD (2017))

MIN 206 - land at Oak Field, west of Lynn Road, Tottenhill (our response to the preferred options consultation was 'This is an extension of existing works. The Tottenhill sites would be worked sequentially to mitigate any cumulative impacts. Potentially acceptable subject to the requirements in the policy'.) There is a planning application currently being considered by NCC (Validated June 2021) for the site.

Silica Sands

MIN 40 - land east of Grandcourt Farm, East Winch (allocation carried forward from the existing Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD (2017))

SIL01 - land at Mintlyn South, Bawsey (allocation carried forward from the existing Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD (2017))

Silica Sands Areas of Search - the plan does not allocate any areas of search for silica sand and instead contains a criteria-based policy for the consideration of any future planning applications for silica sand extraction

In terms of waste management facilities, as sufficient capacity currently exists to meet the growth forecast in waste arisings it is not considered necessary to allocate any specific sites for waste management facilities in the NM&WLP. Instead a criteria based policy will be in place to assess any windfall sites if they come forward.

Overall, we are of the opinion that the plan is legally compliant and sound.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99160

Comment

Respondent: Bradwell parish council (Catherine Bacon, Parish Clerk) [21932]**Summary:**

I am writing to advise that Bradwell Parish Council has no comment to make about this consultation.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99507

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Breckland District Council recognises the importance of having sufficient minerals and waste provisions within the county to support growth and broadly supports Norfolk's Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

It has the following comments:

1. Nutrient Neutrality

In March 2022, Norfolk LPAs were alerted to the issue of the "unfavourable condition" of the River Wensum and Broads SAC leading to a requirement to mitigate nutrient pollution from development, farming and to upgrade wastewater treatment works. Nitrogen and Phosphorus affects both water and air quality and Breckland District Council considers that the location of waste facilities particularly from agricultural waste and composting and its impact on the River Wensum and Broads SAC should be carefully considered.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99492

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]**Summary:**

Thank you for your recent consultation on the above document. Having reviewed the consultation documents, we are pleased to note that the previous comments made by South Norfolk Council in relation to Policies MW6, WP2, WP15 and MIN 212 (now removed) have been incorporated into the updated document.

However, we also note that the other amendments suggested in our response to the Initial Public Consultation (dated 13 August 2018) which were also reiterated at Regulation 19 (dated 29 October 2019) have not been included within the latest version of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan. We therefore wish to reiterate these comments and where relevant provide any further note.

Summary

Overall whilst the Councils have provided comments on the updated document, these are considered suggestions and in most cases are reiterating previous comments. Consideration has also been given to the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (NSPF), where the plan is largely consistent with the agreements of this Framework.

Therefore, the Council wishes to make has no object to the adoption of the plan and look forward to working with you further as the plan progresses.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99148

Comment

Respondent: Bungay Town Council (Roz Barnett, Town Clerk) [21923]

Summary:

Bungay Town Council requested that the pre application advice should be made public. The Council also requested that the wider environmental impact on extraction of minerals and the waste produced should be considered. Consultation materials should be sent to the parish where the development takes place and all the surrounding parishes that could be affected.

E.g., Any mineral extraction in Earsham impacts on Bungay.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99157

Comment

Respondent: East Suffolk Council (Mr Ian Johns, Planning Policy Officer) [21848]

Summary:

I am writing to you in response to your Pre-Submission Consultation for the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review, which was received on 26th September 2022. East Suffolk Council had previously commented on the three mineral extraction sites at Earsham (sites MIN209, MIN210 and MIN211). However, according to information in the Statement of Consultation these have all now been granted planning permission and implemented. Therefore, having considered the document carefully, the Council has no specific comments to make in response to the Pre-Submission Consultation and does not wish to raise any objections.

It was decided not to complete the online form because none of the sections were relevant, and a letter was considered a more appropriate form of response.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99515

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Further Consultation Draft. As a statutory consultee, our role is to ensure that the conservation of the historic environment is fully integrated into planning policy and that any policy documents make provision for a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

Our comments below should be read with reference to our previous comments dated 31st August 2018 and 30th October 2019.

Please also see our detailed comments in the attached table, Appendix 1.

SUMMARY

Whilst we welcome many of the changes you have made in this latest draft of the Plan and consider many aspects of the plan to be sound, we have identified issues with some of the policies and site allocations which remain and do compromise the overall soundness of the plan.

Under paragraph 35 of the NPPF some aspects of this Plan are unsound as they have not been positively prepared, are not justified, effective, or consistent with national policy. We have identified below some of the key areas where we find the Plan unsound and what measures are needed to make the Plan sound.

In summary we highlight the following key issues:

a) Insufficient Historic Environment Policy (MW1, WP2 and MP2)

Whilst we appreciate that you have made some changes to policy MW1 to include more references to the historic environment, which is welcome, it is still our view that there is currently insufficient policy provision for the historic environment in the Plan. Normally we would expect to see a specific separate policy for the historic environment in a Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This policy is insufficient as it stands. We are particularly concerned about the lack of detail in relation to below ground archaeology.

We have also raised concerns about the wording in relation to harm to the historic environment in policies WP2 and MP2.

In order to make these policies consistent with the NPPF and effective in securing sustainable development, we suggest that the policy wording is amended.

Further detail is set out in the attached table.

b) Site allocations requiring further assessment/ proportionate evidence

Thank you for the helpful update on the status of the various sites where we had previously requested a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). We appreciate that for some of those sites an HIA is no longer necessary (for example the site is no longer allocated).

However, we continue to have concerns about sites where permission has been granted but not yet implemented (MIN 207 and MIN 65), and also a couple of sites where an application is due (MIN 25 and MIN 96).

Further details of each of these main areas are set out in the attached table.

We have suggested a series of other changes to the Plan. Many of these changes do not go to the heart of the Plan's soundness, but instead are intended to improve upon it. We believe that these comments can be addressed by changes to wording in the plan.

In preparation of the forthcoming local plan, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the county archaeologist and local heritage groups.

Please note that absence of a comment on a policy, allocation or document in this letter does not mean that Historic England is content that the policy, allocation or document is devoid of historic environment issues. We should like to stress that this response is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise as a result of this plan, where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment.

If you have any questions with regards to the comments made, then please do get back to me. We suggest it might be helpful to set up a meeting to discuss any outstanding issues and begin work on a Statement of Common Ground. Please suggest some potential meeting times (noting my part time hours). In the meantime, we look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99203

Comment

Respondent: Kirklees Council (Mr Nick Reeves, Planner) [21941]**Summary:**

We have considered the latest Aggregate Minerals Survey data which indicates that there have been no aggregate flows between Kirklees/West Yorkshire and Norfolk. We therefore have no comments to make on the minerals policies and designations in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Kirklees Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmv>

99170

Comment

Respondent: Marine Management Organisation (Mr Andrew Davis, Administration Officer) [21929]**Summary:**

Please be aware that any works within the Marine area require a licence from the Marine Management Organisation. It is down to the applicant themselves to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether their works will fall below the Mean High Water Springs mark.

Response to your consultation

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.

Marine Licensing

Works activities taking place below the mean high-water mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009.

Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence.

Applicants should be directed to the MMO's online portal to register for an application for marine licence

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application>

You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in English waters.

The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining Harbour Orders in England, together with granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours.

A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.

The MMO is a signatory to the coastal concordat and operates in accordance with its principles. Should the activities subject to planning permission meet the above criteria then the applicant should be directed to the follow pages: check if you need a marine licence and asked to quote the following information on any resultant marine licence application:

- local planning authority name,
- planning officer name and contact details,
- planning application reference.

Following submission of a marine licence application a case team will be in touch with the relevant planning officer to discuss next steps.

Environmental Impact Assessment

With respect to projects that require a marine licence the EIA Directive (codified in Directive 2011/92/EU) is transposed into UK law by the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (the MWR), as amended. Before a marine licence can be granted for projects that require EIA, MMO must ensure that applications for a marine licence are compliant with the MWR.

In cases where a project requires both a marine licence and terrestrial planning permission, both the MWR and The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/571/contents/made> may be applicable.

If this consultation request relates to a project capable of falling within either set of EIA regulations, then it is advised that the applicant submit a request directly to the MMO to ensure any requirements under the MWR are considered adequately at the following link

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application>

Marine Planning

Under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 ch.4, 58, public authorities must make decisions in accordance with marine policy documents and if it takes a decision that is against these policies it must state its reasons. MMO as such are responsible for implementing the relevant Marine Plans for their area, through existing regulatory and decision-making processes.

Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. Proposals should conform with all relevant policies, taking account of economic, environmental and social considerations. Marine plans are a statutory consideration for public authorities with decision making functions.

At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan

boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark.

A map showing how England's waters have been split into 6 marine plan areas is available on our website. For further information on how to apply the marine plans please visit our Explore Marine Plans service.

Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist. If you wish to contact your local marine planning officer, you can find their details on our gov.uk page.

Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments

If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below.

- The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.
- The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.
- The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.

The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land-based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.

If you require further guidance on the Marine Licencing process, please follow the link <https://www.gov.uk/topic/planning-development/marine-licences>

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Marine Management Organisation submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmb>

99520

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]

Summary:

Thank you for your recent consultation on the above document. Having reviewed the consultation documents, we are pleased to note that the previous comments made by South Norfolk Council in relation to Policies MW6, WP2, WP15 and MIN 212 (now removed) have been incorporated into the updated document.

However, we also note that the other amendments suggested in our response to the Initial Public Consultation (dated 13 August 2018) which were also reiterated at Regulation 19 (dated 29 October 2019) have not been included within the latest version of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan. We therefore wish to reiterate these comments and where relevant provide any further note.

Summary

Overall whilst the Councils have provided comments on the updated document, these are considered suggestions and in most cases are reiterating previous comments. Consideration has also been given to the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (NSPF), where the plan is largely consistent with the agreements of this Framework.

Therefore, the Council wishes to make has no object to the adoption of the plan and look forward to working with you further as the plan progresses.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

99491

Comment

Respondent: Surrey County Council (Thoma Light, Senior Planning Officer) [21976]**Summary:**

Thanks you for consulting Surrey County Council on the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Please not that we do not have any comments to raise.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99161

Comment

Respondent: The Coal Authority (Deb Roberts, Planning & Development Manager) [21933]**Summary:**

The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.

As you are aware Norfolk County Council lies outside the defined coalfield and therefore the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on any stages of your Local Plan; SPDs etc.

In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality, it will not be necessary for the Council to provide the Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Plans. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements at examination, if necessary.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

1. Introduction, 1.2

99118

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

Factual issues

1.2 – rather than 'lodged with district councils' say 'lodged with Norfolk Local Planning Authorities' – as written, it excludes the Broads Authority.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99118 and 99119 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmk>

2. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan process, 2.6

99409

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk County Council - Natural Environment Team (Mr James Fisher, Principal Ecologist) [21965]

Summary:

It may be helpful to clarify that applicants will be required to submit ecological information to demonstrate that their proposal meets the requirement as set out in the Environment Act 2021 to achieve a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

It may be helpful to clarify that applicants will be required to submit ecological information to demonstrate that their proposal meets the requirement as set out in the Environment Act 2021 to achieve a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: NCC - Natural Environment Team submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnr>

2. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan process, 2.8 Historic Environment and Archaeology

99220

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

Para 2.8/2.9 and site assessments for allocations

Historic Environment and Archaeology assessment

We have reviewed the site assessments methodology and the site assessments themselves.

Whilst these are a helpful starting point, they do not constitute Heritage Impact Assessments. As advised in previous consultations, we continue to request that Heritage Impact Assessments are prepared to inform a number of the more sensitive the allocations.

Our advice note 13 Mineral Extraction and Archaeology (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/mineral-extraction-and-archaeology-advice-note-13/heag278-mineral-extraction-and-archaeology/>) sets out the requirement for heritage impact assessments to inform site allocations in Minerals Plans.

It states, 'Where potential allocations are identified as being likely to impact on heritage assets, undertake an appropriate Heritage Impact Assessment to evaluate the extent to which the significance of any assets may be harmed and to identify measures to remove or reduce that harm. Historic England Advice Note 3: The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans sets out advice on site allocations in Local Plans'.

The 5-step methodology for HIA is set out on page 5 of our advice note HEAN 3 Site Allocations in Local Plans (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>).

Change suggested by respondent:

Prepare Heritage Impact Assessments for the sites indicated (MIN 96 Spixworth and MIN 25 Haddiscoe) prior to EiP to inform site allocation and revised policy wording.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

3. Norfolk Spatial Portrait, 3.12

99120

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

3.12 – could the navigable waterways of the Broads be used for the transport of such freight?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

3. Norfolk Spatial Portrait, 3.21 Carstone

99221

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

3.21- 3.23 Carstone

We welcome the reference to Carstone. It is important that provision should be made to protect historic sources of building stone from sterilisation from non-minerals development or from overuse as fill etc. in order that they might be used for the future repair of historic properties or even for new build using traditional vernacular. The plan should provide an appropriate Policy which would facilitate the reopening of historic sources of building stone where they are needed for the future repair of historic properties/ building in the traditional vernacular.

Change suggested by respondent:

Ensure provision is made for the use of Carstone in repairs of historic buildings and for new build in the traditional vernacular materials.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

Minerals and Waste Local Plan Vision to 2038

99167

Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Philip Dash, Principal Planner) [16208]

Summary:

Vision

The intention for Norfolk to be self-sufficient in sand and gravel production and waste management, where practicable, is supported. The continuing recognition that Norfolk is an important supplier at the national level of silica sand is also welcomed, as is the acknowledgement of the need to safeguard minerals and waste infrastructure. The inclusion of all developments providing biodiversity net gains is supported.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Essex County Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmx>

99423

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]**Summary:**

Natural England commend the consideration of our comments during the initial consultation on the NMWLP in 2018, which has resulted in the removal of MIN 71 and MIN 204 as they are considered unsuitable due to the potential for adverse effects on designated sites.

Nature Recovery Network (NRN) and Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSS)

Natural England commends the NMWLP for acknowledging the potential that restoration and after-use of mineral workings has for the benefit of enhancing landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity. We welcome the reference to contributing, "to identified strategic green infrastructure corridors and known ecological networks," made in Policy MP7. We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network

[<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included in the Plan vision (pg. 19). The NRN is a commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and enacted by the Environment Act 2021. Natural England is working with partners on NRN and the development of LNRSS [<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/land-use/local-nature-recovery-strategies/>]. The NRN is used to refer to a single, growing national network of improved joined-up, wildlife rich places which will benefit people and wildlife. LNRSS will be the key mechanism for planning and mapping local delivery of the NRN.

LNRSS will form a new system of spatial strategies for nature that will be mandated by the Environment Act. They will cover the whole of England and will be developed by Responsible Authorities (RAs) appointed by the Secretary of State, usually at a county scale. Each strategy will:

- Map the most valuable existing habitat for nature
- Map specific proposals for creating or improving habitat for nature and wider environment goals
- Agree priorities for nature's recovery

LNRSS have also been designed to help local planning authorities deliver existing policy on conserving and enhancing biodiversity and to reflect this in the land use plans for their area.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

In line with paragraph 174(d) of the NPPF, reference to providing BNG is made throughout the NMWLP, which Natural England commends. BNG will be an important tool in securing investment for nature recovery through the planning system, helping deliver the government's commitment to create a national NRN. However, we advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG. Strategic level viability assessments in Kent have concluded that this shift will not impact viability in most cases irrespective of onsite or offsite BNG delivery. This is because after the initial cost of securing the minimum 10% BNG, the cost of increase to 15 or 20% is much less and generally negligible. Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 3.1 may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project.

It is the government's intention that mandatory BNG will provide a financial incentive for development to support the delivery of LNRSS through an uplift in the calculation of biodiversity units created at sites identified by the strategy through the Biodiversity Metric 'strategic significance' scoring.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network [<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included in the Plan vision (pg. 19). we advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99509

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would support the Vision promoted by the council in section 4 of the document. However, the company would like to see emphasis placed on the value and significance of minerals and waste development in providing a diverse and affluent rural economy consistent with Paragraph 84 of the NPPF (2021).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99336

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]

Summary:

We support the requirement for progressive restoration schemes and the enhancement of Norfolk's biodiversity but given the significant changes since the previous iteration of the plan in 2019 (changes to the National Planning Policy Framework, the passing of the Environment Act 2021 and the Leaders Pledge for Nature made at a virtual United Nations event in September 2020), there is a clear need for planning policy to not only encourage but ensure delivery of nature's recovery.

Recent reporting from the COP27 and COP15 international summits on climate change and biodiversity, highlight the need for significant and urgent progress to be made in tackling the interlinked global crises of biodiversity loss and climate change.

We expect all Norfolk planning policy to make serious and effective contributions towards society's goals of delivering a carbon neutral future and halting the ongoing decline of biodiversity, in line with legal requirements set out legislation such as the Climate Change Act and the Environment Act. To bring greater certainty to the framing of the objectives and ensure that the plan not only supports meaningful change but requires it, we recommend the wording of the Vision is changed.

Change suggested by respondent:

Where the plan states 'Mineral development and waste management facilities will be located, designed and operated without unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity of local communities, the natural, built and historic environment, the landscape and townscape of Norfolk. Opportunities to enhance such features will be supported and all developments will provide biodiversity net gains.' In order to bring greater certainty to the framing of the objectives, we recommend the wording of the final sentence is changed to read 'Opportunities to enhance such features will be supported and all development will provide measurable biodiversity net gains'.

We recommend that in order to help frame and support plan objectives and policies that actively deliver the necessary outcomes, that the wording of this final paragraph of the Vision is modified as follows:

'Minerals development and waste management within Norfolk will be undertaken in ways that ensure that all development consented under its policies contributes to carbon neutrality and avoids development which results in a net carbon burden to society as it progresses towards the 2050 net zero legal targets. It will also be designed and located to ensure that all opportunities to avoid, reduce and mitigate climate change contributions, and maximise adaptation measures to climatic effects, such as flooding are taken in site allocation and design'.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: We wish to be able to expand on the reasons given in our comments in order to help ensure the plan is effective and avoids impacts on Norfolk's wildlife.

Attachments: None

4.2 Waste Management Strategic Objectives

99426

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]

Summary:

Natural England welcome the Plan's emphasis on ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is achieved, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and taking a positive approach to mitigate and adapt to climate change. There is also a clear emphasis on ensuring high quality restoration and after-use of sites to protect Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land and to enhance Norfolk's biodiversity and protect its landscapes. However, we advise that there is scope for the Plan to be more ambitious in its delivery of some of these policies and objectives.

Nature Recovery Network (NRN) and Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSSs)

Natural England commends the NMWLP for acknowledging the potential that restoration and after-use of mineral workings has for the benefit of enhancing landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity. We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network is also included within Waste Management Strategic Objective WS07 (pg. 20).

The NRN is a commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and enacted by the Environment Act 2021. Natural England is working with partners on NRN and the development of LNRSSs. The NRN is used to refer to a single, growing national network of improved joined-up, wildlife rich places which will benefit people and wildlife. LNRSSs will be the key mechanism for planning and mapping local delivery of the NRN.

LNRSSs will form a new system of spatial strategies for nature that will be mandated by the Environment Act. They will cover the whole of England and will be developed by Responsible Authorities (RAs) appointed by the Secretary of State, usually at a county scale. Each strategy will:

- Map the most valuable existing habitat for nature
- Map specific proposals for creating or improving habitat for nature and wider environment goals
- Agree priorities for nature's recovery

LNRSSs have also been designed to help local planning authorities deliver existing policy on conserving and enhancing biodiversity and to reflect this in the land use plans for their area.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

In line with paragraph 174(d) of the NPPF, reference to providing BNG is made throughout the NMWLP, which Natural England commends. BNG will be an important tool in securing investment for nature recovery through the planning system, helping deliver the government's commitment to create a national NRN. However, we advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG. Strategic level viability assessments in Kent have concluded that this shift will not impact viability in most cases irrespective of onsite or offsite BNG delivery. This is because after the initial cost of securing the minimum 10% BNG, the cost of increase to 15 or 20% is much less and generally negligible. Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 3.1 may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project.

It is the government's intention that mandatory BNG will provide a financial incentive for development to support the delivery of LNRSSs through an uplift in the calculation of biodiversity units created at sites identified by the strategy through the Biodiversity Metric 'strategic significance' scoring.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network is also included within Waste Management Strategic Objective WS07 (pg. 20).

We advise strengthening the wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

4.3 Minerals Strategic Objectives**99289****Object**

Respondent: Breedon Trading Limited (Mr Shaun Denny, Planner) [21948]

Summary:

To fully reflect guidance provided by NPPF paragraph MS01 should refer to the need to provide a steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals for at least a seven year landbank.

Change suggested by respondent:

To provide a steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals and to provide at least a 7-year land bank for sand and gravel, and 10-year landbank for carstone, by identifying adequate mineral extraction sites/areas within Norfolk sufficient to meet the requirements of the Local Aggregate Assessment and safeguarding existing infrastructure.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99222

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

Map 1 Key Diagram

We note that the map includes lots of different designations but no heritage designations. Whilst we appreciate that putting individual listed buildings on such a map of this scale would be difficult, area-based designations e.g. Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and scheduled monuments could be included and would help to identify a wider range of environmental factors.

Change suggested by respondent:

Include heritage designations e.g. conservation areas, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments on the map.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99290

Comment

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

Mineral Strategic Objective

The following adjustments are suggested to objectives MSO1 and MSO2 to make them to properly reflect NPPF;

Change suggested by respondent:

MSO1. To provide a steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals [insert: 'and to provide at least a 7-year land bank for sand and gravel, and 10-year landbank for Carstone'], by identifying adequate mineral extraction sites/areas within Norfolk sufficient to meet the requirements of the Local Aggregate Assessment and safeguarding existing infrastructure.

MSO2. To provide a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by identifying adequate mineral extraction sites/areas within Norfolk sufficient to meet the forecast need [insert: 'and stocks of permitted reserves of silica sand of at least 10 years production for individual silica sites or at least 15 years where significant new capital is capital is required'] and safeguarding existing infrastructure.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EIP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99424

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]

Summary:

Natural England welcome the Plan's emphasis on ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is achieved, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and taking a positive approach to mitigate and adapt to climate change. There is also a clear emphasis on ensuring high quality restoration and after-use of sites to protect Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land and to enhance Norfolk's biodiversity and protect its landscapes. However, we advise that there is scope for the Plan to be more ambitious in its delivery of some of these policies and objectives.

Natural England commends the NMWLP for acknowledging the potential that restoration and after-use of mineral workings has for the benefit of enhancing landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity. We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network [<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included within Minerals Strategic Objective MS09 (pg. 21). The NRN is a commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and enacted by the Environment Act 2021. Natural England is working with partners on NRN and the development of LNRs [<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/land-use/local-nature-recovery-strategies/>]. The NRN is used to refer to a single, growing national network of improved joined-up, wildlife rich places which will benefit people and wildlife. LNRs will be the key mechanism for planning and mapping local delivery of the NRN.

LNRs will form a new system of spatial strategies for nature that will be mandated by the Environment Act. They will cover the whole of England and will be developed by Responsible Authorities (RAs) appointed by the Secretary of State, usually at a county scale. Each strategy will:

- Map the most valuable existing habitat for nature
- Map specific proposals for creating or improving habitat for nature and wider environment goals
- Agree priorities for nature's recovery

LNRs have also been designed to help local planning authorities deliver existing policy on conserving and enhancing biodiversity and to reflect this in the land use plans for their area.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

In line with paragraph 174(d) of the NPPF, reference to providing BNG is made throughout the NMWLP, which Natural England commends. BNG will be an important tool in securing investment for nature recovery through the planning system, helping deliver the government's commitment to create a national NRN. However, we advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG. Strategic level viability assessments in Kent have concluded that this shift will not impact viability in most cases irrespective of onsite or offsite BNG delivery. This is because after the initial cost of securing the minimum 10% BNG, the cost of increase to 15 or 20% is much less and generally negligible. Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 3.1 may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project.

It is the government's intention that mandatory BNG will provide a financial incentive for development to support the delivery of LNRs through an uplift in the calculation of biodiversity units created at sites identified by the strategy through the Biodiversity Metric 'strategic significance' scoring.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network [<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included within Minerals Strategic Objective MS09 (pg. 21).

We advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99306

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]

Agent: David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]

Summary:

In relation to the Minerals Objectives, whilst Norfolk Gravel recognise that the council have an objective to provide a steady and adequate supply, it is considered that this needs to also include the actual commitment (i.e requirement to maintain relevant landbanks).

Change suggested by respondent:

In relation to the Minerals Objectives, whilst Norfolk Gravel recognise that the council have an objective to provide a steady and adequate supply, it is considered that this needs to also include the actual commitment (i.e requirement to maintain relevant landbanks).

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.

Attachments: Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99303

Comment

Respondent: Norwich City Council (Mrs Joy Brown, Senior Planner (Policy)) [21952]**Summary:**

Whilst Norwich City Council has no objection to objective MS05 or policy MP10, for the avoidance of doubt 'agent of change' should be defined.

Soundness test: Not Justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Agent of change should be defined either within the explanatory text or within the glossary.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

5. Presumption in favour of sustainable development, 5.3

99510

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel is pleased to see the council's commitment to Sustainable Development, but remains disappointed to note that the council haven't provided a clear policy in this regard. Such an approach is clearly not consistent with the NPPF nor the attendant Planning Practice Guidance. The council already has a policy in this regard (SD1 of the Mineral Site Allocations DOD 2017) which could be easily translated into this emerging policy document.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

Policy MW1: Development Management Criteria

99271

Object

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

We note that the policy has been amended to include additional clauses regarding the conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, and surrounding landscapes. Whilst we support the policy aims, the approach is unclear and does not provide sufficient detail for applicants.

For example, the bulleted list provides a range of measures and enhancements to be provided, but these should be informed by the context of the application, given that the nature of mineral extraction and waste management proposals vary significantly. Furthermore, the supporting text for the requirement to provide biodiversity and geodiversity net gains, does not provide an interpretation of geodiversity net gain nor how applicants should demonstrate how it will be provided and managed.

We disagree with the use of the 'must' in the final section of this policy, as the purpose of planning is to balance the benefits versus the harm. We propose that 'should' is a term that provides a better interpretation of this policy requirement, particularly as enhancement measures need to be justified and proportionate to development proposals.

The policy seeks to address a wide range of development management criteria and it may be clearer if it is split into specific subject/topic areas that reflects the supporting text.

Soundness test: not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

We disagree with the use of the 'must' in the final section of this policy, as the purpose of planning is to balance the benefits versus the harm. We propose that 'should' is a term that provides a better interpretation of this policy requirement, particularly as enhancement measures need to be justified and proportionate to development proposals.

The policy seeks to address a wide range of development management criteria and it may be clearer if it is split into specific subject/topic areas that reflects the supporting text.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99493

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]**Summary:**

Note that Policy MW2: Development Management Criteria is now referenced as MW1, however our comment in relation to several policies concerning particular development types still referring to general development management policy (now) MW1 is reiterated, and whilst the reason for this is understood, the policies in the plan should be read as a whole.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99138

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

It is good that light pollution is mentioned in terms of amenity, but situations could arise where a site is isolated and there would be no impacts on amenity, but light pollution could be caused. The policy needs to consider the impact of light pollution in all instances – on people, landscape, dark skies, wildlife. The current wording is narrow in scope - only impact on people (amenity). Addressing light pollution is not necessarily about not having lighting, but a good design, doing what is needed at the right intensity and for as long as needed. Particularly in or near the Broads which have intrinsically dark skies. As worded, the policy means that schemes that have external lighting that does not cause amenity issues, but could cause other light pollution issues, fall through the gap.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Another criterion needs to be added that specifically talks about light pollution. Para 6.12 is very good, but that is not policy – adding that wording as a new criterion would address our comment. Noting our comments on para 6.16 (see other comment), lighting needs to be fully justified as well. Referring to this guide would also address our comments: "Towards A Dark Sky Standard" [<https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Towards-A-Dark-Sky-Standard-V1.1.pdf>]. This is a general guide and overview of the key considerations needed for good lighting design and the protection of dark skies.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99144

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

MW1 part 1 – to be consistent with the NPPF, this criterion needs to mention the impact on the setting of these assets as well as on the assets themselves.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Change criterion to say:

Protected landscapes [insert: 'and their setting'] including the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Heritage Coast and the Broads.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99201

Object

Respondent: Pauline Davies [21940]**Summary:**

Having reviewed the available documentation considering mineral extraction and waste management in Norfolk with other scientific evidence, I am concerned that climate change and the risk of flooding issues are not addressed sufficiently within the narrative and responses. Please see the map diagram from the journey of flood management 2020, showing flood risk in Norfolk.

In this regard, several submissions by various environmentally focused agencies that signal concerns have met a council response that indicates that no action is required.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Full representation text and flood risk map - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzy>

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

Whilst we appreciate that you have made some changes to policy MW1 to include more references to the historic environment, which is welcome, it is still our view that there is currently insufficient policy provision for the historic environment in the Plan. Normally we would expect to see a specific separate policy for the historic environment in a Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This policy is insufficient as it stands. We are particularly concerned about the lack of detail in relation to below ground archaeology. In order to make this policy consistent with the NPPF and effective in securing sustainable development, we suggest that the policy wording is amended.

Although our preference would be for a separate historic environment policy, we recognise that this policy is now much more detailed in relation to the historic environment which is welcomed.

We note that the policy has been expanded to include greater reference to the historic environment which is welcomed. This has included reference to the NPPF, balancing harm and public benefit and avoiding harm in the first.

The policy does reference cumulative effects and enhancement which is welcomed.

The policy now also includes reference to the need to conserve and where opportunities arise enhance the historic environment which is welcomed.

In the list of bullet points we suggest a minor rewording to read;

- the [delete: setting] significance of heritage assets [insert: '(including any contribution made to significance by setting)'] and protected landscapes, Although this represents an improvement on the previous draft of the policy, we remain concerned that the policy does not provide sufficient protection for the historic environment. Normally we would expect to see a specific separate policy for the historic environment in a Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This policy is insufficient as it stands. This policy remains unsound as it does not meet the requirements of paragraph 210(f) of the Framework. In fact, Policy MW2 appears to be a similar list of areas to cover in paragraph 210 but provides limited historic environment criteria against which planning applications will be assessed so as to ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts.

As this policy underpins all the other policies in the plan we are concerned that, as drafted, this policy undermines the plan.

We are also concerned about the lack of detail in relation to below ground archaeology in this policy. In relation to archaeology, we offer the following more detailed advice:

When considering the historic environment, it is necessary to consider the below ground archaeological remains which includes structures, artefacts, and deposits/features of palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological interest such as palaeochannels.

The potential for these sorts of remains to be present, both within the area of proposed works and in the adjacent areas needs to be investigated as part of the desk-based assessment and evaluation stages.

The impacts of the proposed extraction works also need to be considered in terms of the direct and indirect impacts that may occur. This includes the potential for the works to alter the groundwater levels within the areas of the proposed works and in adjacent areas, which may affect the movement of water through archaeological deposits, or the preservation conditions. If this occurs it can result in the damage or even loss of vulnerable archaeological remains, such as waterlogged wood, leather or palaeoenvironmental remains, or effect the preservation of archaeological materials (e.g. peat).

There is also the potential for the effects of mineral extraction to impact adjacent areas. For example, hydrological assessments were carried out before, during and after the extraction of materials at the Over quarry, Cambridgeshire, which demonstrated that ground water levels were lowered by between 2 to 5m up to 500m from the quarry face (French 2004, Environmental Archaeology vol 9).

We would therefore recommend that the following Historic England documents are referred to in terms of the materials that may be present and how the potential impacts could be investigated, such as changes to the groundwater levels or chemistry in the area:

Preservation of Archaeological Remains (2016):

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/preserving-archaeological-remains/>

Environmental Archaeology (2011):

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/>

Geoarchaeology (2015):

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geoarchaeology-earth-sciences-to-understand-archaeological-record/>

Change suggested by respondent:

Include a separate policy for the historic environment to more closely reflect the requirements of the NPPF. This should cover matters such as the need to conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings and incorporate the relevant tests in relation to harm.

The separate historic environment policy should also address below ground archaeology.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99467

Support

Respondent: Ministry Of Defence (Defence Infrastructure Organisation) (Mr Chris Waldron, DIO Assistant Safeguarding Manager) [21971]

Summary:

The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the Ministry of Defence (MOD) as a statutory consultee in the UK planning system to ensure designated zones around key operational defence sites such as aerodromes, explosives storage sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites are not adversely affected by development outside the MOD estate. For clarity, this response relates to MOD Safeguarding concerns only and should be read in conjunction with any other submissions that might be provided by other MOD sites or departments.

DIO Safeguarding may be involved in the planning system both as a statutory and/or non-statutory consultee. Statutory consultation occurs as a result of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas) Direction 2002 (DfT/ODPM Circular 01/2003) and the location data and criteria set out on safeguarding maps published by the Secretary of State for Defence and issued by Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) in accordance with the provisions of that Direction.

The area covered by the NM&WLP will both contain and be washed over by safeguarding zones that are designated to preserve the operation and capability of defence assets and sites including RAF Marham, RAF Mildenhall, RAF Lakenheath, RAF Honington. RAF Trimmingham, RAF Weyborne, RAF Neatishead and the East 2 WAM Network

Copies of these plans, in both GIS shapefile and .pdf format, can be provided on request through the email address above.

The MODs primary concern with respect to minerals and waste development is the potential for detriment to aviation safety, specifically related to birdstrike. The working or subsequent restoration of either mineral or waste sites have the capacity to form environments that might attract those large and/or flocking bird species that form a hazard to aviation safety. Amongst the statutory safeguarding zones issued to Local Planning Authorities through the DLUHC are those specifically designed to identify a 12.87km (8 mile) radius around military aerodromes within which birdstrike risk is most critical.

In addition to birdstrike issues, MOD may have concerns that mineral and waste development might incorporate or require structures that might fall within safeguarding zones drawn to preserve the operation and capability of technical assets such as communication systems, navigational equipment, or radar; or that might project into the airspace above and surrounding an aerodrome.

The MOD welcome the provisions of Policy MW1: Development Management Criteria and the supporting information set out in paragraphs 6.45 to 6.49 which provide an overview of the issues above and make a potential requirement for mitigation clear. It is noted that paragraph 6.49 identifies that mitigation should be provided at the planning application stage, in order to provide additional guidance to a prospective developer it would be beneficial to make clear within this section that it may be necessary that mitigation is secured through planning condition and/or planning obligation.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Ministry of Defence - Defence Infrastructure Organisation full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnnv>

99425

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]

Summary:

Natural England welcome the Plan's emphasis on ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is achieved, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and taking a positive approach to mitigate and adapt to climate change. There is also a clear emphasis on ensuring high quality restoration and after-use of sites to protect Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land and to enhance Norfolk's biodiversity and protect its landscapes. However, we advise that there is scope for the Plan to be more ambitious in its delivery of some of these policies and objectives.

Nature Recovery Network (NRN) and Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSs)

Natural England commends the NMWLP for acknowledging the potential that restoration and after-use of mineral workings has for the benefit of enhancing landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity. We welcome the reference to contributing, "to identified strategic green infrastructure corridors and known ecological networks," made in Policy MP7. We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network

[<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included within strategic Policy MW1 (Development Management Criteria) (pg. 27). The NRN is a commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and enacted by the Environment Act 2021. Natural England is working with partners on NRN and the development of LNRSs [<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/land-use/local-nature-recovery-strategies/>]. The NRN is used to refer to a single, growing national network of improved joined-up, wildlife rich places which will benefit people and wildlife. LNRSs will be the key mechanism for planning and mapping local delivery of the NRN.

LNRSs will form a new system of spatial strategies for nature that will be mandated by the Environment Act. They will cover the whole of England and will be developed by Responsible Authorities (RAs) appointed by the Secretary of State, usually at a county scale. Each strategy will:

- Map the most valuable existing habitat for nature
- Map specific proposals for creating or improving habitat for nature and wider environment goals
- Agree priorities for nature's recovery

LNRSs have also been designed to help local planning authorities deliver existing policy on conserving and enhancing biodiversity and to reflect this in the land use plans for their area.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

In line with paragraph 174(d) of the NPPF, reference to providing BNG is made throughout the NMWLP, which Natural England commends. BNG will be an important tool in securing investment for nature recovery through the planning system, helping deliver the government's commitment to create a national NRN. However, we advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG. Strategic level viability assessments in Kent have concluded that this shift will not impact viability in most cases irrespective of onsite or offsite BNG delivery. This is because after the initial cost of securing the minimum 10% BNG, the cost of increase to 15 or 20% is much less and generally negligible. Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 3.1 may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project.

It is the government's intention that mandatory BNG will provide a financial incentive for development to support the delivery of LNRSs through an uplift in the calculation of biodiversity units created at sites identified by the strategy through the Biodiversity Metric 'strategic significance' scoring.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network [<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included within strategic Policy MW1 (Development Management Criteria) (pg. 27).

We advise strengthening this wording on BNG by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99307

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]

Agent: David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]

Summary:

The company would support Policy MW1, but would suggest that in the final paragraph when considering potential environmental benefits this could clearly states geo-diversity benefits where applicable.

Change suggested by respondent:

In the final paragraph when considering potential environmental benefits this could clearly states geo-diversity benefits where applicable.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99171

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Local Access Forum (NLAF) (Su Waldron, Project Officer) [21926]

Summary:

Given the significant impact made on local communities by extraction works, and the large sums of money generated, NLAF requests that every opportunity is taken to upgrade and enhance both footpaths, bridleways and cycleways wherever possible.

Past experience suggests that when extraction works are completed, there can be considerable reluctance to honour promises of funding for restoration and improvements. NLAF asks that Norfolk County Council should find some way of ensuring that funding is ring fenced or a Bank Guarantee is put in place to ensure that agreed measures are fully implemented when the work is completed.

NLAF also requests that as a statutory advisory body to the County Council on access matters, it be added (using this email address) to the list of future consultees on any matters which could impact public access to the countryside (in its widest sense).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99338

Support

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]

Summary:

We support the inclusion of the natural environment in the list of features where development would only be regarded if unacceptable impacts are avoided. The requirement to conserve and enhance the natural environment as set out in this policy is a clear commitment to the biodiversity duty laid on the Council in the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 and the 2021 Environment Act.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99541

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

19. Policy MW2: Development Management Criteria Under s. (i) Public Open Spaces, suggest adding at the end, "including appropriate well-used, open-access, Forestry Commission land."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

99522

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]**Summary:**

Note that Policy MW2: Development Management Criteria is now referenced as MW1, however our comment in relation to several policies concerning particular development types still referring to general development management policy (now) MW1 is reiterated, and whilst the reason for this is understood, the policies in the plan should be read as a whole.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.9

99538

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

23. Under Pollution and Local Community Inputs, on page 28 of the NMWLP document, May 2022, s. 6.9: suggest adding the phrase, "including areas of public recreation." to the end of the first sentence.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.16

99143

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

Paragraph 6.16 – bullet point on lighting – needs to say more – it is about justifying the need for light in the first place, designing light so it is shielded and pointing down, of the right intensity for the job and only on when needed. This paragraph is a good start but does not go far enough and as per the comments on MW1, Policy MW1 needs to be wider than the impact of light on amenity.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Change criterion to say:

[Insert: 'Only using lighting if fully justified'], minimising the use of external lighting, use hooded/cowled lighting to direct light downwards, [insert: 'only have the lighting on when it is needed (use timers, on/off switches or motion sensors), make sure the intensity is appropriate for the lighting task'] and contain light within the site.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.18

99291

Object

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Para 6.18 – 6.21

We consider that the above paragraphs do not properly reflect NPPF in that the Plan as drafted does not properly distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites as required by paragraph 171 of the NPPF. As such the Plan is unsound.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EIP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.19

99119

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

6.19 – again by only mentioning district and borough local plans, you don't include the Broads Authority's Local Plan. Say Norfolk LPA Local Plans.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99118 and 99119 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmk>

99337

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]

Summary:

In addition to project level HRA, there is a clear need for the Plan to demonstrate that it won't result in adverse effects on any European Sites (SPAs and SACs, whilst Ramsar sites are also afforded the same level of protection). The Plan's HRA should be able to demonstrate without reliance on deferral to the project level stage that it can avoid adverse effects on SACs and SPAs. Deferral to project level HRA leaves uncertainty which could result in an undeliverable plan if there are adverse effects only identified at the project stage.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.22

99410

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk County Council - Natural Environment Team (Mr James Fisher, Principal Ecologist) [21965]

Summary:

Section 6.22: Regarding the requirement for the Biodiversity Survey and Report to contain a Phase 1 habitat survey, it is important to note that in the near future, the UK Habitat Classification is set to replace the Phase 1 Habitat Survey method as the standard survey method used as part of Preliminary Ecological Appraisals. The UK Habitat Classification is the preferred survey method used to inform the Defra Metric for biodiversity net gain calculations; it is therefore advised that reference is made to both Phase 1 and the UK Habs Classification.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: NCC - Natural Environment Team submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnr>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.25

99537

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

24. Under Visual and Landscape Character Impacts, pages 30-31 of the NMWLP document, May 2022, s. 6.25: suggest after, "locally designated landscapes of importance, ..." add, "including public rural recreational areas"..."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.26

99534

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Under s. 6.26, page 30, In the Safeguarding Local Features bullet, continue "... hedgerows, viewpoints" with "and public rural recreational areas ...)."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.27

99536

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

26. Under Recreation, page 31 of the NMWLP document, May 2022, s. 8.26 discusses public rights of way (PROW) in the context of the Definitive map. It is acknowledged that many ways are under-registered from the instigation of the Definitive Map as only basic cartography was available in the 1950/60s. The surveying authority has a statutory duty to keep the Definitive map under continuous review, but this is an unfunded mandate and cannot be achieved. There is however the presumptive responsibility to consider the question of whether there might be under-registered or unregistered PROW on the site when the potential for major topographical changes is proposed. Furthermore, a separate diversion order has to be obtained to justify a temporary deviation, although it does not alter the Definitive Map. This section of the NMWLP goes on to state that the restoration must have access at least as good as that existing previously. Under s. 261(1)(b) and (2)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, the highway must be restored "to a condition not substantially less convenient to the public." This is customarily interpreted to mean in length, conditions, and enjoyment. The word "access" in the context of restoration appears misguided.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

s. 8.27 could usefully be modified by inserting a sentence after "... means of accessing the countryside." After the end of the first sentence. I suggest adding, "Areas of investigation must be evaluated for under-registered or unregistered public rights of way according to the statutory duty to keep the Definitive Map under continuous review (s.53(2), Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981).

