

MEETING TRANSCRIPT

FUL/2022/0056 Land off Crab Apple Lane, Haddiscoe,
Norfolk NR14 6SJ
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n4yZ4ZIXBZ0>

In attendance at meeting on: 24th May 2024

Councillors:

Lesley Bambridge, Graham Carpenter, Robert Colwell, Alexandra Kemp, Mark Kiddle-Morris (Vice-Chair), Paul Neale, William Nunn (Chair), William Richmond, Mike Sands, Martin Storey, John Ward, Anthony White

Officers:

Andrew Harriss (Planning Officer), Nick Johnson (Planning Service Manager)

Speakers:

Cllr Sari Kelsey (Haddiscoe Parish Councillor, Objector), Lewis Williams (Breedon Group, Applicant), Applicant's Air Quality Expert, Cllr Barry Stone (Local Member)

Speaker	Transcription	Para
Chair	So we go on to item 5, Land off Crab Apple Lane, Haddiscoe. I could for completeness mention that the BBC are in the room and are filming for this item I believe.	1.
Andrew Harriss	<p>Right. Thank you, Chairman. Just before I start, I'll just draw attention to the fact there is an update sheet for this application which Members of the Committee will have been sent yesterday, which includes some late representations, including some requests for what are relatively minor amendments to some of the conditions from the applicant, two or three additional representations from objectors, an additional comment from South Norfolk District Council Environmental Health and also some, two or three, corrections in the report.</p> <p>I'll move straight on to the presentation. This will be fairly short. I'm not going to run through the whole report again because it's a fairly lengthy report, but essentially to introduce the application, so it's application number FUL/2022/0056 which is Land off Crab Apple Lane, Haddiscoe, and it's an application for the extraction of sand and gravel with low level restoration to meadow species rich grassland with an ephemeral water body, and the applicant is Breedon Trading.</p> <p>So the proposal is for an area of 21½ hectares of what is currently arable agricultural land immediately to the northwest of Haddiscoe. The application is submitted as a satellite extension to the existing Norton Subcourse Quarry which is about 2½ miles to the northwest, 4½km or so to the northwest, of Haddiscoe. The proposal is to extract 650,000 tonnes of gravel per year – sorry, 650,000 tonnes of gravel in total for export to Norton Subcourse where it would be quarried. It's also intended to extract 510,000 tonnes of sand, although that will be retained on the site and used as part of the restoration material.</p> <p>The site is not an allocated site in the current Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework, although it is proposed as an allocated site in the emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plan which has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. Essentially, what's proposed on the site includes seven phases of extraction over seven years, so roughly a phase a year and roughly at a rate of 100,000 tonnes per year.</p> <p>As I've set out in the report, there was a previous application for mineral extraction on this site which was submitted in 2011 and was refused and then subsequently went to appeal and we had an appeal decision on that application in 2014 and the refusal was upheld. I should point out, as is set out in the report, it was a different application</p>	2.

	<p>insofar as it was for an additional area and for a larger amount of mineral over a longer period of time and, as set out in the report, there are key differences with that proposal.</p> <p>The restoration is what's called a low level restoration where it is intended to refill the site with imported material and the restoration is back to neutral grassland for grazing and biodiversity enhancement.</p> <p>In terms of representations submitted, there's been a substantial number of objections submitted to this application, around about 550 submissions. That's not the actual number of objections, because some of them involve multiple documents, so from around about 177 third parties. There have been two or three additional representations since the report was finalised and these slides put together, so there's two or three additional to be added to that.</p> <p>To go into the – if that's going to work – sorry, there's a lag there. I'll just make sure I've got that right. Yeah. Sorry. There's actually a lag here, so forgive me if I press that once or twice.</p> <p>So just to give you an idea of where the site is, it sits right next to Haddiscoe village. It's the area outlined in red there. You can see the area with the yellow edging around it is the Broads Authority area. On one side of the site is actually the boundary of the Broads Authority. If I just zoom in, you can see the village of Haddiscoe there which is on the right-hand side. So you can see how the site essentially abuts the northwest side of the village. You've got Crab Apple Lane is the left-hand side of the application site. Vehicles will come out of that, turn left and then come down to the road which forms the southern boundary of the site, which is the B1136, Loddon Road.</p> <p>Just to give you an idea of the relationship with Norton Subcourse Quarry, as I say, it's about 2½ miles, just over 4km, northwest of Haddiscoe, and the idea is that material will come out of the site in 20 tonne HGVs and will be transferred to Norton Subcourse along the B1136, which is the yellow road you can see on there with black dots on it, and then go into Norton Subcourse for substantive processing there. So there's no substantive processing proposed on this site as part of the application other than the separation of the sand and gravel, as I've set out in the report.</p> <p>Just to give you an idea, you'll see reference in the report to the public right of way which is a bridleway which runs across the site. It's Bridleway Haddiscoe BR5. That's the pink line there, I'm afraid it doesn't show very well there. There's a slight discrepancy in reality on the ground compared with the statutory alignment, it's one of these public rights of way, you've probably seen them, that run through a crop and they tend to move around a little bit, so there's a little bit of a difference in reality between where the path is and where the statutory alignment is, but that's the statutory alignment, and you can see it connects with the footpath network to the northwest.</p> <p>And then I'm just going to cycle you through a series of slides here which just show how the working will proceed. There's seven phases which are shown there, so working would start in that bottom left-hand corner in phase 1. And if I'll just cycle through these, we'll then proceed to phase 2. As the work proceeds into phase 2, restoration will begin in phase 1 or part of phase 1. The access is in the bottom left-hand corner which is why there's a strip there which is retained. And then moving into phase 3, you can see the orange there, how the working moves across the site, phase 2 moves into restoration and then the brighter green area is phase 1 going into final restoration. So it's phased working with phased restoration behind it.</p> <p>So I'll just cycle through the rest of these. You'll see there's the orange strips around the edge of the site. They're bunds which are – they're amenity bunds which are constructed from the topsoil removed off the site, both along the south side of the site and along the northern boundary of the site.</p>	
--	---	--

So I'll just cycle through these, so you can go from phase 3 to phase 4. At this point, the working will begin to interfere with the bridleway, so at this point there will be a diversion of the bridleway and it'll run around the northern and western boundary of the site. So from phase 4 into phase 5, then phase 6 and you can see how the restoration follows behind and is completed, so the bright green is the restored. And then finally into phase 7, again with the restoration following behind.

And then the overall concept of the restoration scheme, as I said, it's low level restoration, so there is no import of fill material as part of the restoration. The site will simply be re-graded. It's currently agricultural land. It will be restored to grassland which can be used for grazing, but the essential purpose here is also to introduce an element of biodiversity net gain, so there'll be additional tree planting that you can see on the site, hedgerows and an area of – an ephemeral wet area in the middle of the site, with the footpath aligned which you can see is the black line that runs – hopefully – where the pink line you saw earlier on the map runs through, as it's shown on there.

And I've just got some sections, I'm afraid that you may find this hard to see, there were some concerns about, because it's low level restoration, that you get a drop off at the edge of the quarry. In reality, that's not the way it'll work. You can see the green line, I hope you can see it on here, how it's a very, very gentle slope down to the centre of the quarry across the site, so it just gives you an idea of what the slope will be on the site.

There'll be an improvement, there'll be the new access created near the bottom left-hand corner of the site, as you saw it, and there'll be – and the road, the highway from the Loddon Road junction will be increased to 6½ m in width. Currently, Crab Apple Lane is a single track lane, hence the need for the highway improvement between the junction with Loddon Road and the access into the site. The access into the site would be taken away as part of the restoration at the end of the scheme.

And then there's just a few photographs to show you to give you an idea of what the site looks like. As I say, it's an arable field. It's had a strip of advanced woodland planting which was established quite some time ago, I think it was more than ten years ago, which has begun to mature. And that's what you can see around the site here, and it runs around the three sides of the site, as I've set out in the report, so around that western boundary, the southern boundary and the northern boundary. I'll just cycle through these. I think you'll get the idea depending on which view.

That's the view looking north along Crab Apple Lane, again this is on the outside of the planting, the screen bund. That's the view across the field. You can actually just see the line of the footpath running through in the foreground there past the telegraph pole. You can see how it is one of those footpaths that runs in an open field, so it does move a little bit, but again you can see the screen planting in the background which is the northern boundary.

Sorry, there's a delay. It's about 10 seconds delay between when I press the button and the slide. Again, that's just another view looking down the side of the site, so you can see how the peripheral planting has begun to mature around the edge of the site. And it's very deliberate, it's been planted obviously with the intention in mind that it, you know, establishes before the site is ever worked. That's the view again along Crab Apple Lane where the intention, as I've set out in the report, was originally to use the existing field access which is what you see there, but in fact it's further south from this.

