RICHARD BUXTON
solicitors
environmental • planning • public law

01223 328933
ptaylor@richardbuxton.co.uk
sknox-brown@richardbuxton.co.uk

Our ref: ALD2/1 (PDT/SKB)
Your ref:

21 June 2024

BY EMAIL ONLY: annette.feeney2@norfolk.gov.uk

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Examination – MIN 25, Main Matter 4 Hearing

Submissions on behalf of Stopit2

Dear Sirs

1. We are instructed on behalf of Stopit2, a group of residents who object to the inclusion of MIN 25 – land at Manor Farm (between Loddon Road and Thorpe Road) (the '**Site'**), Haddiscoe, for the extraction of 1,300,000 tonnes of sand and gravel, across 21.95 ha, in the emerging Norfolk Minerals and Waste Draft Local Plan ('**NM&W Draft Local Plan')** Examination. MIN25 was one of four sites appraised in South Norfolk during the sustainability appraisal ('**SA**') process.

2. Stopit2 have been involved in a recent fight against a planning application ('**Planning Application**') for mineral extraction on the Site, reference FUL/2022/0056, for 'Sand and Gravel with low level restoration to meadow species rich grassland with an ephemeral water body at land off Crab Apple Lane, Haddiscoe, Norfolk, NR14 6SJ', refused 31 May 2024 ('**Decision'**).

3. The Inspector for the NM&W emerging plan Examination has invited Stopit2 amongst others to make representations on how this Decision is relevant to the NM&W emerging Plan, the policies contained therein and the methodology that led to the identification of MIN25, which these submissions will do.

4. A transcript of committee meeting (recorded by video)[1] has been arranged by Stopit2. Stopit2 believe that this will be helpful for the Inspector to gain a full picture of the concerns of the committee which led to the refusal. We have referenced the relevant parts in terms of these submissions for ease, but enclose the entire session for completeness at Appendix 1.

5. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

    1. *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 contrary to Policies CS14, DM8, and DM12 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010-2026 (2011), Policies 2 and 3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (2024), Policies DM1.4, DM3.13, DM3.14*

[1] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n4yZ4ZlXBZ0

and DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015), and paragraphs 191, 195, 203, 206, 208 and 217, of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

6. Following information that has come to light during the planning application process, from the committee meeting and the Decision itself, it is said that the allocation of MIN 25 is flawed for the following reasons:

   - The Decision, identified that the applicant had failed to demonstrate how they would sufficiently mitigate impact on heritage and amenity (including impact of noise, dust etc on residential properties). It is Stopit2's opinion that these reasons are inescapable given the nature of the Site e.g. its proximality to heritage assets and residential properties, and would undermine any application made on this Site. This demonstrates that the allocation of MIN25 entirely futile, contrary to national policy NPPF paragraphs 216 and 217;

   - The Decision assists in evidencing that the SA was not justified in its exclusion of the three alternative sites over MIN 25; and

   - There is considerable uncertainty over the amount of sand and gravel that can be excavated within the parameters of MIN 25, especially considering the 100m buffer from working area to residential properties. The deliverability of MIN 25 is therefore called into question, making the inclusion of MIN 25 contrary to national policy NPPF 16.

7. On review of the SA for other alternative sites in South Norfolk, some of sites were dismissed unjustifiably. Furthermore the scoring for MIN 25 would surely change now specifically in relation to the ability to effectively mitigate heritage and amenity issues, making some of the other sites potentially more favourable.

8. The below submissions will set out Stopit2's case in detail.

Plan making - requirements

9. NPPF paragraphs 15 – 37 set out the framework for plan making. Of importance in the circumstances of these submissions are paragraphs:

   16. Plans should:

   …

   (b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable;

   …

   (d) contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals;

   …

31. The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.

10. The specific concerns raised reflect the following parts of the NPPF:

216. Planning policies should:

f) set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality;

217. …. In proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should:

b) ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality;

c) ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions and any blasting vibrations are controlled, mitigated or removed at source, and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties;

218. Local planning authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in Mineral Safeguarding Areas if it might constrain potential future use for mineral working.

219. Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by:
…
f) maintaining landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel.

11. In terms of the sustainability appraisal, its role is to consider and compare all reasonable alternatives as the plan evolves, including the preferred approach, and assess these against the baseline environmental, economic and social characteristics of the area and the likely situation if the plan were not to be adopted.