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these view it is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.28

99535

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

27. Under s. 6.28, after "other outdoor facilities such as ...", suggest adding, "Commons, country parks, and important rural, public recreation areas" and continuing, "are protected in District, ..."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.30

99139

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

Para after 6.30 could do with a para number

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99139 to 99142 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmm>

99225

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

Whilst we broadly welcome the requirement for a heritage and archaeology statement to accompany a planning application, for some sites this assessment work may need to be done prior to allocation within the Local Plan as part of the evidence base. We would expect to see this work completed prior to EiP. Further detail on this is given in relation to the comments on specific sites later in this table.

Change suggested by respondent:

Prepare HIAs for sites MIN96 Spixworth and MIN25 Haddiscoe.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.40

99159

Comment

Respondent: Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council) (Mr Mark Ogden, Flood & Water Manager) [21927]**Summary:**

Flooding, water resources and water quality - 6.40: We would suggest the inclusion of wording to cover the requirement for consenting and/or permitting from the appropriate body for any works that could affect the flow or cross-sectional area of a watercourse. You will need a consent or permit if your work or structure will affect the flow or cross-sectional area of a watercourse. This applies to both temporary and permanent changes. For further help and advice visit Consent for work on ordinary watercourses - Norfolk County Council. You must have a consent or permit by law before you begin work. If you begin work without this, you could be asked to change or remove the works. A watercourse consent application is managed outside of the planning process and can take up to 8 weeks.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Lead Local Flood Authority submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmc>

6. Development Management Criteria, 6.49

99469

Comment

Respondent: Ministry Of Defence (Defence Infrastructure Organisation) (Mr Chris Waldron, DIO Assistant Safeguarding Manager) [21971]**Summary:**

The MOD welcome the provisions of Policy MW1: Development Management Criteria and the supporting information set out in paragraphs 6.45 to 6.49 which provide an overview of the issues above and make a potential requirement for mitigation clear. It is noted that paragraph 6.49 identifies that mitigation should be provided at the planning application stage, in order to provide additional guidance to a prospective developer it would be beneficial to make clear within this section that it may be necessary that mitigation is secured through planning condition and/or planning obligation.

Change suggested by respondent:

It is noted that paragraph 6.49 identifies that mitigation should be provided at the planning application stage, in order to provide additional guidance to a prospective developer it would be beneficial to make clear within this section that it may be necessary that mitigation is secured through planning condition and/or planning obligation.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Ministry of Defence - Defence Infrastructure Organisation full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnm>

Policy MW2: Transport

99121

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

MW2 - should this refer to how staff travel to and from the site as a place of work?

MW2 – should this refer to the potential to use clean fuel/net zero emissions fuel for the HGVs or other work vehicles?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

99292

Comment

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

Suggested altered wording for the last bullet point of the policy as follows to make the policy effective.

This alteration is made to prevent a dogmatic approach being taken. We have examples of cycle racks needing to be provided when it was clearly impractical for individuals to safely cycle to the site.

Change suggested by respondent:

[insert: 'Where practical and'] appropriate measures to reduce car travel to the site by workers and visitors and encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EIP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99419

Support

Respondent: National Highways (Alice Lawman, Spatial Planner) [21967]**Summary:**

National Highways welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2038. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies that will be used to help support growth across the region.

National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to this consultation, our principal interest is safeguarding maintenance and the operation of the A47 and A11 which route through the Plan area.

National Highways welcome the decision that each site must be accompanied by a transport Assessment as and when they come forward to understand the impact on the road network (Policy MW2: Transport). We look forward to working with you as the Minerals and Waste Plan emerges. We welcome any opportunities to join in discussions on site location where there is a potential for changes to existing trip generation or where new sites are proposed.

I hope that the above comments are useful in the progression of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, and will allow you to move forward, and we will continue to work with yourselves as you move forward.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99308

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Regarding Policy MW2 whist the company supports the aspiration for the use of other transport modes, more often than not such avenues are not available, and as such the term "Where appropriate" should replace the word "All". Similarly, in relation to the last bullet point of the policy is it not always practical to access a site by alternative means, and often access by car is the only means, especially for mineral sites which tend to be located in the rural hinterland.

Change suggested by respondent:

The term "Where appropriate" should replace the word "All". Similarly, in relation to the last bullet point of the policy is it not always practical to access a site by alternative means, and often access by car is the only means, especially for mineral sites which tend to be located in the rural hinterland.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

Policy MW3: Climate change mitigation and adaption - STRATEGIC POLICY

99272

Comment

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]

Summary:

We support the aims of the policy which aligns with our Strategic Direction Statement and strategic ambitions. Anglian Water recognises that climate change is one of the key challenges for us as a water company, and we have a clear ambition to become a net zero business by 2030 and reduce capital (embedded) carbon by 70% from a 2010 baseline. Our Net Zero Strategy to 2030 includes measures for decarbonising our electricity supply and vehicle fleet, as well as focusing on procuring green electricity. Currently we generate around 30% of our energy from renewable sources including bio-resources, wind, and solar power – our existing renewable energy installations not only contribute towards our renewable energy target, but also help to provide energy security for the operation of essential infrastructure such as our water supply and water recycling networks and assets. Our 2025 target is to increase our energy from renewables to 45% and 100% by 2030. Our strategy is based on decarbonisation principles and hierarchy that first reduces emissions, uses renewables and green energy, and then utilises carbon insets/offsets through natural sequestration measures.

We have also maximised opportunities to extract heat from final effluent discharged from Anglian Water water recycling centres which is then transferred to greenhouses in Norfolk (Whitlingham) and Suffolk. Closed-loop heat pumps are used to transfer waste heat from our water recycling centres to the greenhouses to accelerate the growth of the plants. The heat pumps are powered by a new CHP (Combined Heat and Power) plant, the carbon emissions of which are channelled back into the greenhouses to help the plants grow.

The policy accords with the paragraph 20 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), although it could set out clearer planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation. A complete policy position would set out the current baseline of emissions from the mineral and waste sectors and show the pathway to reducing emissions by 78% by 2035 and to net zero by 2050, as set out in the Climate Change Act.

The recent announcement that the government has proposed changing national planning policy to relax restrictions on building new onshore wind farms in England by removing the rigid requirement for onshore wind sites to be designated in a local plan, is an opportunity to highlight that our operational sites such as WRCs could be potential locations for onshore wind, subject to other policy considerations.

In addition, we welcome the amendments to criterion d. following our representation to the Preferred Options consultation, regarding managing surface water flows through sustainable drainage systems, and connections to the public sewerage network.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99122

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

MW3 - Where a site will be in place for a number of years, would resilience to the effects of climate change be sensible to consider?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

99293

Comment

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

Due to the often-isolated nature of mineral workings public transport or cycling are not practical. Therefore, the additional wording is suggested to make the policy effective and preventing unnecessary work for the developer/applicant.

Change suggested by respondent:

Proposed Changes

g) set out how the transportation related to the development will help reduce carbon emissions and incorporate proposals for sustainable travel, including travel plans where [insert: 'practical and'] appropriate; and

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EiP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99339

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]

Summary:

We support the policy requirement for proposals to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change. However, the wording of section f appears unclear and open to interpretation. We recommend the policy wording better reflects the important role protecting all Priority Habitats, not just woodland, has in mitigating climate change and contributing to climate adaptation. We also recommend the inclusion of specific targets in order to ensure the policy is effective and delivers guaranteed benefits.

Full text: We support the policy requirement for proposals to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change. However, the wording of section f appears unclear and open to interpretation. In mitigating climate change and helping wildlife adapt to the changing climate, the retention of existing habitats is far preferable to their loss and replacement. Their value comes in part from their ability to sequester carbon but also from the carbon then stored in the soils, plus their ability to contribute to adaptation through allowing native species to move in response to climate change, helping secure the ongoing contribution of the natural environment to climate mitigation in the future. We therefore recommend the wording is modified to ensure that retention of not only trees but all Priority Habitats, are retained as the preferred option with the other options only where on site retention is not possible. We also query why the policy does not include any specific targets, instead using language such as 'minimise greenhouse gas emissions' and 'help reduce carbon emissions'. Noting the legal targets for net zero by 2050, despite the best intentions of this policy it is unclear how it will actually secure the plan's contribution to national climate change targets, or measure that delivery to demonstrate its effectiveness.

Change suggested by respondent:

We therefore recommend the wording is modified to ensure that retention of not only trees but all Priority Habitats, are retained as the preferred option with the other options only where on site retention is not possible.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

Policy MW4: The Brecks Protected Habitats and Species

99422

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]**Summary:**

Natural England welcome the inclusion of policy MW4, specific to the Brecks' protected habitats and species. The Brecks is an area rich in biodiversity and is of particular value for a number of ground-nesting bird species including Stone Curlew *Burhinus oedicephalus*.

Natural England are currently in the process of revising our guidance on assessing development effects on Breckland SPA stone curlew populations, which could influence the detail of policy MW4. We would advise the removal of the following paragraph, "A buffer zone has also been defined (indicated in orange hatching on Map 2) that extends 1,500 metres around areas that have a functional link to the SPA, because they support Stone Curlew outside, but in close proximity to the SPA boundary, within which new built development would be likely to significantly affect the SPA population." Whilst at the draft stage of development, Natural England would be happy to discuss the proposed new guidance with Norfolk County Council so that it can be used to inform this policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Natural England are currently in the process of revising our guidance on assessing development effects on Breckland SPA stone curlew populations, which could influence the detail of policy MW4. We would advise the removal of the following paragraph, "A buffer zone has also been defined (indicated in orange hatching on Map 2) that extends 1,500 metres around areas that have a functional link to the SPA, because they support Stone Curlew outside, but in close proximity to the SPA boundary, within which new built development would be likely to significantly affect the SPA population."

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>**Policy MW5: Agricultural soils**

99128

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

Could the situation arise whereby peat is excavated, not as a produce to sell, but to access a minerals site or to develop a waste site? Peat has many qualities. We have a policy that seeks the reduction of peat excavated as part of a scheme and its appropriate assessment/'disposal' to address these qualities and prevent it from becoming a carbon source. Should the Minerals and Waste plan have something similar? (See DM10, page 49 Local-Plan-for-the-Broads.pdf (broads-authority.gov.uk)).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

99294

Comment

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

It is felt that the last bullet point is unnecessary and could dilute the policy in terms of the importance of agricultural restoration. With climate change the ability to have land to grow food will become even more important. The proposed changes make the policy effective.

Change suggested by respondent:

The wording of the policy needs adjusting as follows:

Proposed Changes

Where development is proposed on agricultural land, the County Council has a clear preference for locating new mineral extraction and associated activities, and composting facilities, on land of agricultural grades 3b, 4 and 5.

Development proposals affecting Grade 1 agricultural land will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, where it is demonstrated that there are no alternative locations for the development.

In addition to the above, when minerals development, particularly extraction, is proposed on agricultural land of grades 1, 2 or 3a it will [delete: only] be permitted where:

- Provision is made for high standards of soil management that would enable restoration to a condition at least as good as its previous agricultural quality. To demonstrate this, soil and land quality surveys, and soil handling and replacement strategies (based upon Defra's 'Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils') must be submitted to the County Planning Authority; or

[delete: • The benefit of restoring the land to another after-use can be shown to outweigh the loss of the agricultural use of the land.]

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EiP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

Policy WP2: Spatial Strategy for waste management facilities – STRATEGIC POLICY

99273

Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]

Summary:

Anglian Water is supportive of the policy and welcomes the amendments following our previous representation, to ensure that it is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and planning practice guidance in terms of the specific locational needs for water recycling centres.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99448

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:****Nutrient Neutrality**

In March 2022, Norfolk LPAs were alerted to the issue of the “unfavourable condition” of the River Wensum and Broads SAC leading to a requirement to mitigate nutrient pollution from development, farming and to upgrade wastewater treatment works. Nitrogen and Phosphorus affects both water and air quality and Breckland District Council considers that the location of waste facilities particularly from agricultural waste and composting and its impact on the River Wensum and Broads SAC should be carefully considered.

Consider the impact of increase Nitrogen and Phosphorus Pollution from organic waste (development, agriculture) on nitrogen and phosphorus sensitive zones (i.e. where the river catchment is deemed to be in “unfavourable condition” with regards the spatial strategy for waste management facilities.

The location of agricultural waste treatment, windrow composting and community composting to nutrient sensitive river catchment areas.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99117

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

This policy says 'New or enhanced waste management facilities should be located within five miles of one of Norfolk's urban areas or three miles of one of the main towns and be accessible via appropriate transport infrastructure, subject to the proposed development not being located within: the Broads Authority Executive Area or the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest'.

Elsewhere, throughout the document, the stance is no minerals and waste sites within the Broads, yet this policy says they could be.

A look at the maps suggests that there are no settlements that need a facility within the AONB or Executive Area to achieve the 3 miles/5 miles criteria; as such, why is this criterion needed?

Soundness test: Not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

If this part of the policy is to be kept in, we request there is reference to the need for close working with the Broads Authority.

We also request that any proposals would need to demonstrate no alternative sites are available.

You could amend bullet point 1 as follows:

the Broads Authority Executive Area or the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Any proposals in these areas would need to also demonstrate that no alternative sites outside of these areas are available. Scheme promoters will be required to work closely with the Broads Authority and AONB.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99205

Object

Respondent: Pauline Davies [21940]**Summary:**

Given the existential threat to properties in West Norfolk, it surely is appropriate to locate future waste management locations beyond flooding-prone areas, which may be beyond the 3–5-mile guideline.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Full representation text and flood risk map - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzy>

99226

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We have raised concerns about the wording in relation to harm to the historic environment in policy WP2.

In order to make this policy consistent with the NPPF and effective in securing sustainable development, we suggest that the policy wording is amended.

We welcome the addition of designated heritage assets as a bullet point in this policy. Conservation Areas should also be added to this list as they are designated heritage assets.

Substantial harm is a very high bar. Less than substantial harm is still harm and harm should be avoided in the first instance. We suggest that you reword this bullet point to delete the word substantial and add reference to significance and setting.

The bullet point would then read:

- a designated heritage asset, including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, [insert: 'conservation areas'] and scheduled monuments, or their settings if the proposed development would cause [delete: substantial] harm to [delete: or] the [delete: loss] [insert: 'significance'] of the heritage asset [insert: '(including any contribution to significance by setting)'].

Change suggested by respondent:

Amend text to read;

a designated heritage asset, including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, [insert: 'conservation areas'] and scheduled monuments, or their settings if the proposed development would cause [delete: substantial] harm to [delete: or] the [delete: loss] [insert: 'significance'] of the heritage asset [insert: '(including any contribution to significance by setting)'].

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>**W2. Spatial Strategy for waste management facilities - STRATEGIC POLICY, Map 4. 5-mile zones surrounding urban areas and 3-mile zones surrounding main towns**

99449

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Many of the urban areas highlighted are in nutrient sensitive river catchment areas

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99140

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

Map 4 – may not matter, but the urban areas are blue, and the main towns are blue, and the shades are not very different, so it is not easy to tell which blue is which.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99139 to 99142 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmm>

Policy WP3: Land suitable for waste management facilities – STRATEGIC POLICY

99274

Object

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]

Summary:

The Local Plan is unsound because Policy WP3 is not positively prepared in terms of achieving sustainable development or justified given reasonable alternatives.

We would welcome modifications to the policy and supporting text.

Reference is made to waste management facilities on water recycling centres being limited to composting and anaerobic digestion. In our representation to the Preferred Options Consultation, we indicated that Anglian Water as sewerage undertaker is concerned that this is not justified in that there may be other waste management uses which would be suitable at water recycling centres, dependent upon both scale and location. The policy as currently drafted stifles innovations coming forward in the field of bio-resources. Therefore, the policy should be flexible to ensure that future sustainable options for bio-resources are considered - particularly in the context of addressing climate change mitigation and nutrient neutrality.

We consider that the development management criteria in Policy MW1 should be appropriate to ensure that suitable waste management facilities are considered at water recycling centres, and the specific types of facilities do not need to be specified.

We would therefore welcome modifications to Policy WP3 to allow for other waste management uses at water recycling centres associated with ambitions for the long-term sustainable management and operation of our facilities. Amending the policy would support the delivery of lower carbon solutions and so assist in the pathway to net zero for the sector in Norfolk.

g) water recycling centres [delete: (composting and anaerobic digestion only)];

Change suggested by respondent:

g) water recycling centres [delete: (composting and anaerobic digestion only)];

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99450

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Consideration of the impact of open air composting on air and water quality for habitat sites.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99494

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]**Summary:**

Note amendment to include 'redundant' so that criteria d) reads: 'land within or adjacent to redundant agricultural and forestry buildings'. Whilst this differs from the Councils suggestion, this is considered acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99080

Object

Respondent: Middleton Aggregates Ltd [1861]**Agent:** Stephen M Daw Limited (Mr Stephen Daw) [143]**Summary:**

The use of the term, 'at existing sand and gravel workings' has in the past been overinterpreted to mean within the active working area rather than 'at' a quarry. Siting of inert recycling facilities in such a way is unnecessarily restrictive and can prove problematical as the working area is by definition busy, constantly moving and can lead to contamination (of mineral) issues.

Change suggested by respondent:

Clarification is required, so that the policy cannot be interpreted in an overly restrictive manner, thus allowing recycling facilities to be positioned elsewhere at a quarry and for example on previously worked land or on land adjoining a quarry, provided all other criteria are met. Similar clarification is required to identical wording used in Policy WP4.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** In order to be able to fully explain the rationale behind the change requested and to counter any resistance to the change.**Attachments:** None

99517

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]

Summary:

Note amendment to include 'redundant' so that criteria d) reads: land within or adjacent to redundant agricultural and forestry buildings. Whilst this differs from the Councils suggestion, this is considered acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

W4. Recycling or transfer of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste, W4.1

99166

Comment

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Philip Dash, Principal Planner) [16208]

Summary:

The following text 'Whilst the resultant material is typically lower grade, recycled inert material can still often act as a substitute for freshly excavated material' to qualify that recycled aggregate cannot always be used as a direct substitute for primary aggregate is welcomed. In the same vein, it could be noted in a relevant part of the Plan that marine-won aggregate cannot always be used as a direct substitute for land-won aggregate.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Essex County Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmx>

Policy WP4: Recycling or transfer of inert construction, demolition and excavation waste

99495

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]

Summary:

Note amendment to replace the word 'may' so that it reads 'will only be acceptable'. Whilst this differs from the Councils suggestion, this is considered acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99524

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]

Summary:

Note amendment to replace the word 'may' so that it reads 'will only be acceptable'. Whilst this differs from the Councils suggestion, this is considered acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

Policy WP5: Waste transfer stations, materials recycling facilities, end-of-life vehicle facilities and waste electrical and electronic equipment recovery facilities

99496

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]

Summary:

Note amendment to replace the word 'may' so that it reads 'will only be acceptable'. Whilst this differs from the Councils suggestion, this is considered acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99525

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]

Summary:

note amendment to replace the word 'may' so that it reads 'will only be acceptable'. Whilst this differs from the Councils suggestion, this is considered acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

Policy WP7: Household Waste Recycling Centres**99497****Comment****Respondent:** Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]**Summary:**

WP7 – reiterate previous comments. The Policy could be more effective as ‘will not be acceptable outside of land identified in’ and ‘Concerned that this may not be legally sound, in that it goes beyond the remit of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan by seeking developer contributions. It would also be difficult to ‘retro-fit’ new Household Waste Recycling Centres into identified growth locations, if it was not a requirement when those locations were identified. Consideration could be given to allocating sites in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which have good access to the growth locations.’

Change suggested by respondent:

The Policy could be more effective as ‘will not be acceptable outside of land identified in’.

Consideration could be given to allocating sites in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which have good access to the growth locations.’

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>**99521****Comment****Respondent:** South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]**Summary:**

reiterate previous comments. The Policy could be more effective as ‘will not be acceptable outside of land identified in’ and ‘Concerned that this may not be legally sound, in that it goes beyond the remit of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan by seeking developer contributions. It would also be difficult to ‘retro-fit’ new Household Waste Recycling Centres into identified growth locations, if it was not a requirement when those locations were identified. Consideration could be given to allocating sites in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which have good access to the growth locations.’

Change suggested by respondent:

The Policy could be more effective as ‘will not be acceptable outside of land identified in’. Consideration could be given to allocating sites in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which have good access to the growth locations.’

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>**Policy WP8: Composting****99453****Comment****Respondent:** Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Consideration of air pollution on sensitive habitat sites (Natural England’s Shared Nitrogen Air Pollution Schemes in Breckland)

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

W9. Anaerobic digestion, W9.1

99526

Comment

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

It would be helpful if the supporting text explained that anaerobic digestion (AD) produces biogas (a mixture of around 60% methane and 40% carbon dioxide) and digestate, and that biogas can be burned directly in a gas boiler to produce heat or burnt in a combined heat and power (CHP) unit to produce heat and electricity.

Alternatively, the biogas can be cleaned to remove the carbon dioxide and other substances, to produce biomethane, which can be injected into the national gas grid to be used in the same way as natural gas or used as a vehicle fuel. This would demonstrate the options available from AD and replace the text in paragraph W9.1 that states methane gas drives a diesel generator.

Change suggested by respondent:

SUPPORTING TEXT MODIFICATION: It would be helpful if the supporting text explained that anaerobic digestion (AD) produces biogas (a mixture of around 60% methane and 40% carbon dioxide) and digestate, and that biogas can be burned directly in a gas boiler to produce heat or burnt in a combined heat and power (CHP) unit to produce heat and electricity.

Alternatively, the biogas can be cleaned to remove the carbon dioxide and other substances, to produce biomethane, which can be injected into the national gas grid to be used in the same way as natural gas or used as a vehicle fuel.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>**Policy WP9: Anaerobic digestion**

99275

Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

We support the policy, which acknowledges that anaerobic digestion facilities will be acceptable where they are integrated with water recycling centres.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99454

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Consideration of nitrogen and phosphorus pollution on the river catchment areas of the River Wensum and Broads SAC.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99123

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

WP9 – aren't anaerobic digesters an in-scope type of development in terms of impact on nutrient enrichment and therefore nutrient neutrality?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

Policy WP11: Disposal of inert waste by landfill

99227

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We welcome the changes made to criterion d to reference the historic environment. We also welcome the text at paras W11.3 and W11.4 regarding restoration and Historic Landscape Characterisation.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99508

Comment

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (Mr Ross Walker, Sr Planning officer) [21966]

Summary:

- Point c "improvements to biodiversity" could be changed to "deliver measurable improvements to Biodiversity net gain" ... this will bring it in line with the language used in the environment act around net gain.

- This would make the policy more effective, better mirroring of working in the acts / legislation.

- Otherwise quite strong landfill policy

Change suggested by respondent:

Point c "improvements to biodiversity" could be changed to "deliver measurable improvements to Biodiversity net gain" ... this will bring it in line with the language used in the environment act around net gain.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Suffolk County Council response Norfolk MWLP 16.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmt>

Policy WP12: Non-hazardous and hazardous waste landfill

99228

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We welcome the changes made to criterion e to reference the historic environment. We also welcome the text at paras W11.3 and W11.4 regarding restoration and Historic Landscape Characterisation.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99444

Comment

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (Mr Ross Walker, Sr Planning officer) [21966]

Summary:

- Point e "improvements to biodiversity" could be changed to "deliver measurable improvements to Biodiversity net gain" ... this will bring it in line with the language used in the environment act around net gain.

Change suggested by respondent:

- Point e "improvements to biodiversity" could be changed to "deliver measurable improvements to Biodiversity net gain" ... this will bring it in line with the language used in the environment act around net gain.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Suffolk County Council response Norfolk MWLP 16.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmt>

Policy WP13: Landfill Mining and Reclamation

99124

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

Policy WP13 and paragraph 13.5 - Some of the wording in 13.5 is not included in WP13. In particular, there is no mention in the policy of the need to mitigate the potential rapid release of leachate or emissions and odours. This is mentioned in 13.5 but not in the policy. This may be covered to some extent in MW1, but as it is raised specifically in 13.5, does it need to be a consideration for schemes captured by WP13?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

W14. Water Recycling Centres, W14.2

99276

Comment

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

SUPPORTING TEXT MODIFICATION: We would welcome modifications to this paragraph of the supporting text as it implies that there have been recent changes to the General Permitted Development Order (2015) regarding the permitted development rights for water and sewerage in Schedule 2. It would be correct to state:

"W14.2 With increasing populations and water quality standards there is continuing investment being made into wastewater treatment. [delete: Although changes to permitted development rights have sought to remove the need for planning applications for very small developments] [insert: 'Permitted development rights exist for certain types of water and sewerage development which are set out in the General Permitted Development Rights Order 2015 (as amended).] [Insert: 'However'], there are still applications that will need to be determined [insert: 'beyond the thresholds for permitted development']".

Change suggested by respondent:

It would be correct to state:

"W14.2 With increasing populations and water quality standards there is continuing investment being made into wastewater treatment. [delete: Although changes to permitted development rights have sought to remove the need for planning applications for very small developments] [insert: 'Permitted development rights exist for certain types of water and sewerage development which are set out in the General Permitted Development Rights Order 2015 (as amended).] [Insert: 'However'], there are still applications that will need to be determined [insert: 'beyond the thresholds for permitted development']".

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>**Policy WP14: Water Recycling Centres**

99277

Object

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

The Local Plan is unsound because Policy WP14 is not positively prepared in terms of achieving sustainable development or justified given reasonable alternatives.

We support the amendments to this policy that reflect our previous representations to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

However, we note that policy MW3 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides a positive policy framework for renewable energy to support our routemap to net zero ambition - this includes renewable energy installations contributing to our energy requirements at our water recycling centres (WRCs). It would be helpful if the policy and supporting text acknowledges that improvements to existing sites and supporting infrastructure relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation and resilience of essential infrastructure will be addressed through Policy MW3.

Change suggested by respondent:

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:

New or extended Water Recycling Centres, or improvements to existing sites and supporting infrastructure, will only be acceptable where such proposals aim to:

- a. treat a greater quantity of wastewater; and/or
- b. improve the quality of discharged water; and/or
- c. reduce the environmental impact of operation; [insert: "and/or"]

[insert: 'd. incorporate climate change adaption and mitigation measures (as detailed in Policy MW3)'].

Proposals must also comply with the development management criteria set out in Policy MW1.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99455

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Suggest in light of the issues around nitrogen and phosphorus pollution to remove the word "or" and replace with the word "and".
"WRCs will only be acceptable if they treat greater quantity of water and improve quality of discharged water."

Change suggested by respondent:

Suggest in light of the issues around nitrogen and phosphorus pollution to remove the word "or" and replace with the word "and".
"WRCs will only be acceptable if they treat greater quantity of water and improve quality of discharged water."

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>**W15. Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre, W15.2**

99278

Object

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

Paragraphs W15.2 and 15.3: We are disappointed that these paragraphs infer that there is no information relating to planned improvements at Whitlingham WRC, even though information was provided in our submission to the Preferred Options consultation. Through our PR19 Business Plan we identified investment to extend our plant at Whitlingham to cater for growth and increased capacity to cater for the additional sludges from our water recycling centres as a result of higher environmental quality regulations. This will provide sufficient capacity to deal with the impacts of regional growth and for increased sludge loads received from other WRCs affected by the WINEP (Water Industry National Environment Programme) phosphate reduction programmes as they are delivered through AMP7. This investment strategy is based on a longer-term plan and the knowledge that further staged investment will be needed in AMP8 and AMP9 to keep ahead of the growth projections across the Anglian region and to respond to changes in environmental legislation.

Our draft Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) was published for consultation earlier in the summer and we are now reviewing the responses with a view to publish the final version in 2023. The DWMP will support the development of our Long- Term Delivery Strategy (LTDS) and our business plan for the 2024 Price Review (PR24).

The draft DWMP identifies Whitlingham WRC as a catchment where there is already partnership working. The medium-term strategy for the Whitlingham water recycling catchment is attenuation with a longer-term strategy to 2050 of surface water removal, a new permit, new process streams, and infiltration removal.

We strongly suggest that the text is revised to ensure that it accurately signposts the relevant plans and strategies prepared by Anglian Water that inform our investments for Whitlingham WRC, so that the Local Plan is referencing the correct information and decision makers can access the this information through the lifespan of the plan, as our own plans are updated every 5 years to take account of changes to growth projections, regulatory and legislative changes, and environmental implications. This ensures that we can plan effectively and invest where it is needed.

Change suggested by respondent:

We strongly suggest that the text is revised to ensure that it accurately signposts the relevant plans and strategies prepared by Anglian Water that inform our investments for Whitlingham WRC, so that the Local Plan is referencing the correct information and decision makers can access the this information through the lifespan of the plan, as our own plans are updated every 5 years to take account of changes to growth projections, regulatory and legislative changes, and environmental implications. This ensures that we can plan effectively and invest where it is needed.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

W15. Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre, W15.3**99285****Object****Respondent:** Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

The Local Plan is unsound because Policy WP14 is not positively prepared in terms of achieving sustainable development or justified given reasonable alternatives.

Paragraphs W15.2 and 15.3: We are disappointed that these paragraphs infer that there is no information relating to planned improvements at Whitlingham WRC, even though information was provided in our submission to the Preferred Options consultation. Through our PR19 Business Plan we identified investment to extend our plant at Whitlingham to cater for growth and increased capacity to cater for the additional sludges from our water recycling centres as a result of higher environmental quality regulations. This will provide sufficient capacity to deal with the impacts of regional growth and for increased sludge loads received from other WRCs affected by the WINEP (Water Industry National Environment Programme) phosphate reduction programmes as they are delivered through AMP7. This investment strategy is based on a longer-term plan and the knowledge that further staged investment will be needed in AMP8 and AMP9 to keep ahead of the growth projections across the Anglian region and to respond to changes in environmental legislation.

Our draft Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) was published for consultation earlier in the summer and we are now reviewing the responses with a view to publish the final version in 2023. The DWMP will support the development of our Long- Term Delivery Strategy (LTDS) and our business plan for the 2024 Price Review (PR24).

The draft DWMP identifies Whitlingham WRC as a catchment where there is already partnership working. The medium-term strategy for the Whitlingham water recycling catchment is attenuation with a longer-term strategy to 2050 of surface water removal, a new permit, new process streams, and infiltration removal.

We strongly suggest that the text is revised to ensure that it accurately signposts the relevant plans and strategies prepared by Anglian Water that inform our investments for Whitlingham WRC, so that the Local Plan is referencing the correct information and decision makers can access the this information through the lifespan of the plan, as our own plans are updated every 5 years to take account of changes to growth projections, regulatory and legislative changes, and environmental implications. This ensures that we can plan effectively and invest where it is needed.

Change suggested by respondent:

We strongly suggest that the text is revised to ensure that it accurately signposts the relevant plans and strategies prepared by Anglian Water that inform our investments for Whitlingham WRC, so that the Local Plan is referencing the correct information and decision makers can access the this information through the lifespan of the plan, as our own plans are updated every 5 years to take account of changes to growth projections, regulatory and legislative changes, and environmental implications. This ensures that we can plan effectively and invest where it is needed.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

W15. Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre, W15.4

99279

Object**Respondent:** Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

As we previously stated in our representation to the Preferred Options Plan, the focus of the Local Liaison group was on operational issues only and was not intended to consider wider issues.

The Local Liaison Group was active a few years ago for Whitlingham WRC to discuss matters including odour. However, the group has not been active for some time, and we consider that this text is out of date and should be removed from the Local Plan. Should there prove to be a need for a liaison group to be re-established in the future then we will work proactively with Norfolk County Council, relevant stakeholders, and the local community to discuss any concerns regarding our site.

We work to engage stakeholders through the development of our plans and strategies, including our emerging Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP). Furthermore, development that requires planning permission, has a statutory consultation process whereby the local communities are informed of planned works. As we have indicated through our proposed modification to paragraph W3.2, the Plan should indicate that the General Permitted Development Order (2015) provides a wide range of permitted development rights on our operational land.

Change suggested by respondent:

We consider the text regarding the Local Liaison Group is out of date and should be removed from the Local Plan.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>**W15. Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre, W15.5**

99280

Object**Respondent:** Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

As stated above [regarding paragraphs W15.2 - W15.3] and in previous consultation responses, we have clearly recognised the need for a long-term strategy for our water recycling centres and the foul sewerage network to accommodate further growth as set out in our Water Recycling Long Term Plan. The emerging Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) will consider the need for further investment at our existing water recycling centres which has been developed in consultation with the Norfolk authorities, The Broads Authority, and the Environment Agency. We would therefore suggest that the supporting text in this paragraph is amended to make this clear and ensure that reference to a masterplan is removed. It is not possible to produce a masterplan for the site as there are so many factors that can change overtime, which impact on our investments and capital programmes - including innovative technology, changes to emerging growth patterns, and changing legislative requirements. These changes include the proposed measures in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill to address nutrient issues. As an environmentally regulated utility, all works Anglian Water undertakes are necessary and have a clear purpose and wider environmental benefit. We regularly update our plans, engaging with our regulators, stakeholders and working in partnership with other stakeholders to provide positive environmental outcomes. The recent nutrient neutrality issue in Norfolk is one such issue that will have implications for future investments at certain WRCs within the River Wensum and The Broads catchments. Therefore, the requirement for a masterplan would put the delivery of strategic investment at Whitlingham WRC at risk.

Change suggested by respondent:

We have clearly recognised the need for a long-term strategy for our water recycling centres and the foul sewerage network to accommodate further growth as set out in our Water Recycling Long Term Plan. The emerging Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) will consider the need for further investment at our existing water recycling centres which has been developed in consultation with the Norfolk authorities, The Broads Authority, and the Environment Agency. We would therefore suggest that the supporting text in this paragraph is amended to make clear and ensure that reference to a masterplan is removed.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

W15. Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre, W15.6**99125****Comment****Respondent:** Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

WP15.6 – how does the likely requirement for all WRCs to be at best available technology by 2030 relate to what is written here?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>**Policy WP15: Whitlingham Water Recycling Centre****99281****Object****Respondent:** Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

The Local Plan is unsound because Policy WP15 is not positively prepared in terms of achieving sustainable development or justified given reasonable alternatives.

We support the amendments to the policy because of our previous consultation submission to the Preferred Options consultation in 2019. However, there remains an outstanding area of concern that we wish to raise, as a result of our comments on the supporting text above, regarding our current and emerging plans and strategies that provide further detail regarding future investments at Whitlingham WRC.

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: Our draft DWMP consultation was undertaken with a wide range of stakeholders including local authorities and The Environment Agency. The policy does not need to reference the requirement for a longer-term masterplan as this aspect is fulfilled by the DWMP, which Councils are consulted on, and future AMP (Asset Management Plan) periods for investments in capital programmes. Therefore it is proposed that Policy WP15 of the local plan is amended.

We acknowledge that The Broads SAC (Special Area of Conservation) and the Crown Point Registered Park and Garden are designated wildlife and heritage sites in proximity to Whitlingham WRC and these are identified in the newly introduced criteria d. and e. of the policy. We would question why these criteria are specifically required when natural and historic environment criteria are already wholly addressed through Policy MW1, together with other natural and historic environment designations and assets. We consider that Policy MW1 provides a comprehensive approach to the relevant development management criteria that should underpin development proposals that require planning permission at our WRCs, including Whitlingham WRC.

Change suggested by respondent:

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: Our draft DWMP consultation was undertaken with a wide range of stakeholders including local authorities and The Environment Agency. The policy does not need to reference the requirement for a longer-term masterplan as this aspect is fulfilled by the DWMP, which Councils are consulted on, and future AMP (Asset Management Plan) periods for investments in capital programmes. Therefore, it is proposed that Policy WP15 of the local plan is amended as follows:

"Any proposals for the improvement of the WRC must [delete: be accompanied by and] be consistent with a longer-term [delete: 'masterplan'] [insert: 'strategy'] for the WRC [insert: 'which forms part of Anglian Water's Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan, or is required to:'] [delete: produced in collaboration with the constituent authorities of the Greater Norwich Growth Board, the Broads Authority and the Environment Agency].

[insert: 'a) comply with new legislation; and/or

b) accommodate growth within, or connecting to, the Whitlingham water recycling catchment.']

We would question why criteria d. and e. are specifically required when natural and historic environment criteria are already wholly addressed through Policy MW1, together with other natural and historic environment designations and assets.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99456

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]

Summary:

Consider whether the policy should refer to water quality improvements required at this site?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99229

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We welcome the reference to Crown Point RPG in the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

Policy WP16: Design of waste management facilities

99457

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]

Summary:

Suggest that reference should be made to natural based solutions within the design? E.g. wetlands around WRC, other nature based waste management solutions

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99498

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]**Summary:**

WP16 – This seems to overlap with Policy MW1: Development Management Criteria, and it is considered that this policy would be better placed and combined with MW1.

Change suggested by respondent:

It is considered that this policy would be better placed and combined with MW1.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99131

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

Uses the word 'should'. This is a weak term and all other policies before use the term 'will' – why is this wording used in this policy and why is it different to other policies?

Does WP16 repeat MW1? If they are both needed, then WP16 needs to refer to impact on the Broads and AONB and their setting.

Should it cross refer to MW1 like lots of other policies do?

Soundness test: Not justified**Change suggested by respondent:**

Continue to use the word 'will' or equivalent, like all other policies do. Refer to the impact on the Broads and AONB and/or cross refer to MW1. Suggested amendments are as follows:

Policy WP16: Design of waste management facilities

All waste management development [delete: should] [insert: 'will'] secure high-quality design and waste management facilities [delete: should] [insert: 'are required'] to incorporate:

- a) designs of an appropriate scale, density, massing, height and materials.
- b) efficient use of land and buildings, through the design, layout and orientation of buildings on site and through prioritising use of previously developed land.
- c) safe and convenient access for all potential users.
- d) schemes for the retention of existing and provision of new landscape features.
- e) measures which will protect, conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance the natural, built, and historic environment including the setting of heritage assets; and
- f) climate change adaption and mitigation measures (as detailed in Policy MW3)

Proposed variations shall not materially diminish the quality of the approved development between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme.

[insert: "All schemes must also comply with the development management criteria set out in Policy MW1"].

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99230

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We welcome bullet e) in policy WP16 on the use of design to protect, conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance the historic environment.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99523

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]

Summary:

This seems to overlap with Policy MW1: Development Management Criteria, and it is considered that this policy would be better placed and combined with MW1.

Change suggested by respondent:

It is considered that this policy would be better placed and combined with MW1.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

Policy WP17: Safeguarding waste management facilities – STRATEGIC POLICY

99282

Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]

Summary:

We welcome the amendments to this policy following our representation on the Preferred Options consultation, which recognise the consultation areas extending from our WRCs and pumping stations.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99165

Comment

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Philip Dash, Principal Planner) [16208]**Summary:**

The additional information around a Waste Management Facilities Impact Assessment (WMFIA) and Appendix 9 which set out the nature of evidence that would be required to be submitted alongside a non-waste application such that the County Council could be satisfied that the proposed development would not impact on the operation of the current or future waste management facility is welcomed.

It is also considered that the plan makers consider including extending safeguarding provisions to sites allocated for a waste use. Whilst it is noted that the current version of the emerging Plan includes no such waste allocations, this stance may change in the future, and the inclusion of 'allocated sites' in the policy wording at this juncture may future proof the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Essex County Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmx>

99204

Comment

Respondent: Kirklees Council (Mr Nick Reeves, Planner) [21941]**Summary:**

We have considered the latest WDI data on waste flows between Norfolk and Kirklees and we note in the past few years strategic movements of hazardous waste have taken place between Kirklees and a WEEE Treatment Facility in Thetford (operated by Wiser Recycling). Subsequently, we checked the Policies Map and Policy WP17 and note that the site has not been safeguarded nor does it meet the safeguarding criteria in Policy WP17. Despite this, we do not feel that it is necessary to comment on the soundness or legal compliance of the Plan, but we will continue to engage with Norfolk CC through the DTC process as and when appropriate.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Kirklees Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmv>

99445

Comment

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (Mr Ross Walker, Sr Planning officer) [21966]**Summary:**

In line with previous comments, it is suggested to re 20,000 tonnes per annum. There may be hazardous waste management facility operating below 20,000 tonnes which may be worth safeguarding.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Suffolk County Council response Norfolk MWLP 16.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmt>

Calculation of forecast need for sand and gravel

99082

Object

Respondent: Earsham Gravels Limited [4031]**Agent:** Stephen M Daw Limited (Mr Stephen Daw) [143]**Summary:**

The Plan should include an additional 20% of 0.274 million tpa for each year, giving a total forecast need of 1.643 million tpa, equivalent to 29.957 mt over the Plan period and a shortfall of 15.059 mt, or an additional 2.462 mt required. The additional requirement could be partly met by the allocation of MIN 212 Mundham.

Change suggested by respondent:

The forecast shortfall does not give sufficient flexibility given the uncertainties of future demand and problems which may arise preventing allocated sites from being developed. A greater flexibility has recently been given in the Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan adopted in July 2020 (para 5.33). The additional requirement could be partly met by the allocation of MIN 212 Mundham, for the reasons given in a separate representation.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** In order to be able to fully explain why additional flexibility should be made in the forecast shortfall for sand and gravel.**Attachments:** Chapters-1-to-18-SMWLP-Adopted-July-2020.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svkr>

99078

Object

Respondent: Middleton Aggregates Ltd [1861]**Agent:** Stephen M Daw Limited (Mr Stephen Daw) [143]**Summary:**

The forecast shortfall does not give sufficient flexibility given the uncertainties of future demand and problems which may arise preventing allocated sites from being developed. A greater flexibility has recently been given in the Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan adopted in July 2020 (para 5.33).