So that's the same spot looking back towards the Loddon Road, so in practice the access will be down towards the end of the road, as you can see it there, adjacent to the junction with the Loddon Road, but again that shows you the extent and height and thickness of the tree belt around the site. And this is just the view looking down Thorpe Road in the northwest corner of the site. Again, you can see the tree belt on the right-hand side.

	<p>And then I think that's where the slides in your pack of slides end. I've actually put in two or three additional slides which you don't have in the pack you've got. I've included these because you'll see in the report one of the main issues that's been raised is to what extent the development of the site will impact on the Grade A listed – sorry, Grade I listed Church of St Mary which is at the bottom of the site there where the blue arrow is. It's about 100m south of the site and you'll see from the report there's been quite a lot of objection about the potential impact on the church. So I've included three slides just to give you an idea of this because it is one of the issues the objectors in particular have highlighted.</p> <p>So on the one hand, you've got this photograph which was taken from the environmental assessment submitted with the information, which is the view on the ground from the church towards the site and of course from that there's no view into the site, so at ground level there's no inter-visibility.</p> <p>However, the point the objectors have made, if we move on to the next slide, is that there is visibility from the church tower towards the site, so this photograph is actually submitted by the applicant, but what it shows is the view from the bridleway running across the site towards the church, and what you can see on there, I hope you can just see it in the middle, I don't know if I can – I haven't got a pointer, but if you can just see in the middle of the site there where the arrow is, you can see the church tower is visible from the public right of way, so clearly there's inter-visibility between the top of the tower and the site.</p> <p>And then the third photograph, this is the last one, this is one provided by Haddiscoe Parish Council, and this is the view taken from the top of the church tower where clearly you can see from that that you can see into the site. So I've sort of given you two or three different photographs there, just so you're aware of exactly what that issue is around that part of the debate.</p> <p>And then just the final slide is just the summary. So just the overall summary, as I said, it's not an allocated site in the current Minerals and Waste Development Framework, but it is proposed for allocation. There are no objections from statutory consultees, albeit from Historic England there's a fairly strongly worded letter of concern about the impact, particularly relating to St Mary's Church, but they haven't actually expressed an objection.</p> <p>The Parish Council, Haddiscoe Parish Council, have objected and there are comments as well from the other Parish Councils that I have set out in the report. Major concerns are the impact of dust, noise, traffic, emissions, the impact on amenity, landscape and the impact on the historic environment. There are also other issues which I've set out in the report.</p> <p>The Officer advice is that the application as submitted is in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations that would lead to a different recommendation being given to you and accordingly it is recommended that permission is granted. And that's it, Chairman. Keep it short.</p>	
Chair	<p>Thank you very much, Andrew. The way this will now work is Members will ask questions of Andrew. Following that, we will hear from Sari Kelsey who will speak in her private capacity. She will then speak again as the Haddiscoe Parish Councillor. I would ask you that you'll speak for five minutes, we'll stop you, ask you questions and then speak again and then we can ask you questions again.</p> <p>Then we've got the applicant, Lewis Williams from the Breedon Group, again five minutes and we will ask you questions, and then the Local Member, Cllr Barry Stone. So are there any questions now for Andrew from the floor? I'll start on the left. Graham. Cllr Carpenter.</p>	3.
Cllr Carpenter	<p>Yes. Thank you, Chairman. You refer to some bunds around the area, particularly along the main road. How high are these going to get? Is there going to be a cap on those?</p>	4.

Andrew	Yeah, the bunds will be 3m high, so they won't be as high as the trees, but the intention is that they provide acoustic screening in addition to the trees and also act as a barrier for dust emissions from the site, but they won't exceed 3m in height.	5.
Cllr Carpenter	Yes. Thank you. Can I just follow up with a supplementary question on that? The material that's going to be excavated from the site I understand is going to be used for the bunds. Is there likely to be an excess or not enough to construct the bunds from that particular source?	6.
Andrew Harriss	My understanding is that the construction of the bunds has been based on the soil balance that's been calculated by the applicant, so it's intended exactly to marry up. In other words, they've put the bunds forward related to the quantity of material they actually have. So the bunds, just so Members are clear here, is constructed out of the top soils, the soils that are initially taken off at the top of the site before you get down to the mineral, because clearly you want to retain that material ultimately for use in restoration. So it serves a purpose that (a) it's stored, it's retained, but it's also used for the purposes of constructing the bunds.	7.
Cllr Carpenter	Thank you very much. Thank you, Chairman.	8.
Chair	Thank you. Cllr Sands.	9.
Cllr Sands	Thank you, Chair. I've got a few questions, so if you don't mind I'll put them in a little group, if that's okay. First question. By the time the process of extraction is completed here, and ignoring what's going to be a dip or a pond in the middle, how much lower on average will the area be compared to how it is now? And will it still be above the adjacent Broads area, you know, above the potential water level there? And also, with the phased extraction, why weren't phases 3 and 4 chosen as the phases 1 and 2, so they could be restored before the rest of the extraction continues? And also, what makes this application fundamentally different from that which was refused some years ago?	10.
Andrew Harriss	I'll just make a note so I don't forget your questions. Okay. So the depth, it varies across the site, because clearly you saw from the sections that the idea is it sort of slopes back up, but I don't think the depth from memory will be more than about 10m maximum, so there's not a huge depth in it, and overall it'll be less than that. In terms of the phasing, it's probably a question you need to address to the applicant, as they can explain why they chose that particular order. I can't tell you specifically myself, but I think there'll be an opportunity they can answer that question for you. In terms of the previous application they've submitted, the key differences between that application and this one are essentially threefold. Firstly, the proposal was – it included a larger area and the additional area that it included is the – you can see that the B1136 runs along the southern boundary of the site there and you'll see the yellow area there and there's an area – there's essentially a rectangular area below that on the south side of the Loddon Road. And that was the additional area that was included in the previous application and that area was a plant area, because the intention under that application was to extract the sand and the gravel and to process it on this site. So essentially, that grey area, as you see it in the south on the bottom left-hand side, there was a processing area with quite a large plant operation there and that was really one of the key issues in the appeal, was the fact that it did extend in the road and it did include quite a sizable plant. The amount, a substantially larger amount, albeit in this case, if you add together the sand and gravel, it's not so different. And it was planned that the site would operate over a 21-year period, so it is a very substantially longer operation than is currently proposed under this application which is only for a seven-year period plus one year for restoration. So there's some quite significant differences between this application and the previous one which was refused at appeal.	11.
Chair	Thank you very much. Rob Colwell.	12.
Cllr Colwell	Thank you, Chair. Yeah, Andrew, I've got three questions, if I may. I wanted to get a bit	13.

	<p>of an understanding about this term satellite extension. Is this a genuine thing or are we kind of being a little bit cheeky here in the application? That's the first question.</p> <p>The second question is in relation to the phased extension, it's a slightly different angle. I'm interested in relation to the anticipation of the Council as to when the land adjacent to that of St Mary's Grade I Church will be back to relative normality, so that's the second question.</p> <p>And the third question is in relation to Devils End Meadow County Wildlife site, I don't know – would you be able to point that out to us on the map, please? Thank you.</p>	
Andrew Harriss	<p>Right. Okay. I may struggle with that third one only for lack of a plan, but I'll see what I can do. Firstly, the issue of the satellite extension, it's a good question, you know, what is an extension, because policy does favour extensions to quarries. This is one of these unusual applications where clearly it's a distance away from the existing quarry with which it's associated and in that respect it's clearly physically a separate site, but the processing is not going to be undertaken here, so there is a clear operational link between the two.</p> <p>You know, I've tried to set it out in the report, because I have to admit almost the first sentence I wrote, you'll see it in the report, it's literally the first sentence in the report, it makes reference to a satellite extension. So it's clearly been described deliberately like that by the applicant and that's the way I presented it because that's the way they've presented it. But you raise a valid point. Is it validly a satellite extension? Is it a different site? There is clearly an operational link between the two sites, that's the way it's going to work, and all the mineral that comes out of here will all go to Norton Subcourse and will not go directly anywhere else, so there is a clear link. That's probably as good an answer as I can give you. Okay?</p> <p>In terms of the phasing, you've asked about the phasing closest to the Church of St Mary, in fact we're just on those three slides, so you can see we've got – the Church of St Mary is just to the south of the site here, so clearly the three nearest phases I think in some respects are not actually the phases that you'll be most aware of when you're at the Church of St Mary, although on the one hand because you're nearer you may hear them more readily.</p> <p>But on the other hand because they're actually screened by the trees – the band of trees that are around the site, as you're standing on top of the tower, I suspect you're more likely to see the far end of the site because you haven't got screening on the northern side of the site. So I suspect it's one of those issues where what the impact will be, my guess actually the impact may be slightly greater in the phases that are slightly further away, just simply because you'd have that clear visual line, but...</p> <p>And the Devils, I haven't got the boundary of it unfortunately, but I'm just trying to think if I've got – I don't think I've got a plan that I can show it to you on unfortunately, but it's around about 140/150m south of the site. Yeah, it's to the south. So I haven't got a plan that will show it for you unfortunately, but it's around about 150m south of the site.</p>	14.
Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. Cllr Kemp.	15.
Cllr Kemp	<p>Thank you, Chair. My question is around the people living in the vicinity of this facility. And first of all, it's been said that there's nobody living within 100m of the site, but then we've had something from one of the objectors saying that there are four receptors, so could you clarify that, please?</p> <p>And secondly, regarding the advice from Public Health, they're recommending real time automated monitoring of dust emissions and they say that because there's no current PM₁₀ monitoring, which can of course be harmful to human health, undertaken in the area, there's no way of verifying the accuracy of the model data that's being relied upon here. Now, how is this going to be addressed? Because obviously dust and sand are notable issues for human health and we've got to address health inequalities in the county, so what is going to be done to address that, please?</p>	16.
Andrew	Okay. All right. So the issue – is that on? Yes, right, there we go. Yeah. The issues	17.