12. The Inspector is to consider when assessing MIN 25 is whether the allocation is sound, i.e. positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

MIN 25 - Haddiscoe

13. The NM&W emerging plan SA Table at Appendix B for MIN 25[2] appraises the Site, and concludes:

> *"The site is located in an area of low flood risk. There are potential negative effects on air quality, the historic environment, landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity, water resources, agricultural land and amenity; however, it is considered that these effects could be appropriately mitigated. There could be positive effects for biodiversity on restoration. Sand and gravel extraction has positive economic impacts as it provides raw materials for the construction industry*". (emphasis added)

14. The main body of the SA describes the Site on page 102, when choosing this Site as the preferred one over the three alternatives (MIN 92, Min 212 and min 79) as:

> *"The site is proposed as a new sand and gravel extraction site, although the mineral extracted is proposed to be processed at an existing site at Norton Subcourse. The Sustainability Appraisal raised potential negative effects due to the proximity of residential dwellings to the site boundary, the location of a Public Right of Way through part of the site and the proximity of listed buildings to the site. The site policy requires the submission of a noise and dust assessment and mitigation measures to deal with any amenity impacts including setting back the working at least 100 metres from the nearest residential properties. The draft site policy also requires the submission of a suitable scheme for the temporary diversion and reinstatement of the Public Right of Way. The draft site policy also requires the submission of a Heritage Statement to identify heritage assets and their settings, assess the potential for impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures. The site is well screened by mature hedges on all sides of the site apart from a section of the eastern boundary closest to Manor Farm. The site is separated from the Church of St Mary buy the B1136 Loddon Road and the screen planting along the road. Therefore, with the addition of bunding during the operational phases it is considered that mineral extraction at the site would not affect the setting of the listed buildings. This site is not located near any other allocated sites in the NM&WLP and is sufficiently distant from the nearest mineral extraction site at Norton Subcourse, which is also well screened by mature planting, that unacceptable adverse cumulative effects are not expected. It is concluded that the site is suitable to allocate, subject to compliance with the policy requirements at the planning application stage."* (emphasis added)

15. Unsurprisingly, some of these factors were relevant in the context of the planning application FUL/2022/0056 which was rejected in May 2024.

Air Quality - Dust

16. Air Quality is assessed in the SA, Appendix B under objective SA2, however the SA concentrated on dust as part of SA3 which assesses minimising noise, vibration and

[2] SA Appendix B, Page B207-211

visual intrusion (in essence, amenity). The score during the extraction phase given for SA3 was "- -"[3]

17. The appraisal refers to the number of sensitive receptors at this site:

> *"The nearest residential property is 19m from the site boundary. There are 53 sensitive receptors within 250m of the site boundary and 15 of these are within 100m of the site boundary. Most of these properties are within the settlement of Haddiscoe, which is 55m away."*[4]

18. It then states:

> *"It is considered that noise and dust can be mitigated to acceptable levels within 250m of the source; the greatest impacts will be within 100m, if uncontrolled. Noise and dust assessments, and mitigation measures to appropriately control any amenity impacts, must form part of any planning application for mineral extraction."*

19. The applicant in FUL/2022/0056 as part of their EIA Regulation 25 response to the Council, revised the application so that there would be a **100m excavation boundary stand-off from the boundary of sensitive residential properties**[5], to bring it in line with the NM&W Plan[6] which requires setting back the working at least 100 metres from the nearest residential properties.

20. Instead, in practice the Applicant took the measurements from the nearest buildings.

21. MIN 25 uses the word 'property' - the term "property" clearly includes the land as well as the actual buildings. Furthermore, the term 'properties' in the NM&W Plan must be intended to apply to the boundaries of the land (rather than the buildings) since (for example) the impact of dust and noise on residents that live at these properties will necessarily be greater when the residents are outside.[7]

22. These residential properties have been identified as sensitive receptors, and it is common place for air quality assessments of sensitive receptors to include back gardens – an example of this is the Standard for Highways 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' LA 105 – Air Quality, which defines a sensitive receptor to include residential properties, back gardens, schools, hospitals, care homes, public open spaces, public access[8].

23. Despite significant negative effects being identified in the SA, it is assumed in the draft Plan that these could be appropriately mitigated.