Change suggested by respondent:

The Plan should include an additional 20% of 0.274 million tpa for each year, giving a total forecast need of 1.643 million tpa, equivalent to 29.957 mt over the Plan period and a shortfall of 15.059 mt, or an additional 2.462 mt required. The additional requirement could be partly met by the allocation of MIN 205 and land immediately to the north of MIN 205.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** In order to be able to fully explain the case being made for more flexibility in the forecast demand for sand and gravel**Attachments:** Chapters-1-to-18-SMWLP-Adopted-July-2020.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svjm>

MP1. Provision for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP1.10**99231****Object****Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:****Carstone Requirement and Shortfall**

We note the section on Carstone. Carstone is probably the most important building stone within the county and can be seen in historic buildings and structures of western Norfolk. It is largely quarried today for construction rather than conservation purposes, but it is essential that some extraction takes place for building stone uses and that minimal crushing of good quality carstone takes place for construction purposes.

We note that there is one site allocation later in the Plan for Carstone although the Plan states that this is of insufficient quality for use as a building stone.

We therefore we recommend that an alternative site for building stone be sought. It is important that such stone is available for historic conservation work and also for limited use in new build where using traditional building materials can be a helpful design tool in picking up on local vernacular, character and distinctiveness in sensitive design.

Change suggested by respondent:

Consider site allocation for Carstone as building stone for conservation purposes (rather than just for general construction).

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>**MP1. Provision for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP1.19****99478****Object****Respondent:** Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:**Glass Recycling as a Silica Sand Substitute A**

Glass recycling can potentially contribute to the shortfall of silica sand extraction though it is far from being straight-forward. However, Sibelco have a celebrated history in Belgium of developing a supply chain for the provision of suitable glass cullet. Sibelco UK have not encouraged such a development in the UK and it is not included by N.C.C. in the new Policy MPSS1. Glass recycling would indeed support the presumption of sustainable development. The main issue is to provide a clear glass cullet that is not contaminated. The NMWLP, 2022, and NMWLP Preferred Options, July 2019 do not consider this option.

The issue was discussed at length in a public consultation document ID no.94688, dated 26/10/2019 submitted by CATSS, Campaigners Against Two Silica Sand Sites. A recent British Geology Survey/DEFRA Mineral Planning Fact Sheet entitled, Silica Sand, dated January 2020 is also very relevant. These documents make a compelling case for Norfolk to do more to meet the potential market for recycling selected glass cullet suitable to supplement silica sand extraction.

In 2020, 38.5% of UK glass container manufacture comprised recycled glass. This reduced the demand for raw materials. Every ton of glass cullet saves 1.2 tons of extracted sand. Furthermore, as it takes less energy to melt; every ton of cullet in container glass manufacture saves 580kg of CO₂, aiding global warming amelioration. Flat glass manufacture by the float glass process is highly sensitive to impurities and so demolition site glass and most curbside collected glass is particularly difficult to use. Flat glass cullet from downstream fabricator glass wastage in the automobile and double-glazing industries can however be readily substituted. Preparative technologies are continually improving the cullet that can be used.

In several places in the "consultation" record in the document, NMWLP Statement of Consultation, May 2022, the possibility of supplementing the Norfolk silica sand extraction with appropriate glass recycling is raised in order to conserve both resource and landscape. Variations on a standard response is generated, such as that on page 58: "Norfolk already has a well-developed and effective collection process for glass recycling at the kerbside, through Household Waste Recycling Centres, and bring banks. The glass collected through these methods in Norfolk is sent to existing glass recycling facilities located elsewhere in the UK. Silica sand is a necessary ingredient in the remelt feedstock for recycled glass. The NM&WLP contains criteria based policies which would be used to determine planning applications for waste management facilities including glass recycling and other inert waste recycling. The plan does not fail the Sustainability appraisal Report."

While these statements are reasonably correct, they hide the fact that the N.C.C. "well-developed and effective collection process for glass recycling" is very much unsuitable for the supplementation of silica sand extraction. Furthermore, Norfolk's performance in general glass recycling does not hold comparison with European performance, and so the deficits in performance are not being acknowledged. It is true that in some areas of Norfolk, 99% of glass is recycled for general glass reclamation, but the figures are patchy across the County. The total recycling of domestic waste glass was 44.21% in 2021/22, compared with 46.71% in 2016/17 so there appears to be no improving trend. The retention of business glass waste is probably better. These figures have not met the 2015 MRF target for the separate collection of glass. It has to be remembered that glass is essentially inert and that theoretically almost all glass can be recycled in a circular economy with optimal recycling, and the availability of materials recycling and reprocessing facilities.

In the EU, the average closed-loop glass recycling figure is 74%, with 61% in France and 77% in Germany. This includes 90% of bottles in the EU. There has been considerable investment in bottle bank systems, and in public education. Clearly there are substantial technicalities, but these comparative figures have some legitimate force. DEFRA has proposed that by 2030, 83% of glass should be recycled with an 82% remelt target. The biggest losses are occurring at the collection stage where the conventional curbside collections result in unacceptable contamination. Deposit-return schemes elsewhere in the western world have resulted in up to 98% recycling of beverage glass. Universally-available glass and bottle collection facilities are also fundamental. The scaling up of refillable glass packaging schemes too are being promoted.

Glass recycling for silica sand replacement has to be based upon the reclamation of clear glass with minimal contamination. However, a much higher-value glass cullet is required. Although not obligated by the NPPF, it makes eminent sense in a situation where the selection of potential silica sand extraction sites in Norfolk has become increasingly difficult to the extent of N.C.C. now proposing to abandon its main proposals under the NMWLP, 2022, to optimize its recovery of silica sand-worthy recycled glass. This seems to be just another denial of the facts.

Sibelco UK has recently acquired glass processing centres in Peterborough, Sheffield and Motherwell. The company seeks to increase the UK average glass recovery to the European average of 90%, and to improve glass collection away from contamination in domestic waste. Is not the prospect of optimising the substitute replacement of silica sand raw material with good quality colour-sorted cullet of correct composition and low levels of contamination for both glass container and flat glass manufacture an important strategic opportunity for Norfolk in collaboration with Sibelco UK?

Soundness: Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

This issue deals with potential, enhanced-sustainability improvements to the NMWLP.

Suggest the formation of a C.C. committee, involving glass industry and waste specialists, to determine whether glass recycling can be improved in Norfolk, and with particular reference to silica sand substitution, with modification of the NMWLP to accommodate such change, if appropriate.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed evidence to support these views. It is probably important to support those contested by the MPA

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission E. glass recycling as a silica sand substitute and protection of woodland - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn5>

Policy MP1: Provision for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY

99216

Comment

Respondent: Breedon Trading Limited (Mr Shaun Denny, Planner) [21948]

Summary:

Neither the policy itself or its pre-amble actually identify which sites have been selected to fulfil the 12.597 mt. It would be helpful for readers of the document for the sites identified to be listed in the policy itself or the pre-amble, or a reference made to where the schedule of identified sites lies within the wider document.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99288

Object

Respondent: Breedon Trading Limited (Mr Shaun Denny, Planner) [21948]

Summary:

The Company wishes to object to the inclusion of the following phrase within the policy: -

"...Mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside of allocated sites will be resisted by the Mineral Planning Authority unless the applicant can demonstrate:

a) There is an overriding justification and/or overriding benefit for the proposed extraction..."

In the Company's view this does not sit at ease with the following quote from paragraph 5.3 of the Plan

"...Norfolk County Council will take a positive approach to minerals development and waste management development that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development..."

To be consistent Policy MP1 should reflect the statement made by paragraph 5.3, i.e., that the Council will take a positive approach to minerals development that reflects the principles of sustainable development.

Change suggested by respondent:

The Company suggests that the presumption against sites not allocated by the Plan is dropped and replaced by the following: -

"Mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside of allocated sites will be viewed positively the Mineral Planning Authority provided such proposals are demonstrably sustainable development and:

a) There is an justification or benefit for the proposed extraction..."

In the Company's view this better aligns Policy MP1 and paragraph 5.3 of the Plan.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Objection to Policy MP1 of the Norfolk County Council.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzt>

99351

Object

Respondent: Longwater Gravel Co. Ltd. [9380]

Agent: Heaton Planning Ltd (Georgina Illsley) [21957]

Summary:

We are making representations to the above consultation on behalf of our client, Longwater Gravel Company Ltd. ('Longwater'). Longwater is a mineral operator with sand and gravel quarries and minerals and waste processing plants with the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) area. These representations are being submitted to ensure adequate flexibility is provided within the emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plan policies concerning the provision of aggregate supply.

On a procedural point, the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan has, as part of this consultation, been further extended by a 2 year period. Firstly, to take account of delay in Plan preparation as a result of the pandemic but also to ensure the Plan covers a 15 year period to comply with national guidance. Notwithstanding opportunities for review of the Plan (as a minimum every 5 years) to ensure that policies are effective and remain relevant and up to date, Longwater considers that this extension of time should have been subject to consultation earlier than Publication stage where the Plan is effectively considered sound. Industry were asked back in 2017 to propose sites for consideration within the emerging Plan as site specific allocations based on an end date of 2036. The two-year delay in adopting the emerging plan along with the change in end date will leave a supply gap at the end of the Plan period which industry have not been asked to comment on or the offered opportunity to promote additional sites that could be considered suitable for allocation.

As a result of the above, Longwater is seeking amendments to the general aggregate supply policy to ensure there is sufficient flexibility to enable suitable sites to come forward subject to certain policy criteria.

Minerals Specific Policies

The NPPF sets out different requirements for maintaining supply depending on the type of minerals and their end uses. For aggregate minerals which are used in building and construction, supply is maintained country-wide through the managed aggregate supply system (MASS) and through the maintenance of landbanks of permitted reserves.

Minerals can only be extracted where they naturally occur and, therefore, any strategy for planning the location of mineral development is constrained by the geographical distribution of mineral resources within the Plan area. In broad strategic terms, as depicted on the Key Diagram, this means that sand and gravel will largely be extracted in the central, northern and eastern parts of the Plan area, Carstone in the western parts and silica sand in the central / western parts of the plan area.

The strategic locational strategy is further influenced by the different requirements for maintaining supply depending on the type of minerals and their end uses. As set out above, aggregate supply is maintained through the managed aggregates supply system (MASS). Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) are required to make provision in their local plans to ensure the supply of aggregates over the Plan period i.e. to 2038. Such provision should take the form of specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search and locational criteria as appropriate.

Paragraph 213 (f) of the NPPF requires MPAs to maintain a landbank of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock, whilst ensuring that the capacity of operations to supply a wide range of materials are not compromised. The footnote to part f) states that 'longer periods may be appropriate to take account of the need to supply a range of types of aggregates, locations of permitted reserves relative to markets, and productive capacity of permitted sites'.

As set out in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), an adequate or excess landbank is not a reason for withholding planning permission unless there are other planning objections which are not outweighed by planning benefits. Valid reasons for bringing forward an application of minerals development in an area where there exists an adequate landbank include:

- significant future increases in demand that can be forecast with reasonable certainty;
- the location of the consented reserve is inappropriately located relative to the main market areas;
- the nature, type and qualities of the aggregate such as its suitability for a particular use within a distinct and separate market; or
- known constraints on the availability of consented reserves that might limit output over the plan period.

Policy MP1: Provision for minerals extraction

As identified above, there is concern that sites (including proposed allocations) will be worked out towards the end of the Plan period. The current policy wording seeks to 'resist' applications for development outside of those specifically allocated. That approach could result in sustainable extensions, appropriately located resource and application seeking to ensure continuity in production/of certain types of resource being contrary to policy. This approach does not provide a positive framework for new applications coming forward and provides uncertainty to operators in submitting Planning Applications that would be contrary to the adopted Plan.

Policy MP1 identifies a need for at least 12,597 mt of sand and gravel to be allocated over the emerging Plan period (shortfall in the forecast need minus permitted reserve). 16 sites have been allocated, including sites MIN 51, MIN 13 and MIN 08 at Beetley and MIN 64 at Horstead. Planning permission has been granted for MIN 64 (FUL/2020/0045) and the permission has been implemented. Condition 2 of that permission allows for mineral working for 15 years from commencement of the development. This will result in the exhaustion of reserves at Horstead within the Plan period.

The emerging Plan identifies a resource of 1,830,000 tonnes of sand and gravel collectively within the Beetley site allocations, and a resource of 1,480,000 tonnes available during the Plan period (up to 2038).

In both cases (Beetley and Horstead) it is assumed that the sites will operate in accordance with current demand and makes no assessment/forecast of need for upturns in production/supply.

Our client has submitted a planning application (FUL/2022/0021) to work sites MIN 51, MIN 13 and MIN 08 which, cumulatively, provide ca. 1,550,000 tonnes of mineral, ca. 300,000 tonnes below the estimated total resource. There is a possibility that the overall tonnage may be reduced further as a result of statutory consultation and minor amendments to the working scheme. There is an unidentified shortfall between estimated mineral resources and permitted mineral reserve within sites MIN 51, MIN 13 and MIN 08. This is likely to occur within other sites allocated under policy MP1. In addition, sites that obtain planning permission may be exhausted before the end of the Plan period. As is the case with the current adopted Plan, there is the prospect at sites may not come forward as applications and that poses a threat to overall supply within the Plan. Therefore, it is important to ensure that adequate flexibility is built into the strategic policies for minerals provision over the Plan period.

These amendments [see suggested policy amendments] are considered to provide greater flexibility which is necessary to safeguard the provision of sand and gravel within Norfolk over the emerging plan period due to potential shortfalls/discrepancies in estimated figures. Furthermore, these amendments support potential extensions to existing sites that might be brought forward over the plan period. Extensions to existing sites are considered to be, on balance, often more economically and environmentally sustainable due to the following factors:

- existing plant and infrastructure is in place which reduces start-up costs;
- existing jobs are retained;
- opportunity for a strategic approach to restoration; and
- continuation of existing operations which limits any cumulative impacts.

Change suggested by respondent:

We suggest the following amendments to policy MP1:

Mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside of allocated sites will be [delete: resisted] [insert: 'supported'] by the Mineral Planning Authority [delete: unless] [insert: 'where'] the applicant can demonstrate:

- a) There is an overriding justification and/or overriding benefit for the proposed extraction; [delete: and]
- a)[insert: 'proposals are justified in that location taking into account the need for the specific mineral;
- b) is an extension to an existing permitted aggregate site that is required to maintain production from that site or is needed to meet an identified shortfall in the landbank;
- c) proposals enable the continued use of existing appropriately located and designed quarry plant and infrastructure;
- d) is for a new quarry that is required to replace an existing permitted site that is nearing exhaustion where it has been demonstrated that there are no potential extensions to that site or that remaining sites cannot maintain the required level of provision;
- e) proposals protect and/or provide additional local employment and support local businesses and economic prosperity;']
- f) The proposal is consistent with all other relevant policies set out in the Development Plan.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Heaton Planning for Longwater Gravel full text submission - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmj>

99083

Object

Respondent: McLeod Aggregates Limited [21904]

Agent: Stephen M Daw Limited (Mr Stephen Daw) [143]

Summary:

It is requested that an additional circumstance is bulleted when planning permission can occur on a non-allocated site. Due to a shortage of available fresh water for use in the processing of mineral and a shortage of space for the disposal of processed silts, there is an imminent requirement to extract minerals on an extension to the Plant Site at Bittering Quarry. The extraction would enable the formation of new fresh water and silt lagoons to be restored to a mixture of open water, scrub and wet woodland (see Location Plan).

Change suggested by respondent:

The change sought would add an additional circumstance to MP1.27 in order to address this specific issue stating for example 'the formation of fresh water lagoons and/or silt lagoons at an existing quarry'.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Location plan - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svks>

99295

Object

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

Changes are required to make it clear that the landbanks levels have to be maintained so they are in place at the end of the plan period to make the policy accord with national policy and be effective. In respect of silica sand changes are needed to make the policy accord with NPPF. As currently drafted the policy is unsound as it is not compliant with National Policy.

In respect of silica sand Paragraph 214 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

"Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by:...

c) maintaining a stock of permitted reserves to support the level of actual and proposed investment required for new or existing plant, and the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment⁷⁴."

Footnote 74 states:

"These reserves should be at least 10 years for individual silica sand sites; at least 15 years for cement primary (chalk and limestone) and secondary (clay and shale) materials to maintain an existing plant, and for silica sand sites where significant new capital is required; and at least 25 years for brick clay, and for cement primary and secondary materials to support a new kiln."

National policy is clear that Mineral Planning Authorities are required to plan for a steady and adequate supply of silica sand, it is therefore wholly inappropriate for Policy MP1 to state that a landbank of at least 10 years shall be maintained "where practical". It is notable that where significant new capital is required a landbank of at least 15 years is required rather than just 10 years. This means that the policy as drafted is not prepared positively and is not consistent with national policy.

The calculation of forecasted need is not consistent with national policy. Whilst there is no guidance on how this should be calculated for the purposes of plan making, Paragraph: 090 Reference ID: 27-090-20140306 of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides guidance for how this should be calculated at the point of planning application submission:

"The required stock of permitted reserves for each silica sand site should be based on the average of the previous 10 years sales. The calculations should have regard to the quality of sand and the use to which the material is put."

No reference is made to the permitted throughput of a processing site. Indeed the 'throughput' of a particular site does not determine the sales made from the site. National policy makes the clear distinction that sales should be used to determine the level of permitted reserves required as the processing of raw mineral results in waste unsuitable for sale.

We are advised that the average 10-year sales (2012 to 2021) for our member Sibelco King's Lynn Quarry complex is 807,548 tonnes per annum.

Therefore, the forecasted need over the Plan period is at least 14,535,864 tonnes.

Taking into consideration permitted silica sand reserves (3,232,000 tonnes) this indicates a shortfall of 11,303,864 million tonnes.

Soundness test: not compliant with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

Suggested re wording of policy as follows;

Proposed Changes

The strategy for minerals extraction is to allocate sufficient sites to meet the forecast need for both sand & gravel and hard rock (carstone).

For sand and gravel, specific sites to deliver at least 12.597 million tonnes of resources will be allocated. The sand and gravel landbank will be maintained at a level of at least 7 years supply [insert: 'throughout the Plan period'] (excluding any contribution from borrow pits for major construction projects).

Mineral extraction for sand and gravel outside of allocated sites will be resisted by the Mineral Planning Authority unless the applicant can demonstrate:

- a) There is an overriding justification and/or overriding benefit for the proposed extraction, and
- b) The proposal is consistent with all other relevant policies set out in the Development Plan.

There is not a forecast shortfall in permitted reserves for Carstone during the Plan period. However, a site for Carstone will be allocated to provide flexibility to meet any future increase in demand for Carstone. The landbank for carstone will be maintained at a level of at least 10 years' supply [insert: 'throughout the Plan period'.]

For silica sand, sufficient sites to deliver at least [delete: 10.34] [insert: '11.30'] million tonnes of silica sand resources will be required during the Plan period. The landbank for silica sand will be maintained at a level of at least 10 years' supply [insert: 'or at least 15 years' supply where significant new capital is required'] [delete: where practicable]. Planning applications for silica sand extraction located outside of allocated sites, which would address the shortfall in permitted reserves, will be determined on their own merits in accordance with the policies in this Local Plan, including the requirements contained within Policy [insert: 'MP2 and'] MPSS1.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EIP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99309

Support

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

As regards to the Mineral policies the contents of paragraphs MP1-MP10 inclusive are supported in full, although at the outset when considering the sand and gravel landbank, Norfolk Gravel would question why when considering the sand and gravel landbank ten year sales doesn't include 2021, when the returns and data should be readily available at this time of the year?

No comments are offered on the remainder of the "strategic landbank" type policies for the other minerals.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

Respondent: Sibelco UK Limited (Mr Lewis Williams, Planning Manager) [18360]

Summary:

1. Policy MP1 is not legally compliant or sound.
2. Paragraph 214 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:
"Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by:..."
- c. maintaining a stock of permitted reserves to support the level of actual and proposed investment required for new or existing plant, and the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment⁷⁴."
3. Footnote 74 states:
"These reserves should be at least 10 years for individual silica sand sites; at least 15 years for cement primary (chalk and limestone) and secondary (clay and shale) materials to maintain an existing plant, and for silica sand sites where significant new capital is required; and at least 25 years for brick clay, and for cement primary and secondary materials to support a new kiln."
4. National policy is clear that Mineral Planning Authorities are required to plan for a steady and adequate supply of silica sand, it is therefore wholly inappropriate for Policy MP1 to state that a landbank of at least 10 years shall be maintained "where practical". It is notable that where significant new capital is required a landbank of at least 15 years is required rather than just 10 years. This means that the policy as drafted is not prepared positively and is not consistent with national policy.
5. It follows that the calculation of forecasted need is not consistent with national policy. Whilst there is no guidance on how this should be calculated for the purposes of plan making, Paragraph: 090 Reference ID: 27-090-20140306 of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides guidance for how this should be calculated at the point of planning application submission:
"The required stock of permitted reserves for each silica sand site should be based on the average of the previous 10 years sales. The calculations should have regard to the quality of sand and the use to which the material is put."
6. No reference is made to the permitted throughput of a processing site. Indeed the 'throughput' of a particular site does not determine the sales made from the site. National policy makes the clear distinction that sales should be used to determine the level of permitted reserves required as the processing of raw mineral results in waste unsuitable for sale.
7. The average 10 year sales (2012 to 2021) for the King's Lynn Quarry complex is 807,548 tonnes per annum. Therefore, the forecasted need over the Plan period is at least 14,535,864 tonnes.
8. Taking into consideration permitted silica sand reserves (3,232,000 tonnes) this indicates a shortfall of 11,303,864 million tonnes.

Change suggested by respondent:

We suggest Policy MP1 should be reworded as follows:

Proposed Changes

"For silica sand, sufficient sites to deliver at least [delete:10.34] [insert: '11.30' million tonnes of silica sand resources will be required during the Plan period. The landbank for silica sand will be maintained at a level of at least 10 years' supply [insert: 'or at least 15 years' supply where significant new capital is required] [delete: where practicable]. Planning applications for silica sand extraction located outside of allocated sites, which would address the shortfall in permitted reserves, will be determined on their own merits in accordance with the policies in this Local Plan, including the requirements contained within Policy [insert: 'MP2 and'] MPSS1."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Sibelco would like to be present at any Examination in Public.

Attachments: Proposed Silica Sand Allocations - Appendix B Charity Field supporting info.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzc>
Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Button Fen Heritage Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzd>
Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Marham Agricultural Land Classification and Soil survey.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzw>
R001 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Preliminary Ecology Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzf>
Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_ document minus appendices - redacted personal data.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzg>
Sibelco full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn7>

99481

Comment

Respondent: The Lyndon Pallett Group Ltd [21973]**Agent:** PDE Consulting Limited (Mr George Massingham, Consultant) [21972]**Summary:****Timescales**

In examining the sites put forward for allocation within the MWLP we have taken note of the anticipated lifespan of the sites which have been proposed for allocation (as described above). Having taken into consideration the proposed start dates and anticipated lifespan of the developments it is notable that there will be a slight reduction in mineral production towards the middle of the plan period. This is because virtually all of the proposed allocations are planned to commence towards the start of the plan period (2022-2025). This means that as the shorter life developments end, overall mineral production will decline as only one site (MIN 208) is planned to commence later within the plan period.

If the Feltwell extensions were to be allocated within the MWLP this would help to bridge a gap within the centre of the plan period following the cessation of extraction from the shorter-lived sites prior to the commencement of further extraction later within the plan period. The proposed extensions to Feltwell would represent a mid-range in terms of lifespan, operating for approximately 11 years from a start date of 2024 when mineral extraction would cease within the existing quarry.

Mineral Production Shortfall

With regard to mineral production, the MWLP makes provision for 1,506,000tpa of sand and gravel production over the plan period. This demand figure is based upon sales during the period 2011 to 2020 plus an allowance of 10% in order to account for increased mineral demand during the three year period between 2018 and 2020. It is, however, recognised within the industry as a whole, that there is an ongoing decline in permitted aggregate reserves nationally.

The Mineral Products Association (MPA) recently published a report titled Aggregates Demand and Supply in Great Britain: Scenarios for 2035. Within the report the MPA note that the decline in permitted reserves for primary aggregates urgently needs to be addressed within the next 15 years. Demand projections suggest that, by 2035, some 277 to 323 million tonnes of aggregates will need to be supplied each year. This means that between 3.8 and 4.1 billion tonnes of aggregates will be required between 2022 and 2035, compared with a total of 3.2 billion tonnes of aggregates supplied in the previous period, between 2008 and 2021.

In Britain as a whole for the past decade, for every 100 tonnes of sand and gravel produced from permitted reserves, only 63 tonnes have been replaced through new planning permissions.

Whilst there is an element of uncertainty within the MPA forecasts due to future changes in economic output and changes in industry practices which may impact the demand for aggregate, it is still predicted that aggregate demand will increase over the next 15 years. This is based on the general resilience of the construction industry to recent economic uncertainty and government investment in upcoming infrastructure projects.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: To discuss the allocation of Feltwell Quarry within the minerals and waste local plan as a site suitable for sand and gravel provision within the County. The reasons why we consider the Site to be suitable for allocation are set out within the attached covering letter.

Attachments: KD.FELT.D.001 Location Plan - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz6>
 KD.FELT.D.002 Current Situation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz7>
 KD.FELT.D.003 Block Proposals Plan - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz8>
 KD.FELT.D.004 Concept Restoration - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz9>
 Feltwell Quarry Proposed Extensions allocation: Ecological Assessment - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzb>
 GM.049 letter representation no signature.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzh>

MP1. Provision for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP1.27**99101****Object****Respondent:** Folkes Plant & Aggregates Limited [17581]**Agent:** Stephen M Daw Limited (Mr Stephen Daw) [143]**Summary:**

The Plan does not give sufficient weight to the provision of a local supply of aggregate for the Great Yarmouth Urban Area. As drafted, the Plan would not allow a future extension of Welcome Pit, Burgh Castle as a non-allocated site, even though this is the only source of land-won aggregate within 10 miles of Great Yarmouth. This stance will result in unnecessary transportation costs; higher carbon emissions and is completely contrary to mitigating climate change, an environmental objective of the NPPF (para 8.c)) and the aim of the Climate Change Act 2008 to reduce UK greenhouse gas emissions.

Change suggested by respondent:

Where there is inadequate mineral supply in a sub-area, Plan Policy should allow mineral extraction at either new or extended unallocated sites.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** In order to fully explain the arguments for local supply.**Attachments:** Representation received. ID_93242.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svky>**MP2. Spatial strategy for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP2.1****99232****Object****Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We note that this section includes a list of factors that have been considered in the spatial strategy for minerals. We are very concerned to see that there is still no reference to the historic environment in this regard.

Change suggested by respondent:

Ensure that historic environment is given due consideration in spatial strategy and (if it has) add reference to the historic environment in this paragraph.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>**MP2. Spatial strategy for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP2.5****99310****Comment****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Under paragraph MP2.5, the company would question the definition of a Main Town as this does not appear to list the town of Sherringham which is a clear development centre identified under local policy documents.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MP2. Spatial strategy for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP2.7

99540

Object**Respondent:** Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

21. Under Policy MP2.7: suggest addition at end of paragraph of, "Open access land, including well-used Forestry Commission land, is also protected.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

MP2. Spatial strategy for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY, MP2.11

99539

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

22. Under Policy MP2.11, suggest removal of the word "ancient" from the word "woodland; in concurrence with the decision of Cabinet relayed in the meeting report dated December 10, 2019. A definition of a minimal size of woodland would likely be necessitated, e.g. in MP2.11(b). I suggest it would be appropriate to add the phrase, "and well-used open-access Forestry Commission land." for purposes of clarity.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

Policy MP2: Spatial Strategy for minerals extraction – STRATEGIC POLICY

99233

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We have raised concerns about the wording in relation to harm to the historic environment in policy MP2.

In order to make this policy consistent with the NPPF and effective in securing sustainable development, we suggest that the policy wording is amended.

We welcome the addition of designated heritage assets as a bullet point in this policy. Conservation Areas should also be added to this list as they are designated heritage assets.

Substantial harm is a very high bar. Less than substantial harm is still harm and harm should be avoided in the first instance. We suggest that you reword this bullet point to delete the word substantial and add reference to significance and setting.

The bullet point would then read:

a designated heritage asset, including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, [insert: 'conservation'] areas and scheduled monuments, or their settings if the proposed development would cause [delete: substantial] harm to [delete: or] the [delete: loss] [insert: 'significance'] of the heritage asset [insert: '(including any contribution to significance by setting)].

Change suggested by respondent:

Amend text to read;

a designated heritage asset, including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, [insert: 'conservation'] areas and scheduled monuments, or their settings if the proposed development would cause [delete: substantial] harm to [delete: or] the [delete: loss] [insert: 'significance'] of the heritage asset [insert: '(including any contribution to significance by setting)].

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99296

Object

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]**Summary:**

Policy MP2 is not legally compliant or sound. Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states:

"It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation."

It is notable that Policy MP2 dictates that specific sites for silica sand, "should be located where they are able to access the existing processing plant and railhead at Leziate via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route." There is no basis or justification for imposing this restriction as a new mineral site could be a significant distance from the existing processing plant which might mean that the only viable or the most sustainable option is to build a new processing plant or warehousing facility. This is clearly not an effective approach to meet unmet need and is not consistent with the principles of national policy which set out that minerals can only be worked where they are found.

Furthermore, there is very little basis for the remainder of the spatial strategy, which simply states areas where mineral extraction sites are not acceptable. This ignores that silica sand is a nationally important mineral and that the extraction of this mineral in areas mentioned within the policy has been found to be acceptable. This very clearly cannot be termed a spatial strategy for silica sand extraction and as drafted is not justified, consistent with national planning policy, effective or positively prepared. It is simply unsound.

Paragraph 23 of the NPPF states:

"Broad locations for development should be indicated on a key diagram, and landuse designations and allocations identified on a policies map. Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area (except insofar as these needs can be demonstrated to be met more appropriately through other mechanisms, such as brownfield registers or nonstrategic policies)."

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF states:

"Planning policies should:

a) provide for the extraction of mineral resources of local and national importance, but not identify new sites or extensions to existing sites for peat extraction;...

The reasoning for removing Areas of Search from the plan is unequivocally flawed. Especially as the criteria used differs from that set out in the policy

and effectively implies that the whole of the resource area is an unacceptable location for minerals development. This undermines the strategic and national importance of silica sand whilst also prejudging specific applications which may evidence that a particular location is suitable for mineral extraction.

The draft Plan approach does not meet the requirement of Paragraph 210 of the NPPF which states that planning policies should provide for the extraction of mineral resources. Indeed, Paragraph 23 of the NPPF is clear that strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing forward sufficient land to address objectively assessed need. This policy does not do this, but rather attempts to set out a principle that silica sand resources are not located in areas acceptable for extraction. This means that the policy is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. It is important to note that Norfolk is one of the only areas in England processing sand capable of colourless glass manufacture. This damaging rhetoric and reckless approach to policy making threatens the viability of the nation's glass industry. Using a set of baseless principles that would be liable to legal challenge.

The policy as drafted serves no basis and should be re-evaluated in light of the above-mentioned policies and PPG. Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 27-008-20140306 of the PPG states:

"Mineral planning authorities should plan for the steady and adequate supply of minerals in one or more of the following ways (in order of priority):

1. Designating Specific Sites – where viable resources are known to exist, landowners are supportive of minerals development and the proposal is likely to be acceptable in planning terms. Such sites may also include essential operations associated with mineral extraction;
2. Designating Preferred Areas, which are areas of known resources where planning permission might reasonably be anticipated. Such areas may also include essential operations associated with mineral extraction; and/or
3. Designating Areas of Search – areas where knowledge of mineral resources may be less certain but within which planning permission may be granted, particularly if there is a potential shortfall in supply.

National Park Authorities are not expected to designate Preferred Areas or Areas of Search given their overarching responsibilities for managing National Parks.

Furthermore, in exceptional circumstances, such as where a local authority area is largely made up of designated areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it may be appropriate for mineral planning authorities to rely largely on policies which set out the general conditions against which applications will be assessed.

In planning for minerals extraction, mineral planning authorities are expected to co-operate with other authorities."

The Specific Sites proposed for allocation cover a very small proportion of the overall forecasted need for silica sand. Sibelco strongly disagree with the Council's assertion in paragraph 13.4 of the Silica Sand Topic Paper that, "there are exceptional circumstances in Norfolk to rely largely on a criteria-based policy." Norfolk is not made up largely of designated areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are a number of areas where silica sand extraction could come forward in both non-designated and designated areas. Nationally important mineral is routinely extracted within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other designated sites such as Ramsar and SSSI's where effective mitigation measures can control development. The following evidence should also be considered in NCC policy making:

- In his examination of the Norfolk County Council Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD (2017) the Inspector found that to address a shortfall of 0.68 million tonnes of silica sand, it was appropriate to designate some 946 hectares of Area of Search. On this matter the Inspector concludes, "I am mindful that the Plan has identified 946 hectares of land within the AoS, which I consider provides a suitable level of provision, given the uncertainties involved and the need for some flexibility should the future need for silica sand increase. Overall, I consider that the site selection methodology is sound."
- In his examination of the Norfolk County Council Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD (2017) the Inspector found the site selection methodology sound. The current site selection methodology appears to be the same. It is therefore difficult to understand why the Sustainability Appraisal excludes all the proposed Areas of Search, especially as these areas were deemed acceptable for inclusion and proposed allocation within the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review Preferred Options.

Change suggested by respondent:

The policy should be deleted and replaced with the following wording:

"To help meet the at least 14.54 million tonne silica sand requirements for the Plan period as identified in in Policy MP1, the following hierarchy of resource delivery will apply:

1. the delivery of specific sites MIN 40 and SIL01 over other proposals; then
2. the delivery of a site Preferred Area; then
3. an extension to an existing quarry located within an Area of Search; then
4. an extension to an existing quarry outside an Area of Search or a new quarry located within an Area of Search; then
5. a new quarry outside of an Area of Search."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EiP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99311

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

In respect of Policy MP2, paragraph 23 of the NPPF states "Broad locations for development should be indicated on a key diagram, and land use designations and allocations identified on a policies map." Can the council please confirm that when referencing "resource areas" within the policy they are actually referring to the "Mineral Safeguarding Areas" on the Key Diagrams as a "reserve area" is noted in the legend for those plans.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99340

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

In order to ensure the plan is effective and does not set policy MP2 against policy MW1, we recommend that County Wildlife Sites are added to the list provided in bullet points at the end of the policy. The CWS network in Norfolk consists currently of approximately 1400 sites, the safeguarding of which is vital to the future of Norfolk's wildlife. With legal targets in the 2021 Environment Act for nature's recovery, a duty on public bodies to have regard to nature's conservation and enhancement in the NERC Act and the Environment Act, and a policy requirement in policy MW1 to safeguard and provide gains for biodiversity through planning decisions, it would be counterproductive to not afford the CWS network the same policy protection under policy MP2.

Change suggested by respondent:

County Wildlife Sites should be added to the list of locations/features where development should not be located within.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: We wish to be able to expand on the reasons given in our comments in order to help ensure the plan is effective and avoids impacts on Norfolk's wildlife.

Attachments: None

99479

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:**Protection of Woodland**

In Policy [paragraph] 8.1, it states, "The Climate Change Act 2008 sets up a framework for the UK to achieve its longterm goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and to ensure that steps are taken towards adapting to the impacts of climate change. That Act also introduced a requirement into the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004, for local planning authorities to address climate change in preparing Local Plans. In 2019, the Climate Change Act was amended to commit the UK government by law to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 100% of 1990 levels (net zero) by 2050. The government's Net Zero Strategy, Build Back Greener (2021), sets out policies and proposals for decarbonising all sectors of the UK economy to meet net zero target by 2050.

Policy [paragraph] 8.3 adds, "Forestry and woodlands act as carbon sinks and capture greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, habitat creation and the expansion of existing habitats can increase the resilience of the natural environment to cope with climate change." It goes on to support these objectives in the reclamation of mining sites.

Policy MW3 states, "Proposals for new minerals and waste developments (including extensions to existing sites) will therefore be expected to: (f) take opportunities to incorporate trees, retain existing trees and include measures to assist habitats and species to adapt to the potential effects of climate change wherever change is possible."

The NMWLP establishes 'ancient woodland' and 'veteran trees' as landscape features that will be strongly protected. Development Management Policy OM 8.23, (NMWJP, Preferred Options, July 2019) for example, states, "There are also important areas of ancient woodland across Norfolk, often with veteran treesAll of these landscape features will be strongly protected from any adverse impacts arising from minerals and waste management development." [paragraph 6.24 of Pre-Submission document]

To help allay Net Zero, the UK government is dedicated to plant 1M acres of trees by 2050, increasing national tree cover from 14.5 to 17.5 %. In September 2019, the Norfolk County Council committed to planting 1 million trees over the next 5 years. In the Cabinet Members Delegated Decision Paper on the Preferred Options Consultation, dated December 10th, 2019, there was an important statement. Under a heading, Policy MP13 Silica Sand Area of Search AOS E and Policy MP2, it was stated, "(this) suggests a significant policy shift in the important roles that trees play in County Council operations. It is clear that much more attention needs to be given the retention of existing tree cover, with additional recreational opportunities. An elevated status needs to be given this in the planning balance as to whether an Area of Search should be designated at Shouldham. The Borough Council view is that the County Council should remove the AOS for this reason."

It continues, "Additionally, Policy MP2 provides a degree of protection for areas with defined characteristics. Clause a) refers to 'ancient woodland.' In view of the County Council decision referred to above, it would be appropriate to delete the word 'ancient' leaving an enhanced level of protection to woodland in general." The next sentence refers to this new protection of woodland in the decision to remove AOS E from the preferred options site selection.

This change of definition is yet to find its way into the NMWLP document. It should be modified to affect this change.

Soundness: Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

This issue deals with potential, enhanced-sustainability improvements to the NMWLP.

Change of the informing documents and of the NMWLP to recognise the formal protection of trees in established woodland from felling for minerals extraction, in accordance with both the Norfolk and HMG climate policies and cabinet decision making. The opportunity for tree planting in mining mitigation measures and in site restitution should be codified in order to support the climate initiatives

Important public recreational landforms to be protected ad infinitum from surface mining, in the absence of a formal change of use. Shouldham Warren, West Bilney Woods, and other significant public recreational sites to be fully protected from inclusion in the Norfolk opencast mining safeguarding maps and from planning orders.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed evidence to support these views. It is probably important to support those contested by the MPA

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission E. glass recycling as a silica sand substitute and protection of woodland - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn5>

99471

Object

Respondent: Sibelco UK Limited (Mr Lewis Williams, Planning Manager) [18360]

Summary:

Policy MP2 is not legally compliant or sound.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states:

"It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy, and goods that the country needs. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation."

It is notable that Policy MP2 dictates that specific sites for silica sand, "should be located where they are able to access the existing processing plant and railhead at Leziate via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route." There is no basis or justification for imposing this restriction as a new mineral site could be a significant distance from the Leziate Plant Site which might mean that the only viable or the most sustainable option to provide a steady and adequate supply of silica sand is to build a new processing plant or warehousing facility. This policy is clearly not an effective approach to meet unmet need and is not consistent with the principles of national policy which set out that minerals can only be worked where they are found.

Furthermore, there is very little basis for the remainder of the spatial strategy, which simply sets out where mineral extraction sites are not acceptable. This ignores that silica sand is a nationally important mineral and that the extraction of this mineral in areas specified within the policy has been found to be acceptable. This very clearly cannot be termed a spatial strategy for silica sand extraction and as drafted is not justified, consistent with national planning policy, effective or positively prepared. It is simply unsound.

Paragraph 23 of the NPPF states:

"Broad locations for development should be indicated on a key diagram, and landuse designations and allocations identified on a policies map. Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area (except insofar as these needs can be demonstrated to be met more appropriately through other mechanisms, such as brownfield registers or nonstrategic policies)."

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF states:

"Planning policies should:

a) provide for the extraction of mineral resources of local and national importance, but not identify new sites or extensions to existing sites for peat extraction;...

It follows that the reasoning for removing Areas of Search from the plan is unequivocally flawed. Especially as the site selection criteria used differs from that set out in the policy and effectively implies that the whole of the resource area is an unacceptable location for minerals development. This undermines the strategic and national importance of silica sand whilst also prejudging specific applications which may evidence that a particular location is suitable for mineral extraction.

Fundamentally it does not meet the requirement of Paragraph 210 of the NPPF which states that planning policies should provide for the extraction of mineral resources. Indeed, Paragraph 23 of the NPPF is clear that strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing forward sufficient land to address objectively assessed need. This policy does not do this, but rather attempts to set out a principle that silica sand resources are not located in areas acceptable for extraction. This means that the policy is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. It is important to note that Norfolk is one of the only areas in England processing sand capable of colourless glass manufacture. This damaging rhetoric and reckless approach to policy making threatens the viability of the nation's glass industry, using a set of baseless principles that would be liable to legal challenge.

The policy as drafted should be re-evaluated in light of the above-mentioned policies and PPG. Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 27-008-20140306 of the PPG states:

"Mineral planning authorities should plan for the steady and adequate supply of minerals in one or more of the following ways (in order of priority):

1. Designating Specific Sites – where viable resources are known to exist, landowners are supportive of minerals development and the proposal is likely to be acceptable in planning terms. Such sites may also include essential operations associated with mineral extraction;
2. Designating Preferred Areas, which are areas of known resources where planning permission might reasonably be anticipated. Such areas may also include essential operations associated with mineral extraction; and/or
3. Designating Areas of Search – areas where knowledge of mineral resources may be less certain but within which planning permission may be granted, particularly if there is a potential shortfall in supply.

National Park Authorities are not expected to designate Preferred Areas or Areas of Search given their overarching responsibilities for managing National Parks.

Furthermore, in exceptional circumstances, such as where a local authority area is largely made up of designated areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it may be appropriate for mineral planning authorities to rely largely on policies which set out the general conditions against which applications will be assessed.

In planning for minerals extraction, mineral planning authorities are expected to co-operate with other authorities."