	<p>with the nearest receptors, as you'll see, one of the issues, the points that's been raised by the objectors is that the assessments that have been undertaken have not identified all the nearest residential properties. There are properties within 100m of the site, of the application site, but what the applicant has tried to do is have an extraction boundary within the application boundary that pulls that extraction boundary back to 100m.</p> <p>And the reason why they do that is because the advice on the methodology for doing dust impact assessments sets out that there is essentially a cordon of 100m within – you know, beyond which you shouldn't get dust impacts from dust from mineral extraction sites. That's the logic behind it. And that's the basis for the 100m that has been proposed as the cordon in the Emerging Minerals Local Plan. Having said all that, the bottom line is there's still a requirement to do the assessment and look at the impacts on properties around the site and that's what the applicant's done.</p> <p>So in answer to your question, yes, there are properties within 100m of the application site. What the applicant's trying to do is to ensure that the boundary of the extraction area, because the guidance is concerned with the source of the dust rather than – you know, it makes sense because at the end of the day, you may have land within the extraction boundary where there's no extraction but is certainly within 100m of a property.</p> <p>In terms of the issue with the – you were talking about the requirement for the real time monitoring there and the –</p>	
Cllr Kemp	The PM ₁₀ s.	18.
Andrew Harriss	– the PM ₁₀ s, yeah. It is the case, there isn't [REDACTED], you know, there isn't anywhere they can essentially use as a – you know, to base their assessment from, but that's the whole point of the condition, is that it introduces real time monitoring which would be undertaken in conjunction with the imposition of a limit in terms of wind speed, so that monitoring, it's undertaken, it's recorded and essentially, because you've got no baseline, you set a cut-off point at which you say if the wind reaches a certain speed, then at that point the operations of the quarry would stop, but that's the whole point of the condition.	19.
Cllr Bambridge	<p>[REDACTED] question. Also, can we really afford to lose good agricultural land? I say good, because clearly there's gravel and sand beneath the topsoil which is good for drainage and that's something that we really need now, if you look around at the fields, we need good drainage for agricultural land.</p> <p>On the dust issue that Cllr Kemp has just raised, as I was going to anyway, I don't know about you, but I've noticed how windy it is these days, much more windy than it has been for many years everywhere, so I do think that is a big issue, and it's not just an issue for now, but it's an issue for a year's time if it's going to continue to be like that.</p>	20.
Andrew Harriss	<p>I'll take each of your points in turn. Firstly, the issue with the short – there's two different things here to be aware of. There is – the reference to the shortfall is actually a reference to what we do through the Local Plan process, and it's the amount of mineral that's going to be required through the duration of the next Local Plan, which has just been submitted for examination. And the shortfall is the amount of additional mineral that we essentially need to include in the sites reallocating that Plan, and this site is one of those sites that has been put forward to meet that shortfall. So in itself, the shortfall is not – it doesn't relate to this application, albeit this application, as I've set out in the report, has been put forward in anticipation of the new Plan going to examination.</p> <p>Being cynical, you could say, well, then what's happened here is the applicant has jumped the gun and has put the application in in advance of the enquiry, but on the other hand they're perfectly entitled to do so too, so it's their choice. They could have waited. It's not uncommon. So the shortfall is actually about that figure in the Local Plan. There's a separate issue which is about the landbank which is about how much mineral we've got currently consented in the county, but that's different from the</p>	21.

	<p>shortfall, and I've set that out in the report. Okay? So that's the shortfall.</p> <p>Then you went on to agricultural land. It's a good point. It's always a valid consideration. It's one of those subjects, I think I maybe said this at the last committee actually on the application we had at Beetley, you know, clearly where you've got what we call best and most versatile agricultural land, that's Grades 1 to 3a, there's been a policy imperative for a number of years to try and safeguard that. It's got weaker and weaker over the years. It used to be that it was very – it was simply discouraged to develop on best and most versatile agricultural land. Now the advice is that you have to look at the overall sustainability issues that are presented by the application in relation to maintaining and protecting that agricultural land, so it's much more of a balancing act these days.</p> <p>In this particular case, the intention is – the bulk of the site, around about 95% of the site, doesn't actually fall into the category of best and most versatile agricultural land. It's actually Grade 3b land, but the soils are being retained on the site and will be put back as part of the restoration, so that over the vast majority of the site you're not going to get any diminution in the value of the agricultural land. There is a small amount. Natural England are the agency that comment on this, and they've advised that they're happy with the restoration that's being put forward, because ultimately the site can continue to be used in an agricultural use, albeit that the restoration scheme is intended to secure biodiversity gain. So the idea is the soils are retained there and they will be put back.</p> <p>Your next question was – sorry, I'm trying to read my note here.</p>	
Cllr Bambridge	Following on from the dust and wind.	22.
Andrew Harriss	Yes. Sorry, remind me of the question again. I'm just looking [REDACTED].	23.
Cllr Bambridge	Well, Cllr Kemp raised the question of dust and I said has everybody noticed how windy it is, every day just about?	24.
Andrew Harriss	That's right. Yeah. And the intention here is that – what the Environmental Health and Public Health have acknowledged here is that clearly because of the issue with the dust and because of their recommendation for real time monitoring, there would also need to be monitoring of the wind speeds. And what they've actually recommended is that there's a cut-off point in terms of the level of wind speed beyond which the site wouldn't operate, essentially as an additional safeguard. So if it gets more windy and we've got more of a problem, the conditions are actually built into the recommendation to actually ensure that there's a safeguard there, even if wind speeds go up further.	25.
Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. Martin Storey.	26.
Cllr Storey	<p>Thank you, Chairman. Good morning. Good morning, everybody. Just to say, as regards the planning process, when we read a report like this and we read a report with so many objections, that's not often we get that amount of objections on an application to be fair, I just wonder what dialogue has been taking place between all those objecting, such as the Parish Councils, the residents and the developer themselves. I just wondered if there's any meetings, public consultation meetings, which have taken place which can try and allay some of these fears that obviously residents have.</p> <p>I think that's very important, that that system actually plays into the planning process personally, because we're all entitled to know exactly what's going to happen near us, to be fair, because obviously those one would assume who are objecting obviously live locally, and that's going to affect all sorts of things when you get an application such as this. So it's very important to get that right in my opinion from the start, and then some of these fears could be allayed.</p> <p>Chairman, just to, if I may, make a second point. This business, very interesting business, about land use, I am a farmer and I've always took the business about land use, the poorest grade land, we know that 90-odd per cent of this is on 3b which is very poor agricultural land. But I asked myself today, is there such a thing as poor</p>	27.