---

[3] Significant negative effect – see SA Report, page 23

[4] SA Appendix B, Page B207

[5] Page 3 of the applicant's Regulation 25 response (enclosed here as Appendix 2)

[6] Page 26 of the applicant's Regulation 25 response

[7] As part of the Planning Application, the applicant actually wrongly mapped the 100m from the residential buildings, rather than the boundaries of the properties, and as such the distance from the excavation site to the residential property boundaries was much less than 100m in some cases. Stopit2 commissioned Hume Engineering to map the correct distances on the nearest receptors (enclose here as Appendix 3). This is most relevant when considering excavation area – as discussed below at paragraphs 38-67.

[8] https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/tses/attachments/10191621-07df-44a3-892e-c1d5c7a28d90?inline=true (page 8)

24. The transcript of the committee meeting illustrates that, even with the best practice, the Committee was not satisfied that it is possible on this site to sufficiently mitigate out these harms. Regardless of the reason for refusal being because this applicant in this application failed to successfully mitigate the harm, discussion between the applicant and the committee shows that the applicant believed that it had adopted the best possible approach to mitigation (see examples at paragraphs 80, 99, 110, 112, 113, 115, 130, 132). Despite the submission of an expert assessment, proposals for mitigation and assurances from the applicant at the committee, members were concerned about the possibility of any mitigation to be adequate given the site's constraints and characteristics, (proximity of residential dwellings, wind, squalls etc) a concern shared from Environmental Health and Public Health during consultation leading to the need for a condition to require real time monitoring of wind speeds to shut down works when unacceptable levels reached which would create too much dust. There are concerns raised throughout by committee members, but to point to a couple of examples see transcript paragraphs 20, 29, 30, 98, 109, 111,114, 139, 149, 153, 155, 157, 159, 176.

25. The minerals on this Site as part of MIN 25 would be extracted above the water table[9], and as and such it would be a dry excavation, resulting in more dust. This was a source of concern at the committee, as the Planning Application proposed the same (see transcript 29-30).

26. The reason for refusal does not stop with this application. There is a systematic issue with the Site- the applicant has failed to mitigate sufficiently because it is constrained by the characteristic of the site e.g. proximity to residential dwellings, wind, squalls. MIN 25 relies solely on the ability to be able to mitigate these issues to make the inclusion of this Site acceptable, and as such this Decision casts certain doubt on the ability to do so[10].

27. This makes MIN 25 inconsistent with national policy NPPF 216 and 217 set out above, as well as unjustified as a final selection for South Norfolk.

The historic environment

28. The SA states:

> *"There are three Listed Building within 250m of the site; they are Grade II White House Farm (70m away), Grade I Church of St Mary (110m away), Grade II Monument to William Salter set in the churchyard wall (130m away). There are 13 Listed Buildings within 2km of the site "*

29. The impact was assessed at "significant negative effect" for both the extraction and post extraction phases.

---

[99] SA Appendix B – Discussion on SA6, Pages B203-B204

[10] Even if it is thought satisfactory mitigation could be provided, this in turn is likely to have a consequential impact on the potential yield – a point made by Breedon in their statement on Main Matter 3 (at page 4) on the Draft Local Plan *("some allocated sites may find that the reserve needs to be revised downwards, to allow for greater mitigation measures than anticipated, once detailed environmental and amenity assessment have been undertaken at the planning application stage.").* Enclosed here as Appendix 3. This point is addressed further below.

30. In relation to FUL/2022/0056, Historic England raised concerns about:

- The impact of view from the Church of St Mary
- The views of the Church of St Mary (with the Church of St Matthias)
- The noise impact

31. Since Historic England will be making its own submissions, the concerns are not described in detail here. Nevertheless, it is again significant that this was a reason for refusal as the planning committee was not satisfied that there would be no unacceptable impact on these heritage assets. This again gives rise to doubts as to whether this can in fact be achieved, and again inconsistent with national policy NPPF 216 and 217, as well as being unjustified as the final selection for South Norfolk.