The Specific Sites proposed for allocation cover a very small proportion of the overall forecasted need for silica sand. Sibelco strongly disagree with the Council's assertion in paragraph 13.4 of the Silica Sand Topic Paper that, "there are exceptional circumstances in Norfolk to rely largely on a criteria-based policy." Norfolk is not made up largely of designated areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are a number of areas where silica sand extraction could come forward in both non-designated and designated areas. Nationally important mineral is routinely extracted within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other designated sites such as Ramsar and SSSI's where effective mitigation measures can control development. The following evidence should also be considered in the Council's policy making:

• In his examination of the Norfolk County Council Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD [Single Issue Silica Sand Review] in 2017 the Inspector found that in order to address a shortfall of 0.68 million tonnes of silica sand, it was appropriate to designate some 946 hectares of Area of Search. On this matter the Inspector concludes, "I am mindful that the Plan has identified 946 hectares of land within the AoS, which I consider provides a suitable level of provision, given the uncertainties involved and the need for some flexibility should the future need for silica sand increase. Overall, I consider that the site selection methodology is sound."

• In his examination of the Norfolk County Council Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD [Single Issue Silica Sand Review] in 2017 the Inspector found the site selection methodology sound. The current site selection methodology appears to be the same. It is therefore difficult to understand why the Sustainability Appraisal excludes all of the proposed Areas of Search, especially as these areas were deemed acceptable for inclusion and proposed allocation within the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review Preferred Options. The following observations are made on the summary text in Section 6.3.4 of the Sustainability Appraisal which indicate the reasons why the proposed Areas of Search have been excluded from the Minerals and Waste Plan Pre-submission Document.:

AOS E:

The impacts on the setting of heritage assets at Wormegay and on the setting of Pentney Priory was a material consideration for the Inspector when he found the inclusion of this AOS as sound. The AOS was included in the Preferred Options stage with basic heritage assessment evidence informing the designation. Using Heritage as a constraint is not a justifiable reason to remove the AOS given nothing has changed in the evidence base since the AOS designation was considered sound.

o The statutory safeguarding area around RAF Marham was a material consideration for the Inspector when he found the inclusion of this AOS as sound. The Ministry of Defence raised concerns about minerals development in response to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Initial Consultation but did not object. The Council's response was to amend Policy MP13 to require a Bird Hazard Management Assessment at planning application stage. The Ministry of Defence provided the same comments in response to the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review Preferred Options Consultation and did not object to the inclusion of the AOS. Bird strike is not a justifiable reason to remove the AOS. It would be for an individual application and working scheme to mitigate any impacts within the context of these policies.

o The loss of access to public open space was a material consideration for the Inspector when he found the inclusion of this AOS as sound. Mineral extraction is a temporary and progressive operation and there is no reason why public open space cannot be either be maintained or returned upon restoration.

AOS F, AOS I and AOS J:

o The statutory safeguarding area around RAF Marham was a material consideration for the Inspector when he found the inclusion of this AOS as sound. The Ministry of Defence raised concerns about minerals development in response to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Initial Consultation but did not object. The Council's response was to amend Policy MP13 to require a Bird Hazard Management Assessment at planning application stage. The Ministry of Defence provided the same comments in response to the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review Preferred Options Consultation and did not object to the inclusion of the AOS. Bird strike is not a justifiable reason to remove the AOS.

o The Inspector found the size of this AOS as acceptable and it is therefore not just able to remove on this basis.

It is also noted that a number of superfluous reasons with little planning basis have been used to reject the Areas of Search approach. For instance, landowner willingness is not required by PPG for Preferred Areas or Areas of Search. In addition, in relation to designations such as AONB's, SPA's and SAC, mineral extraction has been found to be acceptable both within and in close proximity to these designations.

In summary there are no sound planning reasons to deviate from the Areas of Search approach. Omitting Areas of Search and introducing a criteria-based approach renders the Plan not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. The Plan is unsound.

We suggest Policy MP2 is re-worded to include Areas of Search and also set out a hierarchy of delivery. to properly set out a spatial strategy for silica sand development.

Change suggested by respondent:**Proposed Changes**

[delete: 'Within the resource area identified on the key diagram, specific sites for silica sand should be located where they are able to access the existing processing plant and railhead at Leziate via conveyor, pipeline or off-public highway haul route.

This spatial strategy for mineral extraction sites is subject to the proposed development not being located within:

- the Broads Authority Executive Area or the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest, or
- a Site of Special Scientific Interest or a habitats site and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it, or
- ancient woodland, or
- a designated heritage asset, including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, and scheduled monuments, or their settings if the proposed development would cause substantial harm to or the loss of the heritage asset']

To be replaced with:

[insert: 'To help meet the at least 14.54 million tonne silica sand requirement for the Plan period as identified in in Policy MP1, the following hierarchy of resource delivery will apply:

1. first priority: the delivery of specific sites MIN 40 and SIL01 over other proposals; then
2. second priority: the delivery of an Preferred Area; then
3. third priority: an unidentified extension of an existing quarry located within an Area of Search; then
4. fourth priority: an extension to an existing quarry outside an Area of Search or a new quarry located within an Area of Search; then
5. fifth priority: a new quarry outside of an Area of Search.]

We suggest that, based on the revised policy wording above, the following sites are allocated to help meet the identified need.:

Specific Site

- Grandcourt Quarry Extension – Charity Fields

Preferred Area

- South of A47

Areas of Search

- Roydon
- Ashwicken
- Shouldham (Effectively AOS E with additional land immediately adjacent of the River Nar)
- Sandringham

Sibelco submit the separate document 'Proposed Silica Sand Allocations Norfolk County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication Document Consultation Supplementary Information Report' which provides an assessment of the above areas justifying their inclusion in the Plan.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Sibelco would like to be present at any Examination in Public.

Attachments: Proposed Silica Sand Allocations - Appendix B Charity Field supporting info.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzc>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Button Fen Heritage Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzd>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Marham Agricultural Land Classification and Soil survey.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzw>
 R001 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Preliminary Ecology Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzf>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_ document minus appendices - redacted personal data.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzg>
 Sibelco full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn7>

MPSS1. Silica Sand extraction sites, MPSS1.2

99533

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The added comments principally seek to correct unnecessary weaknesses in the rule making regarding silica sand extraction site selection for public rural recreation areas such as Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

17. Mineral Specific Policy MPSS1.2: on the 7th line, after "Open Access Land", add "and appropriate Forestry Commission Land," for clarity. The word "appropriate" is deliberate as it permits interpretation.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

Policy MPSS1: Silica sand extraction sites – STRATEGIC POLICY

99283

Object

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

The Local Plan is unsound because it is not justified given reasonable alternatives.

Whilst we welcome the introduction of the policy and its approach, we would welcome modifications to the policy and supporting text as follows":

We note that the Preferred Option M&WLP policy SIL 02 - land at Shouldham and Marham (silica sand) has been removed from the Publication M&WLP and replaced with new strategic policy MPSS1. We support the inclusion of criterion (f) to require an acceptable Hydrological Impact Assessment to identify any potential impacts to groundwater and appropriate mitigation measures.

Furthermore, we welcome inclusion of criterion (i) in the policy regarding sufficient stand-off distances around any water main that crosses the site or diversion of the water main at the developers' cost and to the satisfaction of Anglian Water. We recommend that the supporting text explains that the developer will need to confirm the stand-off distances with Anglian Water in advance of submitting their application.

Change suggested by respondent:

We recommend that the supporting text explains that the developer will need to confirm the stand-off distances with Anglian Water in advance of submitting their application.

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: Anglian Water would also require the standard protected easement widths for the sewers and for any requests for alteration or removal to be conducted in accordance with the Water Industry Act 1991. We therefore recommend that criterion (i) reads as follows:

(i) A sufficient stand-off distance around any water main [insert: 'or foul sewer'] that crosses the site or diversion of the water main/[insert: 'sewer'] at the developer's cost and to the satisfaction of Anglian Water;

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>

99162

Comment

Respondent: Dersingham parish council (Ms S Bristow, Parish Clerk) [1733]**Summary:**

From: Dersingham Parish Council - Norfolk County Council's Minerals and Waste Plan - Cllr Shepherd advised about a consultation by NCC on this long-term countywide plan. Concerns had previously been raised about the potential for silica sand extraction to the northwest of the village. The proposal to define areas of search had been dropped and a criteria-based policy was proposed. After discussion it was agreed to comment about policies MP2 and MPSS1 because of a conflict between the policies in respect of accessing the existing processing plant at Leziate.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99234

Support

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We welcome the criteria based policy approach for Sand and Silica given the many factors that have made it difficult to allocate Areas of Search.
We welcome criteria c, d, e and f.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99513

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

1st Complaint Lack of observance of obligated actions

There is a legal duty (Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Infrastructure and Development Select Committee, 28 May, 2022. pp165-212) under section 16 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004, to prepare and maintain a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme. The scheme must specify the development plan documents (DPDs) that the County Council will produce. their subject matter, geographical area and their timetable for the preparation and revision of the DPDs. The Council is required to periodically review these documents and keep them up to date.

There is also a legal duty under section 18 to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement which "sets out who, how, and when groups and individuals are engaged in this planning process." In addition. the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations, 2012 (as amended) also require a Statement of Community Involvement to be reviewed every 5 years.

The process of producing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan must be carried out in accordance with the above legislation, as well as with other relevant planning legislation. The Local Plan is considered a Major Planning Application under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedures) (England) Order, 2015.

The best reviews of this complicated process are perhaps to be found in the documents, (i) Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) - Single Issue Silica Sand Review: Sustainability Appraisal Report - Non-technical Summary, (ii) N.C.C. NMWLP Preferred Options, July 2019, and (iii) Minerals and Waste Local Plan, N.C.C. Infrastructure and Development Committee Agenda, pp.165-212, May 25, 2022.

The comments in these pre-submission consultation documents are principally concerned with the silica sand extraction site selection process.

The NMW Local Plan silica sand programme is a complex, multifaceted process that has been specifically designed to establish new sources of silica sand to supply a formal Norfolk obligation to supply approximately 800,000 tons of silica sand per annum for the period 2022-2038. The sand is to be transported to the Sibelco UK Ltd facility in Leziate for processing. This is the first time these specific procedures have been used and therefore the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication, May 2022, has to be assessed in its entirety - for "soundness" as well as for "legal compliance" regarding both the functionality and integrity of the entire package.

I suggest that the document fails to demonstrate "soundness" for the following reasons

1. The evidentiary foundations fall down at certain crucial points as to their robustness and the dubious credibility of evidence;
2. Problems are being introduced by not asking the appropriate questions that need to be considered, notably with regard to the disregard of certain public interests and the failure to properly account for cumulative mining blight in West Norfolk after several hundred years of sand mining.
3. A final proposal has been introduced at the end of this process, without adequate justification, that appears inconsistent with national policy.

There is questionable "legal compliancy" within crucial aspects of (a) the Statement of Community Involvement, (b) the Silica Sand Safeguarding Procedures, and in (c) the absence of a regional assessment of cumulative impacts. Basic tenets within the National Planning Policy Framework are being overlooked. These will be discussed separately in additional submissions

In effect, after a 13-year process, the Local Plan involves a manifest failure to identify sources to supply a shortfall of more than 10M tons of silica sand up to 2038. Instead, the Local Plan declares victory, fundamentally changes the rules, and gives responsibilities to Sibelco and landowners to create the necessary blizzard of documentation necessary to document a poorly explained and novel "criteria-based locational policy." with applications to be submitted by the proponents directly to the District Planning Processes, apparently without collaborative involvement. It must be noted that the public are permitted little role in the Planning procedures, and the absence of public consultation in this venue appears to seriously disregard principles of

process equity. The District Council Planning processes are being asked to deliberate exclusively on a slew of mineral licensing issues, while, at a minimum, the public interest matters have not been settled and have little standing in this venue.

What constitutionally is a collaborative process between the Mineral Planning Authority and the silica sand applicants, with the presumption of sustainable development, has been turned on its head, owing to the Plan (as conducted) not identifying appropriate sources of silica sand. There is clearly a need to undertake a root and branch analysis to investigate how this process can be adapted to provide equitable solutions and to identify potential silica sand sites within the current regulatory framework. It is a fairly logical assumption that N.C.C. Minerals and Waste may have proposed this solution as they perceive that the District Planning Procedures offer an environment in which they have more effective influence. If correct, this device would be a proposal to undermine democratic safeguards inherent in the regulatory processes. What is required is a far more rigorous application of the protocols, with sustainability and the presumption of sustainable development, economic, social, and environmental, as guiding lights.

Instead, the can is kicked on down the road straight into the Planning Process. Moreover, there appears to be no consideration given to the strong possibility that the Planning Procedures are ill-suited to deal with the complexity and volume of less-regulated assessments. Might Planning become overstretched and generate increased process appeals to the Minister of State? The Planning Procedures are ill-equipped to deal with issues that should have been identified and managed early in the Plan. Inflexibility and poor governance may result. For example, the Planning Process permits no possibility of public representation when, as currently, this has been severely curtailed over the last five years by the manner in which the Norfolk Statement of Community Involvement has been interpreted - undermining the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 16(c) in which "early, proportionate and effective engagement between planmakers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees" is urged. Note that communities head the list.

I suggest that such a fundamental change to the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme requires additional representational and public consultation on this consequential procedural change. There would not normally be such an opportunity had the process proceeded along the original direction of the Plan (paragraph 3.1.1.2 of the N.C.C. Statement of Community Involvement, 2022).

Examples of the subject areas that have been poorly considered in the Local Plan to date, and which may therefore become even more problematic in the Planning Procedure venue, include major deficiencies in considering the legitimate, site-specific public land usage interests. The Norfolk Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Policies DPD, 2011, for example, fails to consider that the public could ever be a legitimate land-usage stakeholder. In fact, this public interest issue is not mentioned in any silica sand document from the inception of this process in 2010 until the 2022 final NMWLP document. Other potentially troublesome issues include: inequities in the silica sand safeguarding procedures; the failure to update and assess historical public rights of way in contravention of responsibilities under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981; the failure to consider climate change regulations and procedures in proposals that involve the destruction of woodland; and with regard to the urgent national and county requirements for reforestation. On a process matter, it has become clear that uncomfortable truths are being suppressed in the N.C.C. process and that there is a systematic problem in a frequent failure to answer the submitted representations, even to the abbreviated selected comments. These issues, as they affect the silica sand site selection process, will be described in separate submissions.

How this undertaking required of Sibelco or by individual land owners to replace the coordinating role of the surveying authority and assemble the considerable cases required to make a planning application on their own - for each candidate site - is not explained. The additional cost implications are unassessed. The process deficits are unexamined, and the process integrity is untested. Furthermore, how this approach is to be integrated into the Minerals and Waste silica sand Local Plans going forward is not developed. The process failure in avoiding the collaborative role to fully investigate and promote silica sand sites, placing the sole responsibility on the proponent corporations or individuals is contrary to the duty to cooperate.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Plan planning process should be "collaborative" and "positively prepared with the lead from planning authorities, "including working proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social, and environmental conditions." I submit that this new structure of so called, "criteria-based policy (as if the NPPF-based policy constructed between 2010 and 2022 was not!) is contrary to provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. The National Planning Practice Guidance/ Minerals Specific Policy MP2.10 states that mineral planning authorities should plan for the steady and adequate supply of minerals in one or more of the following ways, in order of priority: designating specific sites liable to be acceptable in planning terms; designating preferred areas in areas with known mineral resources within which planning permission might be reasonably anticipated; and designating areas of search where details are less certain. N.C.C. has fallen back on an unnecessary device to help solve a problem, which to some extent is of their own making, and which is less likely to provide sound decisions as the statutory-based Plan. The Minerals Planning Guidance document, 2014 (page 7) states, "Designating Specific Sites in minerals plans provides the necessary certainty on when and where development may take place. The better the quality of data available to mineral planning authorities, the better the prospect of a site being designated as a Specific Site." Perhaps the implications behind this statement have been overlooked.

Silica Sand is a mineral of national importance. The Norfolk distribution of silica sand is located in an approximately linear north-to-south band between Heacham and Methwold and extending to within 1-2 miles of Kings Lynn. It is no more than a few miles wide at its greatest width. After a 12-year Planned process starting in 2010, only 4 million tons of silica sand of permitted reserves have been identified from an Initial Options sequence between 2015 and 2019, and a Preferred Options sequence from 2019-2022. There remains a deficit of approximately 10 million tons for the period to 2038. The Norfolk Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD was found to be legally compliant in 2017, yet only one new silica sand site has been identified in the interim. This is a complex process and reviews of specific factors must be the foundation of any valid proposals to revise NMWLP (2022) protocols.

It is a matter of concern that Minerals and Waste have included in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (NMWLP) that "there are no (available) specific sites or preferred areas suitable to allocate for silica sand extraction." primarily due to the 13 km-radius bird strike safety zone around RAF Marham; RAF Lakenheath; and RAF Mildenhall; the North Coast AONB; the impact risk zone for the Wash SSSI; the hydrogeological catchment around Roydon Common SSSI and Dersingham Bog SSSI (recently supported by 1.5 km buffer zone); and designated open access areas at Shouldham Warren and East Bilney Wood. It is relevant to note that the selection criteria adopted (NMWLP Single-issue Sand Review, 2017, p. 3-4) abandoned sites that

involved almost any of the major statutory constraints. This is possibly a logical conclusion given the processes stipulated in the NMWLP, 2022, notably the fact that almost all the proposed AOS were within the RAF Marham bird-strike safeguarding radius.

The NMWLP 2022 asserts that virtually the entire cohort of sites allocated in the Preferred Options silica sand site selection process are thereby cancelled. They allege, without specific evidence, that this failure was because of because of alleged inherent defects in the area of search methodology (NMWLP 2022, policy MP 2.10) recommended by the National Planning Policy Framework. This decision is just stated, and there is no attempt made by N.C.C. to explain their judgement, other than acknowledging that their process has failed! The NMWLP 2022 implies that it is impossible to identify silica sand AOS under the RAF Marham bird-strike safeguarded area or within the North Norfolk Coast AONB. The failure may be in not collaboratively selecting potential mining sites, as recommended by the NPPF, 2012. It should be recognized that a significant part of the North Park Quarry and the Preferred Area allocated as an extension to the existing quarry, all lie within the Surrey Hills AONB.

There is a remarkable absence of clarity and accountability in this decision, and which is eminently inappropriate. The MHA selected the sites, their size and boundaries, often mistakenly selected very large AOS (up to 1,014 hectares in size) which are then compounded by a number of cautionary factors. N.C.C. also have a contradictory policy (MPSS1.m, page 77, NMWLP, 2022) of requesting sites within easy reach of the Leziate processing factory, by pipeline, conveyer, or internal haul route, and avoiding the public road system where possible. This naturally has the consequence of concentrating proposals in areas already badly scarred from ancient and active mining sites in areas close to the River Nar medieval monastic landscape, to the River Nar core valley and SSSI, and within the RAF Marham bird-strike restriction zone. Much of the silica sand safeguarded area therefore 'appears' underinvestigated.

A special exemption can be applied for in confounded areas under exceptional circumstances, involving careful site selection among other factors. Under these specific circumstances, the normal expectation would be that various safeguarding assessments and the mitigation of impacts would be obligated, and which can sometimes provide sufficient mitigation support for a successful application. The unknown variables here are in identifying just what is "acceptable mitigation." as the NMWLP documentation leaves these details to the district planning procedures, with little quantitative guidance provided. More contentiously, N.C.C. also abandon three other AOS (AOS F. I. & J) comprising 61 hectares, 47 hectares, and 23 hectares, respectively. They were cancelled with the sole explanation that "they would be too fragmentary to form an appropriately sized area within which to find a potentially viable silica sand extraction site." It is not explained why this was not foreseen. No assessments of potential yield have been forthcoming, so that the factors in these decisions are difficult to judge.

It is not clear whether it is being claimed that all sites within the entire silica sand safeguarded area present too great a difficulty to support Areas of Search as a feasible method of delivering silica sand sites, or whether this statement should be limited to the Leziate Beds, the historical preferred site of Sibelco UK, the owner of the Leziate processing factory. The Plan does little to amplify the implications of these statements, other than that to propose an unproven ploy (in this context). replacing the NPPF-guided process with direct applications through the district planning process accompanied with at least 18 dedicated assessments, statements, or plans, as specified by statute (described above). There are no explanations and justification for this untested proposition other than the failure (with a single exception, MIN 40 at East Winch) of N.C.C. over at least 12 years to identify silica sand extraction sites away from Mintlyn.

Immediate problems include the absence of recognition of local public concerns and the failure to recognize recreational public land-use issues. As we shall see later, the NMWLP planning has almost completely ignored the interests of local and regional communities throughout the 13-year history of this Plan. The NMWLP document, 2022, under review, furthermore, has failed to give due recognition and has essentially suppressed the submitted views of 4.500 local citizens who submitted statements that they systematically used the Shouldham Warren area (AOS E and SIL 02) for recreation as an open access site. It will also be shown that worrisome facts that are inconvenient to the MH/\ have been deliberately suppressed.

(1). A root and branch analysis might start here, as all these confounders were established well before 2013 and should by rights have been largely predictable, if this is a full statement of the facts. Instead. a "criteria-based policy" is introduced, avoiding further rounds of "consultations": and in conflict with the guidances of the National Planning Policy Framework - by replacing the collaborative Plan-led process, so laboriously assembled, with direct, unaided, specific applications to the district Planning Procedures by the silica sand mining companies and/or landowners - as described in the first segment. It is pertinent that there has been no discussion as to whether this novel approach offers any benefits with regard to the former collaborative structure and no trial event. Indeed, N.C.C. offered considerable expertise to the conventional Plan-led process that would now 'seem' to be less available to the crucial site selection process. N.C.C. Minerals and Waste apparently propose to step back somewhat from their application support responsibilities in the Norfolk silica sand Local Plan. How this proposal is supposed to work in future cycles is not codified.

The Local Plan spatial strategy documents emphasise the first statement contained in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 210(f), but entirely disregard its second undertaking. Paragraph 210(f) reads, "planning policies should set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality". This is given additional weight by NPPF paragraph 211(b) which states, "In consideration of proposals for mineral extraction, planning authorities should ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse effects on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality." In a condensed area that has been subject to sand and gravel mining for several hundred years, and to silica sand mining for 150 years, this is a cogent consideration for parts of West Norfolk. However, accumulated blight gains no mention in any of the cumulative silica sand documents, nor in the final Local Plan; these discuss solely the local simultaneous intrusion of active mining sites. It is also omitted from the Local Plan silica sand Minerals Specific Policies. Land use in West Norfolk over time has been subject to multiple other governmental intrusions. This is an unidentified regulatory issue and will be explored in a separate submission.

(2). Insights may be gained from the consideration of the allotted sites and from the proposed sites that failed examination, although it must be realized that many individual factors may be amenable to mitigation. The two allotted sites in the NMWLP are SIL 01 at Mintlyn South, Bawsey, with a reserve of

1.1 M tons, and MIN 40, Land East of Grandcourt Farm, East Winch, containing 3 M tons of silica sand. Both are extensions of existing Sibelco sites and are within the RAF Marham bird strike area. and mitigation measures will be required. SIL 01 is 700 metres from the Leziate processing plant and the mineral will be transferred by conveyor. MIN 40 is 1.8km from the Leziate plant and transportation will involve an established internal haul route.

The historic SIL 01 landscape character is of heritage mineral working. Other particular considerations for the SIL 01 were for adjacent listed buildings, scheduled monuments, two County wildlife sites, hydrogeological concerns, and restraints on dewatering owing to Gaywood River and Middleton Drain catchments. Restoration of SIL 01 was proposed primarily to a lake with wildlife habitat (acid grassland/heath/ inland dune) woodland, and scrub - with recreational opportunities.

MIN 40 is proposed on grade 4 farmland at the western boundary of East Winch village with numerous sensitive receptors within 250 metres. the closest at 84 m. and the nearest listed building only 50m away, across the A-47! Mitigation will be required with sightline bunding and screening. for potential impacts on the East Winch Common SSSI and two adjacent County wildlife site, restitution of a restricted byway, and protection for the Mintlyn Stream, a Water Framework Directive Body, which is crossed by the haul route. Restoration of MIN 40 is proposed primarily to a lake, with wildlife habitat (acid grassland/heath/inland dune).

AOS A covered 328 hectares located in a flat, agricultural drained coastal marsh in western Ingoldisthorpe. Snettisham. and Dersingham, located to the east of an area of previous mineral workings which is now part of a bird reserve, and south of Snettisham Common which contains a previous silica sand pit. The three villages were all 250 metres from the site, which was 20 km from the Leziate Plant by road. The most significant potential problems were with the Wash Ramsar and Wash SAC habitat regulations and with three adjacent county wildlife sites. Another significant concern was the River Ingol which, as a Water Framework Directive waterbody, crossed the site and would require assessments for potential impacts and appropriate mitigation. The area contained priority geomorphological features and potential impacts to geodiversity. Over half the site was within the Tidal hazard extent. The local Councils were concerned over difficulties of screening and the potential impacts on tourism. The AOS was withdrawn.

AOS D Land in the vicinity of West Bilney Wood, comprising 109 hectares. Roughly half is Forestry Commission woodland in West Bilney Woods which is open access land, a significant impediment. Much of the rest is grade 3 agricultural land. with fen and open inland marshes in the south. There are adjacent old and current silica sand workings and a sand and gravel allocation. The site is within East Winch and Pentney. and 9km from the Leziate processing plant by road. The site is within the River Nar valley concentration of medieval religious institutions and so there are important archaeological concerns. Pentney Abbey is 400 metres from its southern boundary. There is a County Wildlife site within the AOS, and two others close by. The River Nar SSSI and East Winch Common SSI would be vulnerable to water level changes, as would the County Drain, a Water Framework Directive waterbody, running through the site. It is also within the bird-strike radius of RAF Marham. The previously unrecognised open access land in West Bilney wood and its recreational importance appears to have played an important role in the abandonment of AOS D in the initial consultation.

SIL 02 Land in Shouldham and Marham was established as a Preferred Area with an estimated resource of 16M tons. The site lay just off the NW corner of RAF Marham. As a lake was to be the resultant landform, there was anxiety from the Defence Infrastructure Organisation over a potentially enhanced birdstrike risk. This was the primary cause of its 2016 withdrawal. If a full SIL 02 analysis exists in the cumulative documents, I am unable to find it. Other significant issues were the potential hydrogeological risks to the River Nar, the River Nar SSSI, a water Framework Directive watercourse, and the high exposures of the Pentney Priory Gatehouse and associated protected buildings and also the motte and bailey Wormegay Castle and several Wormegay conservation area buildings. An Historical Environment Impact Assessment report for designated heritage assets for both SIL 02 and AOS E was published in April 2019.

AOS E, Land to the north of Shouldham, was an allotted site in the initial consultation phase. With the demise of SIL 02, a large section of SIL 02 was added onto AOS E to form a revised AOS E. The total area of AOS E was increased from 815 hectares to 1,014 hectares in size! AOS of colossal size are very troublesome and should be specifically proscribed as one consent can more easily lead to several. and the larger the AOS, the more contentious the regulatory issues may become In the NMWLP document, Main Modifications and Additional Modifications, July 2017, p.16. it states, "AOS E is significantly larger than the area of extraction to meet the silica sand shortfall to the end of the Plan period." i.e. x 25! It continues, "therefore, a number of alternative extraction locations are likely within the area of search..." This is not "taking each application on its merit," but would almost certainly have guaranteed a continuing and repetitive destructive cycle over this unique and sensitive site, an artifice to create a long-term hegemony. There is no reason why large AOS cannot be reduced to a number of component parts. AOS E did not survive the rather secretive post-Preferred Options Consultation (Autumn 2019) sequence, apparently quoting the adjacency of RAF Marham, the then new N.C.C. policy on the climatic importance of woodland, and its open access status.

AOS E therefore shared many of the features of SIL 02. Moving the site one mile further to the west did not significantly alter the risks of bird strike at RAF Marham. Indeed. The final AOS E was 2.6 times larger in size than the SIL 02 site had been. It lies adjacent to areas of previous and current mineral workings and close to a sand and gravel allocation between the villages of Marham. Shouldham. Wormegay and Shouldham Thorpe. It contains almost the entire 372-hectare-site of Shouldham Warren, a Forestry Commission mixed forest that is managed together with the adjacent West Bilney Woods plantation, and which provides a unique, combined wildlife habitat for the region. The remainder of AOS E is mainly grade 3 and 4 agricultural land with an inland fen County Wildlife site and adjacent to two other County sites. There are numerous protected, rare, or declining species on AOS E, including Nightjar Woodlark, and Stone Curlew.

The Warren is a transitional landscape at the fen edge and provides variable terrain and landscape and has been used recreationally as an open access site for two to three generations by tens of thousands of people per annum, both local and regional, with a large variety of pursuits. It is the gem of rural West Norfolk recreation. These facts are well known to N.C.C.

yet throughout the 13-year process of preparing the NMWLP, 2022. N.C.C failed to mention this public land-use issues in any of its cumulative documents and was only mentioned, in passing as an open access area, for the first time in the final Local Plan document. Additional evidence shows this to be a deliberate avoidance of the public interests and not an oversight (see below)

AOS E lies within the medieval monastic landscape close to Pentney Priory, Shouldham Priory, Marham Abbey, five listed buildings. several monuments within 300m, and Wormegay motte and bailey castle is in clear view. AOS E lies within the Core River Valley of the River Nar and is close to the River Nar SSSI (N.C.C claim in the Statement of Consultation, May 2022, page 211 that AOS E is not in the Core River Valley, but the map on p.99 of the NMWLP Local Maps document, December 2017 appears to show that the entire area is part of the River Nar core valley. The River Nar hydrogeology and multiple Water Framework Directive water courses would require careful management. The primary reasons for the withdrawal of EOS E are believed to be a combination of its closeness to RAF Marham and the forested nature of much of the site. The systematic public land usage preceded the 2006 formulation of mineral safeguarding - by two or three generations. The purpose of mineral safeguarding is to protect mineral sites from other planning consents. but Shouldham Warren had had extensive public open access land use for very many years already, and was already prioritised. This had been recognized by not being included in the safeguarding map, although this fact never appeared in the Plan cumulative documents. The current N.C.C. proposal for direct applications to the Planning Process could presumably permit reapplications or modified applications to involve Shouldham Warren without the ability to provide a systematic public response. One fact that is yet to be properly considered was the proposal to pipe 800,000 to 900,000 tons of silica sand per annum from SIL 02 the 15 km to Leziate; this would presumably have involved huge volumes of water, but where would this water have come from?

AOS F, Land to the North of Stow Bardolph. The allocation consists of two parcels of land of approximately 31 and 30 hectares, respectively within the parishes of Runcton Holme and Stow Bardolph on either side of the A-10. The individual sites are 400m south of South Runcton and 250m north of Stow Bardolph, in the wider setting of parkland and estates related to Stow Hall (now demolished) and Wallingford Hall. Transportation to the Leziate Plant, 17 km away, would be by road. The main conflicting factors appeared manageable. There were two County wildlife sites close by, including a series of mesotropical lakes, as well as three hydrological catchments within 500-1,000 m that could be vulnerable to changes in the watertable from extraction below this level and/or dewatering: this would necessitate a hydrogeological assessment and potential mitigation. The AOS was cancelled, with an explanation given that the sites were not of sufficient size. but this may possibly be referent to the resource size. It is not clear.

AOS I, Land to the East of South Runcton. The AOS covers 47 hectares of settled grade 3 farmland and plantations just to the north of AOS F, lying between the A10 and A134. It is 16 km from the Leziate plant and mineral transfer would likely be by road. Heritage buildings would require a Heritage Statement and a mitigation plan. Screening of open views of the site would also be necessary. A hydrogeological risk assessment and mitigation would be required for extraction below the water table and/or dewatering. A single County Wildlife Site is over 600 m distant. Again, the technical reasons behind the deselection of AOS I appear not to have been revealed in the Plan documents. No size of the resource has been published.

AOS.J, Land to the east of Tottenhill, covers 23 acres of grade 4 agricultural land between the A10 and A134, close to the western boundary of AOS E. Tottenhill village lies 300m to the west. The site lies 15 km by road from the Leziate factory. There is a grade 1-listed church within 325m, and the site is 1.2km from Wormegay motte and bailey castle and 1.6m from Wormegay Priory Scheduled Monument. An archaeological plan would be required. Two County wildlife sites are within 300m of the site. No clear potentially unmitigatable factors are reported, and the deselection of AOS J is essentially unexplained. No size of the resource has been published

It is important to assess the background of this Single-issue Silica Sand Site-specific Allocations Process. N.C.C published cabinet reports reveal that the sole confirmed silica sand sites in the period 2010 and 2022 were SIL 01 and MIN 40, that were first allocated around 20015/16. MIN 39 in Ashwicken was also selected only for landowner consent to be withdrawn. It is difficult to view the process as 'sound' or "effective" None of the seven sites proposed during the present Site-specific Allocations programme have made it through the Plan-led selection.

An explanatory statement is made in the NMWLP Publication, May 2022, p.76. "Whilst site specific allocations have been made for 4.1 million tonnes of silica sand resource, they are not sufficient on their own to meet the forecast need. There are no other specific sites or preferred areas suitable to allocate for silica sand extraction primarily due to the proximity of RAE Marham to large parts of the silica sand resource and the concerns raised by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation about the bird-strike risks to aircraft from the creation of large areas of open water following mineral extraction..... In addition, large parts of the silica sand resource are within the setting of the Norfolk Coast AONB, the impact risk zone for The Wash SSSI or other SSSIs, the hydrogeological catchment around Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SSSI, the setting of designated heritage assets, on designated Open Access Land, on grade 1 and 2 Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and in proximity to sensitive receptors such as residential dwellings. The remaining areas of the silica sand resource would be too fragmentary to form an appropriately sized area within which to find a potentially viable silica sand extraction site"

In a June 14, 2013 Report to Cabinet Member For Decision, we read, "No replacement sites for silica sand extraction are proposed to be allocated because none of the alternative sites or areas of research proposed are considered to be appropriate to allocate due to their proximity to Roydon Common SSSI and, in line with the precautionary principle, they cannot be allocated." At this time, sites in East Winch. Ashwicken. and Roydon were being evaluated. Bird strike risks. particularly at RAF Marham. the environmental impact, and major amenity concerns also may be difficult to ameliorate. However, there is a hierarchy of statutorily-defined factors involved in the decision-making over silica sand site selection, and many are capable of being satisfactorily mitigated on a case-by-case basis. Ultimately, Sibelco UK or other mineral operatives must be convinced that they have an economic case to proceed, given the (alleged) national statutory undertaking to provide the bulk of their local needs.

It is clear from data in released cabinet papers, that Sibelco UK are largely concerned with production as there are no AOS that they do not support. The preoccupation in the single-issue search from 2016 on SIL 02 and AOS-E close to RAF Marham (NMWLP Development Management Policy 7) was always likely to be problematic as most of the fully refined options were from the same basket. There has been concern at cabinet level (June 14, 2013) that the long-term extraction site shortfall should not lead to the presumption in favour of sustainable development taking precedence over the Local Plan assessment. There is now concern that the proposed bypassing of the established procedures by directly referring these judgements to the District Planning Processes, where the opportunity for public contribution is curtailed, and where perhaps the County authorities hold more sway, is clearly poor policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

(3). I can only look at the silica sand procedures for the selection of extraction sites from an external perspective. The sight of a process that for at least a decade has continued to adopt an unsuccessful procedure while expecting different results is discouraging. Given the 'fixed' mineral requirement from an area already ravaged by governmental obligations, the possibility of expedient governance becomes more problematic. I propose the need for an independent consultation to devise a more coherent procedural structure. consonant with NPPF paragraph 121, which adjures local planning authorities to bring forward land suitable for development. The more issues that can be resolved at the pre-application stage (NPPF, paragraph 41) the better, and perhaps this can more closely engage Sibelco UK. The public interests need to be involved at an early stage. probably by local public meetings (including NIMBYs); the public are not statutory consultees in the Local Plan Review and are inadequately represented in this Local Plan process. Early proactive landowner discussions and the early estimation of the proposed silica sand resource should be enabled as they are also basic factors in the decision-making. The larger the individual areas of search, the more likely that impediments will be found. The recent historical evidence suggests that the silica sand site selection process is not currently fit for purpose. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible (NPPF, paragraph 47).

(4). A crucial factor in the West Norfolk and northern Brecks landscape that is being largely ignored is the very high level of landscape scarring associated with old sand mining, and by current inactive sites and active extraction sites. The Local Plan only considers the latter. It is 'unsound' to disregard facts of local topography. I am not aware that this feature has yet been mapped. I suggest that a custom map of the extent of all current, recent and historical mining sites in the silica sand extraction region is needed, with some urgency, to allow informed judgements of site suitability. As an example, a resident of East Winch recently told me that her community felt that it was almost surrounded by old or current mining sites - MIN 40 is proposed right up to the village boundary, and one local post-mining lake had recently been proposed as a private holiday homes development. In Beetley, a sand and gravel site, in contiguity with prior mining sites, is being proposed on a site that is also at the village boundary and interposes somewhat between the two component residential areas of Old Beetley and Beetley village. The Local Plan encourages the use of the site which is adjacent to an active quarry site. The contiguity is undoubtedly an attractive economic and mineral quality option. but the effect of several hundred years of old mining sites also requires consideration on a local and regional level. As the Minerals Planning Guidance, 2014, states, "the suitability of each proposed site, whether an extension to an existing site, must be considered on its individual merits, taking into account issues such as: need for the specific material, economic considerations...; positive and negative environmental impacts... and the cumulative impacts of proposals in the area." Almost all the recent crop of candidate sites were closely related to old or current mining sites.

(6). The recent history of silica sand extraction applications shows a marked tendency for sites as close as possible to the Sibelco UK Leziate processing plant, inadvertently selecting for local blight. It appears that Sibelco is driving this process without a great deal of advice from the County Minerals authority. It is apparent that some sites, such as AOS A, SIL02. and AOS E always had considerable headwinds, yet they were the main sites proposed by the MPA in the last few years. Appreciable efforts had to be made by the public and by several of the nominated consultees to address the SSSI, AONB, environmental and hydrogeological risks, the bird-strike risk close to RAF Marham, and of Shouldham Warren being the rural recreational jewel of West Norfolk. This considerable cumulative effort was in effect only necessary because of programmatic shortfalls. If the statement is true that "areas of search are no longer considered to be a deliverable method to use to plan for future provision in Norfolk" as stated in the May 25, 2022 presentation to the N.C.C. Infrastructure and Development Select Committee, then I respectfully suggest that Minerals and Waste at least owe the process a comprehensive explanation of their thinking and its implications. The NMW Local Plan, 2022, document does not amplify this statement. Is it that proposed AOS are too large to work in this locality, and that the emphasis should be readdressed to identifying Specific Sites, as defined by National Planning Guidance MP 2.10 – which will require much more investigative preparation and delayed applications by Sibelco UK? This does not justify the ill-judged bypassing of the public accountability processes in the National Plan. If site selection is as difficult as claimed, is the current Norfolk silica sand excavation requirement still logical, or should it be reduced, and by how much? Has the full extent of the available silica sand reserve actually been comprehensively evaluated? Indeed, might the present putative impasse be the result of planning to keep sites close to the Leziate processing plant? There does need to be discussion as to whether exceptional circumstances can overcome the major restrictive parameters. and under what local circumstances, if any? The national mineral guidelines (NPPF paragraphs 199 to 208 may be difficult to apply. However, paragraph 207 does state, "not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance...(the site) should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 201 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 202, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage site as a whole."

(7). And finally, what are the reasons, compromises, and the disadvantages of invoking the bypassing of a significant part of the Local Plan, by short-cutting the process, leaving all deliberations with the Planning Process when constitutional problems may still remain, including deficits in public accountability? I suggest that this very late procedural change undermines the democratic process. I maintain this is an "unsound" development and is not "legally compliant."

(8). The archaeological and hydrogeological assessments are perhaps ripe for more definitive scientific application.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission A. process soundness - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn4>

Summary:**6A. Letter to the N.C.C. Chief Executive concerning Silica Sand Site-selection Issues over Shouldham Warren (AOS E) and the Improper Data Suppression**

The August 13, 2020 letter brought a number of issues related to maladministration within the NMWLP processes to the attention of the Chief Executive. The data has proven unacceptable to the MPA and they have not found the light of day within the Plan process, as statutorily required. There is no reference to these issues within the NMWLP, 2022. Document, or elsewhere in the record. I will present it without comment as I believe it is self-explanatory, and the issues have been covered in passing elsewhere in this submission. The implications regarding the integrity of the silica sand site-selection processes in the Local Plan are not attractive. The information is illustrative of how the public common has been at serious disadvantage in this Norfolk Statement of Community Involvement-driven process. [letter text attached]

6B. Public Accountability

1. These observations have been mainly relevant to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection Process, but there is also evidence of both inattention and of group think in the MPA responses to both consultations and commentaries.

2. It is extraordinary to observe a 12-year, major Local Plan, and in its silica sand mining programme in particular, where an established regional pattern of public recreational land use - in Shouldham Warren - is intentionally disregarded, for (presumably) internal departmental reasons.

3. A few words on public rights of way. The MPA has not understood that it is the revealed historical nature of the way that determines its status under law. Once a public way has been acknowledged, the public rights of way persist in the absence of a legal modification, and even when privatised and no longer in use. It is the County responsibility to keep the Definitive Map continuously updated, The refusal of the MPA to accept this data and acknowledge its existence on the programme website was improper. To attempt to game the system and assure that they would not consider the issues before the mine might have been in operation for many years was irresponsible and unacceptable. The facts were reported to the Chief Executive. but there was no acknowledgement of the implications for Shouldham Warren planning in the Plan documents: the issue was suppressed.

4. The extensive public recreational land-use preceded the silica sand safeguarding map by 2-3 generations, and indeed Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Woods were not included on the map. Yet, the MPA continued to support the introduction of sand mining at Shouldham Warren, presumably as it could potentially be compatible with the RAF Marham bird-strike risk aversion. When provided with an opportunity to re-establish public accountability. the Chief Executive failed in his duty. The NMWLP 2022 still prefers to characterise the Shouldham Warren issue as one of open access (and one only recently acknowledged) and not primarily one of a public right to recreation and a historical public utility. The massive public reaction appeared to be a complete surprise to N.C.C. Far too many MPA officer responses to the consultations and commentaries have been inaccurate, opaque, casual, just plain wrong, or have avoided an answer. It is not difficult to answer fully and appropriately, but internal considerations appear to have got in the way.

