









































	<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.