

I wish to make objections to the proposed NW&WLP specific to the site at Crab Apple Lane  
Haddiscoe ref M25

#### M25 - 1 Objections

The proximity of the site to a large number RESIDENTIAL dwellings (PEOPLES HOMES) which are within 250m of the proposed site.

The site is right in the middle of the village, which I believe is contrary to your Mineral Strategic Objectives MS07 which states that the potential impact on the amenity of residents adjacent to the site are effectively minimised, controlled and mitigated to "acceptable levels ???" Currently nuisance noise from agricultural vehicles can be heard but fortunately this is on an infrequent basis during sowing and harvest times

Air quality - Mineral extractions should be located, designed and operated to ensure no unacceptable impact on air quality

Because the proposed site is so close to the Village under certain conditions modeling has confirmed that the impact of MIN25 will affect up 2/3rds of the Village

Because of the Rural location of the Village there currently is minimal light pollution. The site is at one of the highest points of the village and during winter months and given the proposed operational hours of the site this is unacceptable

#### M25 - 2 Objections

80 Vehicle movements per day - if processed gravel is transported from the Norton site to Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft, then these additional 80 HGV movements will add considerably to the overall traffic movements through the Village.

The roads through the village are single track and heavily used and therefore the approval of the Crab Apple Lane site will severely impact on the safety of Villagers

#### M25 - 8 Objections

The Disused Quarry at the Eastern Boundary of the proposed site is now a Natural Haven for wildlife and is used by Dog Walkers and Children Playing and making Dens in the Woods, and Villagers who just want a tranquil area to walk and relax

This will now be next to the Site and as such tranquility will be a thing of the past and a potential danger to children who may inadvertently stray out of the area and onto the site.

Again this would appear to contravene MS07

This also disagrees with your own Policy MW1 to protect Public Space, Green areas and Local green Space and Public Rights of way

I currently frequently use the Public Footpath which bisects the site again this will be a loss of amenity.

#### M25 - 9 Objections

This is misleading !! It infers that the only reason Planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected was the part of the proposed development South of the B1136. This is not the case. In his proof of evidence in 2014 Mr Simon Smith (NCC Planning) quotes the original grounds for refusal, including "The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the overall appearance and rural character of the area" and "The proposed development would adversely affect amenities of nearby Residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry" which applies to the whole of the area and not just the proximity of Grade 1 listed St Marys Church.

This is unsound and not positively prepared

MP1

States that the shortfall of 12.6m tonnes is less than the estimated resource bank at 15.4m tonnes (appendix 1), so the Haddiscoe site M25 could be removed all together from the plan and there would still be an excess of 1.5m tonnes ( $15.4 - 1.3 = 14.1$  less 12.6m assuming that all other sites are approved). The inclusion of recycled aggregates in the methodology would further increase the excess supply. This is unsound and not justified

M25

The Haddiscoe site is included at 1.3m tonnes. The Breedon presentation in June 2022 estimated that the site would only produce 0.65m tonnes, so its removal would have even less impact on the plan. I would also argue that the inclusion of recycled aggregate removes the need for the Haddiscoe Site M25 entirely. This is unsound and not justified

MS06

This states "To ensure the sustainability and expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm, positively contributing to the Natural, Built and Historic environments and mitigating against adverse cumulative impacts" One such cumulative impact is the call for sites for Housing Allocation in the Greater Norwich Development Plan which includes 4 sites adjacent to the A143 in the Centre of Haddiscoe. If any or all of these were to be adopted then the time frames will overlap and there is potential for 2 major construction sites ongoing at either end of the village at the same time which would be even more disruptive in what is already a congested road system. This is unsound and ineffective

M25 - S4.1

This states that "Mineral development and Waste Management within Norfolk will be undertaken that minimise and mitigate their contribution to climate change. The plan acknowledges that gravel extraction is climate heavy. MS08 states "to ensure mineral development addresses the impacts it will have on climate change by minimising greenhouse gas emissions during the winning, working and handling of minerals, providing for sustainable patterns of minerals transportation where practicable and integrating features consistent with climate change mitigation and adoption into design and restoration and aftercare proposals" MIN25 is particularly climate change heavy since as the sand and gravel is quarried which releases 100% carbon, but only the gravel is required and transported to the Breedon Norton Subcourse Quarry.

Additionally the Breedon proposal is to return the site to the landowner for an unspecified use. This is inconsistent with a positive climate change aftercare proposal

M25 states "The site will need to be worked without dewatering, unless an Hydrogeological Impact Assessment identifies either no unacceptable Hydrological impacts or appropriate mitigation is identified to ensure no acceptable impact to Hydrogeology"

The site is at the highest point of the village and in close proximity to dwellings. 6.44 states that "mineral development must also ensure that there will be no significant change to the ground water or surface water levels, including monitoring of dewatering operations to ensure on adverse impacts on surrounding water availability and/or the water environment" The excavation will have an unspecified impact on the water tables of the dwellings in the village, which have already been materially impacted by a combination of heavy rainfall and prolonged drought conditions. This is unsound and ineffective

I also believe that the location of the site will have a visual impact on the Grade 1 Listed St Marys Church as well as noise, light and dust pollution which will affect services, weddings, funerals and the general tranquillity of the church grounds