	<p>agricultural land. With farm and practices gone the way they're going and the developments of all sorts of things in the farming world, such land as 3b or 3a, most of this now has become high valuable vegetable land, especially those who've got irrigation to that and can irrigate.</p> <p>So when we hear about poor land I'm just wondering to myself, well, is it actually poor land, but I understand the point of view, where are we going to get sand and gravel if we don't go on those sort of sites? But that's a very difficult one to square when you look at these very high cash value crops coming off that type of land. Thank you, Chair.</p>	
Chair	Thank you, Cllr Storey. Could I just reiterate, I'd quite like Members to ask questions when we question the speakers. We'll have plenty of time following all of the speakers for debate. Cllr Kiddle-Morris.	28.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	<p>Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody. I come from a division with – I've had to write this down because I didn't believe it actually. I've got one restored landfill site, three restored quarries, three working quarries and one that's just been granted planning permission, so it's eventually four working quarries. Now, all those quarries that are being worked and the ones that have just been given planning permission are what I call wet quarries, because they go below the water table to extract some of the sand and gravel.</p> <p>From what I understand from this one, actually you're extracting above the water table, so therefore you're dry extracting. Now, I'm coming from the same direction as Cllr Bambridge and Cllr Kemp, that that will generate more dust than normal. And I'm particularly concerned that paragraph 342 says, "includes setting operational cut-offs for wind speeds across the site", and I won't sort of blow my own trumpet, but I did sail for about 30 years on the south coast and you get squalls like that and they could go from some nice summer's day to a squall in 30 seconds.</p> <p>How are you going to say we'll stop doing it? Because everybody else around you is going to be covered in sand. That's one thing. How are you going to say what sort of cut-off are you going to put in place? Or what can possibly be put in place to stop sand and dust? Because it is dry.</p> <p>And the other question I've got is, in 313 neglect – apparently, you've neglected to mention Thorpe Hall, and is that a listed building and is it actually closer than the Grade 1 listed church? Thank you, Chairman.</p>	29.
Andrew Harriss	Yeah. On your point about the wet working, yes, you're absolutely right, in this particular case the intention is not to extract below the water table, obviously very different from the sites in your division. In fact, I think you've got more applications to come very shortly in your division too. But yeah, it's a good point and, yes, clearly the issue with the dust is a major concern. We haven't by condition proposed a specific limit on the wind speed at this stage, precisely because we would probably want to take further advice on what's appropriate and we'd have to look at what the conditions are in terms of the wind on the site and we would take specific advice on that issue. But I think it's very definitely a valid point.	30.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	Just to come back a minute, Chairman, because of course we hand the responsibility for enforcement to South Norfolk District Council, do we not?	31.
Andrew Harriss	<p>Yeah, and what's proposed here is that there would be real time monitoring and the intention is essentially there would be a direct link to South Norfolk so they can actually monitor in real time what the conditions are on the site.</p> <p>The issue of Thorpe Hall, yes, you're correct. It's not that we've ignored it in the report, it's that there's an issue that's been raised, I think it was by the Broads Authority, that Thorpe Hall was omitted from the assessment on the impacts on the historic environment, and that has been acknowledged by the applicant. We've addressed that in the report.</p> <p>There is another adjacent listed building where we've looked at the overall comments that have been made in relation to the various listed buildings around that site. It is</p>	32.

	quite some considerable distance further away from the site than the Church of St Mary, but you're right, it has been omitted from the assessment. It's not the building – the nearest building to it has been included. There aren't predicted to be any significant impacts in relation to that other building. We've had to make a judgment call at the end of the day. It's not ideal, but that's where we are. That's what we've got.	
Chair	Thank you very much. Now I've lost track of who else put their hand up to speak. Is it just Cllr Neale left? Okay. Cllr Neale. Thank you.	33.
Cllr Neale	Thank you, Chair. Just a couple of questions. The first one is, I noted that the gravel is going to be separated from the sand on this site but would not be treated in any way, which means it's not going to be washed, is one thing. So what effect would that have when it's going to be transported to the other site where it would be treated? Because normally when you transport these things, they're treated before they're transported, so could you give me... And the second question is biodiversity net gain, we've needed that for decades so speed is important, so this is quite relevant to what two other speakers have mentioned, is the phasing operation. I'd like to know whether the introduction of wet woodland shrub and, well, basically re-establishing the area in phases or is it all going to be held back until – how many years is it? Six, seven? Yeah. So biodiversity is going to have to wait if it's not done phased. So is it planned to do that in the phased plan?	34.
Andrew Harris	To address your first point, yes, you're correct. It is the case that the only – to the extent there's any processing on the site, it is purely the separation of sand and gravel and there wouldn't be any washing on the site at all and that will happen at Norton Subcourse. Obviously, that raises issues of, and I can see where the concern is here, that if you've got that being transported, is there greater potential for dust, and it's obviously going to be for the applicant to ensure that that doesn't arise. You'd expect it to happen through the sheeting of lorries. And in terms –	35.
Cllr Neale	Sorry, can I just stop you there?	36.
Andrew Harris	Yeah.	37.
Cllr Neale	You said you hope it would be, so there's nothing...	38.
Andrew Harris	Well, if there's – you know, if it's a concern and it's certainly something we can condition that all trucks, and it's quite a common thing to do, is to impose a condition on the permission that trucks that leave the site should be sheeted.	39.
Cllr Neale	So that's not conditioned at the moment.	40.
Andrew Harriss	At the moment I don't think we've got a condition there, but there's nothing to stop us imposing that condition.	41.
Cllr Neale	Okay. Thank you.	42.
Andrew Harriss	Yeah. In terms of the restoration of the site, as I showed you on the plans, the intention is that there would be phased restoration that will relate to the land form. Quite how far the applicant will go in terms of proceeding with, if you like, the detail, the actual landscape, the planting, is something that we still need to get some further detail on, and we've reserved that by condition at the moment.	43.
Cllr Neale	So we can actually put a condition in?	44.
Andrew Harriss	Yes.	45.
Cllr Neale	Requesting that it is fully –	46.
Andrew Harris	Yeah.	47.
Cllr Neale	– well, for lack of a better word, re-landscaped as opposed to just shovelling soil back on.	48.
Andrew Harris	Yeah. There's a – at the moment there is essentially a concept restoration plan and what we've done is we've accepted the concept restoration, but we've actually reserved the detail of how they're going to implement that further by condition. So there's more to be agreed by condition.	49.
Chair	Okay. Thank you. I've got Cllr Carpenter.	50.
Cllr Carpenter	Thank you, Chairman. I hate to labour a point on the dust, but this site is [REDACTED] is the satellite site from the other site which is just up the road at Norton Subcourse. Has	51.

	any study been done there of the amount of dust that that one produces? Is it a similar operation?	
Andrew Harriss	I don't know the answer to that, but it's a question you might like to ask the applicant when they speak. They can probably advise you on that. No, it's not something we would ask for, because obviously we're dealing with this site, but it's a question –	52.
Cllr Carpenter	Yeah, I appreciate that.	53.
Andrew Harriss	Nothing came of the current application, let me put it like that.	54.
Cllr Carpenter	It just seems like common sense.	55.
Andrew Harriss	Sure. Sure.	56.
Cllr Carpenter	If there's no problems there, there might not be any problems there and vice versa.	57.
Andrew Harriss	Yeah. No, yeah.	58.
Cllr Carpenter	Okay. Thank you, Chairman. Thank you.	59.
Chair	Cllr Colwell.	60.
Cllr Colwell	Thank you, Chair. Just a really short question to make sure that I've understood this correctly if that's okay, Andrew. I appreciate this is not in an allocated site and I think I understand from the papers that it's national policy for land banking for this kind of gravel for seven years. We in Norfolk have 11.6 years' worth at the moment. So would it be fair to say that we don't have to rush a decision in theory if we didn't feel comfortable today, because we've got a lot to meet the needs of Norfolk and it might be better potentially to... well, yeah, is that – have I understood that?	61.
Andrew Harris	You've got that absolutely – that's exactly right, spot on. I mean the advice – I've set this point out in the report because I have said, you know, in terms of what we're advised to do is to maintain a minimum of seven-year land bank. There's no maximum. And there are Authorities elsewhere in the country that have got 20 years, you know, because they've chosen to grant additional consents. As a result, the advice is, and sorry we're straying a little bit into issues around the determination here, but it's a good point, the advice here is that there is no maximum and in itself it's not really something you can use as a reason for refusal on the one hand. But on the other hand it is relevant, it is a relevant consideration. And if you've got a – if you're looking at what are the benefits of the scheme, then clearly that in terms of what it does of adding to and maintaining a land bank, that's clearly a consideration. If we were right down at seven years or below seven years, then clearly we'd be saying to you, you know, it's important that we actually have permission for additional sand and gravel resource in the county. But obviously it's something that you need to consider as a committee today, the fact that we have a land bank at the moment which stands at eleven years.	62.
Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. I see no further questions, so I'd like to go on to Sari Kelsey who's an objector.	63.
Cllr Kelsey	Thank you, Mister Chairman, Councillors. My name is Sari Kelsey and I here represent the majority of Haddiscoe village and the Stopit Campaign. Despite suggestions that much has changed in this current application from that of 2011, we feel little in fact has changed. At the 2011 application the then Planning Committee rejected the plan on heritage grounds, the right decision as the Secretary of State later agreed. This time Historic England have raised the exact same objections as they did in 2011. We are again here against this quarry proposal for the same field known as MIN25. We have fundraised to deliver legal advice, obtain reports from dust experts and mining engineers. These reports we have submitted to Norfolk County Council and to your hands. We raise significant areas of concern. Haddiscoe is again fighting for the well-being of its residents, the well-being of its land	64.