5. It does not appear that there is an established rule-based environment at the MPA when we see some of the actions reviewed in this section. Are there effective SOPs in place to govern decision-making? In such a complex regulatory environment, there probably should be in place so that consistent, lawful decisions continue to be made.

6. To undo the unnecessary assault on regional recreational interests in the attempts by Norfolk MPA to incorporate Shouldham Warren (and West Bilney Wood) into AOS when neither was on the safeguarding map. and then to attempt to game public "commentaries" that mentioned the extent and variety of public recreational use requires N.C.C to recognise that major public recreational centres are protected from minerals development by law. The huge number of "commentaries" received by the MPA reflected also the totally inadequate public discourse that had been undertaken. These activities had been sanctioned in a poorly conceived section of the Norfolk Statement of Community Involvement, of which this Local Plan process was its first time in the sun. If the SCI is not improved, these events or something like them will be feted to return in the future. The SCI is currently under review and needs to integrate appropriate changes. Another contentious issue was the diffident consultation offered the general public, and with "commentaries" rather than a true "consultation" as offered to all other stakeholders. Village/town meetings are needed. Other instances have been mentioned in these documents. The discounted treatment of the public's views continued throughout the long process.

7. These data support the notion that, for a variety of reasons, the MPA silica sand extractive site-selection process has been unsuccessful at maintaining sufficient reserves. NPPF explains the task of identifying accessible sites as a cooperative process with minerals firms, but for Norfolk silica sand developments, there is little evidence of this publicly. Perhaps the Rt. Hon. Elizabeth Truss MP has a correct analysis and Sibelko UK have not been pulling their weight. The company, however, has certainly been investigating widely over the last 18 months. Perhaps there have been strategic mistakes. Dependency on AOS as large as 1,014 hectares in size do appear, while having the attraction of scale, to founder on unmitigatable issues when promulgated in the centre of a river valley characterised by numerous medieval monasteries, and close to a major military airbase.

8. The water-body bird-strike issue is presented as an immovable object, tin spite of the fact that both of the recently successful sites. SIL 01 and MIN 40, lie within this umbrella. Instead of looking for improvements and a change of tack. the MPA has decided to simplify its task and to refer all applications directly into the district planning procedures. A more focused policy, based upon going the extra distance and identifying potential mineral sites, is recommended by the NPPF. There may indeed be other reasons why the proposed AOS sites have not been adopted, although there is no such explanation given. Instead, the MPA relies on an obscure rule intended for mineral areas inside extensive AONB, as decision-making is usually secondary to the landscape designation, that, only then, is the MPA permitted to allow mineral applications directly into planning inspection. I doubt most sincerely that the large safeguarded area for silica sand mining falls into this criterion, partly because it is a widely spread area. The public representation over the 12-year advent of this Local Plan has demonstrably been poor and sub-standard. What is your public supposed to do when they would likely have no standing in the planning application process, and anyway there would be no statutory obligation to even inform the public that the planning application meeting was to take place?

9.I cannot support the proposed shredding of the NPPF criteria-led process and see too many demerits of the voidance of foundational Local Plan principles and the referral directly to the district planning procedures, with untested overall consequences, and lessening yet further the opportunities for representation of the public interests.

10. In Consultation no. 99001, The Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council said the following (as quoted in its abstracted form), "it would be unrealistic to seek to have no areas of search at all, and the Plan could be found unsound" The answer ignores the cadence of this statement. It is suggested. as your district council is too polite to lay out fully, that the current County proposals for the selection of silica sand sites are contrary to basic tenets of the NPPF and I suggest are, in fact, unsound. The silica sand extraction site development programme needs to be redrawn in accordance with the regulations.

Soundness test: not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

The silica sand extraction site development programme needs to be redrawn in accordance with the regulations.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed evidence to support these views. It is probably important to personally bolster those contested by the MPA.

Attachments: August 2020 letter from Mr Ormerod to Tom McCabe NCC - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzm>

Dr D Ormerod full text submission F. MPA response to public consultations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn6>

99532

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

The new "Criteria-based Policy

One concern over from the newly-proposed "criteria-based policy" shortcircuiting the NMWLP site assessments directly into the Planning Process is that a new, refashioned minerals application might be afforded lesser oversight than the Local Plan provided. The evidence shows unequivocally that no part of Shouldham Warren should ever be proposed for silica sand extraction. The Warren had been used for 40 years before mineral safeguarding was developed. The site had been exempted from silica sand and carstone safeguarding, and the Warren is a uniquely valuable public resource in a regional landscape already badly scarred by several hundred years of sand mining. It is the hope that Shouldham Warren can be preserved ad infinitum and that Norfolk County Council will formally support this characterisation.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Policy MPSS1 - Strategic Policy: Add the statement, "The possibility of unrecorded or under-recorded public rights of way on the site must be investigated." Before the statement beginning, "Submission of a suitable scheme for the temporary diversion and re-instatement of any Public Rights of Way located within the site."

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.those

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>

99472

Object

Respondent: Sibelco UK Limited (Mr Lewis Williams, Planning Manager) [18360]**Summary:**

The supporting text to MPSS1 makes a number of assumptions without evidence and quite fatally disregards the fact that minerals can only be worked where they are found. In particular, the policy is dismissive in relation to silica sand being a mineral of national importance. It follows that there will be a number of potential sites either within or in close proximity to designated areas that may be acceptable for mineral extraction upon balance. However, the Council's approach is to blanket dismiss areas and hide behind designations is a flawed understanding of what they are intended for.

We suggest that a hierarchy of delivery to properly set out a spatial strategy for silica sand development is included to properly plan for the forecasted need for silica sand. This will help to ensure development of mineral resources to directed to more acceptable locations. It is considered that the criteria-based approach could in fact have the opposite approach given the incoherence of the silica sand policies both in approach and wording.

Change suggested by respondent:

We suggest Policy MPSS1 should be reworded as follows:

Proposed Changes

"Planning applications for silica sand extraction located outside of allocated sites [insert: 'will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that greater priority schemes, as outlined in Policy MS2, are either unavailable or not viable to meet future silica sand needs. Otherwise planning applications which would'] address the shortfall in permitted reserves, will be subject to compliance with the Minerals and Waste Local Plan policies and all the following requirements:

a. To address the shortfall in silica sand supply to meet the requirements of the existing [delete: 'processing plant'] [insert: 'site'] (as set out in the NPPF);

(no changes are proposed to policy requirements b. to q. of MPSS1)

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** Sibelco would like to be present at any Examination in Public.

Attachments: Proposed Silica Sand Allocations - Appendix B Charity Field supporting info.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzc>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Button Fen Heritage Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzd>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Marham Agricultural Land Classification and Soil survey.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzw>
 R001 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Preliminary Ecology Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzf>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_ document minus appendices - redacted personal data.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzg>
 Sibelco full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn7>

Policy MP3: Borrow pits

99163

Comment

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Philip Dash, Principal Planner) [16208]**Summary:**

The requirement for a borrow pit to be capable of being accessed from the construction project site either directly or via a short length of suitable highway is considered to be unduly restrictive and may unduly fetter the development management process. Further, rather than stipulating that the borrow pit must be worked and restored by the completion of the related construction project, it may be more appropriate to request that the site is restored by completion of the related construction project or as soon as practicable after, in order to potentially increase the scope for beneficial after-uses to be delivered as part of the restoration of the borrow pit. The remaining provisions are supported.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Essex County Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmx>

99446

Comment

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (Mr Ross Walker, Sr Planning officer) [21966]**Summary:**

Would suggest that policy includes requirement that Borrow Pits will be restored with a measurable increase in biodiversity net gain after use if possible.

Change suggested by respondent:

Would suggest that policy includes requirement that Borrow Pits will be restored with a measurable increase in biodiversity net gain after use if possible.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Suffolk County Council response Norfolk MWLP 16.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmt>**Policy MP4: Agricultural or potable water reservoirs**

99284

Comment

Respondent: Anglian Water (Tessa Saunders, Spatial Planning Advisor) [21901]**Summary:**

We welcome reference to Anglian Water's Water Resource Management Plan in the supporting text to provide context to Policy MP4.

Water Resource Management Plans play a crucial role in securing the public water supply for the region. The plan identifies the investment required to secure public water supply for the region whilst protecting and enhancing the environment. This is then projected into water company business plans. Every five years we develop our Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) which sets out how we will manage the water supplies in our region to meet current and future needs over a minimum of 25 years. Our current Plan, published in 2019, covers the period from 2020-2045. We are now developing our next Plan (WRMP24) for the period 2025 - 2050.

The proposed strategic reservoir options in South Lincolnshire and The Fens are nationally strategic infrastructure and have been identified as strategic supply side options for addressing future water demand in the Anglian Water region due to population growth, climate change impacts and protecting the environment.

As nationally strategic infrastructure projects (NSIPs), these will be submitted as Development Consent Order applications to the Planning Inspectorate. An Examining Authority appointed by the Secretary of State and supported by the Planning Inspectorate examines the application and will make a recommendation to the relevant Secretary of State, who will make the decision on whether to grant or to refuse development consent. In such cases the Local Authority will not be the decision-maker but will provide a statutory local perspective throughout the process and be responsible for discharging the requirements associated with an NSIP in their area if development consent is granted.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anglian Water submission full text 13.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm4>**Policy MP5: Core River Valleys**

99458

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Suggest that it should add that it does not impede on the natural water quality infrastructure e.g. natural riparian strips- reed beds or water woodlands etc

Change suggested by respondent:

Suggest that it should add that it does not impede on the natural water quality infrastructure e.g. natural riparian strips- reed beds or water woodlands etc

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99136

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

This policy does not mention impact on the Broads or its setting and does not cross refer to MW1 like other policies do.
 For consistency, this policy needs to refer to the Broads and/or cross refer to MW1. You could add the following to the end of the policy:
 All schemes must also comply with the development management criteria set out in Policy MW1.
 Soundness: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99235

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We welcome the reference to the historic environment.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
 Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99212

Object

Respondent: Middleton Aggregates Ltd [1861]**Agent:** Stephen M Daw Limited (Mr Stephen Daw) [143]**Summary:**

The policy as worded sets an unreasonably high requirement for mineral developments in a Core River Valley.

Change suggested by respondent:

The policy wording should firstly, be amended so that not all proposals need to result in an enhancement of the landscape, historic environment and biodiversity, to be acceptable. Instead proposals should be expected to result in one or at most two forms of enhancement. Secondly, it is unreasonable to require a mineral development to result in enhancement(s) during working and so this requirement should be dropped.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** In order to be able to fully explain the rationale of the representation**Attachments:** None

99447

Comment

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (Mr Ross Walker, Sr Planning officer) [21966]**Summary:**

- "enhance the biodiversity of the river valley" could replace with... "provide a measurable increase the Biodiversity of the river valley"
- This brings the wording more in line with the Environment act and BNG requirements.

Change suggested by respondent:

- "enhance the biodiversity of the river valley" could replace with... "provide a measurable increase the Biodiversity of the river valley"
- This brings the wording more in line with the Environment act and BNG requirements.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Suffolk County Council response Norfolk MWLP 16.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmt>**Policy MP6: Cumulative impacts and phasing of workings**

99141

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

MP6, as worded, is quite complicated... in the same sentence, the policy talks about making something unacceptable, acceptable... I understand what is trying to be said here, but I wonder if the wording is clear.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99139 to 99142 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmm>

99236

Support

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

The cumulative impact of mineral workings on the historic environment can be significant. We therefore welcome this policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

MP7. Progressive working, restoration and after-use, MP7.2

99459

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]

Summary:

Suggest to add "Or where appropriate provide nature based water filtering enhancements"

Change suggested by respondent:

Suggest to add "Or where appropriate provide nature based water filtering enhancements"

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99411

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk County Council - Natural Environment Team (Mr James Fisher, Principal Ecologist) [21965]

Summary:

MP7.2: It is advised that the last sentence is revised to clarify that "...developments must provide [insert: 'a minimum 10% measurable'] biodiversity net gain...".

Change suggested by respondent:

It is advised that the last sentence is revised to clarify that "...developments must provide [insert: 'a minimum 10% measurable'] biodiversity net gain...".

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: NCC - Natural Environment Team submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnr>

MP7. Progressive working, restoration and after-use, MP7.5

99142

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

MP7.5 – grammar - strategy for maintaining biodiversity

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99139 to 99142 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmm>

99312

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Paragraph MP7.5 refers to Green Infrastructure mapping. It is suggested that a high-resolution copy of the map provided is either included as an appendix or a weblink, as the drawing provided is of low quality and cannot be easily used on an interpretive basis.

Change suggested by respondent:

Paragraph MP7.5 refers to Green Infrastructure mapping. It is suggested that a high-resolution copy of the map provided is either included as an appendix or a weblink, as the drawing provided is of low quality and cannot be easily used on an interpretive basis.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>**MP7. Progressive working, restoration and after-use, MP7.7**

99460

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Suggest to add that restoration should be for the benefit of the river catchment overall.

Change suggested by respondent:

Suggest to add that restoration should be for the benefit of the river catchment overall.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>**MP7. Progressive working, restoration and after-use, MP7.8**

99237

Support

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We welcome the reference to historic character and landscape characterisation in paragraph MP7.8.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

Policy MP7: Progressive working, restoration and after-use

99461

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Add also where appropriate, enhance water quality by provision of natural filtering interventions

Change suggested by respondent:

Add also where appropriate, enhance water quality by provision of natural filtering interventions

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99126

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

MP7 – could the restoration be a walk or cycle route itself – as in, not necessarily connected to the PROW? Could it become an attraction itself?

MP7 – what about access to water, if a body of water becomes part of the scheme?

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

99238

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We welcome the reference to restoration proposals being informed by the historic environment. We suggest a very slight amendment to the wording to read:

The scheme has been informed by the historic environment and historic landscape [insert: "characterisation and landscape character"] assessments and the restoration enhances the historic environment.

Historic landscape characterisation and landscape character assessments are slightly different but have complementary roles.

Change suggested by respondent:

Amend text to read;

The scheme has been informed by the historic environment and historic landscape [insert: "characterisation and landscape character"] assessments and the restoration enhances the historic environment.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99158

Comment

Respondent: Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council) (Mr Mark Ogden, Flood & Water Manager)
[21927]

Summary:

We welcome the inclusion of an assessment of flooding from all sources within the Plan. We would like to provide information which you may wish to consider in relation to Policy MP7 and section Flooding, water resources and water quality.

Policy MP7: We would suggest the inclusion of a specific point relating to restoration proposals.

- The restoration scheme must ensure there will be no increase in flood risk from the pre-development scenarios and opportunities for betterment are sought.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Lead Local Flood Authority submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmc>

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]

Summary:

Natural England welcome the Plan's emphasis on ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is achieved, enhancing the green infrastructure network, and taking a positive approach to mitigate and adapt to climate change. There is also a clear emphasis on ensuring high quality restoration and after-use of sites to protect Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land and to enhance Norfolk's biodiversity and protect its landscapes. However, we advise that there is scope for the Plan to be more ambitious in its delivery of some of these policies and objectives.

Nature Recovery Network (NRN) and Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSs)

Natural England commends the NMWLP for acknowledging the potential that restoration and after-use of mineral workings has for the benefit of enhancing landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity. We welcome the reference to contributing, "to identified strategic green infrastructure corridors and known ecological networks," made in Policy MP7. We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network

[<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included within this policy. The NRN is a commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and enacted by the Environment Act 2021. Natural England is working with partners on NRN and the development of LNRSs. The NRN is used to refer to a single, growing national network of improved joined-up, wildlife rich places which will benefit people and wildlife. LNRSs [<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/land-use/local-nature-recovery-strategies/>] will be the key mechanism for planning and mapping local delivery of the NRN.

LNRSs will form a new system of spatial strategies for nature that will be mandated by the Environment Act. They will cover the whole of England and will be developed by Responsible Authorities (RAs) appointed by the Secretary of State, usually at a county scale. Each strategy will:

- Map the most valuable existing habitat for nature
- Map specific proposals for creating or improving habitat for nature and wider environment goals
- Agree priorities for nature's recovery

LNRSs have also been designed to help local planning authorities deliver existing policy on conserving and enhancing biodiversity and to reflect this in the land use plans for their area.

LNRSs have also been designed to help local planning authorities deliver existing policy on conserving and enhancing biodiversity and to reflect this in the land use plans for their area.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

In line with paragraph 174(d) of the NPPF, reference to providing BNG is made throughout the NMWLP, which Natural England commends. BNG will be an important tool in securing investment for nature recovery through the planning system, helping deliver the government's commitment to create a national NRN. However, we advise strengthening this wording by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG. Strategic level viability assessments in Kent have concluded that this shift will not impact viability in most cases irrespective of onsite or offsite BNG delivery. This is because after the initial cost of securing the minimum 10% BNG, the cost of increase to 15 or 20% is much less and generally negligible. Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 3.1 may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project.

It is the government's intention that mandatory BNG will provide a financial incentive for development to support the delivery of LNRSs through an uplift in the calculation of biodiversity units created at sites identified by the strategy through the Biodiversity Metric 'strategic significance' scoring.

Change suggested by respondent:

We would advise that reference to the Nature Recovery Network [<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nature-recovery-network/nature-recovery-network>] is also included within this policy.

We advise strengthening the wording on BNG by stating the minimum BNG uplift required to be delivered. With regards the upcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG, we advise that you consider BNG delivery above this level, for example at 15% or 20% BNG.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99412

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk County Council - Natural Environment Team (Mr James Fisher, Principal Ecologist) [21965]

Summary:

It is advised that the policy clarifies that the restoration proposal must demonstrate “the scheme provides for a [insert: 'minimum 10% measurable'] biodiversity net gain”.

Change suggested by respondent:

It is advised that the policy clarifies that the restoration proposal must demonstrate “the scheme provides for a [insert: 'minimum 10% measurable'] biodiversity net gain”.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: NCC - Natural Environment Team submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnr>

99313

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]

Agent: David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]

Summary:

In respect of Policy MP7, the application of the wording “exceptional circumstances” is questioned as this creates an unnecessary barrier to change. Sometimes the reason for a change can be simple, and therefore applying a qualifying criterion seems unjustified and unnecessary. The test should be no diminishment in quality, as per the remainder of the policy. The absence of drainage and flood risk wording under Policy MP7 is also notable as these are key aspects when considering the design of any restoration landform under the modern day planning regime. Soundness test: not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99512

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:**Unconsidered Regional Vulnerability to Uncontrolled Silica Sand Mining**

When considering the landscape implications of silica sand mining, almost all documents in the N.C.C. silica sand library and in the NMWLP document, May 2022, consider only the implications of active and proposed silica sand extraction sites, and mainly from the perspective of considerations of local amenity (village) impacts and from the problem of regulating HGV transports. The historical realities are largely being disregarded.

Within and directly adjacent to West Norfolk, there are the widespread, cumulative scars of several hundred years of sand and gravel (aggregates) mining and at least 200 years of silica sand mining for glass, foundry, ceramics, and other industries. New mining sites are selected with almost no consideration of the surrounding blight; many of these sites remain unremediated and many have been reduced to lakes. The NMWLP misleads in its discussion of cumulative adverse effects, claiming that only current mining sites are involved. In fact the National Planning Policy Minerals Guidance (2014) states, "Mineral planning authorities should include appropriate policies in their minerals local plan where appropriate, to ensure that the cumulative impact of a proposed mineral development on the community and the environment will be acceptable. The cumulative impact of mineral development is also capable of being a material consideration when determining individual planning applications" There is no preoccupation with the impacts of active sites in the NPPG or NPPF. It is the true cumulative impacts of local mining that is the pertinent factor.

Indeed, the systematic restoration of old sites would allay some of the widespread public Concerns, but there has been no interest from N.C.C. or from mining groups. Virtually all the sites that have come under consideration in the last decade are adjacent to old workings. The logical approach to this situation is for N.C.C. to contract a map maker to develop (for the first time) a map of historical and current sand mining sites in West Norfolk. The purpose would be to establish more sustainable choices of silica sand extraction sites.

The richness of the Leziat deposits of the Sandringham sand classification has meant that this resource has been preferentially mined, with the extensive blight in Leziat, Mintlyn, Bawsey, Roydon, Middleton, West Winch, Wolferton, Sandringham, and elsewhere. There is an official preference for proposed sites close to the Leziat Factory, which is concentrating the scarring of landscape. even if newly-finished mining sites are now being reclaimed. but there is little evidence that the abundance of old mining sites will not just remain as unreclaimed and often useless landforms.

Sibelco UK, from the evidence of their application history remain quite unconcerned. yet in Belgium, their HQ, the company have a vaunted reputation for both site reclamation and the substitution of significant silica sand inputs with reclaimed glass, but not here in England. N.C.C. are not encouraging or mandating either.

Another unreported impediment to mining in the region is the very high level of governmental neutralisation of large swathes of the countryside. Since 1942, 121 square km have been appropriated as the STANTA military area for the British Army. Since the 1920s, 45,000 acres of the Brecks and West Norfolk have been planted as primarily monocultural Forestry England plantations, the largest lowland forest in Britain. There are three major airforce bases adjacent to the limited regional silica sand resource, RAF Marham, RAF Lakenheath, and RAF Mildenhall; the former in particular may invalidate significant potential sites under its statutory 13 km radius of bird-strike zone, although there are already appreciable numbers of lakes in old mining sites within this zone. There are also scattered areas of residual fen and wet woodland throughout the area. A review of the website, Who Owns Norfolk, shows the vast areas of privately-owned country estates, including the 20,000 acre Sandringham Estate and large Crown Commissioner landholdings. These facts appear never to be considered by N.C.C. in its support and adjudication of the nationally important silica sand industry.

Facts are facts and should not be disregarded. The facts speak to the necessity of a more nuanced approach to silica sand mining, the importance of restoring large swathes of the countryside damaged historically by sand mining, and not just the current mines, a determined consciousness of adjacent damaged areas. and the requirement for a more systematic approach to the identification and selection of new silica sand extraction sites. Familiarity with the cumulative documents on N.C.C. silica sand site selection ought to lead to the conclusion that perhaps a process with greater discretion and success in the identification of appropriate silica sand resources might be achievable. yet the ambient culture seems to expect different results from doing the same thing. It is clear that the public interests must be part of the solution.

Soundness test: not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

Unconsidered Regional Vulnerability to Uncontrolled Silica Sand Mining B

1. The occasional recreational public land-use interests are unrecognised in the planning structure informing silica sand extraction site selection in the NMWLP, May 2022. They are of particular importance because of the local landscape blight associated with historical sand mining and governmental programmes. Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E, the jewel of West Norfolk countryside recreation, is perhaps the best example. Public interests cannot be excluded from planning decisions, and evidence suggests that this absence in NMWLP was systematic. Resets are required in a number of the Plan processes to accommodate this legitimate public interest before the NMWLP can be considered legally compliant.

2. A comprehensive West Norfolk region-specific mapping of both historical and current active and suspended mining sites - for silica sand, sand and gravel, and carstone - should be created to help inform further planning, and restoration. An independent cartographer should be engaged. This needs to be undertaken with some urgency. The purpose is to introduce greater granularity into the process that is currently available to aid specific site selection and to avoid areas of blight.

3. Restoration of the many old neglected sand mining sites, including areas of cumulative industrial blight, is an important issue for the general public as they see additional mining sites proposed for a battered landscape. Public rural recreational areas are now scarce. If the industry will not accept any responsibility, it has to be the responsibility of local government, possibly with private sponsorship.

The Bawsey Lakes area is a classical example with fenced (in disrepair) areas of heavy metal contamination, sinking sands, and chemical contamination, and several unsafe lakes, some with unsecured, below-surface obstructions. The huge site has required surveying and restoration for over 50 years. It ought to be a major regional resource, if funded properly. Ignoring the extensive heritage mining blight in West Norfolk in the execution of planning for silica sand mining is a fundamental and self-inflicted problem. I request consideration of this aspect in the adjudication of the "soundness" of the NMWLP to 2038.

4. The MPA claim that the selection of putative AOS sites may not be a useful approach in the Leziate beds anymore may well be realistic. A greater granularity of approach, aided by the mechanisms suggested, and allied with an improved collaborative endeavour with minerals firms may aid in the recognition of specific sites, and even of multiple smaller sites.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed evidence to support these views. It is probably important to support those contested by the MPA.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission D. Regional vulnerability to uncontrolled silica sand mining - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmp>

99443

Comment

Respondent: Suffolk County Council (Mr Ross Walker, Sr Planning officer) [21966]

Summary:

Would suggest to replace "enhanced" with "measurable increase in biodiversity"

Change suggested by respondent:

Would suggest to replace "enhanced" with "measurable increase in biodiversity"

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Suffolk County Council response Norfolk MWLP 16.12.2022 - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmt>

Policy MP8: Aftercare

99413

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk County Council - Natural Environment Team (Mr James Fisher, Principal Ecologist) [21965]

Summary:

An aftercare strategy of ten years is advised (rather than five years), to ensure habitats have satisfactorily established. It may also be helpful to clarify that biodiversity net gain plans and their associated management and monitoring plans will require a minimum thirty year maintenance period where Biodiversity Units are to be delivered onsite.

Change suggested by respondent:

An aftercare strategy of ten years is advised (rather than five years), to ensure habitats have satisfactorily established. It may also be helpful to clarify that biodiversity net gain plans and their associated management and monitoring plans will require a minimum thirty year maintenance period where Biodiversity Units are to be delivered onsite.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: NCC - Natural Environment Team submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnr>

99341

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]

Summary:

We support the need for planning conditions and or longer term planning obligations where there is a clear need but it is clear from the supporting documents for the Defra biodiversity net gain metric that some habitats require longer than the typical 5 year aftercare period normally attached to minerals consents in order to be successfully created. We therefore recommend that the policy wording is modified in order to ensure it is effective.

Change suggested by respondent:

We therefore recommend that the policy wording is modified in order to ensure it is effective, changing the first sentence of the second paragraph to read 'Planning conditions and/or longer-term planning obligations will be used to ensure that detailed annual management reports and ... to ensure that a detailed annual management where there is a clear need for a longer aftercare period in order to successfully deliver the restoration goals'.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

Policy MP9: Asphalt plants, concrete batching plants and the manufacture of concrete products

99314

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]

Agent: David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]

Summary:

It is respectfully suggested that Policies MP9 and MP10 could be expanded to include reference to precast blockworks to use indigenous materials and aggregate bagging plants, as both are viable forms of ancillary development at aggregates sites in principle.

Change suggested by respondent:

Policies MP9 and MP10 could be expanded to include reference to precast blockworks to use indigenous materials and aggregate bagging plants, as both are viable forms of ancillary development at aggregates sites in principle.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnm>

Policy MP10: safeguarding of port and rail facilities, and facilities for the manufacture of concrete, asphalt and recycled materials – STRATEGIC POLICY

99137

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

This policy uses the term 'should' in relation to the submission of a Minerals Infrastructure Impact Assessment. The rest of the policy uses 'will' for example. It seems that this assessment is essential, but the policy using the term 'should' implies it is not. Why is there difference in wording in this policy when compared to others?

Soundness: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

The criterion could be amended as follows:

Development proposals within 250 metres of the above minerals related facilities [delete: should] [insert: 'are required to'] demonstrate that they would not prevent or prejudice the use of those facilities, through the submission of a Minerals Infrastructure Impact Assessment, as set out in Appendix 9.

The 'agent of change' principle will be applied to all such development.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99164

Support

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mr Philip Dash, Principal Planner) [16208]

Summary:

The additional information around a Minerals Infrastructure Impact Assessment (MIIA) and Appendix 9 which set out the nature of evidence that would be required to be submitted alongside a non-mineral development within the consultation areas of safeguarded sites such that the County Council could be satisfied that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on existing or allocated sites for mineral development is welcomed.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Essex County Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmx>

99297

Comment

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

The MPA welcomes and support the reference to the 'agent of change' principle in the policy and the policy itself. However, it is felt that for the purposes of clarity and effectiveness the wording of the policy should be adjusted as follows for clarity and effectiveness.

Change suggested by respondent:

Proposed Changes

b) Existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of [insert: 'primary'], substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Please note that the MPA would wish to attend the EiP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99315

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

It is respectfully suggested that Policies MP9 and MP10 could be expanded to include reference to precast blockworks to use indigenous materials and aggregate bagging plants, as both are viable forms of ancillary development at aggregates sites in principle.

Change suggested by respondent:

Policies MP9 and MP10 could be expanded to include reference to precast blockworks to use indigenous materials and aggregate bagging plants, as both are viable forms of ancillary development at aggregates sites in principle.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99304

Comment

Respondent: Norwich City Council (Mrs Joy Brown, Senior Planner (Policy)) [21952]**Summary:**

Whilst Norwich City Council has no objection to objective MS05 or policy MP10, for the avoidance of doubt 'agent of change' should be defined.

Soundness test: Not Justified**Change suggested by respondent:**

Agent of change should be defined either within the explanatory text or within the glossary.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99305

Comment

Respondent: Norwich City Council (Mrs Joy Brown, Senior Planner (Policy)) [21952]**Summary:**

Whilst Norwich City Council has no objection to policy MP10, we have previously commented that the policy should acknowledge the proximity of the Trowse Railhead to sensitive residential users and to the east Norwich sites with major regeneration potential including the Deal Ground, Utilities Site and Carrow Works.

The safeguarded Trowse Railhead and adjacent Lafarge plant are located in east Norwich adjacent to the Deal Ground site (allocated in Norwich's Site Allocations Plan under policy R9, with extant consent for 670 units of housing) and in close proximity to other allocated sites including the Utilities site (R10), Gothic Works (R11), and Land adjacent to the Football club (CC16 – part developed). The adopted Joint Core Strategy identifies east Norwich as a priority for regeneration in policy JCS12. A major (20ha) site in east Norwich, Carrow Works is now also available for development following relocation of the previous occupier (Britvic /Unilever), and is located adjacent to the safeguarded site.

With the addition of Carrow Works, the East Norwich sites represent a transformative opportunity for the regeneration of this area and the wider city. An ambitious regeneration project is underway to create a sustainable new urban quarter for the city, supported by the preparation of a masterplan for east Norwich and a commitment to substantial future investment. The masterplan was completed in May 2022 and provides for over 3,600 new homes and 4,100 jobs across East Norwich. The masterplan and associated documents have informed emerging policy in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) which identifies the major east Norwich sites, including the Deal Ground, Utilities site and Carrow Works, as a strategic regeneration area under policy 7.1, and an allocation under policy GNLP0360/3053/R10. It is anticipated that an East Norwich supplementary planning document will be adopted alongside or shortly after adoption of the GNLP in early 2024 to guide future regeneration of East Norwich.

Norwich City Council accepts the need to safeguard the railhead under policy MP10; however the minerals and waste plan should acknowledge its proximity to sensitive residential users and to the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area.

Soundness test: Not Justified

Change suggested by respondent:

The minerals and waste plan should acknowledge the proximity of the Trowse Railhead and adjacent Lafarge plant to the East Norwich Strategic Regeneration Area and sensitive residential users. This could potentially be acknowledged in the explanatory text for MP10 (paragraph MP10.3) by amending the second sentence to read:

“Each decision will take into account the particular use of the safeguarded site, the nature of the proposed development, including its policy context and relationship to strategic regeneration opportunities,.....”

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**Policy MP11: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas – STRATEGIC POLICY**

99239

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We welcome the reference to the conservation benefits of carstone.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99298

Support

Respondent: Mineral Products Association (Mr M North, Director of Planning - Aggregates & Production) [17995]

Summary:

The MPA supports this policy and the additional reference to the agent of change.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: The MPA would like to be present at any EIP.

Attachments: Mineral Products Association full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn8>

99488

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]

Summary:

Silica Sand Safeguarding Programme

1. Silica sand mineral deposits in Norfolk are confined to a narrow linear band lying close to the eastern side of Kings Lynn and oriented in a north-south direction. The resource has been protected from the uncontrolled imposition of other developments by the Norfolk Safeguarding programme for silica sand (and carstone) as represented by the Safeguarding Map. All developments proposed to the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council and adjacent District Councils within this area have to be permitted by the County Council. One potential problem is in the absence of democratic control of this process. It is administered by N.C.C. Minerals and Waste officers, although the map is published electronically. Public familiarity with the safeguarding map is uncommon and, as only one area of the County is involved, it should probably be more actively promoted, certainly among parish councils. It was a considerable surprise to the great majority of users of Shouldham Warren (AOS E) and West Bilney Wood (AOS D) when these sites were proposed for silica sand extraction. The failure to involve the public is not a 'sound' policy.

2. Presumably at the development of the silica sand safeguarding map (around 2004), it was decided that the two sites were unsuitable for consideration as open-cast mines because of their long history as important sites of public recreation. Both wooded areas were omitted from the map, leaving two lacunae within the otherwise homogeneous safeguarded area. There was no relevant N.C.C. comment in NMWLP documents when both were incorporated in suggested silica sand extraction AOS in both the Initial and Preferred Options consultations; in neither did this fact appear to play any role in the decision-making. Their prior long-term existence as heavily used public recreation areas also was not mentioned in any of the curated development documents.

The Mineral Consulting Area (MCA) in Norfolk is defined in Policy MP11 as the Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA). An additional 250m safeguarded buffer is established around all permitted and active silica sand extraction sites, providing a buffer that might contain extensions of deposits and to prevent future non-minerals development that might prevent access.

Safeguarding retains the flexibility to identify areas which have the least impact on the environment. There is no presumption that any areas within an MSA will ultimately be acceptable for mineral extraction. Defining the MSA in strategic terms, ensures that known mineral resources are optimally considered in land-use planning decisions. MCAs are principally defined as tools to ensure that mineral resources are considered at the district level by consultation with the county MHAs.

How two sites that were not within the MSA/MCA because of high-level public usage were then proposed as part of two of the most significant AOS is not explained. It is significant that both were selected by Sibelco UK who were clearly unconcerned by their public nature and by the several other confounding factors involved. This clearly was 'unsound,' 'unjustified,' 'not evidence-led,' and inconsistent with national policy.'

3. The DEFRA document, A Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England, published in 2007, is a useful explanatory text. Under Part 1, it states, "Key stakeholders, including communities, should be informed at the outset and kept informed During the process of creating an effective system." It does not appear that this ever occurred with the four village communities adjacent to Shouldham Warren, or with the wider user community. During the long gestation period of the NMWLP, there is no evidence of any intention to protect Shouldham Warren in the cumulative documents, and there was little direct communication on this matter with local government.

4. The MCA/ MSA should be defined with the best available data. It is not clear whether new data from Sibelco UK is incorporated into the map. It is known that Sibelco has been conducting extensive bore hole investigations over a wide area during the last two years. Is a map update due, or is this information retained within the company? This is a relevant issue, as collaboration is supposed to suffuse the process. "Any modification by a mineral planning authority (MPA) to the BGS mineral resource outlines, such as decisions not to include a particular resource, or reduce or extend a resource boundary, will need to be based on robust and credible evidence to withstand the scrutiny of a public examination."

Ultimately selecting an extraction site is a dynamic process that takes into account a range of factors defined in the Plan DPD. Mineral-specific factors

include the quality, thickness and extent of the deposits, as well as its variability and situation. The presence of an MSA does not necessarily preclude all development within these areas, although the current abandonment by N.C.C. of all AOS in the Preferred Options group might imply this to be the case. Whether more defined and fully investigated potential extraction sites might be a more effective strategy appears untried.

5. There is a conundrum in this Local Plan in that, at the death, N.C.C. announce that nothing can be achieved with the present national system, and that a simplified mechanism, with the direct referral by commercial mineral operators directly into the district planning procedures, where, incidentally, there is no guaranteed access for outstanding public interest concerns. Neither am I impressed that the NMWLP, 2022 has provided sufficient evidence for this conclusion. The solution proposed appears to be at odds with fundamental democratic principles elaborated by the National Planning Policy Framework. I respectfully suggest that the newly recommended approach to silica sand site selection is neither legally compliant or sound.

6. The minerals planning processes are not fixed. The above mentioned DEFRA Safeguarding Guidance reports how Staffordshire County Council had adapted their procedures as of 15 years ago. Basically, this approach involved (i) BGS data were periodically revised to incorporate all mineral data as it accumulated primarily from industry; (ii) continual refinement of the MSA using Master Map (a very large data set) - including removal of uneconomic areas and addition of mineral buffers (250m for silica sand); (iii) introduced a schema to identify the granularity of (primarily) residences within the MSA by creating building clusters of buildings within 100m of each other with an additional 25m around the outermost buildings, and the infill of all interior polygons (as too small to be productive) and the removal of conurbations greater than 20 hectares in size as "urban areas." Communities divided by rivers had special treatment. "Interior open spaces ... such as golf courses, recreation grounds, (and) urban parks were included in the building clusters polygon"; in Norfolk, this would have removed Shouldham Warren and West Bilney Wood from contention. The procedures are reviewed in the Guidance.

This is not to claim that the system could work in Norfolk. It is mentioned only to bring attention to different approaches that have been used elsewhere to accommodate community granularity and other factors. This is from 15 years ago, and it is a safe assumption that this and other approaches will have improved utility in the interim, and possibly incorporating additional factors - as a possible alternative to "declaring victory from defeat and going home." However initially extraction sites are defined, they will need to be refined in discussion with industry and other stakeholders. Sustainable development remains the strategic objective. There is an ironic component in the failure to protect public recreational sites, as it is the widespread historical pattern of sand mining in West Norfolk that has caused the acute shortage of rural sites, such as Shouldham Warren and East Bilney Wood, for personal and institutional public recreation. A failure to explore realistic alternatives in a 13-year journey might be considered an 'unsound' approach. To accept a market failure without a comprehensive analysis of opportunities and practices is an unsound proposition.

Change suggested by respondent:

1. The Norfolk Silica Sand Safeguarding map should be published annually to the village and town councils within West Norfolk and within a 15-mile radius of the Silica Sand and Carstone Mineral Safeguarding Area, as well as the respective District Councils. Any submission of an application to mine silica sand or Carstone should result in immediate notification to all councils within a 10-mile radius. of the site, including transportation routes. One suggestion is to reverse the general ignorance of mineral safeguarding as regards this rare and strategically important mineral amongst parish/town councils, and taking the opportunity to educate the public. Otherwise, proposed licenses for mineral extraction are (often inadequately) released to an uninformed and unprepared population.

2. The attempt to avoid public accountability by the Mineral Planning Authority in proposing areas of long-term public recreational land-use for an AOS, without comment, when they had already been excluded from the MSA was an invalid act that was contrary to the rules related to open access land and irreplaceable landforms. Shouldham Warren (AOS E) and West Bilney Woods (AOS D) presented unique qualities for regional public recreation and a highly-valued landscape that could not be substituted from elsewhere - owing to the systematic loss of equivalent land over several centuries of sand mining in a limited mineral area. N.C.C. declined to discuss the issues in contravention of the NPPF. A confirmation of the 'permanent' removal of these two sites from the silica sand safeguarding map (and consideration) is sought. It is requested that the entire set of both consultee consultations and public "comments" that were submitted for both AOS E (including Shouldham Warren) and AOS D (including East Bilney Wood) be retained for at least 25 years, instead of the 4 years sanctioned by the NMWLP process, as they represent massive public and private involvement that has not been answered by the county authority. It is not lost on the public that the suggested "criteria-based policy may encourage the return of extraction site applications involving these sites, but in the District Council planning process where some issues, such as public land-use, may be more difficult to affect owing to an absence of standing.

3. I wish to make a general comment. As I understand it, for both silica sand safeguarding and the selection of acceptable extraction sites to work optimally, there is a requirement for good cooperation between the Mineral Planning Authority and Sibelco UK and other mineral operators. By the (unsuccessful) promotion of a series of AOS's close to RAF Marham, within the medieval monastical landscape, and in the protected River Nar valley, it seems as if lessons have not been learned. Similarly, the silica sand safeguarding program appears to have been partially dysfunctional. On the face of it, new minerals data appears not to have been shared as they appear to have played no role. And finally, why has there been such a negative conclusion made about a national minerals planning regime? Cannot it be put back on the rails without just kicking it downstairs? I don't know the national picture, and none is quoted in the Plan documents. In this regard, it is difficult to propose realistic solutions, other than perhaps an exploratory committee with a number of independent contributors, including public representatives, to identify a structure which is more likely to work, and which is consistent with the NPPF. It should not be impossible to identify seriously mitigated sites within the silica sand MPA. Forgive my incoherence.

4. Is the Norfolk Silica Sand Safeguarding programme working? The principle of protecting the resource is successful, but is it facilitating the identification of practical silica sand mining sites? Might the conventional, unadapted map be improved by greater granularity? Is there a problem with how the map is being used might there be a preoccupation with searching only in the traditional Leziate Beds, leaving the rest of the reserve underexploited? Or is it the time to revisit the residual productivity that can realistically be expected from the Norfolk silica sand reserve, as the N.C.C. MPA action perhaps implies?

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those comments contested by the M.P.A.

Attachments: Dr D Ormerod full text submission C. silica sand safeguarding - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmy>

99473

Comment

Respondent: Sibelco UK Limited (Mr Lewis Williams, Planning Manager) [18360]

Summary:

We support the inclusion of a mineral safeguarding and mineral consultation policy but believe the policy wording should be amended as set out below. The changes set out below are suggested to ensure adequate protection of mineral resources in accordance with paragraph 210 of the NPPF. In particular, the additional text reflects the national and strategic importance of Norfolk's silica sand resource with particular reference to colourless glass production. This would allow the Council to consult with mineral operators to seek their technical industrial knowledge of minerals to best ensure effective safeguarding. This is an approach taken by Devon County Council in response to the existence of nationally important ball clay resources.

Change suggested by respondent:

Proposed changes to first policy paragraph: "The County Council will safeguard existing, permitted and allocated mineral extraction sites from inappropriate development proposals. Mineral Consultation Areas are delineated on the Policies Map and extend to 250 metres from each safeguarded site. Development proposals within 250 metres of a safeguarded site should demonstrate that they would not prevent or prejudice the use of the safeguarded site for mineral extraction and the 'agent of change' principle will be applied in all such cases. [insert: 'In consultation with mineral operators'], the County Council will object to development proposals which would prevent or prejudice the use of safeguarded sites for mineral extraction.