Alternative sites

32. There were three alternative sites to MIN 25 appraised in the SA for South Norfolk:

- MIN 92 – Land east of Ferry Lane, Heckingham:
  Extraction of 570,000 tonnes of sand and gravel, size of site 15.18ha
- MIN 212 – Land south of Mundham Road, Mundham:
  Extraction of 325,000 tonnes of sand and gravel, size of site 4.95ha
- MIN 79 – Land north of Hickling Lane, Swardeston:
  Extraction of 1,970,000 tonnes of sand and gravel, size of site 38.56ha

33. All of the sites identified potential negative effects on the historic environment, landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity, agricultural land and amenity. However for MIN 92 it was considered that the effects on landscape could not be appropriately mitigated[11], as well as retention of trees on site making it an unacceptable working scheme[12].

34. SA8 regarding landscape in the SA for MIN 92 indicated that an appropriate mitigation strategy and restoration scheme would minimise the impact; despite this it was excluded on grounds of landscape harm. Since it is now clear following the Decision that MIN 25 **cannot be appropriately mitigated in terms of Air Quality, dust and amenity**, it therefore follows that if the doubts on landscape mitigation were enough to exclude MIN 92, then this too should follow for MIN 25.

35. There was also concern in the Committee relating to HGV movements. MIN 212 was excluded on the basis of highways impacts from the 14 HGV movements per day over a 11 year this would create, in conjunction with HGV movements from another plant already going through Trowse, which the movements from MIN 212 would also need to do[13]. However, MIN25 says that up to 80 HGV movements per day could be possible, and MIN25 could be extracted in 9 years[14]. The exclusion of MIN 212 on this basis,

[11] SA Appendix B, page B216
[12] SA Report, page 103
[13] SA Report, page 103
[14] NM&W Draft Local Plan, page 180

compared to the very large number of HGV movements associated with MIN 25 over a very similar period of time, is unjustified.

36. All three alternatives are generally further away from sensitive receptors, and those that are within 100m or 250m of the site boundary are fewer in numbers.

37. Min 212 and MIN 79 are not to be worked dry, and therefore following the overt concern and acknowledgement between dry working and dust, these sites are more appropriate in terms of amenity and air quality.

The Amount of Gravel to be Excavated

38. The methodology which led to MIN 25 being selected relied upon, in part, the ability of the Site to deliver what it says it can, over the plan period i.e. 1.3million tonnes of sand and gravel.

39. The Inspector has invited Stopit2 to comment on how this Decision is relevant to this identification of MIN 25. The Planning Application also demonstrated that the likely amount of gravel and sand available for excavation is likely to be much lower in practice. Since the volume that could be delivered is a relevant factor in assessing the suitability of MIN 25, this is clearly highly relevant.

40. A number of important points can be made:

a) the expected yield from the Site

41. The expected yield from the Site according to the NM&W draft Local Plan is stated to be 1,300,000 tonnes.[15]

42. However, the geology report submitted on behalf of the applicant in the recent Planning Application, based on an earlier report by Cemex in May 2018, stated[16] that

> *"the deposit holds 810,865 m3 gross volume of mineral, resulting in a measured resource of 1.168 Mton."* (Report extracts enclosed as Appendix 4 to these submissions).

43. More detail is contained on the last page of the report[17]: The bottom table states the workable area and workable tonnage is: 148,880 sq/m and 1,167,645 tonnes.

44. Furthermore, as the recent Planning Application demonstrates, and Breedon's submissions on the NM&W draft Local Plan confirm[18], it is likely that the sand will have

[15] NM&W Draft Local Plan p180.
[16] S7.3
[17] Breedon's Geology Report Appendix 5 page 73
[18] See also Breedon's Main Matter 3 statement page 5 *"The site will yield significantly less workable reserve than allocated. The recovery of the gravel and not the sand reflects the need for additional gravel to blend with existing permitted sand rich deposit at Norton Subcourse, but also restoration design. The sand is to be retained*

to remain to ensure that the site can be restored to a satisfactory standard[19]. The projected yield must therefore be reduced to reflect the likelihood that only the gravel will be extracted.

45. In the geology report, at 7.2.2 there is an attempt to estimate the proportion of gravel to sand based on information from bore-holes. The report says:

> *"it can be seen the gravel content of the mineral at the site ranges from 33-90%. Given the variability of gravel percentage it has not been deemed appropriate to provide an average (weighted or otherwise) gravel content for the site as a whole,"*

46. The original Planning Application (form B) referred to planned extraction of 650,000 tonnes of gravel. It is not clear how this figure was reached. Given a total of 1.3m tonnes (in the NM&W draft Local Plan), the figure of 650,000 tonnes of gravel may have been based on the assumption that half of the yield would be gravel and half would be sand.