	<p>and national heritage. The Secretary of State's own representative uniquely raised concerns for the well-being of our population, heritage and tourism when looking at MIN25. Homes that are 100m from the proposed site and beyond are threatened by dust and especially the invisible particulate matter 2.5. This 2.5 particulate matter embeds itself straight into the lung, causing significant damage.</p> <p>The field where the proposed quarry would be is 25 football pitches in size and sits on a high point in the village overlooking the Broadland National Park. Quarrying in this field would only serve to whip up dust and roll it out over the village. You'll be told that the exact level of PM2.5 dust distributed in quarrying is unknown and that 2.5 particulate matter is not yet identified in quarry planning application legislation, but the medical fact that 2.5 particulate matter is risky is undisputed. We, the residents of Haddiscoe, do not want to be the trial case where the full knowledge is made apparent to the detriment of the life of our children. Remember Ella's Law.</p> <p>I wonder if any of your committee has visited the village or the site. The pictures we have seen doesn't show where the houses are or the church. We are proud of our church. A thousand years old, it is prominent, looking out over the Broadland delta, protecting the villagers from marauders. One of a cluster of nine round tower churches, the setting in which St Mary's Haddiscoe sits is spectacular. She stands high with rolling agricultural land to one side and a dramatic fall away to the Old Coach Road and ancient woodland on the other. The proposed quarry is in that rolling agricultural side.</p> <p>If the excavation and sifting for gravel within this field goes ahead, we know all too well in Haddiscoe that this field's natural character will be lost forever and become a blot on the landscape, as on other sites. The process will despoil the setting of St Mary's, our Grade I listed church, one of the 2.5% such churches in Great Britain. If the quarry is agreed, the noise of gravel being sifted from sand will accompany our baptisms, weddings and funerals for years to come, but the damage to her setting will be forever.</p> <p>Commercially, we know or believe that Norfolk County Council has already well met its performance indicator for gravel without the proposed quarry. With a 100m buffer zone being properly observed for all homes around the site, the quantity of any gravel that may in fact be extracted will be less than has been advertised, especially as the tonnage estimated comes from the land that includes the tree belt around the site, as our hand-out that we distributed earlier shows. Councillors, there's no hard evidence that the gravel estimated exists at all. Estimates are circumstantial. This mistake has made us suffer before in Haddiscoe.</p> <p>Most landowners and farmers see themselves as steward of the land, preserving or improving the ground they in the historical sense temporarily have responsibility for. This land will return to the landowner. We know to our cost in Haddiscoe that projects like this quarry –</p>	
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	You have one minute.	65.
Cllr Kelsey	<p>– does not see the land improving its agricultural ability or grazing. We already have a sunken field that is of no use to the farmer. Rather, it drives tourism and business away. How can the Parochial Church Council use Tower Tours, as they have repeatedly done, to raise money for our church if this quarry happens? Access to the tour offered a historical glimpse across the agricultural landscape to neighbouring St Matthias, a view of ancestors. That view will be destroyed forever, as it is between these proposed churches the quarry lies.</p> <p>My father is buried in St Mary's Church, a World War II fighter pilot three times decorated for bravery by the then King, he gave his youth and well-being fighting for democracy against unspeakable tyranny. Today, Councillors, we have no control over your vote, but please hear us. The village doesn't want this quarry. The Parish Council doesn't want this quarry. We have the support of our elected County Councillor, District Councillor and MP. So please reject this planning application. Reject MIN25</p>	66.

	from your mining policy. Look after our county and country's national heritage. Look after our farmland for the future and our people's well-being. Thank you.	
	[Applause]	67.
Chair	Thank you very much, Sari. Very well spoken. Members, do you have questions for Sari? No? Yes.	68.
Cllr Storey	Chairman, just to say that I don't know whether the speaker would answer my question which I asked earlier, that's regarding has there been consultation between the Parishes, public meetings by applicants and yourselves, to try and come to some sort of agreement or not? Has there been much dialogue between you and the developer?	69.
Cllr Kelsey	Right at the beginning, the developer held a public display which the village attended. We found some inaccuracies in some of that display and some concerns about the fact that the sifting of gravel was not something that was openly discussed.	70.
Chair	Okay. Thank you. Cllr Neale.	71.
Cllr Neale	I just want to clarify from the speaker and from Andrew, the speaker said that this is the same as the old application that came in and Andrew, the Officer, has told us it's not and the material fact was that the processing plant was going to be on the other side of the road which would have obviously been in sight of the church and a much different scenario. So who is correct?	72.
Cllr Kelsey	There is indeed no cement works in front of the church, but the quarry is exactly the same quarry site that lies right alongside it. If you were – I was today to take you there, you would see that the quarry is right – there is just a very narrow road to Hales and then there's the quarry. It's the same quarry.	73.
Chair	Okay. Thank you. Sorry, would you like to now do your second presentation, if you've drawn breath? Thank you very much.	74.
Cllr Kelsey	<p>You're very kind. Thank you. Chairman, Councillors, here as a Parish Councillor, I speak on behalf of Haddiscoe Parish Council. We in the Parish Council have watched with deepening concern as the pressure of yet another quarry application on the self-same site as rejected in the 2011 application has resulted in stress for our parishioners and fear detrimental to their mental health. We have noticed our expressed concerns to the application dismissed and belittled.</p> <p>We are now angry. We see that this quarry application wrongly repeatedly infers or claims that the proposed quarry is part of the NCC Plan before this matter has been in fact debated and decided. We believe that Norfolk County Council is already in potential breach of CS1 by being in excess of its gravel land bank allocation. This application would exacerbate the position. We feel that the applicant is in breach of C14 through failure to ensure no unacceptable impact of PM2.5. The unresolved full conflict of opinion between the two dust experts, one purchased by Stopit, one by the developer, must surely worry, as we as Parish Councillors like yourselves, have a duty to protect well-being.</p> <p>We can only see further devastation of our serviceable agricultural land and natural habitats. We know that our parishioners' homes and right to live will be despoiled through dust and noise, their properties devalued as they remain stuck in their homes and the enjoyment of their rural setting ruined. We are in full support of Stopit2, representing, as it does, the majority of the Parish, with only 1% in favour of the quarry. We are proud of the efforts by fundraisers to get independent dust and engineering reports and concerned to see the amount of missed or underreported points in the applicants' reports and other supporting papers.</p> <p>We have now no trust in this application. Vague comments, unsubstantiated, like work stopping on a windy day, so at what speed? Blatant underreporting of Historic England's concerns, plus the tonnage being estimated taking in not only the tree belt but within the 100m boundary of people's properties, i.e. their gardens, have been but starters to this distrust. The 100m buffer zone for properties should be taken from the boundary of the whole, not just the buildings. We have gardens and we use them. This is blatant disregard for people's lives.</p> <p>The fact that Stopit had to bake cakes to fund expert reports to notice inaccuracy is outrageous. Stopit Humes Engineering, not the developer, has produced the plan</p>	75.