Proposed changes to last policy paragraph: In line with the NPPF, the Mineral Planning Authority, [insert: 'in consultation with mineral operators'], will object to development which would lead to the sterilisation of the mineral resource., [delete: 'and it would be for the relevant Local Planning Authority to decide whether there are compelling planning reasons for over-riding this safeguarding objection.']

It is considered that the delineation of the Mineral Safeguarding Area and subsequently the Minerals Consultation Area should be amended on the Policies Map as silica sand resources known to Sibelco occur outside of the area proposed to be safeguarded for silica sand. This is reflected by the extent and location of sites contained within the 'Proposed Silica Sand Allocations Norfolk County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication Document Consultation Supplementary Information Report'. The supporting geological information supports this conclusion. On this basis it is considered that the following geological areas in the British Geological Survey (BGS) Geology 50K (DigMapGB-50) mapping should be safeguarded for silica sand:

- Leziate Member,
- Mintlyn Member and
- Carstone Formation.

Advice produced by the BGS (Mineral Safeguarding in England: Good Practice Advice (British Geological Survey, 2011) and reference in PPG Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 27-003-20140306 states that where available other data should be incorporated into the process of defining mineral safeguarding areas. This other data is set out in paragraph 4.1.4 of the BGS advice documents and includes, "exploration data from industry that is not held by BGS, such as shallow borehole information and trial pit investigations." It is on this basis the safeguarding area for silica sand should be extended to incorporate the above mentioned geological areas.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Sibelco would like to be present at any Examination in Public.

Attachments: Proposed Silica Sand Allocations - Appendix B Charity Field supporting info.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzc>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Button Fen Heritage Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzd>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Marham Agricultural Land Classification and Soil survey.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzw>
 R001 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_Appendix C - Preliminary Ecology Appraisal 2017.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzf>
 Proposed Silica Sand Allocations_ document minus appendices - redacted personal data.pdf - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzg>
 Sibelco full text submission letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn7>

99352

Object

Respondent: Taylor Wimpey UK Limited & Manor Farm Rackheath Ltd. [21960]

Agent: GP Planning Limited (Miss Maureen Darrie, Director) [21959]

Summary:

Paragraph MP11.1 - the quote from National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 210) omits reference to Mineral Consultation Areas:

c) safeguard mineral resources by defining Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas; and adopt appropriate policies so that known locations of specific mineral resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this should be avoided (whilst not creating a presumption that the resources defined will be worked);

There are two issues with the wording/content of the policy MP11.

Firstly, the final paragraph is not in line with NPPF. Stating that the Mineral Planning Authority will object regardless of any other factors is clearly wrong and contrary to policy. NPPF at paragraph 12 states: Local Planning Authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in Mineral Safeguarding Areas if it might constrain potential future use for mineral working."

Nowhere in the NPPF or Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) does it state that MPAs should object to every application that would lead to sterilisation, which is basically what the draft policy is saying.

This also sits contrary to the supporting text at paragraph MP11.11.

Secondly, the link to Appendix 10 in the third paragraph of the policy will cause problems for some developments. Appendix 10 basically reiterates the guidance note referred to above. At least in this case it allows interested parties to comment on its content, unlike the current Plan where neither the policy nor the supporting text refers to the Guidance Note on the Mineral Safeguarding Process for Aggregates -Sand & Gravel and Carstone (2014). This note is referred to on the Council website but has no statutory status as it was not subject to any consultation. Therefore it does not form part of the development Plan. It is also noted that the 'link' to the document only takes you to the Core Strategy, so it is not actually available through the main website pages.

In general, the proposed Appendix 10, is too onerous and rigid and does not follow BGS advice, which is cross-referenced in PPG. Of particular concern is paragraph 4.11 in Appendix 10: "The assessment of the onsite mineral resources would require the addition of Particle Size Distribution (PSD) tests of batches of any sand and gravel bearing deposits recovered, although this is often carried out for the FRA. Assessment of the results of Particle Size Distribution testing should refer to material class types in Table 6/1 of the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works vol 1: Specification for Highway Works Series 600. to identify potential suitability for use in the construction phases."

This is a very onerous requirement, particularly for smaller developments, where an FRA or boreholes may not be needed as part of the site assessment.

In addition, the statement at the end of paragraph 10.5.2 (in the Appendix) that "Assessing the practicality of prior extraction as a standalone operation is to assess a false premise" is neither clear nor helpful.

The imposition of MMP-Ms through condition (requiring PSD testing) would be onerous and very difficult to manage on a large phased development. If a developer is required to produce a plan to cover every phase, including boreholes and having the material tested this will be an extremely onerous task and could prejudice the delivery of non-mineral related development (e.g. housing).

Change suggested by respondent:

The policy should be reworded to be in line with the NPPF:

"The County Council will safeguard Norfolk's silica sand, carstone, and sand and gravel mineral resources, within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas identified on the Policies Map, from inappropriate development proposals. For mineral resources the Mineral Consultation Area is the same defined area as the Mineral Safeguarding Area.

The Mineral Planning Authority should be consulted on all development proposals within Mineral Consultation Areas, except for the excluded development types set out in Appendix 4.

For relevant development proposals located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area the Mineral Planning Authority will expect to see [delete: appropriate] [insert] 'proportionate' investigations carried out to assess whether any mineral resource there is of economic value, and if so, whether the mineral could be economically extracted prior to the development taking place. This information should be provided through the submission of a Mineral Resource Assessment (MRA) [delete: as set out in Appendix 10].

The conservation benefits of carstone will be a consideration in safeguarding resources.

[delete: In line with the NPPF] The Mineral Planning Authority, [delete: will object to development] [insert:] 'through consultation and review of the MRA, will provide an objective response to development' which would lead to the sterilisation of the mineral resource, and it would be for the relevant Local Planning Authority to decide whether there are compelling planning reasons for over-riding this safeguarding objection."

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Given that the draft policy does not comply with NPPF and the MRA requirements are not proportionate and onerous, this requires airing and discussion at the examination.

Attachments:

Mineral Extraction Sites, Sand and gravel

99215

Comment

Respondent: Breedon Trading Limited (Mr Shaun Denny, Planner) [21948]

Summary:

The references to the planning status of the Attlebridge and Haddiscoe sites should be updated. Attlebridge is current not subject to a planning application whilst the Haddiscoe site is (submitted November 2022).

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99211

Object

Respondent: Windmill Cottage Kennels (Miss Helen Gough) [17772]

Summary:

This paragraph states the shortfall being 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource of 15.4m tonnes, in effect this means that the Haddiscoe site could be removed and still there would be an excess.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

MIN 12 - land north of Chapel Lane, Beetley, M12.15 Flood Risk:

99182

Comment

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]

Summary:

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN12 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 12 (land north of Chapel Lane, Beetley):

99084

Object

Respondent: Beetley Methodist Chapel (Mr John Hull, Steward) [21910]

Summary:

Ref: MIN12 Beetley

The Methodist Chapel, at the junction of High House Road and Chapel Lane, faces the proposed site. It is a well-used building.

It is essential that the restrictions suggested are complied with, in particular the stand-off area to the south, the screening, landscaping and dust mitigation.

Transportation by HGV should be restricted to the B1146 and banned from using High House Road.

Change suggested by respondent:

Though it would be preferable for the Chapel for this development not to go ahead, it would seem that the mitigation issues, provided they are complied with, will at least restrict the potential disruption to what is at present a quiet rural area.

A change that would improve the issue would be to enlarge the stand-off area. This would help both the chapel and the two dwellings nearby.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99218

Object

Respondent: Beetley Methodist Chapel (Mr John Hull, Steward) [21910]**Summary:**

Minerals and Waste Local Plan – MIN 12 Land north of Chapel Lane, Beetley

Further to my submission sent on 18th October, with the extension until the 18th December, I would like to add additional detail.

1. We are disappointed and do not understand how this proposal has once more come forward when it was declined just four years ago.

2. Sand and gravel resources are widespread throughout most of Norfolk.

3. This is the second extension of a Middleton Gravel site that has progressively expanded to the south east. Whilst this may provide some economic benefits to the mining company, it is inexplicable why the proposed site has been extended up to the Beetley village boundary when resources are common in Norfolk. Shouldn't Middleton Gravels be asked to find another site that is away from village boundaries, for such sites undoubtedly do exist. Why is a small village abused in such a way?

4. I understand that it is customary with minerals site extensions for there to be planning conditions that a new phase is not opened until the earlier site has been officially closed and restored to the conditions set out in the original permit. In this case, the first site, while apparently no longer in use, has not been restored at all. The second site is still in active use. Can it be presumed that if the new site goes forward, that it cannot start until mining the prior site is completed?

5. Furthermore, this new site has begun to interpose itself between Old Beetley and (new) Beetley village, which is surely not acceptable in civic terms.

6. Beetley Chapel was founded in 1871 as the Primitive Methodist Chapel for Beetley. The evangelist Primitive Methodist churches were often established at the end of fields to serve their agrarian members. This explains why it is situated where it is, and why some respect needs to be afforded to its 151 years of service. There are also several houses adjacent.

7. A buffer zone is proposed up against the Chapel, but there is no indication as to how deep it is. From the map, it does not appear very deep. An obstruction to viewing, as well as noise and dust, can be expected should this mining site (MIN12 land north of Chapel Lane, Beetley) go forward. On open fields, this is usually in the form of a bund. However, bunds do not work well on downward sloping fields. We therefore request that any bund is placed just over the top of the hill – this would keep the site out of visibility. We also request routine use of silencers on heavy equipment, and dust suppression that takes into consideration the siting of the mine near the top of an incline and with the prevailing winds leading to the Chapel area.

8. We would request that there should be no work after 12 noon on Saturday and an absolute prevention of Sunday working. This of course would not stop interference with events on week days.

I trust that our concerns will be taken with the utmost seriousness and thank you for your attention.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99462

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

MIN 12 - This is an extension of an existing site, Breckland DC has no objections.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99511

Comment

Respondent: Gressenhall parish council (Mrs L Jarrett, Clerk to Gressenhall Parish Council) [7945]

Summary:

We note that MIN12 is put forward by Middleton Aggregates as an extension to their existing operation which will take mineral back to their long established plant site due north of Gressenhall Village. We note that this has estimated minerals of well in excess of 1million tonnes and that this allocation will enable the Middleton Aggregates pit to continue to be served well beyond the plan period to 2036. As such we do not have an objection with this allocation.

We consider that the NPP guidance as set out above therefore fully supports our contention that you should support MIN12 but reject MIN13 and MIN51.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99240

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are three listed buildings to the east of the site, including the Grade I listed Church of Mary Magdalene and Old Hall and Beetley Hall, both listed at grade II. Given the open nature of the landscape in this area, extraction at the site could have an impact on the wider setting of the church.

We welcome the specific reference to the nearest heritage assets to read 'heritage assets and their settings (including the grade I listed Church of Mary Magdalene and grade II listed Old Hall and Beetley Hall)...'

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99427

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]

Summary:

We note that for MIN12 it is currently stated that the site is "proposed to be restored at a lower level and returned to arable agriculture. Restoration would include wide field margins, new hedgerows and some woodland".

These allocations are stated as being of Grade 3 agricultural land quality and so it is unclear as to whether or not this is BMV land (i.e. sub-grade 3a). If not, then it could be beneficial in terms of nature recovery in this area to explore whether the restoration of these sites could further complement/expand on the nature recovery ambitions of the nearby Wendling Beck Environment Project [<https://www.wendlingbeck.org/>] to deliver more habitat creation in this area which is bigger, better and joined up in line with the Lawton principles [Making Space for Nature: (nationalarchives.gov.uk) [https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20130402170324mp_/http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/biodiversity/documents/201009space-for-nature.pdf].

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99342

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

The supporting text states that due to the site being 1.16km from the Beetley and Hoe Meadows SSSI site boundary, and being one of the finest remaining areas of wet unimproved grassland in Norfolk, the proposed extraction would be worked dry, above the water table. Also, Dillington Carr, Gressenhall SSSI is 1.44km from site boundary, CWS1027 Gressenhall Green Marshes is 730m from site boundary and Great Wood ancient woodland is 1.28km from the allocation. However, no specific condition is included in MIN12 to ensure that the site will only be worked dry above the water table.

Change suggested by respondent:

In order to ensure that the plan does not result in impacts on SSSIs, CWS and ancient woodland, we request specific inclusion in the policy wording that the site will only be worked above the water table. Policy MIN 200 includes such wording, so in order to ensure that the policy is effective and doesn't inadvertently promote development in conflict with nature conservation laws and policy, and is consistent with the precautionary approach taken in other policy text wording, we strongly recommend that this condition is added to this policy.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**MIN 51 / MIN 13 / MIN 08- land west of Bilney Road, Beetley, M51.2 Highway access:**

99463

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

MIN 51 Land west of Bilney road, Beetley 1,830,000 of sand and gravel

As stated in 2019 consultation, Breckland considers that road improvements would be required for this site due to traffic issues. However, it is noted that Highways considers access by Rawhall Lane is suitable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99464

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

Min 13 - Land west of Bilney Road Beetley Close to Min 51 included in 1,830,000 sand and gravel

As stated in the 2019 consultation, Breckland DC considers Road improvements would be required due to traffic issues. 8, 51 and 13 all very close to each other therefore a very large site. However, it is noted that Highways considers access by Rawhall Lane is suitable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

MIN 51 / MIN 13 / MIN 08- land west of Bilney Road, Beetley, M51.16 Flood Risk:**99183****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN51 / MIN 13 / MIN 08 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 51 / MIN 13 / MIN 08 (land west of Bilney Road, Beetley):****99465****Comment****Respondent:** Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

MIN 8 - land north of Stoney Lane Beetley

Breckland DC has stated in its previous response to the 2019 consultation that it was considered that this site was unsuitable due to excessive increase in traffic in the area and access issues and deliverability as the site is owned by a landowner and not a minerals aggregate operator. The information on this site proposal has been aggregated with the information for Min 51 and 13 so it is not clear whether these issues have been addressed in particular to this site.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

Respondent: Gressenhall parish council (Mrs L Jarrett, Clerk to Gressenhall Parish Council) [7945]

Summary:

Summary: Given that Middleton Aggregates operate a pit next door and mindful of the existence of a second independent based 2 miles away, we see no case for the introduction of another operator. There is plenty of competition in existence able to service the local market and we see no case for that changing. We note the NPP Guidance identifies the need for the mineral in the specific representation; the economic considerations; the positive/negative environmental impact; and accumulative impact of proposals in an area. We consider the guidance supports our contention that you should support MIN12 but reject MIN13 and MIN51.

Full response:

1. You have kindly drawn our attention to the consultation on the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
2. This response is on behalf of Gressenhall Parish Council whose interest is in MIN12; MIN13; MIN51 and MIN08.
3. We note that MIN12 is put forward by Middleton Aggregates as an extension to their existing operation which will take mineral back to their long established plant site due north of Gressenhall Village. We note that this has estimated minerals of well in excess of 1million tonnes and that this allocation will enable the Middleton Aggregates pit to continue to be served well beyond the plan period to 2036. As such we do not have an objection with this allocation.
4. MIN13 and MIN51 have been put forward by a different mineral operator on the basis that the new operator would need to establish its own plant on site.
5. Given that Middleton Aggregates are operating a pit immediately next door and mindful also of the existence of a second independent mineral operator namely McLeod Aggregates who are based approximately 2 miles away on the western side at Bittering, we see no case whatsoever for the introduction of a third operator in this location.
6. By definition there is plenty of competition in existence already with two operators able to service the local market and we see no case for that situation changing. Accordingly we object to the application of MIN13 and MIN51 within the Local Plan.
7. With regard to MIN13 and MIN51, we note the National Planning Practice Guidance which considers the circumstances under which it is appropriate for planning authorities to focus on extensions to existing sites rather than new sites. This guidance goes on to identify the need for the mineral in the specific representation; the economic considerations; the positive and negative environmental impact; and accumulative impact of proposals in an area.
8. We consider that the NPP guidance as set out above therefore fully supports our contention that you should support MIN12 but reject MIN13 and MIN51.
9. Immediately due south of MIN13 and MIN51 is an allocation referred to as MIN08 which we understand has been put in by the landowner. This site does include land owned by the Gressenhall Pools Charity and the extent of the Charity's ownership is shown on the enclosed plan being towards the northern end of MIN08.
10. Gressenhall Pools Charity has made no representation to the Minerals Local Plan and no doubt the Trustees of that Charity will write and confirm this point to you.
11. Notwithstanding that point, we object strongly to the allocation of MIN08 in principle since it is wholly premature and far too close to the village of Gressenhall to be appropriate.
12. We question whether there is sufficient mineral within the field to justify extraction but in any event it is most certainly premature but it is also inappropriate mindful of its location.

Change suggested by respondent:

We believe that no further operations should be opened as there are sufficient pits already operating in the area.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99241

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

There are no designated heritage assets on site. The grade II* church of St Peter, Manor Farmhouse listed grade II and a scheduled monument (a deserted medieval village) lie to the west of the sites whilst to the north of the site lies East Bilney and several listed buildings, the closest of which is the grade II listed Almshouses.

We welcome the specific reference to the nearest heritage assets in the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99286

Support

Respondent: Longwater Gravel Co. Ltd. (Mr Simon Smith, Operations Director) [9381]**Summary:**

Longwater Gravel Company Limited supports the allocation of MIN 51, MIN 13 and MIN 08. A planning application for these sites has now been submitted.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99428

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]**Summary:**

We note that for MIN08, MIN13 and MIN 51 it is currently stated that: "The site is proposed to be restored at a lower level and the majority returned to arable agricultural. Due to the expected depth of extraction, it is recognised that restoration to arable is likely to require the use of imported inert material to provide a suitable profile. Lagoons to be retained as ponds with planting to create wet woodland habitat. Hedgerow interspersed with oaks is to be planted along the northern boundary alongside Rawhall Lane. A proportion of the site will be restored to woodland and associated grassland habitat" These allocations are stated as being of Grade 3 agricultural land quality and so it is unclear as to whether or not this is BMV land (i.e. sub-grade 3a). If not, then it could be beneficial in terms of nature recovery in this area to explore whether the restoration of these sites could further complement/expand on the nature recovery ambitions of the nearby Wendling Beck Environment Project [<https://www.wendlingbeck.org/>] to deliver more habitat creation in this area which is bigger, better and joined up in line with the Lawton principles [Making Space for Nature: (nationalarchives.gov.uk) [https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20130402170324mp_/http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/biodiversity/documents/201009space-for-nature.pdf].

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified

Attachments: Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99343

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

Due to the proximity to Beetley and Hoe Meadows SSSI, Horse Wood Mileham SSSI and Dillington Carr, Gressenhall SSSI, as well as Beck Farm Meadows CWS and Rawhall Wood CWS (also an ancient woodland), the supporting text states that the site would be worked dry only above the water table. However, no specific condition is included in MIN12 to ensure that the site will only be worked dry above the water table.

Change suggested by respondent:

In order to ensure that the plan does not result in impacts on SSSIs, CWS and ancient woodland, we request specific inclusion in the policy wording that the site will only be worked above the water table. Policy MIN 200 includes such wording, so in order to ensure that the policy is effective and doesn't inadvertently promote development in conflict with nature conservation laws and policy, and is consistent with the precautionary approach taken in other policy text wording, we strongly recommend that this condition is added to this policy.

We also recommend that section g of the policy includes specific reference to the new wet woodland around retained wetland areas as mentioned in the previous draft of the policy.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**MIN 200 - land west of Cuckoo Lane, Carbrooke, Site Characteristics**

99344

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

The supporting text for the policy, MP200.10, with reference to Wayland Wood SSSI, which is also a Norfolk Wildlife Trust reserve, states that 'provided that no dewatering is proposed as part of the working scheme, no impacts on this SSSI are expected'. Paragraph M200.19 states that the site is proposed to be restored to nature conservation with open grassland. We support policy section e, and recommend that the reference to open grassland in MP200.10 is added to the policy wording section e for clarity.

Change suggested by respondent:

We recommend that the reference to open grassland in MP200.10 is added to the policy wording section e for clarity.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 200 (land west of Cuckoo Lane, Carbrooke):**

99466

Comment

Respondent: Breckland District Council (Sarah Suggitt) [21969]**Summary:**

This is an extension of existing site and Breckland has no objections

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Breckland response to Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan December 2022 (Reg 19) - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzn>

99242

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

Although there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed Mill House and Windmill lie just to the south of the site. Given the proximity of these assets, we have concerns that extraction at the site will impact upon the settings of these assets. There are also a number of other listed buildings including the church of St Peter and St Paul to the north of the site as well as a scheduled monument. To the south east of the site lies the Carbrooke Conservation Area which also includes several listed building.

We welcome the specific reference to the nearest heritage assets in the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

MIN 202 - land south of Reepham Road, Attlebridge, M202.14 Flood Risk:

99186

Comment

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN202 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified

Attachments: King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 202 (land south of Reepham Road, Attlebridge):

99214

Support

Respondent: Breedon Trading Limited (Mr Shaun Denny, Planner) [21948]**Summary:**

The Company supports the identification of the site as a site allocation for the winning and working of minerals.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified

Attachments: None

99430

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]**Summary:**

Natural England notes that MIN 202 is adjacent to Mileplain Plantation, a Plantation on Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS) and welcomes the requirement for an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in the Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 202. We would recommend reference to standing advice [<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-how-to-review-planning-applications>] for ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees, which has been produced by Natural England and the Forestry Commission for further guidance when making decisions that affect ancient woodland, ancient trees or veteran trees.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99345

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

In our response to the previous 2019 consultation we noted that this site overlaps with Triumph & Foxburrow Plantations County Wildlife Site and the Mileplain Plantation ancient woodland partially within the site boundary. However, the site boundary does not appear to have been changed in order to avoid impacts on these important ecological features. Whilst we have no objection in principle to the majority of the allocation, we are significantly concerned that the allocation includes part of a County Wildlife Site, in clear contradiction with the goals of policy MW1.

Full text: In our response to the previous 2019 consultation we noted that this site overlaps with Triumph & Foxburrow Plantations County Wildlife Site and the Mileplain Plantation ancient woodland partially within the site boundary. However, the site boundary does not appear to have been changed in order to avoid impacts on these important ecological features. Whilst the supporting text for the policy states in M202.12 that there should be a stand off distance of at least 15 metres from the ancient woodland, we question why the red line boundary for the allocation abuts the ancient woodland and includes part of the CWS. Notwithstanding our concerns about the inclusion of part of a CWS in this allocation, and its unacceptable proximity to ancient woodland, we have no objection in principle to the remainder of the allocation area and support the proposed restoration to heathland.

Change suggested by respondent:

We strongly recommend that the site boundary is modified to remove any overlap with the CWS and set the required stand off distance where ancient woodland is present. For section d, we recommend that natural regeneration rather than planting is preferred, as this is far more likely to establish successfully and will avoid any risks of introducing disease from imported tree stock. Given the proximity to Swannington Upgate Common SSSI, part of which is also the Upgate Common Norfolk Wildlife Trust reserve, we recommend that policy wording requiring dry working is included in the policy text, in line with the approach taken for MIN 200, for consistency and certainty of delivery.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: We wish to be able to expand on the reasons given in our comments in order to help ensure the plan is effective and avoids impacts on Norfolk's wildlife.

Attachments: None

99152

Object

Respondent: Claire Woodhouse [21930]**Summary:**

I can confirm that I am the owner of the property [redacted personal data] and at the time of purchase June 2020 I was unaware that Cemex now Breedon Group had made an application to extract minerals just 250m from the property. Recently one of our neighbours, who has lived here 30 years, visited us because he had been asked if sound recording equipment could be placed in his property, he stated his concerns.

Upon investigation we found the application that Cemex had made. We read much of the information in the report including the noise report that was submitted with the application. We noted that there had been sound measurements taken at [redacted personal data] that suggest current sound levels are between 40/50db. With the predominant sound being wind blowing through trees and bird sound. I can confirm that one of the main reasons for the purchase of the property is that it sits in an area of protected woodland with many ancient trees some going back 400 years. It is a very peaceful and quiet location.

The report states clearly that the extraction equipment that a quarry would use will generate noise as loud as 85db. I believe this this is at a distance of 400m. On that basis we will of course object to the quarry permission being granted and any other development on the site including waste management. We also note that there was a letter from Breedon stating that the application had been withdrawn. We received confirmation of this from Martin Clark. So, I am confused by the fact a new letter has arrived stating the project is in the planning process.

In summary, please take this letter as a written notification of objection to any development on the site located 250m from my property. Please advise me in writing of any further activity on the application or any other application that affects the local site.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**MIN 37 - land east of Coltishall Road, Buxton, M37.14 Flood Risk:**

99187

Comment

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN37 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

MIN 64 - land at Grange Farm, Buxton Road, Horstead, Site Characteristics**99287****Support****Respondent:** Longwater Gravel Co. Ltd. (Mr Simon Smith, Operations Director) [9381]**Summary:**

Longwater Gravel Company Limited supports the inclusion of MIN 64 as an allocated site. An application for planning permission was granted planning permission in May 2021 and the allocated reserves will be worked and exhausted during the plan period. However, extending the plan period from 2036 to 2038 will mean that to ensure operations at Horstead Quarry continue beyond 2036, it will be necessary to apply for planning permission to extract sand and gravel from an extension area which will not be an allocated site.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None**MIN 64 - land at Grange Farm, Buxton Road, Horstead, M64.15 Flood Risk:****99188****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN64 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 64 (land at Grange Farm, Buxton Road, Horstead):**99245****Comment****Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

Although there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there is a scheduled monument (Roman camp and settlement site) to the south of the site, grade II* listed All Saints Church to the east and scheduled monument Great Hautbois old church and grade II* listed Church of St Theobald's to the north east of the site. Any extraction at the site has the potential to impact upon the settings of these heritage assets. We welcome the specific reference to the nearest heritage assets in the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>**MIN 65 - land north of Stanninghall Quarry, Site Characteristics****99133****Object****Respondent:** Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

It is noted that this site has planning permission and the plan may not include this policy if the scheme has started. The Site Characteristics para states could be extracted within 13 years. It is not entirely clear whether this refers to the proposed site only or the proposed plus existing sites.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Clarification is required as the timescale clearly influences the duration of effects. The Local Plan needs to clarify the timeline included.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**MIN 65 - land north of Stanninghall Quarry, M65.6 Landscape:****99132****Object****Respondent:** Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

It is noted that this site has planning permission and the plan may not include this policy if the scheme has started. M65.6 Landscape states: it should be possible to design a scheme of working, incorporating screening. However, the plan does not show any screening (only areas of Buffer). Some of the northern and eastern boundaries may require screening as mitigation for adverse visual effects if identified by LVIA. Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

The plan may need to include screening, or the wording of the text improved to refer to the potential need for screening as well as saying that the LVIA needs to address the issue of adverse visual effects (screening).

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

MIN 65 - land north of Stanninghall Quarry, M65.12 Flood Risk:**99189****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN65 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 65 (land north of Stanninghall Quarry):****99135****Object****Respondent:** Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]**Summary:**

It is noted that this site has planning permission and the plan may not include this policy if the scheme has started.

On Google Maps there is a photograph apparently showing some plant of significant size at the existing Tarmac Stanninghall Quarry. The Plan text does not indicate anything of this scale/height although Policy MIN 65 (j) refers to use of existing processing plant at the proposed site. This is somewhat concerning.

The site could potentially have adverse effects on the Broads and setting of the Broads in terms of scale, and proximity in relation to the numbers of visitors to attractions and facilities in Horstead/Coltishall area – this needs to be addressed by the LVIA.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

The Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 65 includes a requirement for submission of an LVIA with any planning application. If larger scale plant is moved to the proposed site, that any LVIA would need to assess the effects of this on the Broads area. The LVIA needs to also assess impact in terms of scale, and proximity in relation to the numbers of visitors to attractions and facilities. These requirements need to be made clearer in this section.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We understand from the Council that planning permission has now been granted for this site and to that end the principle of development has been established.

Nevertheless, it is still important for the policy to set out an appropriate policy framework for the protection of the historic environment as the extant planning permission may not be implemented and an alternative application may be submitted.

In order to make this policy effective, we recommend that the policy would be improved by specifically referencing mitigation measures identified through the planning application process.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are a number of designated heritage assets nearby including the grade II listed Horstead Lodge to the east of the site, the Coltishall and Horstead Conservation Area to the north east of the site (containing a number of listed buildings including the grade I listed Church of St John the Baptist), and a Roman Camp scheduled monument just to the north of the site. We have concerns regarding the potential impact on the setting of these various heritage assets.

We understand that this site now has planning permission and to that end the principle of development has been established. Nevertheless, it is still important for the policy to set out an appropriate policy framework for the protection of the historic environment as the extant planning permission may not be implemented and an alternative application may be submitted.

Whilst we broadly welcome criteria f and g of the policy, the policy would be improved by specifically referencing mitigation measures identified through the planning application process.

Change suggested by respondent:

Reference mitigation measures identified through the planning application process in the policy.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>

Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

**MIN 96 - land at Grange Farm (between Spixworth Road and Coltishall Lane), Spixworth,
Site Characteristics**

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We continue to have concerns regarding the potential impact of this allocation on heritage assets. We consider that there is insufficient historic environment evidence to justify its allocation.

Whilst we appreciate that an application is due shortly, we would still expect the preparation of a heritage impact assessment to inform the policy wording in the Local Plan, particularly, in respect of potential mitigation for the site.

Prepare a proportionate HIA now ahead of the application and EiP to consider the suitability or otherwise of the site and inform its extent and any potential heritage mitigation. The findings of the HIA would then need to inform the policy and supporting text.

In order to justify this allocation, ensure consistency with the NPPF and to make the policy wording effective, for this site we recommend an HIA is prepared now in advance of the EiP. This should provide a robust evidence base for the plan. Any evidence needs to be proportionate and need not necessarily be particularly onerous. For this site a fairly brief HIA will suffice. Our site allocations advice note <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/> provides further advice in this respect and we would be happy to discuss the matter further and advise on a suitable way forward.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are a number of designated heritage assets quite close by including a cluster of grade II listed buildings at Grange Farm, a cluster at Spixworth Hall and Meadow Farmhouse, also grade II listed. The grade I Church of St Peter and Church of the Blessed Virgin and St Andrew and the grade I listed Priory, also scheduled, both lie within the Horsham St Faiths Conservation Area to the west of the site. Minerals extraction in this location therefore has the potential to affect the setting of a number of designated heritage assets.

We note the proposed mitigation buffer to the south east boundary (shown on the map) of the site which is broadly welcomed. We do welcome criteria a, c and d.

However, given our concerns regarding the impact on a number of nearby designated assets we recommended that a Heritage Impact Assessment is completed at this stage to assess the suitability or otherwise of the allocation and extent of the site and consider any mitigation that might be necessary should the site be found suitable from a heritage perspective. The findings of the HIA would then need to inform the policy and supporting text.

Whilst we appreciate that the site is already allocated and that an application is due in 2023, we would still expect the preparation of a brief heritage impact assessment to inform the policy wording, particularly, in respect of potential mitigation for the site.

Change suggested by respondent:

We continue to recommend the preparation of a brief HIA prior to EiP to inform potential mitigation and enhancement measures which should then be incorporated into the policy wording.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>

Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

MIN 96 - land at Grange Farm (between Spixworth Road and Coltishall Lane), Spixworth, M96.14 Flood Risk:**99190****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN96 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 96 (land at Grange Farm, Spixworth):****99501****Comment****Respondent:** Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]**Summary:**

This site is located an equal distance between Spixworth and Horsham St Faith where it should be noted that the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) has preferred sites within Horsham St Faiths for residential or employment use. Whilst not adopted the draft GNLP was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in July 2021. Subsequent Hearings took place in February 2022. In addition, no reference is made to the Spixworth Neighbourhood Plan which was adopted in July 2021.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>**99151****Comment****Respondent:** Horsham St Faith & Newton St Faith parish council (Mr Jim Graves, Parish Clerk) [21843]**Summary:**

Please ensure that any further detailed applications maintain the integrity of Market Field Lane which is a popular walking route between Coltishall Lane and Spixworth Road. The Council is also concerned at the level of HGV traffic that would be using the existing crossing point on Spixworth Road which is a very busy interconnector between local villages.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99346

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

We recommend the addition of species-rich grassland to the habitats listed in section h. on the restoration goals.

Change suggested by respondent:

We recommend the addition of species-rich grassland to the habitats listed in section h. on the restoration goals.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99518

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]**Summary:**

This site is located an equal distance between Spixworth and Horsham St Faith where it should be noted that the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) has preferred sites within Horsham St Faiths for residential or employment use. Whilst not adopted the draft GNLP was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in July 2021. Subsequent Hearings took place in February 2022. In addition, no reference is made to the Spixworth Neighbourhood Plan which was adopted in July 2021.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>**MIN 6 - land off East Winch Road, Mill Drove, Middleton, M6.1 Amenity:**

99077

Object

Respondent: Peter Simmons [21571]**Summary:**

There is already a problem in Blackborough End of dust deposits from existing quarry sites on a daily basis which is unhealthy and could pose a risk to the vulnerable. This, together with the increased truck movements and subsequent emissions would make the village much worse, and make living here onerous and unhealthy and a health risk for the vulnerable; those with existing upper-respiratory track diseases.

Full text: Blackborough End is already suffering from excess dust, which deposits on all surfaces on a daily basis, from existing quarrying. Despite the distance being said to be beyond the distance at which dust is believed to be a nuisance, this is clearly not the case. White cars are a good illustration of this, becoming pale brown very quickly. Indoors there is a continuing issue with dust, which has to be cleaned off regularly, and which is an irritant for anyone with breathing difficulties or upper-respiratory track disease. Even for the healthy, a continuous intake into the lungs of this dust cannot be said to be of no consequence, and there must be damage caused, albeit at a slow rate. Since the majority of residents of Blackborough End are elderly, this should be a matter for concern. Quality of life is affected for all residents. This is the dirtiest place I have ever lived in, and was unaware until I moved that any residential area could suffer such dust pollution.

Change suggested by respondent:

Scrapped. Put people and environment before money.

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

MIN 6 - land off East Winch Road, Mill Drove, Middleton, M6.15 Flood Risk:**99196****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN6 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is King's Lynn IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 06 (land off East Winch Road, Mill Drove, Middleton):****99248****Object****Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We have no objections to the allocation of this site, which would have limited impact on designated heritage assets. However, the site will be for the extraction of carstone, a material that can be used for building stone purposes. Carstone is probably the most important building stone within the county and can be seen in historic buildings and structures of western Norfolk. It is largely quarried today for construction rather than conservation purposes, but it is essential that some extraction takes place for building stone uses and that minimal crushing of good quality carstone takes place for construction purposes.

We note from the first paragraph that the carstone deposit in this site allocation is unsuitable for building stone use. We hope this has been based on a thorough investigation of the deposit within the site and it can be clearly demonstrated that the mineral is of insufficient quality for conservation purposes. If the evidence is lacking, then Policy MIN 6 should include reference to the need for further investigation to establish the quality of the carstone deposit before extraction takes place. This might prevent good quality stone from being needlessly wasted.

In our previous response we raised the issue of exploring the possibility of an alternative site for building stone be given that that this site is of insufficient quality for use as a building stone. It is important that such stone is available for historic conservation work and also for limited use in new build where using traditional building materials can be a helpful design tool in picking up on local vernacular, character and distinctiveness in sensitive design.

Change suggested by respondent:

We continue to recommend that an alternative site for building quality Carstone is identified.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 206 (land at Oak Field, Tottenham)

99250

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

The Tottenham Row Conservation Area is located to the west of the site. Mineral extraction has the potential to impact upon the setting of the conservation area. However, there is already some former mineral extraction closer to the Conservation Area. The nearest listed building is over 1 km away.

We welcome the specific reference to the nearest heritage assets in the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

MIN 40 - land east of Grandcourt Farm, East Winch, M40.15 Flood Risk:

99202

Object

Respondent: Pauline Davies [21940]

Summary:

I live in West Norfolk, where there is an ongoing consideration as to whether the Leziat mineral extraction site should have its rights to mineral extraction extended into the East Winch area, with subsequent waste management plans. At this stage, I have been informed that 'The appeals against non-determination of the planning applications, lodged by the Applicant, are ongoing. ('31 10 22.). While the Applicant may be concerned about delays, their proposed questionable development is extremely close, within a quarter mile, to people's homes in East Winch village. Given the area's flood risk, it is remarkable that anyone or any agency would consider continuing mineral extraction activities appropriate in West Norfolk, let alone extensions of those activities.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Full representation text and flood risk map - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzy>

99180

Object

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]

Summary:

Following review, we note one allocation site which is partially within the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and therefore the Board's Byelaws apply at this site. Whilst the Board's regulatory process (as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws) is separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of any required Land Drainage Consents.

We have previously commented on the planning applications for the site area included within allocation MIN 40 at Land East of Grandcourt Farm, East Winch (C/2/2018/2016 and C/2/2018/2017). The Board's Officers are in contact with the site owner about existing discharges from their operations into the Board's critical maintained watercourse known as Middleton Stop Drain located south of Leziat Works.

Site MIN 40 may require Land Drainage Consent from the Board as outlined in the table below and this has the potential to generate conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regime.

Byelaw 3 - Discharge of water to a watercourse (treated foul or surface water) - Consent required

Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991 - Alteration of a watercourse - Consent may be required

Byelaw 10 - Works within 9 metres of a Broad maintained watercourse - Consent may be required

The Board is particularly concerned about further volumes of water being discharged from the proposed allocation site MIN 40 which could negatively affect the Board's ability to manage catchment flood risk to an acceptable standard.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

MIN 40 - land east of Grandcourt Farm, East Winch, M40.17 Water Framework Directive:

99181

Object

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]

Summary:

Regarding paragraph M40.17, it is essential that the site operator is able to contain any suspended solids arising from their activities which might be detrimental to the Board's Drainage / Flood Risk Management Infrastructure (see also Byelaw 7). The plan needs to provide further detail on the strategy for eliminating silt from entering the wider drainage network.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 40 (land east of Grandcourt Farm, East Winch):

99251

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We have previously raised concerns with this site in terms of the potential impact of on the significance and setting of the Grade II* listed church in East Winch, just 50 metres away. We welcome the inclusion of screening around the edge of the site allocation as shown on the Proposals Map, but there is no certainty that the impact on heritage assets will be properly considered.

We appreciate that an application was submitted for this site in 2018 and whilst Historic England originally objected to the proposal in August 2018 we recommended that an appropriate restoration scheme should be agreed including restoring the land opposite the church to grassland.

We note that criterion K does now refer to the field opposite the church must be restored to arable agricultural land which is welcomed. We suggest the removal of the word arable as pasture would also be acceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

We suggest the deletion of the word "arable" in criterion k.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99347

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

Due to the proximity to East Winch Common SSSI, also a Norfolk Wildlife Trust reserve, we strongly support the requirement for a hydrological assessment accompanying any application on this site. We also recommend that the proposed restoration in section k is revised to incorporate as much heathland habitat similar to East Winch Common as possible, to increase the landscape connectivity and resilience of the SSSI.

Change suggested by respondent:

We also recommend that the proposed restoration in section k is revised to incorporate as much heathland habitat similar to East Winch Common as possible, to increase the landscape connectivity and resilience of the SSSI.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

SIL01 - land at Mintlyn South, Bawsey, S1.13 Flood Risk:**99197****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

SIL01 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is King's Lynn IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy SIL01 (land at Mintlyn South, Bawsey):****99252****Object****Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

The boundaries of this area of search (AOS) are in close proximity of a number of heritage assets comprising the ruined parish church of St Michael (grade II*) and a font against the south façade of Whitehouse Farmhouse (GII).

Other non-designated assets exist and include a series of crop marks related to undated ditches and banks together with a possible Bronze Age barrow. We welcome the reference in the supporting text to nearby heritage assets and the need to provide a heritage statement and LVIA to identify appropriate mitigation with any planning application. We welcome the reference to this in the policy. We also welcome the reference to archaeology requirements in the policy and supporting text.

We welcome the reference to the listed church in the policy. We suggest that other listed structure, the font, is also referenced.

Change suggested by respondent:

Add reference to the font.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99348

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]

Summary:

During the previous consultation we highlighted that part of the proposed allocation overlaps with a woodland CWS. We strongly recommend that impacts to the CWS are avoided by excluding it from the allocation and buffering it and other CWS from indirect dust impacts.

We also note that the land use of the proposed allocation is classed as non-agricultural land, however we understand that this is likely to be incorrect as the southern part of the site has been in regular use as grazed grassland for at least twenty years, with the potential to support features of ecological significance.

Full text: During the previous consultation phase we highlighted that part of the proposed allocation overlaps with CWS 416 '70 & 100 Plantations' and recommended that these areas are safeguarded. The supporting text correctly identifies potential adverse impacts to this CWS and the adjacent CWS 418 Haverlesse Manor Plantation, but makes no attempt to safeguard these. The most appropriate way to ensure that impacts to the CWS are avoided is to exclude it from the minerals allocation, therefore we strongly recommend that CWS 416 is completely excluded from the proposed allocation. In addition, in order to safeguard from any indirect impacts to CWS from impacts such as dust, any allocation would need to include a non-worked buffer between it and both CWS.

We support the recommendations in the policy text for noise, dust, air quality and hydrology assessments which will help inform ecological assessments of potential impacts on nearby wildlife sites. We recommend that any restoration plan ensures that the existing ecological connectivity between the adjacent wildlife sites is maintained through progressive working and that restoration post-extraction complements the adjoining habitats. We also note in the supporting text that the land use of the proposed allocation is classed as non-agricultural land, however we understand that this is likely to be incorrect as the southern part of the site has been in regular use as grazed grassland for at least twenty years. This area is likely to be of ecological significance, with anecdotal records of several protected species present as well as a number of mature oak trees on the southern boundary.

Change suggested by respondent:

The most appropriate way to ensure that impacts to the 70 & 100 Plantations CWS are avoided and ensure this policy complies with policy MW1 is to exclude it from the minerals allocation, therefore we strongly recommend that CWS 416 is completely excluded from the proposed allocation. In addition, in order to safeguard from any indirect impacts to CWS from impacts such as dust, any allocation would need to include a non-worked buffer between it and both CWS. In the absence of further information on the ecological value of the grazed grassland area in the south of the current allocation, and the potential impacts on a range of protected species (and any consequent impacts on delivery) as a precaution we recommend that this part of the site is removed from the allocation.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: We wish to be able to expand on the reasons given in our comments in order to help ensure the plan is effective and avoids impacts on Norfolk's wildlife.