47. During the course of the Planning Application, the anticipated yield was reduced from 1.3m tonnes to 1.16m tonnes[20]. This presumably reflects the amount quantified in the geology report[21]. This is a reduction of 140,000 tonnes of sand and gravel.

48. The Officer's Report states in the executive summary[22] that the application would generate 650,000 tonnes of gravel and 510,000 tonnes of sand. This is a reduction of 140,000 tonnes of sand.

49. There is no explanation why the reduction in yield (caused by the reduction of the excavation area) is all sand rather than gravel.

50. If it is assumed (as elsewhere) that the sand and gravel are distributed evenly, there would in fact be a reduction in the amount of gravel of 70,000 tonnes[23].

51. Following an EIA Regulation 25 Request, the applicant revised the extraction area to incorporate the 100m buffer zone as discussed above. This adjustment reduced the size of the excavation area and a further reduction of 20,000 tonnes in the amount of mineral that could be extracted.[24]

52. Assuming this is 50% gravel and 50% sand, this results in a revised anticipated reduction of gravel of 10,000 tonnes.

---

at Haddiscoe to create a suitable restoration landform, without the need to import material, in order to meet policy restoration requirements for the site"

[19] Officer's Report page 1

[20] Officer's Report para 3.264

[21] S7.3 and page 73

[22] Officer's Report at page 37

[23] The borehole log plan Page. 65 shows the boreholes and BH01/18 in the North, can be seen to be high concentration of gravel and a depth of 9.4m. These borehole logs are what interpreted the cross section on P.71.

[24] Page 26 of applicant's Reg 25 Response

53. The anticipated amount of sand and gravel that would therefore be extracted was reduced to 1.14m tonnes. This is assumed to be 50% gravel, ie 0.57m tonnes. This is before any further reduction arising from additional corrections to the Site boundary/excavation area (see below).

54. In summary, even before possible further adjustment to the excavation area, the likely yield of gravel will be reduced from 650,000 tonnes (in the Plan) to 570,000 tonnes. This has to be compared with the MIN 25 figure of 1.3 m tonnes.

55. If only 0.57 m tonnes are deliverable, this has to be taken into account when assessing the assessment of MIN 25.

b) The impact of the 100m buffer zone and other mitigation measures

56. MIN25 states:

> *"The submission of acceptable noise and dust assessments and a programme of mitigation measures to deal appropriately with any amenity impacts; mitigation measures should include setting back the working area at least 100 metres from the nearest residential properties …"*

57. As noted above, the Applicant in FUL/2022/0056 revised the application so that the excavation area would be at least 100m from the nearest sensitive residential property boundaries, however this has been treated as though from the residential buildings. As discussed above, the term "property" clearly includes the land as well as the actual buildings. Furthermore, the boundary must be intended to apply to the boundaries since (for example) the impact of dust and noise on residents that live at these properties will necessarily be greater when the residents are outside. Stopit2 commissioned Hume Engineering to produce a plan mapping 100m from the closest residential property boundaries to illustrate the reduction in excavation area which is enclosed with these submissions as part of a detailed letter to the Norfolk County Council planning department explaining the issue (see Appendix 5).

58. If the intention in MIN 25 is that the 100m buffer should be between the excavation area to the boundary of the **property (rather than the buildings)**, it is likely that the excavation area and the amount of gravel that can be extracted, will be diminished further. This would mean a likely further decrease in the amount of mineral that could be extracted, below 0.57m tonnes.

59. In addition, as noted above, the recent Planning Application relating to the MIN 25 site was unsuccessful in part because of the inadequacy of the mitigation measures. Further attempts to mitigate the adverse effects are likely to have an impact on the yield from this Site. We have already referred at paragraph 26 above to Breedon's comments on the inter-relationship between mitigation and yield. In Breedon's Main Matter 3 Statement, they identified MIN 25 as a good example of this:

> *"The current planning application submitted to NCC is for 650,000 tonnes of gravel to be extracted at Haddiscoe, with the remaining 510,000 tonnes of sand to be extracted*

to be retained and placed back in the void. The site will yield significantly less workable reserve than allocated. The recovery of the gravel and not the sand reflects the need for additional gravel to blend with existing permitted sand rich deposit at Norton Subcourse, but also restoration design. The sand is to be retained at Haddiscoe to create a suitable restoration landform, without the need to import material, in order to meet policy restoration requirements for the site, in terms of providing a scheme which does not cause substantial harm to the historic landscape setting of the site and surrounding listed buildings. In addition, extraction margins applied for noise, archaeology and other mitigation measures mean that workable reserve is reduced"[25]

60. Given the possibility that the excavation area may need to be reduced further to ensure compliance with the 100m buffer zone and any additional mitigation (over and above that suggested at the recent Planning Application) there is considerable uncertainty about the amount of mineral that can be extracted from this site and its contribution to the volume of gravel that is required. On any basis it is a lot less than the projected figure of 1.3 m tonnes. As noted above, this has to be taken into account when assessing the inclusion of MIN 25.

c) The amount of gravel and sand required for the period of the plan

61. NPPF 219 states:

"Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by:

f) maintaining landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel"

62. The NM&W draft Local Plan calculates[26] the amount of gravel and sand required over the period of the plan:

"Taking into account the existing permitted reserve, the remaining need for allocated sites is 12.597 million tonnes of sand and gravel."

63. The table on page 102 of the NM&W draft Local Plan shows an expected resource available during the plan period of 15,400,000 tonnes.

64. At page 68 of the NM&W Local Plan – Publication version 2022 – it says:.

"MP1.6 The permitted reserve of sand and gravel at 31/12/2020 was 14,511,385 tonnes."

65. The Officer's Report for the recent application[27] states:

[25] See Breedon's Main Matter 3 Statement, page 4
[26] NM&W draft Local Plan MP1.8 page 69
[27] OR Para 3.93

"As of 31 May 2024, the sand and gravel landbank of permitted reserves in Norfolk is calculated to be 11.6 years"

66. An explanation for this calculation has been provided[28] which reveals that:

"additional reserves have also received planning permission since 31.12.2022 so we then need to add them on to the landbank figure. Permission FUL/2021/0007 adds 0.775 million tonnes and permission FUL/2022/0021 adds 1.551 million tonnes, so a total of 2.326 million tonnes additional reserves permitted."

67. If the starting point is that 12.597 million tonnes of sand and gravel were needed, and other sites with 0.775 million tonnes and 1.551 million tonnes respectively have been approved, this suggests that the total required for the period of the new plan is in the region of 10.271 million tonnes.[29] However, it looks like these two sites may have been in the draft Plan (eg as MIN 74, MIN 51, MIN 13 and MIN08) in which case the fact these sites have already been allocated probably makes marginal difference.

68. Based upon the calculations above, MIN 25 can supply less (or no more) than 0.57m tonnes (of gravel). Given the amount of sand and gravel available from the other proposed allocated sites, plus the two sites recently allocated, it is apparent that the amount that can be extracted from MIN 25 is minimal and is not required to meet the overall need for the duration of the plan.

Conclusion

69. Given the difficulties in avoiding/mitigating harm, particularly on the amenity of those occupying the nearby dwellings and the heritage harm, and the significantly reduced volume of material that can be excavated from the site, it is submitted that it would be sensible to remove MIN 25 from the proposed allocation as it is not deliverable, and contrary to national policy.

Yours faithfully

RICHARD BUXTON SOLICITORS

[28] Email from Caroline Jeffrey 17.6.24 (see Appendix 6 to these submissions)

[29] An alternative approach is to use the total anticipated yield of 14.4 m tonnes from page 102 of the NM&W draft Local Plan. If the two newly allocated sites are added, that brings the total up to 16.726 m tonnes.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1	**Transcript - Norfolk County Council planning committee meeting, 24.5.24**
APPENDIX 2	**EIA Regulation 25 response from the applicant for FUL/2022/0056, 20.10.23**
APPENDIX 3	**Breedon Main Matter 3 Statement**
APPENDIX 4	**Geology Report for Planning Application FUL/2022/0056**
	May 2018 (Report and Appendix 5 only)
APPENDIX 5	**Letter to NCC, 10.5.24 (enclosing only: Hume Engineering map, 21.3.24, commissioned by Stopit2)**
APPENDIX 6	**Email from Caroline Jeffrey 17.6.24**