	<p>showing the 100m boundaries around the sensitive receptors, people's homes close to the proposed site. The tonnage achievable can be seen to be overestimated, the surface area reduced by 30%, the volumes of potential minerals reduced by up to 50%. Surely it can be seen that the economics balance with the risk of harm has now totally changed. The quarry is not viable.</p> <p>Historic England has repeated its concerns for our 12th-century church. The statement reads, the setting is at risk above level of harm, the same concern as in 2011 when this informed key grounds to reject the application. This concern has been underrepresented by the applicant.</p> <p>Our parishioners, your constituents, have a right to life. The risk from invisible PM2.5 dust, the noise of gravel sifting from sand so close to homes, the impact of gravel from this proposed quarry in lorries eventually leaving Norton to move through our main street to Great Yarmouth turn this rural village on the threshold of the Broadland National Park into an industrial site.</p> <p>In this election year, please support the majority vote of the District Councillor, the County Councillor and the Parish Council representatives who reject this application. Don't waste voters' money on this site anymore. Say no to this quarry, no to MIN25. It is the only democratic, safe and economic thing to do. Thank you.</p>	
	[Applause]	76.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	I was going to say you had one minute left but you beat me to it.	77.
Cllr Kelsey	I thought I'd be kind to you this time.	78.
Chair	You're only 2 seconds over last time. Councillors, are there any questions? No? Okay. Thank you very much. We will move on to the applicant or agent, Lewis Williams from the Breedon Group. You have five minutes.	79.
Lewis Williams	<p>Chair and Members of the Planning Committee, thank you for allowing me to speak in support of this planning application. My name is Lewis Williams and I'm Breedon's Planning Estates Manager for the East of England region. Breedon is a leading supplier of building materials in the UK, Ireland and the USA. We operate Norton Subcourse Quarry near Hale in Norfolk which has been producing sand and gravel since the 1960s.</p> <p>A blend of sand and gravel is required to provide salable products to meet demand. We have recently faced production difficulties because of a significant shortage of gravel in the remaining reserves. We have submitted the planning application before Members for extraction at Manor Farm near Haddiscoe to address this shortfall in gravel. Extracted gravel will be transferred to Norton Subcourse for processing so that production can return to historic levels and meet existing demand. This will allow Breedon to fully utilise remaining reserves, avoiding sterilisation of sand and making best use of existing processes and infrastructure.</p> <p>In total, around 650,000 tonnes of gravel will be extracted from the site over a period of seven years. The site is allocated in the Emerging Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, meaning the Council has already confirmed that the principle of development in this location is acceptable. This further demonstrates the need for development in that it will help supply the required 12.5 million tonnes of sand in the plan period. Members should note that Norton Subcourse forms a large part of the existing sand and gravel land bank that the Council is mandated to maintain. Without the additional gravel, this land bank will reduce, increasing the requirements of sand and gravel over the plan period.</p> <p>The economic benefits of the proposed development are significant, providing essential materials to support regional construction of housing, roads and other infrastructure while maintaining direct and indirect employment locally through the procurement of contractors and services. We have carefully designed the scheme to minimise impact on neighbours. All processing would take place off site at Norton Subcourse. Mineral would be extracted in a phased manner with progressive</p>	80.

	<p>restoration. No vehicles would be permitted to travel through Haddiscoe village. Hours of operation would be restricted during the week.</p> <p>A 100m standoff would be maintained to the nearest residential receptors throughout development. A range of mitigation measures related to noise and dust are proposed to protect residential amenity, including ongoing monitoring. Mineral will be extracted above the water table so there will be no increase to flood risk through dewatering. These measures are secured by planning conditions which are set out in the committee report.</p> <p>Breedon is aware that issues have been raised by those local to the site. It is important for Members to note that there has been no objection raised by the District Council's Environmental Quality Team or Public Health Team with regards to noise and dust or from the Council's Highway Authority. The Council has undertaken its own heritage assessment as part of the Emerging Plan which states, mineral extraction will not result in unacceptable harm.</p> <p>The submitted environmental impact assessment concludes that the development will be carried out in a sustainable manner. Enhancements will be provided during and following restoration, ensuring net gain to biodiversity. The existing sand on site will be used to deliver a final restoration scheme with over 14 hectares of species rich lowland meadow, over 6 hectares of woodland, provision of several national priority habitats, provision of bat and bird boxes as well as hibernacula. A new [REDACTED] path will also be provided in addition to the reinstatement of Bridleway BR5 which would be temporarily diverted.</p> <p>Breedon is committed to working alongside our neighbours and will establish a quarry liaison group on commencement of development. Outreach is a key focus for the business and we are always keen to participate in the community events and invite local communities into our sites to educate them about quarrying, showcase interesting archaeology or promote a diverse array of biodiversity at our sites. For instance, today is the last day of the company's week -long sustainability festival.</p> <p>The Case Officer's report is detailed and comprehensive, indicating that the proposed development complies with the Development Plan and is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework –</p>	
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	You have one minute remaining.	81.
Lewis Williams	<p>– which states that great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction. It is clear that the significant benefits of the proposal far outweigh any perceived impacts which have been appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>Breedon requests that you approve this planning application in accordance with the Case Officer's recommendation. I'm happy to answer any questions that the Committee might have and I am accompanied by our air quality expert who is also willing to answer any questions. Thank you.</p>	82.
Chair	Thank you very much. Okay. Can you just keep your hands up for a second and my colleague's going to jot them down, but I'll start right at the back with Cllr Ward.	83.
Cllr Ward	Thank you, Chairman. I just want to ask about the bats because one of the objectors said the bat detector wasn't working. Have you done a full bat survey, please?	84.
Lewis Williams	Yeah, the appropriate suite of surveys were carried out as part of the proposal, so all necessary protected species were surveyed, as required by planning policy.	85.
Chair	Okay. Thank you. Cllr Sands. [REDACTED].	86.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	Yes.	87.
Chair	No?	88.
Cllr Sands	I didn't raise my hand, but I do have –	89.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	Probably Cllr Neale.	90.
Chair	Cllr Neale.	91.

Chair	Your ping is going off.	92.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	[REDACTED]	93.
Chair	Hearing aids only in the one ear.	94.
Cllr Neale	You mentioned phased regeneration of – straight after the phasing, progressive restoration you said. Will that include tree planting and shrubs? So it's the full plan as you go or are you planning to only do part of the restoration in phases?	95.
Lewis Williams	The submitted phasing plans show where the restoration would take place, so aside from retaining a whole route to the quarry, the sort of active mineral extraction areas within the phase, all the restoration that could be completed in those areas that are allocated for restoration would be undertaken, so yes, any planting that we can do as and when we go through the development would take place. As the Case Officer noted earlier, we are obligated to provide further details about restoration, so those would include progressive restoration, so that would be picked up as part of that process.	96.
Chair	Okay. Cllr Kemp.	97.
Cllr Kemp	Thank you, Chair. My question to the applicant is about the process of the separation of the sand and the gravel. I understand and am I right in thinking that you haven't done a noise assessment for the church, any sort of activities like weddings or funerals that might go on, for example, but what is the process for sand and gravel separation? Because presumably there must be quite a lot of scope for dust generation but also noise. So can you tell me more about it and what you do to mitigate it, please?	98.
Lewis Williams	So the process will involve the use of a screen, so effectively the sand and gravel is extracted from the ground and it's put through a screen where it's separated and that's it. So yes, that process does generate noise, but all that noise has been appropriately assessed in the noise assessment and has been considered as part of that. So I think you'll find on the proposed conditions there are noise limits which the quarry has to comply with, and those noise limits are set out on the basis of the background noise levels which have been taken as a pre-development scenario and then the noise from all the activities on site has been modelled, so that it generates those noise limits.	99.
Cllr Kemp	Can I just as a follow-up question, is it a mechanical process? It has a machine?	100.
Lewis Williams	Yes, it is.	101.
Cllr Kemp	Okay.	102.
Lewis Williams	Sorry. It's quite a – it's something that you commonly see on the quarry and I think what is important for Members to understand with this development is there's going to be very limited machinery on site. It's not going to be a very intensive activity. There will be two people operating the site, so yeah, there'll be limited machinery on site at any one time.	103.
Cllr Kemp	Thank you.	104.
Chair	Thank you very much. Cllr Carpenter.	105.
Cllr Carpenter	Thank you, Chairman. Just rolling back a little bit, the same question or the question I asked Andrew earlier was concerning the dust and also the other depot at Norton Subcourse. Has there any mitigation been done to reduce dust at that other course, at the Norton Subcourse? And have you had any complaints about it? Is it going to be a similar process at this new site?	106.
Lewis Williams	So yeah, I'll try and answer your question in two parts. So Norton of course is an existing quarry that has its own planning consent and as part of that planning process, an air quality and a dust assessment would have been provided, so that's all catered for. In terms of this planning application here, we've assessed the impacts from this quarry and also any cumulative impacts associated with the operation of our quarry and the Norton Subcourse quarry, so it has been considered as part of the planning process. In terms of the operation at the Norton Subcourse quarry, it's a lot more intensive in terms of processing. The material is washed, it's screened, there's lots of different stockpiles, so the potential for dust there is a lot higher than at this site, but as far as I'm aware, we don't routinely receive any complaints in terms of dust. So yeah, I think for this development here, again, it's a low intensity activity, but it has been assessed as part of the planning application process.	107.

Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. I didn't see any other Members. Cllr Bambridge.	108.
Cllr Bambridge	Thank you, Chairman. On one of the later papers that came through there's the words particulate matter which frightens me. I've got late onset asthma and I know it's only part of that sort of health issue that people might have. This was one of the issues that was raised when the infamous application for an incinerator happened in Kingsley, but that was because of the south-westerly winds. Have you done any tests on the wind direction in this area?	109.
Applicant's Air Quality Expert	There hasn't been any measurements, but for the assessment we used wind – ten-year average wind data from Norwich which is sort of representative of the area. The prevailing wind is from the southwest.	110.
Chair	Excuse me, if I might just follow on that point, a couple of times previously we've had questions raised around will stop when it's windy. How will you know when to stop? Because as we hear, we often get squalls across Norfolk, we often get days when it sort of gusts for half a day and then it dies down. Are we expecting the operators to literally have something on their machines that tells them it's over a certain wind speed, so therefore they have to stop and they'll stand down? Or is there going to be some other process that you've designed into it?	111.
Lewis Williams	I think in terms of the operation, so there'll be a monitor on site that will monitor wind, so we'll have up-to-date readings of wind, so Breedon have the assumption and we best practice – we put best practice measures in place, but we would assume that the Council in their condition that relates to dust and emissions would put an appropriate wind measure and speed in place, so we would work to that.	112.
Applicant's Air Quality Expert	Can I just add as well that there's a dust management plan in place for operations at the site and one of the actions in that dust management plan is that if there's any visible dust at the site boundary, work will cease and actions taken to find the source of that dust and mitigation in the form of water used to stop it.	113.
Chair	So I hate to be pedantic, so that would mean somebody from the residents would have to come and tell you that their houses are now getting covered in dust, so the digger driver could stop, because I guess the digger driver is going to be in the middle of the dust and therefore won't know that the dust is going over the perimeter.	114.
Applicant's Air Quality Expert	All the operatives there will be trained, you know, to maintain appropriate levels of dust and so, you know, they'll keep an eye on their operations and if they see any dust leaving the site, then they'll stop work.	115.
Chair	Okay. Thank you. I've got Cllr White.	116.
Cllr White	Yeah, mine is only a very small query. Is separation by the means of a trommel?	117.
Lewis Williams	Sorry, I didn't catch that last bit.	118.
Cllr White	I said is the separation of the sand and gravel going through a trommel?	119.
Lewis Williams	I'm not quite familiar with that terminology, but it's a screen, so it's a mechanical...	120.
Cllr White	[REDACTED]	121.
Lewis Williams	So it grades and splits out the different sort of coarse and the fine material.	122.
Chair	I hope I haven't got this wrong again. Cllr Sands.	123.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	No, you haven't.	124.
Cllr Sands	Thank you, Chair. Just going back to the 2.5 particulate matter, there seems to be quite a deal of health related material relating to this. And is the particulate matter in this area likely to be silica or quartz based or some other material? I understand the type of material can have different effects on the health and it can embed itself deep into the lungs.	125.
Lewis Williams	I think it's important for Members to take note that – so in terms of extracting the sand, we're not doing anything to those sand particles, so we're not grinding it, we're not making it any smaller. So when you grind material such as sand, that is where you generate these harmful sort of PM2.5s. And we're not doing that on site, we're doing nothing to the particles themselves that would generate this PM2.5 material.	126.
Applicant's Air Quality Expert	Yeah, PM2.5, when we're talking about PM, we're talking about PM10 and PM2.5. PM2.5 is a fraction of PM10, so it's a smaller fraction, and most PM2.5 is produced through combustion processes. So, you know, when we're assessing the impacts on	127.

	health from mineral sites, we would look at PM10. Any PM2.5 emitted will come from any plant on the site and the emissions will be minimal, they'll be very, very small.	
Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. And I have Cllr Kemp.	128.
Cllr Kemp	Yes. Thank you, Chair. Quick follow-up question to the process of separating the sand and the gravel, you said it's a screened process. Now, a screen is like something you put between something or is it going to be completely covered? Because if there's just literally a screen, then the sand and the gravel will rise, particularly the sand, when you separate it. But is it completely covered? Can you quite explain what happens?	129.
Lewis Williams	So yeah, it's not something that's completely covered, but I think it's important for Members to understand that this is a routine process that happens on all quarry sites and our operatives are trained to do certain management practices to ensure that dust isn't generated. So on particularly dry days, there'll be a water bowser in use, so that will dampen down any material, so there are lots of different ways for our site operatives to manage dust, so it doesn't become a nuisance. And we've also got the real time monitoring as well. So it's a process that – it does generate dust, it can generate dust, but equally it's been assessed as part of the planning application in a very detailed manner.	130.
Chair	Now, I'm going to always ask the silly question which hopefully isn't too silly. So I still don't understand. I've never been in a gravel quarry, I don't really understand what screening does and how it does it, so are we talking about a digger that just tips gravel onto a moving shelf or is it a rotating barrel that churns it or is it like an old combine? I know farming. Is it like the combine shakers in the back that literally shake the gravel through?	131.
Lewis Williams	Yes. So these machines basically – so you pour the material into it, it goes into the machine, it's segregated by various grids and then it comes out on the various sort of travelators, if you want to call them that, and it's deposited at the sides of the machine.	132.
Chair	Okay. Thank you. Do I have any further – I do. Cllr Sands. No.	133.
Cllr Storey	Storey.	134.
Chair	Cllr Storey.	135.
Cllr Storey	Thank you, Chairman. Yeah. Whilst we're concentrated on the dust movement as regards the pit itself, I live not far from a gravel pit. To be fair that particular pit is well operated I would say. But having said that, when the lorries are loaded or unloaded coming in and out of the site, they're seemingly, you know, obviously in the bad weather conditions of summer time, there's a lot of dust that comes off the trucks themselves, empty or full, when they're leaving the site or exiting – or coming onto the site. I just wondered how you would deal with that if permission was granted.	136.
Lewis Williams	So, first of all, the HGVs would be sheeted. There'll be some form of wheel wash provision on site as per the required conditions and also generally, as good practice measures, we road treat the roads around the site to keep everywhere clean. I think – I guess a good analogy is this site is farmed, so there will be a lot of dust generated from the process of farming. As a responsible mineral operator, we will ensure the surrounding road networks are clear and clean and we're obviously bound by all the planning conditions on any decision notice to ensure that we do follow through on all these management practices that we put in place.	137.
Chair	Okay. I see no further hands, so I'm going to move on to Cllr Stone. You have five minutes, sir.	138.
Cllr Stone	Thank you, Chairman, and good morning to you all. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the Stopit2 group and the Parish Council for the enormous amount of work that they put into developing their objections and forwarding all the relevant information and finding the relevant information for that matter – excuse me – concerning this application. They've done a really good job and well done. This application or not this application, this idea of having a gravel extraction pit in Haddiscoe has been going on for some years now. I can't remember the exact date, it's somewhere in the region of I think seven years at least, when the threat has been hanging over the village like a Damocles sword that one of these days the application will come back again and it will potentially get passed and the fears of the villagers and the Parish Council, etc. will materialise. This has not been an easy process for them and I sympathise with the anxiety and the concern that has been the result.	139.

	<p>What I would like – and not only that, just while I'm on that and that subject, not only that, but this development is supposedly set for seven years. Now, in my experience in other parts of the county most of these developments come back after their initial period of operation and ask for an extension, and very often they're granted. Norton Subcourse, for example, was granted a 23-year or 25-year extension not that long ago. So in other words, that gravel extraction site will be going for many, many years to come. Is this going to happen again at Haddiscoe once the seven-year period has finished?</p> <p>And I'd mention or suggest to Councillors, to Council Members, that would you like this kind of operation taking place within 100m potentially of where you live? Do you want, would you like to see or would you accept a gravel pit near where you live which is going to be churning out the gravel and sending it by vehicles on narrow country roads? Not necessarily, I know some people live in more built-up areas, but still nevertheless in fairly close proximity, which would lead to, and it has to lead to, but I'm suggesting it would lead to noise, pollution, dust resulting from these vehicle movements going on from 8 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock at night, five and a half days a week. I might possibly wrongly assume that you wouldn't really want one.</p> <p>Now, I know the planning regulations are very strict and the Officer's recommendation is to approve this application. Now, for you to turn down this application, you have to come up with some reasons, legal reasons, according to planning law, as to why you would like to turn this application down, and I hope you will come to that conclusion at the end and turn it down. And I'll give you possibly several options as to why you would be able to turn this application down and be within planning law.</p> <p>If I refer you to the consultation process, which starts on page 50 of my papers, I hope it starts at the same place on yours, and just go through one or two issues there that certainly stood out to me. South Norfolk District Council, no objections, but express concern.</p>	
Chair	You have one minute.	140.
Cllr Stone	<p>Oh my goodness. Thank you. In that case I'll speed up. I need to go to one very positive objection that came up as well which I'll just find very quickly. Sorry. That from Norfolk County Council Public Health, that any new activity, any new operation that takes place should, and I quote from the Officer's report here, "particularly concerned that any [redacted] should provide a net gain overall benefit to the population who it affects". And this is not going to do that. And it will not contribute to better air quality management or in fact give a positive impact to the local residents, so that straightaway is an excuse there.</p> <p>So because I'm running out of time talking too much, I would like to recommend that Members –this controversial application is turned down and that you ask your Officers to go away and look for an alternative site which we assume there is, because the various concerns –</p>	141.
Chair	Thank you, Cllr Stone.	142.
Cllr Stone	– added together should give you enough to be able to say no, turn this application down.	143.
Chair	Thank you.	144.
	[Applause]	145.
Chair	Members, do you have questions for Cllr Stone? No questions. Okay. We move to debate. Do Members have any comments to make on the application? I'll start with Rob, because it's the first hand I saw.	146.
Cllr Colwell	Thank you, Chair. Yes, so we've heard lots of things, if I'm honest with you, Chair, today that have concerned me, primarily the concern around heritage grounds and the fact that this site is around 100m from St Mary's Grade I Church and to me it's a beautiful round church – round tower church, and there has to be concern in this room as to what we're going to do about that. And we've also heard about the location of this area, it abuts the Broads National Park, and at least with the Norton Subcourse, at least there's a buffer there between the area and the Broads National Park.	147.