Attachments: None

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, Site Characteristics

99316

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel has secured planning consent (ref FUL/2019/0001) to recover approximately half of the mineral resource identified in this allocation profile. This planning consent was granted by the members of the council's planning committee, as it represented as a sustainable and logical extension to the current site utilising the processing and access infrastructure (including access arrangements) of the latter. As such 1 million tonnes of the 2 million tonne allocation already forms part of the sand and gravel landbank.

The planning consent was implemented in early 2021, and the extraction operations are within the allocation area. It is therefore proposed that the initial bullet points under the site specific content take this into account.

Norfolk Gravel would also question the need to cover the northern part of the allocation area as this is now operable. Norfolk Gravel would be happy to provide further plan work to support this aspect should the council requires

Change suggested by respondent:

Norfolk Gravel has secured planning consent (ref FUL/2019/0001) to recover approximately half of the mineral resource identified in this allocation profile. As such 1 million tonnes of the 2 million tonne allocation already forms part of the sand and gravel landbank.

The planning consent was implemented in early 2021, and the extraction operations are within the allocation area. It is therefore proposed that the initial bullet points under the site specific content take this into account.

Norfolk Gravel would also question the need to cover the northern part of the allocation area as this is now operable.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.1 Amenity:

99317

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would not disagree with the wording of paragraph M69.1 which is factual in nature but would suggest that for context the influence of the A148 on local amenity is clearly indicated as this forms part of the baseline consideration of any scheme.

Change suggested by respondent:

Norfolk Gravel would not disagree with the wording of paragraph M69.1 which is factual in nature but would suggest that for context the influence of the A148 on local amenity is clearly indicated as this forms part of the baseline consideration of any scheme.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.2 Highway access:

99318

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Regarding paragraph M69.2, this matter was subject to detailed consideration as part of the determination of application ref FUL/2019/0001, with the Local Members agreeing at the point of determination that no such upgrades were required to the junction with the A148. Norfolk Gravel would maintain that there is no need or requirement for any upgrades to this junction which has continued to operate without incident even after the recommencement of extraction activities at the site in 2021. Thus, consistent with Paragraph 110 of the NPPF 2021 it can be readily demonstrated that a "safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users", and as such it is proposed that it is not justified or necessary to include the recommendations for right turn lanes etc.

Norfolk Gravel will continue to challenge the inclusion of such wording through all phases of the plan making process.

Soundness test: not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.5 Archaeology:

99319

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Reference paragraph M69.5, as part of the recently determined planning application Norfolk Gravel, have provided geophysical investigation and trial trench evidence which has identified that whilst there are finds and features on site these are indicative of the surrounding area and as such would only have a local value or significance. These investigations have been set out in a publication report as required under planning conditions. Again, this could be added to provide context, as the report has been published.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.7

99320

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraph M69.7 although again would ask if this content needs to be updated to reflect the grant of consent FUL/2019/0001, and the issue of consent FUL/2019/0000 which related to the older area of working. It may also be worth identifying that the concrete production relates to ready-mix only, as the site no longer has the ability to manufacture precast or other block work products (same comment applying to paragraph M69.9)

Change suggested by respondent:

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraph M69.7 although again would ask if this content needs to be updated to reflect the grant of consent FUL/2019/0001, and the issue of consent FUL/2019/0000 which related to the older area of working. It may also be worth identifying that the concrete production relates to ready-mix only, as the site no longer has the ability to manufacture precast or other block work products (same comment applying to paragraph M69.9)

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.9

99321

Support

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraph M69.7 although again would ask if this content needs to be updated to reflect the grant of consent FUL/2019/0001, and the issue of consent FUL/2019/0000 which related to the older area of working. It may also be worth identifying that the concrete production relates to ready-mix only, as the site no longer has the ability to manufacture precast or other block work products (same comment applying to paragraph M69.9)

Change suggested by respondent:

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraph M69.7 although again would ask if this content needs to be updated to reflect the grant of consent FUL/2019/0001, and the issue of consent FUL/2019/0000 which related to the older area of working. It may also be worth identifying that the concrete production relates to ready-mix only, as the site no longer has the ability to manufacture precast or other block work products (same comment applying to paragraph M69.9)

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

99325

Support

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraphs M69.9 to M69.13 inclusive and would reaffirm that as part of the current planning application the company is developing long term plans to sustainably manage the biodiversity and geo-diversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>**MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.10**

99326

Support

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraphs M69.9 to M69.13 inclusive and would reaffirm that as part of the current planning application the company is developing long term plans to sustainably manage the biodiversity and geo-diversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>**MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.11**

99327

Support

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraphs M69.9 to M69.13 inclusive and would reaffirm that as part of the current planning application the company is developing long term plans to sustainably manage the biodiversity and geo-diversity. In relation to paragraph M69.11, however Norfolk Gravel would point out that rights of way diversions will be required, and some of these have already been secured as part of the working of the minerals consented under FUL/2019/0001.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.12 Ecology:**99328****Support****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraphs M69.9 to M69.13 inclusive and would reaffirm that as part of the current planning application the company is developing long term plans to sustainably manage the biodiversity and geo-diversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>**MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.13****99329****Support****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

Norfolk Gravel would wholly support the wording of paragraphs M69.9 to M69.13 inclusive and would reaffirm that as part of the current planning application the company is developing long term plans to sustainably manage the biodiversity and geo-diversity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>**MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.14****99330****Object****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

In relation to Paragraphs M69.14 - M69.16 inclusive there is no justification for the inclusion of criteria specific to these designated sites. The operations (current or proposed) have no potential whatsoever to impact on the identified SSSI's (a point recognised in the draft wording itself), and therefore it is proposed that the inclusion of such matters is neither justified nor effective.

Soundness test: not justified, not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.15**99331****Object****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

In relation to Paragraphs M69.14 - M69.16 inclusive there is no justification for the inclusion of criteria specific to these designated sites. The operations (current or proposed) have no potential whatsoever to impact on the identified SSSI's (a point recognised in the draft wording itself), and therefore it is proposed that the inclusion of such matters is neither justified nor effective.

Soundness test: not justified, not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>**MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.16****99332****Object****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

In relation to Paragraphs M69.14 - M69.16 inclusive there is no justification for the inclusion of criteria specific to these designated sites. The operations (current or proposed) have no potential whatsoever to impact on the identified SSSI's (a point recognised in the draft wording itself), and therefore it is proposed that the inclusion of such matters is neither justified nor effective.

Soundness test: not justified, not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.18

99333

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

In relation to Paragraphs M69.14 - M69.16 inclusive there is no justification for the inclusion of criteria specific to these designated sites. The operations (current or proposed) have no potential whatsoever to impact on the identified SSSI's (a point recognised in the draft wording itself), and therefore it is proposed that the inclusion of such matters is neither justified nor effective. The same comments also apply to Paragraph M69.18.

Soundness test: not justified, not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.19 Geodiversity:

99322

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

This paragraph relates to matters of geodiversity, and whilst Norfolk Gravel are under a current obligation for a watching brief for the current extension, it does not follow that this would be required for the remainder of site M69. If the current watching brief and annual reporting requirement doesn't identify any features of particular merit or significance, then there may be no need to continue arrangements. Instead of using the word "essential" in the ninth sentence, Norfolk Gravel would merely suggest that the wording "potentially be required" to take account of this occurrence.

Change suggested by respondent:

Instead of using the word "essential" in the ninth sentence, Norfolk Gravel would merely suggest that the wording "potentially be required" to take account of this occurrence.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 69 - land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton, M69.20 Flood Risk:**99191****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN69 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 69 (land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton):****99323****Comment****Respondent:** Norfolk Gravel [21953]**Agent:** David L Walker Ltd (Mr D Walker) [8004]**Summary:**

On the wording of Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 69 (land north of Holt Road, Aylmerton) Norfolk Gravel would re iterate the same points as above, and would comment as follows:-

- criteria d is proposed to be simplified, with any requirements to upgrade the nearby highway removed;
- the need for criteria e is questioned as the stand off is already significant due to the provision of advance planting that would remain in situ;
- under criteria j instead of using the word "necessary" the council could use the wording "need to be maintained" as the advance planting is already installed;

• it is suggested that criteria o be split into two, one aspect related to footpaths and the other related to interpretation boards. Again, however it is questioned why such content needs to be included when it already forms part of the conditions and obligations under consent ref FUL/2019/0001.

A key aspect for the remainder of the allocation area would be to continue to maintain a very high quality restoration scheme for both the existing site, and proposed extension, with an emphasis on nature conservation habitat (specifically heathland), with improved public access, better access to geo-diversity and retention of exposures wherever possible; together with information boards (conveying information about the ecology, geology and geomorphology of the site). The provision of permissive routes through the restoration landform would also be continued to be considered by Norfolk Gravel as part of any future development scheme.

In general terms the company supports the allocation of site MIN69, with the above intended to provide greater context and content for the allocation profile.

Change suggested by respondent:

- criteria d is proposed to be simplified, with any requirements to upgrade the nearby highway removed;
- the need for criteria e is questioned as the stand off is already significant due to the provision of advance planting that would remain in situ;
- under criteria j instead of using the word "necessary" the council could use the wording "need to be maintained" as the advance planting is already installed;
- it is suggested that criteria o be split into two, one aspect related to footpaths and the other related to interpretation boards. Again, however it is questioned why such content needs to be included when it already forms part of the conditions and obligations under consent ref FUL/2019/0001.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To reinforce the above representation or provide new content where applicable.**Attachments:** Dan Walker for Norfolk Gravel submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmn>

MIN 115 - land at Lord Anson's Wood, near North Walsham, M115.17 Flood Risk:**99192****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN115 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>**Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 115 (land at Lord Anson's Wood, near North Walsham):****99099****Object****Respondent:** Mr Andrew Bluss [18422]**Summary:**

My primary concern is with MIN 115 (Lord Anson's Wood, North Walsham). As stated in my previous submission of representation, the impact on the environment alone would be catastrophic!! The acreage of trees that would be destroyed, the associated wildlife that thrives in such a diverse ecosystem. Our own food chain relies on these creatures. From the tiniest of insects to the bees that pollinate our crops to the birds that grace our skies. All would be lost just so we can put a hole in the ground, remove what lies beneath and, when finished in a relatively small timespan, leave it a condition that is beyond the environmental repair that took millennia to create. Planting a few saplings as a token effort of appeasement is nowhere near sufficient.

Then there is the the question of the pollution caused, not just from the extraction and removal process involving hundreds of lorries using our narrow country roads but also the building of the plant in the first instance. Mud during the wet seasons! Dust during the dry seasons! Noise from the mining equipment! These are just three examples of what is going to happen despite anything the proposers of this site will say. They do not have to live here. I, and my neighbours, will have to endure all this!

We then have to address the facts that the location is of nationally historic interest. With the site of the Battle of North Walsham plus the crash site of a World War II aircraft plus any other archaeological items from antiquity that are still to be unearthed.

There are other similar mineral rich veins within and around the United Kingdom that could be removed without causing the disturbance this proposal will. I totally object!!

Soundness test: not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Simple - Go elsewhere!

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99147

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Brzeczek [21922]**Summary:**

I refer to the current Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan and in particular the land known as Lord Ansons Wood, North Walsham Road, Skeyton, reference in the plan MIN115, which has been ear marked as a possible site for the extraction of gravel.

I would point out that the roads around this site are no more than country lanes narrow in the most part with verges, banks, hedges and trees and are unsuitable for use by the large lorries which will be required to transport any gravel from the site. Should two of these meet they will be unable to pass. Should one of these lorries meet a car then it is likely one of the vehicles will have to mount a verge or bank causing damage to these and any growing vegetation or trees. Further there is no suitable exit or entrance into the site because of poor visibility.

Further the site is within an area of woodland and extraction of minerals at this site will do untold damage to the woodland and wildlife which inhabit these woods.

For these reasons I believe it would be wrong to include Lord Ansons Wood in the plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99254

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We welcome the reference in paragraph M115.3 and 115.5 to the nearby heritage assets and the need to provide a heritage statement to identify appropriate mitigation with any planning application. We welcome the reference to a heritage statement in the policy as well as reference to nearby heritage assets. We also welcome the reference to archaeology requirements in the policy and supporting text.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Yes**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99429

Comment

Respondent: Natural England (Miss Emma Hurrell, Lead Adviser) [21912]**Summary:**

Paragraph c. of Specific Site Allocation Policy Min 115, states that there is a requirement for, "an acceptable full biodiversity survey and report, including bat and badger surveys." It is unclear why protected species surveys have been requested specifically for this site. It should be emphasised that protected species surveys will be required at any of the allocated sites where it is likely that a protected species is present. We would recommend reference to our standing advice [<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-how-to-review-planning-applications>] of protected species.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Natural England submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmg>

99217

Support

Respondent: Westwick Farming Partnership [21944]**Agent:** Savills (Mr Mark Little, Head of Norwich Office) [21945]**Summary:**

As agent to the Westwick Farming Partnership, the owners of land outlined within MIN115, I confirm support for the continued inclusion of this area within the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**MIN 207 - land at Pinkney Field, Briston, M207.13 Flood Risk:**

99193

Comment

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN207 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 207 (land at Pinkney Field, Briston):**99255****Object****Respondent:** Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]**Summary:**

We understand from the Council that planning permission has now been granted for this site and to that end the principle of development has been established.

Nevertheless, it is still important for the policy to set out an appropriate policy framework for the protection of the historic environment as the extant planning permission may not be implemented and an alternative application may be submitted.

In order to make this policy effective, we recommend that the policy would be improved by specifically referencing mitigation measures identified through the planning application process.

This site is located within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. The nearest listed building is the grade II* remains of the church of St Peter and St Paul and the nearest scheduled monument is the Castle Hill Medieval ringwork at Hunworth. We have concerns regarding this site given its location within the conservation area.

We understand that this site now has planning permission and to that end the principle of development has been established. Nevertheless, it is still important for the policy to set out an appropriate policy framework for the protection of the historic environment as the extant planning permission may not be implemented and an alternative application may be submitted.

Whilst we broadly welcome criteria e, f and g of the policy, the policy would be improved by specifically referencing mitigation measures identified through the planning application process.

Change suggested by respondent:

Reference mitigation measures identified through the planning application process in the policy.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

MIN 208 - land south of Holt Road, East Beckham, M208.14 Flood Risk:**99194****Comment****Respondent:** King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]**Summary:**

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN208 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Norfolk Rivers IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 208 (land south of Holt Road, East Beckham):

99256

Comment

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, there are a number of grade II listed buildings to the south of the site and the Upper Sheringham Conservation Area and Sheringham Hall registered park and garden lies to the north of the site.

We welcome the reference in paragraph M208.3 - 208.5 to the nearby heritage assets and the need to provide a heritage statement to identify appropriate mitigation with any planning application. We welcome the reference to this in the policy including specific reference to heritage assets. We also welcome the reference to archaeology requirements in the policy and supporting text.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Yes

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>
Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, Site Characteristics

99383

Object

Respondent: Mrs Eve Basford [17842]

Summary:

plan is to take gravel only and leave sand which will increase noise and dust as it is sorted.

Breedon presentation estimated that the Haddiscoe site will only produce 0.65m tonnes and would argue the need for such a small amount unnecessary

Change suggested by respondent:

this site should not be considered

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99367

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]

Summary:

MP1 States that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix1), so the Haddiscoe site M25 could be removed all together from the plan and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4 - 1.3 = 14.1 less 12.6m assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation in June 2022 estimated that the site would only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. I would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe Site M25 entirely. This is unsound and not justified.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99397

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

MP1 States that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix1), so the Haddiscoe site M25 could be removed all together from the plan and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4 - 1.3 = 14.1 less 12.6m assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

M25 - The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation in June 2022 estimated that the site would only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. I would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe Site M25 entirely. This is unsound and not justified.

Soundness test: not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99095

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

M25. The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation on the 16.06.22 estimated that the Haddiscoe site will only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. We would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe site entirely. This is unsound and not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Because I'm a concerned parishoner.

Attachments: None

99098

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

MSO6 states "To ensure the sustainable and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the natural, built and historic environments and mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts" One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for housing allocation in the Greater Norwich Development plan, which includes four sites adjacent to the A143 in the middle of the village. If some or all of these sites are adopted, then the timeframes will overlap and there is the potential for two major construction sites working either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: As a concerned parishoner I wish to attend

Attachments: None

99093

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

MP1 states that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix 1), so the Haddiscoe site (MIN 25) could be removed altogether and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4m – 1.3m= 14.1m less 12.6m), assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99384

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

MP1 states that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix 1), so the Haddiscoe site (MIN 25) could be removed altogether and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4m – 1.3m= 14.1m less 12.6m), assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

M25. The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation on the 16.06.22 estimated that the Haddiscoe site will only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. We would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe site entirely. This is unsound and not justified.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99403

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

MP1 States that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix 1), so the Haddiscoe site M25 could be removed all together from the plan and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4 - 1.3 = 14.1 less 12.6m assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

M25 The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation in June 2022 estimated that the site would only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. I would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe Site M25 entirely.

This is unsound and not justified.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99097

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]**Summary:**

MSO6 states "To ensure the sustainable and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the natural, built and historic environments and mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts" One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for housing allocation in the Greater Norwich Development plan, which includes four sites adjacent to the A143 in the middle of the village. If some or all of these sites are adopted, then the timeframes will overlap and there is the potential for two major construction sites working either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** Because I am a concerned parishioner**Attachments:** None

99096

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]**Summary:**

M25. The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation on the 16.06.22 estimated that the Haddiscoe site will only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. We would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe site entirely. This is unsound and not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** Because I am a concerned Parishioner**Attachments:** None

99094

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]**Summary:**

MP1 states that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix 1), so the Haddiscoe site (MIN 25) could be removed altogether and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4m – 1.3m= 14.1m less 12.6m), assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** Because I am a concerned Parishioner and wish to attend the hearing**Attachments:** None

99441

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Kennedy [18724]**Summary:**

M25 The Haddiscoe site was included to be 1.3 m tonnes, the Breeden presentation on 16/6/22 estimated that this site would only produce 0.65 m tonnes so its removal would have even less impact on your own overall plan. It could also be argued that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe site entirely.

Soundness test: Not justified and not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove the Haddiscoe proposed pit completely as it is unsound, unjust, and unfair!!

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Nicholas Kennedy submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmq>

99506

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

MP1 states that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix 1), so the Haddiscoe site (MIN 25) could be removed altogether and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes (15.4m – 1.3m= 14.1m less 12.6m), assuming that all other sites are approved. The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

M25. The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breeden presentation on the 16.06.22 estimated that the Haddiscoe site will only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. We would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe site entirely. This is unsound and not justified.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breeden planning application.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.

Attachments: Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.1**Amenity:**

99371

Object

Respondent: Mrs Eve Basford [17842]**Summary:**

More residential properties within 250m than any other site for consideration. Noise dust and light pollution etc will affect these properties the most.

Change suggested by respondent:

Why only set operations back 100m if impact is common up to 250m? should be a lot further away from the centre of the village.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99356

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]**Summary:**

The proximity of the site to a large number RESIDENTIAL dwellings (PEOPLES HOMES) which are within 250m of the proposed site. The site is right in the middle of the village, which I believe is contrary to you Mineral Strategic Objectives MS07 which states that the potential impact on the amenity of residents adjacent to the site are effectively minimised ,controlled and mitigated.to "acceptable levels ???". Currently nuisance noise from agricultural vehicles can be heard but fortunately this is on an infrequent basis during sowing and harvest times.

Air quality - Mineral extractions should be located, designed and operated to ensure no unacceptable impact on air quality.

Because the proposed site is so close to the Village under certain conditions modelling has confirmed that the impact of MIN25 will affect up 2/3rds of the Village.

Because of the Rural location of the Village there currently is minimal light pollution. The site is at one of the highest points of the village and during winter months and given the proposed operational hours of the site this is unacceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99390

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

M25 - 1 Objections

The proximity of the site to a large number RESIDENTIAL dwellings (PEOPLES HOMES) which are within 250m of the proposed site. The site is right in the middle of the village, which I believe is contrary to you Mineral Strategic Objectives MS07 which states that the potential impact on the amenity of residents adjacent to the site are effectively minimised ,controlled and mitigated.to "acceptable levels ???". Currently nuisance noise from agricultural vehicles can be heard but fortunately this is on an infrequent basis during sowing and harvest times

Air quality - Mineral extractions should be located, designed and operated to ensure no unacceptable impact on air quality

Because the proposed site is so close to the Village under certain conditions modelling has confirmed that the impact of MIN25 will affect up 2/3rds of the Village

Because of the Rural location of the Village there currently is minimal light pollution. The site is at one of the highest points of the village and during winter months and given the proposed operational hours of the site this is unacceptable.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99173

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]**Summary:**

Contrary to section 2.4 the proposal does not address light pollution in winter months.

The site is at one of the highest elevations in the village.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99174

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]**Summary:**

The MIN 25 site is located in the middle of a village impacting on a larger population than any other proposed site. With ref to MS07 stating "To ensure potential impact on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels".

Soundness test: Not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99116

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Downing [21920]**Summary:**

M25.1 Contrasting with all the sites, the MIN25 will be located central to the village and will have the highest number of residential properties within 250 m of the proposed workings. The other sites have 20 residential properties within a 250 m area. We note this is with the exception of MIN 40 which is an extension of an existing quarry. The extension to MIN40 is a real concern as Haddiscoe could potentially have the same adverse decision and problem with a never-ending workings in the middle of the village and residential area which could desecrate and violate the village. This contradicts the Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular, MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals developments are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels".

Soundness test: Not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Nicholas Downing submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmd>

99086

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

M25.1 Of all the Allocated sites, MIN25 has by far and away the highest number of residential properties within 250 m of the proposed workings (with the exception of MIN40 which is an extension of an existing quarry). All of the other sites have less than 20 residential properties within 250 m of the proposed working area. The MIN25 site, unlike more suitable locations, is right in the middle of a village. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels". This is unsound and not effect

M25.1 does not address light pollution on in the winter months, at one of the highest elevations in the village. This is contrary to Section 2.4 of this document. This is unsound and not positively prepared.

The allocation of this site is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** As a concerned parishioner I wish to attend.**Attachments:** None

99378

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]

Summary:

M25.1 Of all the allocated sites, MIN25 has by far and away the highest number of residential properties within 250 m of the proposed workings at 55 properties (with the exception of MIN40 which is an extension of an existing quarry). All of the other sites have less than 20 residential properties within 250 m of the proposed working area. The MIN25 site, unlike more suitable locations, is right in the middle of a village. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels". Air Quality: 3.18 states that "Mineral extractions and associated development should be located, designed and operated to ensure no unacceptable impacts on Air Quality". This is unsound and not effective.

M25.1 does not address light pollution in the winter months, at one of the highest elevations in the village. This is contrary to Section 2.4 of this document. This is unsound and not positively prepared.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99392

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]

Summary:

We wish to make objections to the proposed NW&WLP specific to the site at Crab Apple Lane Haddiscoe ref M25

M25 - 1 Objections

The proximity of the site to a large number RESIDENTIAL dwellings (PEOPLES HOMES) which are within 250m of the proposed site.

The site is right in the middle of the village, which I believe is contrary to you Mineral Strategic Objectives MS07 which states that the potential impact on the amenity of residents adjacent to the site are effectively minimised, controlled and mitigated to "acceptable levels ???". Currently nuisance noise from agricultural vehicles can be heard but fortunately this is on an infrequent basis during sowing and harvest times

Air quality - Mineral extractions should be located, designed and operated to ensure no unacceptable impact on air quality

Because the proposed site is so close to the Village under certain conditions modelling has confirmed that the impact of MIN25 will affect up 2/3rds of the Village

Because of the Rural location of the Village there currently is minimal light pollution. The site is at one of the highest points of the village and during winter months and given the proposed operational hours of the site this is unacceptable

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99085

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]**Summary:**

M25.1 Of all the Allocated sites, MIN25 has by far and away the highest number of residential properties within 250 m of the proposed workings (with the exception of MIN40 which is an extension of an existing quarry). All of the other sites have less than 20 residential properties within 250 m of the proposed working area. The MIN25 site, unlike more suitable locations, is right in the middle of a village. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MSO7 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels". This is unsound and not effective

M25.1 does not address light pollution in the winter months, at one of the highest elevations in the village. This is contrary to Section 2.4 of this document. This is unsound and not positively prepared

The allocation of this site is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

Omit this site from the plan

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** Because as a parishioner of this village, I want to attend the hearing**Attachments:** None

99107

Object

Respondent: Mr Lee Howell [21914]**Summary:**

M25.1 - The impact this proposal has on Village life with many properties being effected is not Fair and Just.

This is an elevated site over Haddiscoe, Light pollution during winter months is a concern as well as the dust and noise issues that will evolve from this site being so close to village life.

Is consideration being given to the Mental Health and Wellbeing of the residents of the village that this potential extraction site will bring?

Soundness test: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively prepared.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Lee Howell submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm7>

99103

Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Johnson [21918]**Summary:**

M25.1 Does not address the matter of light pollution we benefit from 'dark skies' in this area where the night sky can be enjoyed the year round. The proposed site is central, very close to residents and is at one of the highest points in the village. I believe this to be contrary to section 2.4 of the document. Therefore, I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

M25.1 Of all sites MIN25 has the highest amount of residential properties with in 250m of the proposed quarry the other sites having less than 20 within the same 250m. The proposed quarry is right in the middle of our Village is contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives. MS07 state 'to ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled minimised & mitigated to acceptable levels. Therefore, I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

Soundness tests: Not justified, not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

The application should be rejected in full

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Christopher Johnson submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmw>

99438

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Kennedy [18724]**Summary:**

M25.1 Looking at it, MIN25 has by far the highest number of residential properties within 250 metres of the site. All other proposed sites have less than 20 properties. Why? This goes against your own minerals strategic objectives which states it ensures potential impacts on those people living in proximity to the development are controlled, minimised, and mitigated to acceptable levels. This is unsound!

M25.1 Also does not address anything in regard to light pollution especially in winter months. The area nominated is actually the highest elevation within the village. This again is unsound and not prepared well.

Soundness test: Not justified and not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove the Haddiscoe proposed pit completely as it is unsound, unjust, and unfair!!

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Nicholas Kennedy submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmq>

99442

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Kennedy [18724]**Summary:**

MSO6 states "to ensure the sustainable and expedient delivery of mineral extraction whilst protecting people from harm and mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts". Once such cumulative impact is the call for sites for housing allocation in the Greater Norwich development plan. This includes 4 sites in and around A143 and the middle of the village. If some or all of them approved, the timeframes proposed would overlap each other having the potential for at least 2 major construction sites working at either end of the village working at the same time. This is frankly ridiculous, unsound, and ineffective.

Soundness test: Not justified and not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove the Haddiscoe proposed pit completely as it is unsound, unjust, and unfair!!

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Nicholas Kennedy submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmq>

99299

Object

Respondent: Mr Ray Long [19722]**Summary:**

M25.1 Light pollution, Section 2.4. As this proposed site will no doubt contain valuable plant machinery it will have to be lit after working hours for security purposes. This will provide what i could only imagine light pollution akin to Blackpool illuminations!! I enjoy the lack of industrial light in this village and i can only imagine what it would be like for the poor residents living next door to this light show.

Soundness test: Not Justified and Not Positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

M25.1. Security lighting only to be illuminated for a maximum of 15 seconds in hours of darkness on site.

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Ray Long submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmh>

99153

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Holiday Properties (Mr Sascha Tucker, Managing Director) [21924]**Summary:**

M25.1 The Haddiscoe site has the largest number of residential properties close to the proposal.

M25.1 There is no mention of addressing light pollution, which is an issue particularly in the Winter months.

Soundness test: Not consistent with National Policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Based on the projections, Haddiscoe does not seem to be required. Together with the negative impacts on the area and local economy it should not be considered.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Norfolk Holiday Properties submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm5>

99302

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

M25.1 Of all the allocated sites, MIN25 has by far and away the highest number of residential properties within 250 m of the proposed workings at 55 properties (with the exception of MIN40 which is an extension of an existing quarry). All of the other sites have less than 20 residential properties within 250 m of the proposed working area. The MIN25 site, unlike more suitable locations, is right in the middle of a village. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels". Air Quality: 3.18 states that "Mineral extractions and associated development should be located, designed and operated to ensure no unacceptable impacts on Air Quality". With the proximity to the village and with certain wind strengths and directions, Stopit 2 modelling has confirmed that the impact of MIN25 will extend to impact up to two thirds of the village (104 properties). Consequently the Stopit 2 association represents over 200 parishioners and only 3% are in favour of the proposal. This is unsound and not effective.

M25.1 does not address light pollution in the winter months, at one of the highest elevations in the village. This is contrary to Section 2.4 of this document. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breedon planning application .

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.**Attachments:** Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

99207

Object

Respondent: Windmill Cottage Kennels (Miss Helen Gough) [17772]**Summary:**

The proposed plan for MIN 25 has far more residential properties than other sites, other than maybe one exception. I believe that light pollution especially during winter has not been taken into account and addressed and also this proposed site would have far more detrimental effects on the village in comparison to other potential sites.

Soundness test: Not Effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.2**Highway access:**

99372

Object

Respondent: Mrs Eve Basford [17842]**Summary:**

Allegedly lorries will be using the B1136, but increasing HGV traffic on a road where oncoming lorries often to have to slow to standstill to pass in opposite directions should not be encouraged. Also Crab Apple Lane floods near a patch of hard standing and has done so for many years with no action to remedy it.

Change suggested by respondent:

much fewer journeys

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99388

Object

Respondent: Mrs Clare Beatwell [21962]**Summary:**

M25.2 The site at Crab Apple lane (opposite my quiet and idyllic family home) describes 80+ HGV movements per day. I attended the Breedon presentation on the 16.06.22, it was explained these HGV trucks will transport the processed gravel to numerous sites over the county, massively increasing the overall traffic in the village. My families main concern is the danger associated on Crab Apple lane itself. I use Crab Apple lane several times (at least 4 times) every day (mainly by car and in the summer on foot) to take my children to the local school and nursery, this lane is only wide enough for 1 car and there are no layby's for passing. The busy road to Hales B1136 would definitely not be possible to reverse out onto. How exactly am I supposed to continue to use this road safely if the proposed plan was to go ahead!!? Also this week in the cold icy weather I have seen 2 trucks (one a milk lorry and one pig feed truck) slide down Crab Apple lane on the ice as this is quite a steep hill that is ungritted by the council. The biggest of these trucks actually smashed through my gate and hedgerow, I have 2 small children so I am very worried. This surely proves this small road is not suitable for large heavy trucks and me attempting to pass them daily would put my family at considerable risk. This Local plan proposed in the middle of a village is unsound and not positively prepared.

A traffic, highways and safety assessment needs to be completed, I'm sure this would prove that the site is completely unsafe to go ahead.

Change suggested by respondent:

A traffic, highways and safety assessment needs to be completed, I'm sure this would prove that the site is completely unsafe to go ahead.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99358

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]**Summary:**

M25 - 2 Objections

80 Vehicle movements per day - if processed gravel is transported from the Norton site to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft, then these additional 80 HGV movements will add considerably to the overall traffic movements through the Village.

The roads through the village are single track and heavily used and therefore the approval of the Crab Apple Lane site will severely impact on the safety of Villagers.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99368

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]**Summary:**

MS06 - This states "To ensure the sustainability and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the Natural, Built and Historic environments and mitigating against adverse cumulative impacts" One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for Housing Allocation in the Greater Norwich Development Plan which includes 4 sites adjacent to the A143 in the Centre of Haddiscoe. If any or all of these were to be adopted then the time frames will overlap and there is potential for 2 major construction sites ongoing at either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99391

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

M25 - 2 Objections

80 Vehicle movements per day - if processed gravel is transported from the Norton site to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft, then these additional 80 HGV movements will add considerably to the overall traffic movements through the Village.

The roads through the village are single track and heavily used and therefore the approval of the Crab Apple Lane site will severely impact on the safety of Villagers.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99399

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

MS06

This states "To ensure the sustainability and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the Natural, Built and Historic environments and mitigating against adverse cumulative impacts" One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for Housing Allocation in the Greater Norwich Development Plan which includes 4 sites adjacent to the A143 in the Centre of Haddiscoe. If any or all of these were to be adopted then the time frames will overlap and there is potential for 2 major construction sites ongoing at either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99178

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]**Summary:**

M25.2 The proposed 80 HGV movements per day does not take into consideration any HGV movements through Haddiscoe from Norton to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft adding huge strain on an already heavily used road through Haddiscoe Dam which sees tailbacks into the village even without this added HGV movement.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99179

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]**Summary:**

There is potentially development of housing through Greater Norwich Development Plan, on land adjacent to A 143 in the middle of the village. If time frames for development of some or all the 4 proposed sites overlap with MIN 25 construction, this would lead to even more disruption and traffic congestion right through the middle of our already congested main road through the village.

Soundness test: Not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99087

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

M25.2 describes 80 HGV movements per day but if the processed gravel is to be transported from Norton to Gt Yarmouth or Lowestoft, further HGV movements through Haddiscoe will add considerably to the overall traffic count. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Because I'm a concerned parishoner and I wish to attend.

Attachments: None

99380

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

M25.2 describes 80 HGV movements per day but if the processed gravel is to be transported from Norton to Gt Yarmouth or Lowestoft, further HGV movements through Haddiscoe will add considerably to the overall traffic count. Inevitably, not all of these 80 plus HGV movements will be directly between the Breedon Quarry at Norton Subcourse and Crab Apple lane in Haddiscoe (e.g. HGVs on route from other drop offs to Gt Yarmouth or Lowestoft). The roads through the village of Haddiscoe are single track and already heavily used. Without restrictions on the 80 plus additional Breedon HGVs travelling though the village of Haddiscoe, the approval of the Crab Apple Lane site will adversely impact the safety of villagers. Additionally, Crab Apple Lane itself is a single track road, with no way to pass a lorry and no option to reverse onto the busy B1136. Last week there was an accident on this road junction as a lorry was unable to stop driving straight through a fence and hedge. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99386

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

MSO6 states "To ensure the sustainable and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the natural, built and historic environments and mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts". One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for housing allocation in the Greater Norwich Development plan, which includes four sites adjacent to the A143 in the middle of Haddiscoe village. If some or all of these sites are adopted, then the timeframes will overlap and there is the potential for two major construction sites working either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99396

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

M25 - 2 Objections

80 Vehicle movements per day - if processed gravel is transported from the Norton site to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft, then these additional 80 HGV movements will add considerably to the overall traffic movements through the Village.

The roads through the village are single track and heavily used and therefore the approval of the Crab Apple Lane site will severely impact on the safety of Villagers

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99404

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

MS06 - This states "To ensure the sustainability and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the Natural, Built and Historic environments and mitigating against adverse cumulative impacts" One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for Housing Allocation in the Greater Norwich Development Plan which includes 4 sites adjacent to the A143 in the Centre of Haddiscoe. If any or all of these were to be adopted then the time frames will overlap and there is potential for 2 major construction sites ongoing at either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system.

This is unsound and ineffective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99088

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]**Summary:**

M25.2 describes 80 HGV movements per day but if the processed gravel is to be transported from Norton to Gt Yarmouth or Lowestoft, further HGV movements through Haddiscoe will add considerably to the overall traffic count. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** Because I am a concerned Parishioner and I wish to attend**Attachments:** None

99109

Object

Respondent: Mr Lee Howell [21914]**Summary:**

The proposed additional movement of traffic through the village of Haddiscoe is not fair on local residents. The Haddiscoe to Hales Rd, is already congested and as it is an undulating section of road additional lorries turning into and out of Crab Apple Lane will be extremely hazardous to other road users.

Soundness Test: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Lee Howell submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm7>

99102

Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Johnson [21918]**Summary:**

M25.2 says 80 HGV movements per day back & forth to Norton this will lead to considerably more overall traffic on our small & very busy roads. Therefore, I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

MS06 'to ensure the sustainable & expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm positively contributing to the natural built & historic environments & mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts'. The Greater Norwich Development plan includes sites adjacent to A143 in the middle of Haddiscoe village if any or all of these sites are approved the resulting time frames would overlap giving the potential of multiply construction sites/developments in and around the village at the same time. this would lead to extreme disruption in what is already a very congested road system. I therefore believe this unsound unjustified & ineffective.

Soundness tests: Not justified, not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

The application should be rejected in full.

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Christopher Johnson submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmw>

99440

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Kennedy [18724]**Summary:**

M25.2 Describes 80 HGV movements a day but if the gravel is to be transported from Norton to Great Yarmouth or Lowestoft, further HGV movements will be added and will have to travel through Haddiscoe adding to the already considerable overall traffic count, again this is unsound and incorrectly prepared.

Soundness test: Not justified and not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove the Haddiscoe proposed pit completely as it is unsound, unjust, and unfair!!

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Nicholas Kennedy submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmq>

99301

Object

Respondent: Mr Ray Long [19722]**Summary:**

M25.2

HGV movements. Crab Apple Lane on which these movements will start is a well used single track road. No regard has been demonstrated for safe lay by and passing places for villagers and other users including walkers to be safe whilst on this road. The soft verges will not allow HGVS to pull over so we have the potential of cars backing out onto the main B1136 which would be extremely dangerous.

As well as this the amount of dust and gravel debris left by these movements would cause other hazards to vehicles and especially cyclists.

Can we guarantee that roads are swept every day?

I imagine not!

Soundness test: Not Justified and Not Positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

M25.2. Lay bys and passing places to be correctly constructed on Crab Apple Lane to facilitate the safe passing of cars, walkers and cyclists from the hgv,s leaving the site and correct daily cleaning of all roads effected by hgvs leaving site debri in all weather conditions.

And I will end with the main fact that it is simply morally wrong to dig a gravel pit next door to a beautiful quiet village!!

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Ray Long submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmh>

99154

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Holiday Properties (Mr Sascha Tucker, Managing Director) [21924]**Summary:**

M25.2 80 HGV movements per day is significant for a rural location which does not usually experience a fraction of that. The surrounding infrastructure consists of narrow lanes unsuitable for such activity.

Soundness test: Not consistent with National Policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Based on the projections, Haddiscoe does not seem to be required. Together with the negative impacts on the area and local economy it should not be considered.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Norfolk Holiday Properties submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm5>

99490

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

M25.2 describes 80 HGV movements per day but if the processed gravel is to be transported from Norton to Gt Yarmouth or Lowestoft, further HGV movements through Haddiscoe will add considerably to the overall traffic count. Inevitably, not all of these 80 plus HGV movements will be directly between the Breedon Quarry at Norton Subcourse and Crab Apple lane in Haddiscoe (e.g. HGVs on route from other drop offs to Gt Yarmouth or Lowestoft). The roads through the village of Haddiscoe are single track and already heavily used. Without restrictions on the 80 plus additional Breedon HGVs travelling through the village of Haddiscoe, the approval of the Crab Apple Lane site will adversely impact the safety of villagers. Additionally, Crab Apple Lane itself is a single track road, with no way to pass a lorry and no option to reverse onto the busy B1136. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breedon planning application .

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.**Attachments:** Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

99504

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

MSO6 states "To ensure the sustainable and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the natural, built and historic environments and mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts". One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for housing allocation in the Greater Norwich Development plan, which includes four sites adjacent to the A143 in the middle of Haddiscoe village. If some or all of these sites are adopted, then the timeframes will overlap and there is the potential for two major construction sites working either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breedon planning application.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.**Attachments:** Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

99208

Object

Respondent: Windmill Cottage Kennels (Miss Helen Gough) [17772]**Summary:**

The policy in respect to paragraph M25.2 estimates 80 HGV movements per day. This will add considerable traffic count through the village if as well as this the processed gravel is also taken into account, the roads around the village would be adversely affected.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.4**99489****Object****Respondent:** Mr Anthony Burton [17822]**Summary:**

I also believe that the location of the site will have a visual impact on the Grade 1 Listed St Marys Church as well as noise ,light and dust pollution which will affect services, weddings ,funerals and the general tranquilly of the church grounds.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>**99395****Object****Respondent:** Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

I also believe that the location of the site will have a visual impact on the Grade 1 Listed St Marys Church as well as noise ,light and dust pollution which will affect services ,weddings ,funerals and the general tranquilly of the church grounds

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>**99407****Object****Respondent:** Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

We also believe that the location of the site will have a visual impact on the Grade 1 Listed St Marys Church as well as noise, light and dust pollution which will affect services ,weddings ,funerals and the general tranquillity of the church grounds

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.8**99375****Object****Respondent:** Mrs Eve Basford [17842]**Summary:**

The former Parish gravel pit is used as a recreational area for children to play, there is a playground at village hall which means children on this side of village have to cross A143, dangerous for adults. No attempt at any boundary hedge has been planted here.

This does not comply with MW1 to Protect Public Open Space, Green Space and as a play area could permit children to access the workings.

Change suggested by respondent:

not appropriate to be so close to village centre, any gravel workings should be further away

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**99408****Object****Respondent:** Mr Oliver Beatwell [21964]**Summary:**

M25.8 describes "a small disused mineral working" on the Eastern boundary. This piece of green open land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe and is used by my children for playing. This land and the footpaths that run over the proposed site are also used by my family and many others. The massive increase in traffic, nuisance of noise and dust to us parishioners also poses a risk to children that play and could stray out into a working quarry. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels" It is also at odds with your own Policy MW1 which is supposed to protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities."

These green and natural open spaces are vital for both peoples health, wellbeing and the environment and this has not been considered so is unsound and not positively prepared.

Soundness test: Not Positively Prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99360

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]**Summary:**

M25-8 Objections

The Disused Quarry at the Eastern Boundary of the proposed site is now a Natural Haven for wildlife and is used by Dog Walkers and Children Playing and making Dens in the Woods, and Villagers who just want a tranquil area to walk and relax.

This will now be next to the Site and as such tranquillity will be a thing of the past and a potential danger to children who may inadvertently stray out of the area and onto the site.

Again this would appear to contravene MS07

This also disagrees with your own Policy MW1 to protect Public Space ,Green areas and Local green Space and Public Rights of way.

I currently Frequently use the Public Footpath which bi-sects the site again this will be a loss of amenity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99393

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

M25-8 Objections

The Disused Quarry at the Eastern Boundary of the proposed site is now a Natural Haven for wildlife and is used by Dog Walkers and Children Playing and making Dens in the Woods, and Villagers who just want a tranquil area to walk and relax

This will now be next to the Site and as such tranquillity will be a thing of the past and a potential danger to children who may inadvertently stray out of the area and onto the site.

Again this would appear to contravene MS07

This also disagrees with your own Policy MW1 to protect Public Space ,Green areas and Local green Space and Public Rights of way

I currently Frequently use the Public Footpath which bi-sects the site again this will be a loss of amenity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99175

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]**Summary:**

This is "a small disused mineral working" which is mentioned in M25.8 owned by Parish Council and used for recreational purposes where dog walkers go, and children play in a safe environment. This piece of land is located on the Eastern Boundary to proposed site which could potentially be a hazard should a child wander onto the working quarry.

Your policy MW1 states it will protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way Network and Outdoor Recreational facilities. This disused mineral working is in immediate vicinity to proposed site and at high risk of dust pollution due to its situation.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99114

Object

Respondent: Mrs Maria Downing [21917]**Summary:**

M25.8 refers to "a small disused mineral working" is adjacent to the proposed site and in fact is a recreational space/play area owned by the Parish of Haddiscoe. We use this frequently especially with our Grandsons who we regularly care for while their single mother is working. Both boys thoroughly enjoy the fresh air and playing in this wonderful quiet place and we also use the area for dog walking purposes. There is no doubt that the noise, disturbance, dust and pollutants will affect us and our enjoyment of this wonderful space. [Redacted personal data].

This proposal contradicts your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, particularly MS07, stating "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals developments are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels".

Also, your own policy MW1 supposedly is to protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definite Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities".

Soundness test: Not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Maria Downing full text submission with personal data redacted - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnb>

99090

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

M25.8 describes "a small disused mineral working" on the Eastern boundary. This piece of land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe and is used as a recreational ground for children playing and dog walkers. Apart from the nuisance of noise and dust to these parishioners, children play unsupervised and although they may stray out of the pit onto agricultural fields it would be a quite different matter if they fell into a working quarry. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels" It is also at odds with your own Policy MW1 which is supposed to protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities" This is unsound and not positively prepared. This allocation is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: As a concerned parishioner I wish to attend the hearing

Attachments: None

99381

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

M25.8 describes "a small disused mineral working" on the Eastern boundary. This piece of land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe and is used as a recreational ground for children playing and dog walkers. Apart from the nuisance of noise and dust to these parishioners, children play unsupervised and although they may stray out of the pit onto agricultural fields it would be a quite different matter if they fell into a working quarry. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels". It is also at odds with your own Policy MW1 which is supposed to protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities". This is unsound and not positively prepared.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99398

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

M25-8 Objections

The Disused Quarry at the Eastern Boundary of the proposed site is now a Natural Haven for wildlife and is used by Dog Walkers and Children Playing and making Dens in the Woods, and Villagers who just want a tranquil area to walk and relax

This will now be next to the Site and as such tranquillity will be a thing of the past and a potential danger to children who may inadvertently stray out of the area and onto the site.

Again this would appear to contravene MS07

This also disagrees with your own Policy MW1 to protect Public Space, Green areas and Local green Space and Public Rights of way

The frequently used Public Footpath which bi-sects the site again this will be a loss of amenity.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99089

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]**Summary:**

M25.8 describes "a small disused mineral working" on the Eastern boundary. This piece of land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe and is used as a recreational ground for children playing and dog walkers. Apart from the nuisance of noise and dust to these parishioners, children play unsupervised and although they may stray out of the pit onto agricultural fields it would be a quite different matter if they fell into a working quarry. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels" It is also at odds with your own Policy MW1 which is supposed to protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities" This is unsound and not positively prepared. This site is allocation is unsound and ineffective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** As a concerned Parishioner, I wish to attend the hearing**Attachments:** None

99110

Object

Respondent: Mr Lee Howell [21914]**Summary:**

This proposal will effectively prevent residents in the village using the public space which belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe on the Eastern Boundary.
Soundness test: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Lee Howell submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm7>

99106

Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Johnson [21918]**Summary:**

I feel this leads on from my previous paragraph there is a 'small disused gravel pit' on the eastern boundary of the proposed site. This piece of land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe it is used by most of the local residents as a recreational area where the peace of the countryside can be enjoyed. It is used as a safe area to walk dogs and for local children to play. The proposed workings would produce an unacceptable level of noise & dust for this area to be enjoyed. At present children can play unsupervised safely in this, area it they stray they will only stray onto arable land it would quite dangerous if were into a working quarry. This counter to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives MS07 state 'to ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled minimalised & mitigated to acceptable levels' also MW1 of your own policy which is there to protect 'Public Open Spaces, Local Green Areas the Rights of Way network & Outdoor Recreation Facilities. Therefore, I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

Soundness tests: Not justified, not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

The application should be rejected in full

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** Christopher Johnson submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmw>

99439

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Kennedy [18724]**Summary:**

M25.8 Describes a small, disused mineral working on the eastern boundary. This belongs to the Parish Council and is used for recreational facilities for my own children and dog. Apart from the noise and dust, children often play unsupervised. What would happen if they strayed away from there and into a working quarry?! This is at odds with your own policy (MW1) which is supposed to protect public open space, local green space, public rights of way and outdoor recreational facilities.

Soundness test: Not justified and not effective

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove the Haddiscoe proposed pit completely as it is unsound, unjust, and unfair!!

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Nicholas Kennedy submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmq>

99300

Object

Respondent: Mr Ray Long [19722]**Summary:**

M25.8

The "small disused pit" on the eastern boundry is hidden oasis in the village and it is used by dog walkers and villagers and their children and grandchildren,including mine for picnics and walks.

I feel this piece of land has been completely overlooked by the process and as stated in MS07

"potential impacts on the amenity" does not really cover the potential risk to children, pets and wildlife that use this facility and can we be guaranteed that the site will be protected completely from the public?

This site will be impacted.

Soundness test: Not Justified and Not Positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

M25.8 Security fencing to be sympathetically installed as not to spoil the natural look of the area to protect villagers children and pets from straying into a working quarry. I feel a soil bund is hardly adequate.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Ray Long submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmh>

99499

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

M25.8 describes "a small disused mineral working" on the Eastern boundary. This piece of land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe and is used as a recreational ground for children playing and dog walkers. Apart from the nuisance of noise and dust to these parishioners, children play unsupervised and although they may stray out of the pit onto agricultural fields it would be a quite different matter if they fell into a working quarry. This is quite contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07 which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels". It is also at odds with your own Policy MW1 which is supposed to protect "Public Open Space, Local Green Space, the definitive Public Rights of Way network and outdoor recreation facilities". This is unsound and not positively prepared.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breedon planning application.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination**Oral exam why:** To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.**Attachments:** Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

99209

Object

Respondent: Windmill Cottage Kennels (Miss Helen Gough) [17772]**Summary:**

This particular paragraph seems completely at odds and contradictory to your own strategic objective specifically MS07 regarding the impact on the amenity of people living in the area. There is a recreational ground for children and there is a serious safety concern. Public and green space is supposed to be protected and this is at complete odds with the proposal.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None**MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.9**

99376

Object

Respondent: Mrs Eve Basford [17842]**Summary:**

original refusal said the previous proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry, not just the church.

Change suggested by respondent:

should be refused again

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99363

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]**Summary:**

M25 - 9 Objections

This is misleading !! It infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected was the part of the proposed development South of the B1136. This is not the case . In his proof of evidence in 2014 Mr Simon Smith (NCC Planning) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including " The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the overall appearance and rural character of the area " and " The proposed development would adversely affect amenities of nearby Residents due to increased noise ,dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the whole of the area and not just the proximity of Grade 1 listed St Marys Church.

This is unsound and not positively prepared.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99394

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

M25 - 9 Objections

This is misleading !! It infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected was the part of the proposed development South of the B1136. This is not the case . In his proof of evidence in 2014 Mr Simon Smith (NCC Planning) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including " The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the overall appearance and rural character of the area " and " The proposed development would adversely affect amenities of nearby Residents due to increased noise ,dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the whole of the area and not just the proximity of Grade 1 listed St Marys Church.

This is unsound and not positively prepared.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99176

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]**Summary:**

The original grounds for refusal stated "The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area and "The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise and dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the area as a whole, not just in the proximity of St Marys Church.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

99115

Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Downing [21920]**Summary:**

M25.9 gives the reason planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected was due to the proposed development South of the B1136. However, this is incorrect. Evidence provided by Simon Smith (Planning NCC) in 2014 gives refusal including on the grounds of "The landscape and visual impact of the proposed development, including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area" and "the proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the area as a WHOLE not just to the proximity to St Mary's Church".

I cannot see where anything has changed! The proposal landscaping, IF and when done, will still adversely affect the area.

The proposal will have a detrimental effect on residents in the village with their health and mental wellbeing due to the increased noise and pollutants from the diggers and loaders dealing with the sifting/movements/shaking of the sand and stones etc along with the traffic and additional pollution from the 80 HGV movements each day and the loud reversing beepers.

The village and residents have everything to LOSE and nothing to gain whatsoever from this proposal. All properties will inevitably be down valued considerably, and this will have a huge detrimental effect and impact on the residents and their families' stability, lives and future. This could potentially result in the village failing and negatively affecting the future of the village.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: Nicholas Downing submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmd>

99091

Object

Respondent: Ms Tanya Fairlie [21915]**Summary:**

M25.9 is misleading in that it infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected, was the part of the proposed development south of the B1136. This is not the case. In his proof of evidence in 2014, Simon Smith (Planning NCC) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including "The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development, including the construction of artificial bunds and land-raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area" and "The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the area as a whole, not just in the proximity of St Mary's church. This is unsound and not positively prepared.

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: As a concerned parishoner I wish to attend.

Attachments: None

99382

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

M25.9 is misleading in that it infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected, was the part of the proposed development south of the B1136. This is not the case. In his proof of evidence in 2014, Simon Smith (Planning NCC) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including "The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development, including the construction of artificial bunds and land-raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area" and "The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the area as a whole, not just in the proximity of St Mary's church. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99400

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

M25 - 9 Objections

This is misleading !! It infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected was the part of the proposed development South of the B1136. This is not the case . In his proof of evidence in 2014 Mr Simon Smith (NCC Planning) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including " The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the overall appearance and rural character of the area " and " The proposed development would adversely affect amenities of nearby Residents due to increased noise ,dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the whole of the area and not just the proximity of Grade 1 listed St Marys Church.

This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** Haddiscoe Parochial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99092

Object

Respondent: Mr Tim Haycock [17639]

Summary:

M25.9 is misleading in that it infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected, was the part of the proposed development south of the B1136. This is not the case. In his proof of evidence in 2014, Simon Smith (Planning NCC) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including "The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development, including the construction of artificial bunds and land-raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area" and "The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the area as a whole, not just in the proximity of St Mary's church.

This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

Remove this allocated site

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: As a concerned parishioner, I wish to attend this

Attachments: None

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.9**99105****Object****Respondent:** Mr Christopher Johnson [21918]**Summary:**

This the second time this gravel pit proposal has been submitted in 8 years. I moved here after the previous application was rejected I did not expect it to be re-submitted again in such a short time frame. I believe there should be at least 20 years between such a submission.

I feel that there has not been a material change in the reasons given for the last application to be refused I feel that M25.9 is misleading. Mr Simon Smith (Planning NCC) states 'The landscape & visual impacts of the proposed pit development including the construction of artificial bunds & land-raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance & rural character of the area'.... and...'The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise. dust & traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry' this applies to the whole of the village of Haddiscoe & Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe not just the proximity to the church of St Mary. Therefore, I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

Soundness tests: Not justified, not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

The application should be rejected in full

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Christopher Johnson submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmw>

99503

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

M25.9 is misleading in that it infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected, was the part of the proposed development south of the B1136. This is not the case. In his proof of evidence in 2014, Simon Smith (Planning NCC) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including "The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development, including the construction of artificial bunds and land-raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area" and "The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the area as a whole, not just in the proximity of St Mary's church. This is unsound and not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breedon planning application.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.

Attachments:

Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

99210

Object

Respondent: Windmill Cottage Kennels (Miss Helen Gough) [17772]**Summary:**

This particular paragraph intermates that the previous reason for refusal when it came to being refused was just the development south of the B1136 when this clearly is not the case. There were many factors including increased noise, dust and traffic which would arise and have a clearly detrimental effect on the whole of the area not just one particular location.

Soundness test: Not positively prepared

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Written Representation**Attachments:** None

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.15

99108

Object

Respondent: Mr Lee Howell [21914]

Summary:

There have been sightings of Bats in the Haddiscoe area which I believe are protected and this development could have an effect on any potential habitat, but I am no expert in these matters but needed bringing to Norfolk County Council attention.

Soundness test : Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively prepared.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Lee Howell submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm7>

MIN 25 - land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road), Haddiscoe, M25.18 Flood Risk:

99195

Comment

Respondent: King's Lynn Drainage Board (Eleanor Roberts, Senior Sustainable Development Officer) [21936]

Summary:

The sites allocated within the local plan listed below are not within any of the WMA member Boards' Internal Drainage Districts (IDD) however several sites are within a Board's Watershed Catchment (meaning water from the site will eventually enter the IDD). Maps are available on the Board's webpages showing the Internal Drainage District well as the wider watershed catchments.

For any site with the potential to discharge water indirectly to a WMA Board catchment, we recommend that a drainage strategy is supplied which has been considered in line with the Planning Practice Guidance SuDS discharge location hierarchy. If a surface water discharge proposed to a watercourse within the watershed catchment of the Board's IDD then we request that this be in line with the Non-Statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), specifically S2 and S4. Resultantly we recommend that the discharge from this site is attenuated to the Greenfield Runoff Rates wherever possible. We recommend that due consideration is given to ensuring that runoff from any allocated site is clear from silt and this is closely monitored to protect watercourses from pollution.

MIN25 Internal Drainage District Watershed catchment is Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

King's Lynn IDB representation and supporting information - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzp>

Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 25 (land at Manor Farm, Haddiscoe):

99213

Support

Respondent: Breedon Trading Limited (Mr Shaun Denny, Planner) [21948]

Summary:

The Company supports the identification of the Haddiscoe site as a Specific Site for the winning and working of sand and gravel.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments: None

99500

Comment

Respondent: Broadland District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21977]

Summary:

MIN25 at Haddiscoe – reiterate previous comments: ‘the site is very close to the nearest dwelling and the village generally, it would seem to be quite a significant site in terms of volume of material to be extracted, number of lorry movements etc. (we note there is a balance to be struck between length of extraction time and daily vehicle movements, to address concerns raised by the previous refusal of permission). Is there any scope to reduce the extent of the site, moving the boundary away from nearby dwellings and/or phasing the extraction as part of any mitigation? This, along with the impact on the Grade I Listed church and the visual impact of the proposed bunding, was a concern that South Norfolk Council raised in respect of the previous application on this site. In addition, the landscape assessment refers to mature screen planting, it would be useful if retention of this was picked up in the Initial Conclusion.’

In addition, it should be noted that opposite the site on land south of Beccles Road, Haddiscoe, has been put forward as a preferred option for residential development (Part of SN0414) as part of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnt>

99134

Object

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

This is immediately adjacent to the Broads Authority boundary

Landscape impact concerns are as follows:

Proximity and landscape sensitivity mean that there would be potential for adverse effects on the Broads and setting.

Visual: processing plant – topography could enable this to be more visible. Possible lighting associated with plant and operation would exacerbate visual effects. Bunding during the extraction phases could also cause visual intrusion.

Footpath to NE across marshes - users are sensitive receptors. There may also be views from northern valley side above Blunderston/Flixton to Herringfleet Marshes.

Noise from plant and lorry movements.

Dust from extraction operations.

Additional lorry traffic on local roads in BA area.

Heritage concerns are as follows:

The proposed site here is immediately adjacent to the BA Executive Area boundary and I would suggest that there is the potential for harm to the setting of listed buildings, in particular, the White House, which is positioned to the north-east of the site.

In its assessment the document appears to assess the impact on heritage assets largely in terms of potential views of the mineral extraction site. However, I would suggest that the definition of 'setting' is somewhat wider than that, with the NPPF glossary definition stating it is 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced'. The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 guidance by Historic England goes on to state (p2): 'The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors, such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places'.

Amenity concerns are as follows:

This scheme is going to bring new mineral extraction to the area. There are properties and businesses nearby, that are already in existence. The amenity impacts of the scheme on existing properties needs to be considered. Any scheme will need to consider and address amenity policy requirements and this could relate to the issue or noise, dust, over bearing, hours of operation for example. Has an assessment on the impact on amenity been completed as part of the consideration of this site?

Soundness: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

Policy MIN 25 (b) refers to the submission of an acceptable Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. However, it doesn't include the Broads. The assessment of impacts on the Broads needs to be included as an aim of the study.

The potential for detrimental impact on designated heritage assets is greater than implied in the policy. This section needs to improve reference to the potential for harm to the setting of listed buildings, in particular, the White House. I would suggest that there is some acknowledgement in M25.4 to the impact on the setting of the listed buildings being more than visual and in the last sentence it should say that it may be necessary to require measures to reduce the potential impacts on the setting of issues such as noise, dust and vibration, as well as providing the screening etc referred to, to reduce visual impacts.

Amenity impacts and concerns and the impact on any existing buildings and occupiers needs to be emphasised and addressed in this policy.

Legally compliant: Yes

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Yes

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99370

Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Burton [17822]

Summary:

M25 - S4.1 - This states that "Mineral development and Waste Management within Norfolk will be undertaken that minimise and mitigate their contribution to climate change. The plan acknowledges that gravel extraction is climate heavy. MS08 states "to ensure mineral development addresses the impacts it will have on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions during the winning ,working and handling of minerals, providing for sustainable patterns of minerals transportation where practicable and integrating features consistent with climate change mitigation and adoption into design and restoration and aftercare proposals" MIN25 is particularly climate change heavy since as the sand and gravel is quarried which releases 100% carbon, but only the gravel is required and transported to the Breedon Norton Subcourse Quarry.

Additionally the Breedon proposal is to return the site to the landowner for an unspecified use. This is inconsistent with a positive climate change aftercare proposal.

M25 states "The site will need to be worked without dewatering, unless an Hydrogeological Impact Assessment identifies either no unacceptable Hydrological impacts or appropriate mitigation is identified to ensure no acceptable impact to Hydrogeology"

The site is at the highest point of the village and in close proximity to dwellings. 6.44 states that "mineral development must also ensure that there will be no significant change to the ground water or surface water levels, including monitoring of dewatering operations to ensure on adverse impacts on surrounding water availability and/or the water environment" The excavation will have an unspecified impact on the water tables of the dwellings in the village, which have already been materially impacted by a combination of heavy rainfall and prolonged drought conditions. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Anthony Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm9>

99402

Object

Respondent: Mrs Sheila Burton [17937]**Summary:**

M25 - S4.1

This states that "Mineral development and Waste Management within Norfolk will be undertaken that minimise and mitigate their contribution to climate change. The plan acknowledges that gravel extraction is climate heavy. MS08 states "to ensure mineral development addresses the impacts it will have on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions during the winning ,working and handling of minerals,providing for sustainable patterns of minerals transportation where practicable and integrating features consistent with climate change mitigation and adoption into design and restoration and aftercare proposals" MIN25 is particularly climate change heavy since as the sand and gravel is quarried which releases 100% carbon,but only the gravelis required and transported to the Breedon Norton Subcourse Quarry.

Additionally the Breedon proposal is to return the site to the landowner for an unspecified use. This is inconsistent with a positive climate change aftercare proposal.

M25 states "The site will need to be worked without dewatering, unless an Hydrogeological Impact Assessment identifies either no unacceptable Hydrological impacts or appropriate mitigation is identified to ensure no acceptable impact to Hydrogeology"

The site is at the highest point of the village and in close proximity to dwellings. 6.44 states that "mineral development must also ensure that there will be no significant change to the ground water or surface water levels, including monitoring of dewatering operations to ensure on adverse impacts on surrounding water availability and/or the water environment" The excavation will have an unspecified impact on the water tables of the dwellings in the village, which have already been materially impacted by a combination of heavy rainfall and prolonged drought conditions. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:**Sheila Burton submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmr>

99177

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]

Summary:

Referring to MP1, it appears that Haddiscoe MIN 25 could be surplus to requirements and not necessary if all other sites are approved.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99172

Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Catmore [21692]

Summary:

The Breedon presentation on 16.6.22 estimated that Haddiscoe site would only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have a minimal impact on the overall plan and also the inclusion of re-cycled aggregate removes the need for MIN 25 Haddiscoe site.

Soundness test: Not justified

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99199

Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Clouting [21921]**Summary:**

We are very angry and frustrated that yet again we are having to go through this process.

The proposed site sits right on top of our village and people's homes.

It is clearly visible as you approach the village, particularly in the winter when the trees are bare no amount of screening or moving of boundaries can hide the fact that this site is still wholly unsuitable.

The increase in traffic, noise, dust, pollution and disturbance to the village, is unjustified given that now or in the future nothing will be given back to the village.

NO PIT NO LANDFILL.

Change suggested by respondent:

The only positive change, would be to reject this site once and for all.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99111

Object

Respondent: Mrs Maria Downing [21917]**Summary:**

MIN25 is located in an integral part of the village. This will undoubtedly have a negative effect on all villagers many of whom live within 250 m of the proposed site. I personally strongly object due to the negative health problems resulting from fine airborne particles.[Redacted personal data]. The inevitably noise, disturbance and upheaval will impact villagers' mental health and enjoyment of their environment. There will be diggers and loaders daily dealing with the movement/filtering/shaking/sieving of stones and sand etc along with traffic and pollution from 80 HGV movements per day using compulsory reversing beepers.

Please carefully consider, this proposal is to be set in the middle of a quiet Norfolk village.

This contradicts the Mineral Strategic Objectives, particularly MS07, which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels".

I do not feel this proposal takes into consideration the village and the occupiers.

Soundness test : Not Effective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Maria Downing full text submission with personal data redacted - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svnb>

99100

Object

Respondent: Elspeth Evans [20322]**Summary:**

In response to your letter dated 21 September 2022 it is with great sadness that I find that the area referred to as MIN 25 is again being considered for gravel extraction in spite of not meeting the necessary compliance at the earlier applications.

One of my causes of concern relates to the four listed buildings that are within 250m of the proposed site. According to your own documents the nearest, the Grade II listed White House Farm, is a mere 70m away, whilst the furthest is less than double that, being a Grade II listed Monument to William Salter at 130m distance.

Whereas I feel sure the applicants would try to site the main activities 250 m away from both these areas, the transport they would be utilising, with the recognised increased carbon emission dangers, not to mention the noise pollution, would be inevitably closer. I refer to your paragraph M25.2 Highway Access, in which it is stated that "The site would access Crab Apple Lane and then turn east onto the B1136 Loddon Road to the junction with the A143 Beccles Road,". Mention of this road also raises the question regarding the safety aspect. This crossroads is already a hazard but with the estimated increase of a possible 80 lorries per day the current highways infrastructure does not take into consideration the pedestrian or cycle traffic, including children having to access the local schools. For this application to be granted this junction would have to be altered prior to the proposed increased heavy goods use.

These aforementioned buildings are listed for their historic value and interest. However, there are many dwellings within the locale, the nearest, according to your notes M25.1, is a mere 19m from the site boundary. Your document continues to state "Even without mitigation, adverse dust impacts from sand and gravel sites are uncommon beyond 250m from the nearest dust generation activities. The greatest impact will be within 100m of a source, if uncontrolled." Yet in the same section it is stated "Most of these properties are within the settlement of Haddiscoe, which is 55m away."

The proposed site is actually within the boundaries of the village of Haddiscoe, with many residential properties liable to be affected by the dust, noise and carbon emission pollution that would come with such a venture. In the Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular MS07, which states "To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals developments are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels." London controls vehicular carbon emissions, particularly those from diesel vehicles, by severe fines. Is this what is to be included as part of the mitigation process for those residents so afflicted?

Finally, my concerns also include the so-called sweetener that Breedon were proposing (at the summer 2022 consultation session at Haddiscoe village hall), in the subsequent landscaping of the then derelict site, in a decade. I feel this would be far too difficult to enforce after the site were vacated and instead propose that should this or future applications be successful, the applicants be required to pay an annual tithe to the village, that the current residents might put to improvements for the benefit of the village (not least of which would be the Grade I listed church of Saint Mary, one of the nearest properties that would be affected by this proposal.)

I look forward to common decency prevailing in this matter and that this application be seen for what it is: viz the enhancement to the proposers of this application (who are not local – being based in Leicestershire), at the cost of inconvenience and endangered health of the residents of this small Norfolk village, which is minutes away from access to the famous Norfolk Broads. I trust these comments will be seen for their honesty and that this application be declined.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99334

Object

Respondent: Louise Grimmer [21954]**Summary:**

The site abuts the centre of Haddiscoe village, so that it is located less than 250m from a significant number of residential properties. Our own family home is the closest of all to the site, being located between the site and the Church of St Mary. Our house is situated on the B1136, a mere 40m from the site boundary, 300m from the B1136/Crab Apple Lane junction, and 150m from the B1136/A143 junction. MS07 of paragraph 4.3 (Minerals Strategic Objectives) of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan promises to "ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels." Given the location of our home, immediately next door to the site and very near to the main road junctions, it would be unreasonable to claim that objective MS07 could possibly be met. In addition to the heavy goods vehicle traffic which would be created in the immediate vicinity of our home, noise and dust from the site itself are bound to be so intrusive as to substantially affect our lifestyle, health and wellbeing. It is inconceivable that fencing or screening of any type could provide sufficient and adequate mitigation.

Soundness test: Not Justified**Change suggested by respondent:**

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: Our home is only 40m from the site and sits directly on the stretch of road which would be used by the heavy vehicles and plant serving the site. I therefore deem it absolutely necessary and appropriate to have the opportunity of representing myself and my family at any and all meetings pertaining to this industrial project which is bound to affect the health, lifestyle and wellbeing of my family and myself.

Attachments: None

99377

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

As our Parish Council members are not legally qualified, we cannot comment on the legality of the document however we would like to express our opinion on the different points raised as they are unsound and not effective. This area has previously been designated and had planning permissions applied for. After a great deal of expense and upset to our parishioners planning was refused. Even before the closing date of this pre-submission document Norfolk County Council have again validated a planning application from Breedon and consultations on this will start this week (Ref FUL/2022/0056).

Please take into account the views of the households who live and work in this area.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:**

Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99387

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]**Summary:**

M25. S4.1 states that "Mineral development and Waste Management within Norfolk will be undertaken that minimise and mitigate their contribution to climate change". The plan acknowledges that gravel extraction is climate heavy. MS08 states "to ensure that mineral development addresses and minimises the impacts it will have on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions during the winning, working and handling of minerals, providing for sustainable patterns of minerals transportation where practicable, and integrating features consistent with climate change mitigation and adaption into the design and restoration and aftercare proposals". Min 25 is particularly climate change heavy as the sand and gravel is quarried, which releases the 100% carbon, but only the gravel is required and transported to the Breedon Norton Subcourse Quarry. Additionally, the Breedon proposal is to return the land to the land owner for an unspecified use, this is inconsistent with a positive climate change aftercare proposal. This is unsound and ineffective.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** No**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:**

Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99389

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parish Council (Mrs Liz Fulcher, Parish Clerk) [21961]

Summary:

M25. States "The site will need to be worked without dewatering, unless a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment identifies either no unacceptable hydrogeological impacts or appropriate mitigation is identified to ensure no acceptable impact to hydrogeology"; The site is the highest point in the village and in close proximity to dwellings. 6.44 states that "mineral development must also ensure that there will be no significant change in the ground water or surface water levels, including monitoring of dewatering operations to ensure no adverse impacts on surrounding water availability and/or the water environment". The excavation will have an unspecified impact on the water tables of the dwellings in the village, which have already been materially impact by a combination of heavy rainfall and prolonged drought conditions. This is unsound and ineffective.

Soundness tests: Not Justified, Not Effective, Not Positively Prepared, Not Consistent with National Policy

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Haddiscoe Parish Council submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm8>

99405

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

M25 - S4.1

This states that "Mineral development and Waste Management within Norfolk will be undertaken that minimise and mitigate their contribution to climate change. The plan acknowledges that gravel extraction is climate heavy. MS08 states "to ensure mineral development addresses the impacts it will have on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions during the winning ,working and handling of minerals,providing for sustainable patterns of minerals transportation where practicable and integrating features consistent with climate change mitigation and adoption into design and restoration and aftercare proposals" MIN25 is particularly climate change heavy since as the sand and gravel is quarried which releases 100% carbon,but only the gravelis required and transported to the Breedon Norton Subcourse Quarry.

Additionally the Breedon proposal is to return the site to the landowner for an unspecified use.This is inconsistent with a positive climate change aftercare proposal

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:**Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99406

Object

Respondent: Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council (Mr Anthony Burton) [21975]**Summary:**

M25 states "The site will need to be worked without dewatering, unless an Hydrogeological Impact Assessment identifies either no unacceptable Hydrological impacts or appropriate mitigation is identified to ensure no acceptable impact to Hydrogeology"

The site is at the highest point of the village and in close proximity to dwellings. 6.44 states that "mineral development must also ensure that there will be no significant change to the ground water or surface water levels, including monitoring of dewatering operations to ensure on adverse impacts on surrounding water availability and/or the water environment" The excavation will have an unspecified impact on the water tables of the dwellings in the village, which have already been materially impacted by a combination of heavy rainfall and prolonged drought conditions.

This is unsound and ineffective

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:**Haddiscoe Parocial Church Council full submission text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm3>

99257

Object

Respondent: Historic England (Ms Debbie Mack, Historic Environment Planning Advisor) [17619]

Summary:

We continue to have concerns regarding the potential impact of this allocation on heritage assets. We consider that there is insufficient historic environment evidence to justify its allocation.

Whilst we appreciate that an application is due shortly, we would still expect the preparation of a heritage impact assessment to inform the policy wording in the Local Plan, particularly, in respect of potential mitigation for the site. Prepare a proportionate HIA now ahead of the application and EiP to consider the suitability or otherwise of the site and inform its extent and any potential heritage mitigation. The findings of the HIA would then need to inform the policy and supporting text.

In order to justify this allocation, ensure consistency with the NPPF and to make the policy wording effective, for these sites we recommend an HIA is prepared now in advance of the EiP. This should provide a robust evidence base for the plan. Any evidence needs to be proportionate and need not necessarily be particularly onerous. For this site a fairly brief HIA will suffice. Our site allocations advice note <https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/> provides further advice in this respect and we would be happy to discuss the matter further and advise on a suitable way forward.

Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundaries, there are a number of grade I and grade II listed buildings in close proximity to the site. Of particular concern is the impact on the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St Mary, just 110m away and also the grade II listed White House Farm only 70 metres away. Whilst we note that indicative site buffers/screening are shown on the map, we are still very concerned at the potential impact of the proposed allocation on heritage assets.

We note that the plan states that users of the road would not have views of the mineral extraction when viewing the church, but that is not the same as not affecting the setting. Setting impacts can be not just visual but can include noise, dust, vibration etc.

Indeed, in relation to the previous application on this site we raised strong objections and we advised that 'In considering the contribution to the historic significance of the church made by its setting, it is clear that some harm will result from the proposed quarry, both during its period of activity and from the permanent change to the landscape.'

Although we appreciate that unlike the previous application, the allocation is just to the north of the road. However, we continue to have concerns regarding the potential impact of the allocation on heritage assets.

To that end we recommended that a Heritage Impact Assessment is completed at this stage to assess the suitability or otherwise of the allocation and extent of the site and consider any mitigation that might be necessary should the site be found suitable from a heritage perspective. The findings of the HIA would then need to inform the policy and supporting text.

Whilst we appreciate that an application is due in late 2022, we would still expect the preparation of a heritage impact assessment to inform the policy wording in the Local Plan, particularly, in respect of potential mitigation for the site.

We do welcome criteria a, b, g and h. In addition, we welcome the screening to the around the edge of the site as shown on the map extract.

Change suggested by respondent:

Prepare a proportionate HIA now ahead of the application and EiP to consider the suitability of the site and inform its extent and any potential heritage mitigation. The findings of the HIA would then need to inform the policy and supporting text.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Not specified

Attachments:

Appendix A table of Historic England representations - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svzz>

Historic England response letter - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn9>

99104

Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Johnson [21918]**Summary:**

MP1 The Haddiscoe site could be removed completely if all other sites were approved if not it would further increase the excess supply. Therefore, I believe this to be unsound and totally not justified.

M25 The Breedon presentation on 16th June 2022 estimated that this quarry would only produce 0.65m tonnes therefore its removal would have very little impact on the plan. Indeed, if include re-cycled aggregates it would remove totally the need for the quarry here at Haddiscoe. Therefore, I believe this is unsound & not justified.

Soundness tests: Not justified, not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy

Change suggested by respondent:

The application should be rejected in full

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Christopher Johnson submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmw>

99223

Object

Respondent: Miss Sari Kelsey [17814]**Summary:**

Again with Min 25 Haddiscoe village is having to rebuff applications on gravel extraction. How many times must we reject these proposals? The proposed pit will negatively impact on all, not just the 20 immediately adjacent homes. The site is at a high point in our village, so sound of sand being sifted for the gravel it contains will carry across the valley and will reach all. The tree screening is deciduous, so useless in winter. In summer our local weather patten will result in fine dust covering all. The proposed artificial bunds would destroy the rural character.

Change suggested by respondent:

The impact of repeated applications for pit creations is threatening to destroy our village and is having a negative impact on the well being of our community and so all and any future applications must cease. Our fields are for cultivation of crops. Good farming stewardship would protect our arable land for future generations need for food, this surely should be an objective for a rural county like Norfolk.

In our experience creation of yet more holes in our village results in future applications to fill said hole with waste material.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: The outcome impacts on my community

Attachments: None

99200

Object

Respondent: Alyson Moyse [21939]**Summary:**

We are very angry and frustrated that yet again we are having to go through this process.

The proposed site sits right on top of our village and people's homes.

It is clearly visible as you approach the village, particularly in the winter when the trees are bare and no amount of screening or moving of boundaries can hide the fact that this site is still totally unsuitable.

The increase in traffic, noise, dust, pollution and disturbance is totally unjustified given that now or in the future nothing will be given back to the village.

NO PIT NO LANDFILL.

Change suggested by respondent:

The only changes made to this plan should be to reject it once and for all.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments: None

99155

Object

Respondent: Norfolk Holiday Properties (Mr Sascha Tucker, Managing Director) [21924]**Summary:**

Haddiscoe site has half the tonnage of material based on Breedon's own figures, so is not the most suitable site proposed.

The site would have a negative impact on the tourism which Haddiscoe and the surrounding area enjoys. Haddiscoe is an unspoilt and naturally beautiful area, it's peaceful and home to much wildlife. This attracts a range of visitors to the area who stay in holiday homes and use other local services whilst on holiday. The tourism industry indirectly supports housekeepers, electricians, plumbers, maintenance, caterers, pubs, restaurants, cafes and other establishments. This is an important part of the local economy and a site such as this would be detrimental to this.

Soundness test: Not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

Based on the projections, Haddiscoe does not seem to be required. Together with the negative impacts on the area and local economy it should not be considered.

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: No

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Norfolk Holiday Properties submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svm5>

99349

Comment

Respondent: Norfolk Wildlife Trust (Mr M Jones, Conservation Officer (Planning)) [17979]**Summary:**

The site policy needs an additional requirement for any application to include a hydrogeology assessment in order to ensure that impacts on the nearby Devil's End Meadow CWS, which includes wet woodland Priority Habitat around the Landspring Beck, as recommended in section M25.15 of the supporting text for the policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

The site policy needs an additional requirement for any application to include a hydrogeology assessment in order to ensure that impacts on the nearby Devil's End Meadow CWS, which includes wet woodland Priority Habitat around the Landspring Beck, as recommended in section M25.15 of the supporting text for the policy.

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

99519

Comment

Respondent: South Norfolk District Council (Mr Paul Harris, Place Shaping Manager) [21979]**Summary:**

Reiterate previous comments: 'the site is very close to the nearest dwelling and the village generally, it would seem to be quite a significant site in terms of volume of material to be extracted, number of lorry movements etc. (we note there is a balance to be struck between length of extraction time and daily vehicle movements, to address concerns raised by the previous refusal of permission). Is there any scope to reduce the extent of the site, moving the boundary away from nearby dwellings and/or phasing the extraction as part of any mitigation? This, along with the impact on the Grade I Listed church and the visual impact of the proposed bunding, was a concern that South Norfolk Council raised in respect of the previous application on this site. In addition, the landscape assessment refers to mature screen planting, it would be useful if retention of this was picked up in the Initial Conclusion.'

In addition, it should be noted that opposite the site on land south of Beccles Road, Haddiscoe, has been put forward as a preferred option for residential development (Part of SN0414) as part of the South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:**South Norfolk and Broadland Councils submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svn3>

99505

Object

Respondent: Stopit2 (Mr Marcus Aldren, Treasurer) [21951]**Summary:**

M25. States "The site will need to be worked without dewatering, unless a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment identifies either no unacceptable hydrogeological impacts or appropriate mitigation is identified to ensure no acceptable impact to hydrogeology"; The site is the highest point in the village and in close proximity to dwellings. 6.44 states that "mineral development must also ensure that there will be no significant change in the ground water or surface water levels, including monitoring of dewatering operations to ensure no adverse impacts on surrounding water availability and/or the water environment". The excavation will have an unspecified impact on the water tables of the dwellings in the village, which have already been materially impact by a combination of heavy rainfall and prolonged drought conditions. This is unsound and ineffective.

M25. S4.1 states that "Mineral development and Waste Management within Norfolk will be undertaken that minimise and mitigate their contribution to climate change". The plan acknowledges that gravel extraction is climate heavy. MS08 states "to ensure that mineral development addresses and minimises the impacts it will have on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions during the winning, working and handling of minerals, providing for sustainable patterns of minerals transportation where practicable, and integrating features consistent with climate change mitigation and adaption into the design and restoration and aftercare proposals". Min 25 is particularly climate change heavy as the sand and gravel is quarried, which releases the 100% carbon, but only the gravel is required and transported to the Breedon Norton Subcourse Quarry. Additionally, the Breedon proposal is to return the land to the land owner for an unspecified use, this is inconsistent with a positive climate change aftercare proposal. This is unsound and ineffective.

Change suggested by respondent:

Drop Min 25 from the plan and refuse the Breedon planning application.

Legally compliant: Yes**Sound:** No**Comply with duty:** Yes**Appear exam:** Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: To formally and properly represent over 200 Parishioners in Haddiscoe, who otherwise would not be properly represented.

Attachments:

Stopit2 submission full text - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svz4>

99112

Support

Respondent: Mr Tony Watson [21908]**Summary:**

I fully support this site for extraction.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified**Sound:** Not specified**Comply with duty:** Not specified**Appear exam:** Not specified**Attachments:** None

Appendix 2 – Existing Mineral Site Specific Allocations and Areas of Search Policies

99127

Comment

Respondent: Broads Authority (Miss Natalie Beal, Planning Policy Officer) [16282]

Summary:

We have some queries and questions. These are not saying the Plan is unsound by asking these queries, but we would welcome thoughts on these and they may result in improvements to the Plan.

Appendix 2 – I am not sure what these are. Are you saying that these policies in another document will still be in place? They have not been reviewed, but left as is? So this Local Plan is additional to these policies? Where are these saved policies? This is not clear and might need explaining better. For example, I searched the document for 'Appendix 2' and the only two occurrences are the title of Appendix 2 and the contents page.

Change suggested by respondent:

-

Legally compliant: Not specified

Sound: Not specified

Comply with duty: Not specified

Appear exam: Written Representation

Attachments:

Broads Authority full text submission for rep ID 99120 to 99128 and 99149 -
<https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svmz>

Appendix 12 - Glossary

99542

Object

Respondent: Dr L David Ormerod [21890]**Summary:**

These comments are limited to the Single-issue Silica Sand Site Selection process. It is of considerable concern when the NMW Local Plan policies accommodate a clear avoidance of the public interest.

NPPF paragraphs 98 and 99 are quoted.

As the recreational jewel of West Norfolk within a badly scarred regional environment with a local road system unsuitable for recreational pursuits, and where no realistic alternatives exist, it is surprising that the proposition of AOS E as a silica sand extraction candidate survived for so long. I believe that the Shouldham Warren should have been declared off-limits to all development, including mineral developments, as it provides an absolutely unique and traditional environment for West Norfolk country recreation.

1. The initial task is to convince N.C.C. that public land-use issues must always be respected in silica sand extraction site negotiations in particular, and in mineral and waste site negotiations in general. It is the law. How can the public interest be totally disregarded in a major Local Plan? This fails to pass the notions of "legal compliance" and of administrative "soundness."

2. The main problem with public representation involves the failure to recognize the long-term public recreational land-use interest in Shouldham Warren, part of AOS E.

Soundness tests: Not effective, not positively prepared, not consistent with national policy.

Change suggested by respondent:

20. Local "Amenity": this term is used frequently throughout the detailed planning documents, e.g Policy M.51.1: Amenity. It is used in these documents almost exclusively to mean the amenity of the land within the village boundaries, whereas this restriction is not supported in the National Planning Policy Framework. Amenity should also include the local landforms provided for recreational pursuits and other open-access areas. May I suggest this important change? It would also be useful in the Sustainability Appraisals and Scoping Reports.

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

Comply with duty: No

Appear exam: Appearance at the examination

Oral exam why: I have endeavoured to provide detailed support for these views. It is probably important to support those challenged by the MPA.

Attachments:

Dr D Ormerod full text submission B. Public representation - <https://norfolk.oc2.uk/a/svns>