	<p>And I've also expressed my concern and the unease in the use of the words, the terminology, satellite extension, and I kind of I'd prefer, you know, a bit of honesty. This feels to me like a completely separate site and I understand that there's no processing, but to me this is – this is 4.1 – I mean how far away, how near does it have to be to be considered a satellite? Is some of the things that have been running through my mind, if I'm honest with everyone.</p> <p>And we've heard concerns about dust, we've heard concerns about the health impact and implications for local residents, we've heard that there's well in excess of the seven-year land bank minimum required for the county. So it's not like we have to rush a decision today. It's been made quite clear that this site is not an allocated site. And in theory I kind of hope that this Council is listening on a more wider basis and, even depending on what decision is made today, considers whether or not this area should be removed from the emerging site allocations, so that's how I'm feeling. Thanks, Chair.</p>	
Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. Cllr Carpenter.	148.
Cllr Carpenter	Thank you, Chairman. Couldn't agree more, Rob. Going back to the dust, I live in Belton which is not far from Haddiscoe, and I'm quite near a quarry, about 400 yards, and I regularly dust my car off. The area in question, although I don't know it well, I use that road often to drive up to here, it's a beautiful area. This appears to be a blot on the landscape if this was granted. That's just my opinion. It's not a material matter to consider, but that's the way it is. I am not convinced, from what I've heard, that the dust will be dealt with and will be an issue. Thank you, Chairman.	149.
Chair	Thank you. I have Cllr Richmond.	150.
Cllr Richmond	Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Just to say I'm prepared to put forward a proposal and reasons for the proposal but only when you're satisfied that the Committee have had an opportunity to fully debate and comment on the application. Thank you.	151.
Chair	Thank you. Cllr Kiddle-Morris.	152.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	Yes. Thank you, Chairman. One of the reasons I asked the question I did about whether it was a dry extraction or a wet extraction earlier, what you're going to be left with is a hole of dust, because the site that's being extracted is actually going to be open and long weekend or whatever and you get a gale with no rain, you're going to get dust, and that's without any working going on. So to me, I think this application lacks any clarity on how the residents, the amenity of the residents is going to be addressed. And I also have problems with the proximity of the Grade I listed church, and I think that the amenity of that church will be harmed by this particular application.	153.
Chair	Thank you. Cllr Sands.	154.
Cllr Sands	<p>Thank you, Chair. Looking at page – was it 50? – the page which mentions the County Health Department, and it's very, very inconclusive. It talks about conducting a study, but then it doesn't go through. It seems to have left it to the quarry operators to conduct any kind of real health study and that sort of does concern me.</p> <p>The other thing that does concern me is the sheer proximity of the site to the village of Haddiscoe. Had it been another 300m, 400m, 500m away, I might have some different thoughts, but the whole process does concern me. I mean I do remember I used to drive down the A1136 on a daily basis on my way to work and it is a very pretty area. And yeah, the whole process of this really, really raises some concerns. I'm not certain myself how I feel at the moment as to whether I approve or disapprove of this application, but I'm finding it hard to find reasons to approve of it.</p>	155.
Chair	Okay. Thank you, Cllr Sands. Are there any further comments from Members? Okay. Cllr Kemp.	156.
Cllr Kemp	Yes. I'm minded to think that this application, when it was refused, when it's been loaded up, does give rise for concern because this is so close to the village and there's a grey area between how close the nearest houses were. It turns out some have been left out, some – at least one listed building has been left out. There's considerable doubt about this application, but what we are aware of is that St Mary's Grade I listed Church is very close to it and it will be impacted on and the Planning Inspector thought so too. I would be minded to make a proposal as well after everybody's debated this. Thank you.	157.
Chair	Thank you. Cllr Storey.	158.

Cllr Storey	Mister Chairman, I'm mindful of what everybody said and with the greatest respect, as a Councillor, Chairman, we have to obviously take most importantly the residents we all represent. And we hear today that we have 11.6 years' worth of sand and gravel for Norfolk and that we have time obviously on our side as regarding sites coming forward. I just feel with it being so close to residential areas and the obviously St Mary's Grade I listed Church and may I say the representations we've had from the objectors, with their very well put, strong case, in my opinion I feel, Chairman, as a Councillor to do my job properly and represent Norfolk as a whole, my job is to make that balanced decision and I will do so accordingly when it comes to the vote.	159.
Chair	Thank you. Is there anyone else that wishes to speak? No. Well, I've not heard anything that leads me to think that Members are looking towards the existing recommendation. So is there a proposal or an alternative proposal from the floor? Cllr Richmond.	160.
Cllr Richmond	Yes. Thank you, Chairman. The Committee wish to refuse the application. The Committee considered that there would be an adverse change to the landscape for the duration of the quarry proposed, there would be harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade I listed Church of St Mary. Other potential negative factors include increased noise, dust and traffic. Thank you.	161.
Chair	Okay. Thank you very much. Do I have a seconder for that recommendation? I have many seconders for that recommendation. I'll take Cllr Kemp.	162.
Cllr Kemp	Yes. I think looking at the well-being of the residents and the fact that there would be material harm to a heritage asset, this being so close to it, to St Mary's, and the fact that this is not in the Plan and there isn't a need for it, because we have an 11.6 year supply of sand and gravel in the county, I would agree that we should reject this as a Committee.	163.
Chair	So just for clarity, are we saying that the site is inappropriate or the proposal is inappropriate?	164.
Cllr Richmond	I'd say the site, but that's what I'm putting forward.	165.
Cllr Kemp	I would agree that the site is and the proposal of what's being proposed are unacceptable.	166.
Chair	Okay. Just before we go – oh, sorry.	167.
Cllr Neale	[REDACTED] just some advice from Officers, are these acceptable reasonable grounds? I mean I know appeals come and go and you never know which way they're going, but is it a safe assumption?	168.
Nick Johnson	Well, the Officers have advised you what their recommendation is. Obviously, there's planning judgment to be exercised and you are the parties who are empowered to exercise planning judgment. What I was seeking clarity for, so I had heard a lot of discussions about what the applicant hadn't done or hadn't said or hadn't put in their recommendations or put in their reports or clarified, so I wanted to make it clear whether you were in coming to your recommendations, you were concerned about what the applicant had submitted or about the intrinsic matters of the site. And you've – I think you're somewhere in between the two at the moment, so the question to you is to clarify that point.	169.
Chair	Could I make an alternative proposal that the application be refused on the following grounds. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal as submitted contains sufficient measures to satisfactorily mitigate impact on the nearby heritage assets and reduce amenity impacts to acceptable levels.	170.
Cllr Kiddle-Morris	Yeah, I'll second.	171.
Chair	Are Members happy with that proposal? Yeah. Cllr Bambridge.	172.
Cllr Bambridge	Chairman, we could add harm to the environment as well, but also potential health issues, because there's nowhere in the document that says that the particulate matter will not affect local residents.	173.
Nick Johnson	Obviously, it is for the Members to come to the recommendation they wish to do so. I would highlight that obviously you've got the Environmental Health Officer's report before you as well, so when making that recommendation, bear that in mind.	174.
Chair	Okay. I'm not quite going to move us to a vote. Cllr Sands.	175.
Cllr Sands	No, I agree with your proposal and reasons for refusal. I think had this site been, as I	176.

	said before, several hundred metres further from a settled area, we might be having a different discussion.	
Chair	I'd like us to move to a vote. Could I have those Members in favour of the amended recommendation –	177.
M1	For refusal.	178.
Chair	– for refusal. Okay. That is noted.	179.
F1	I think that's unanimous.	180.
Chair	That was unanimous. Could I also – we'll accept that. Thank you very much. The application is refused. But could I just thank the observers for being so courteous? I recognise it's a very stressful time and I think you behaved impeccably well. Thank you very much.	181.