



Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph

Policy

X

Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is:

Please tick as appropriate

4 (i) Legally Compliant

Yes

☐

No

☐

4 (ii) Sound*

Yes

☐

No

☒

4 (iii) Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes

☐

No

☐

*If you have entered No to 4 (ii), please continue to 5. In all other circumstances, please go to question 6.

5. Do you consider the Local Plan is unsound because it is not...:

(i) Justified

☐

(ii) Effective

☐

(iii) Positively prepared

☒

(iv) Consistent with National Policy

☐

6. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

M25.9 gives the reason planning was refused and the appeal in 2014 was rejected was due to the proposed development South of the B1136. However, this is incorrect. Evidence provided by Simon Smith (Planning NCC) in 2014 gives refusal including on the grounds of 'The landscape and visual impact of the proposed development, including the construction of artificial bunds and land raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance and rural character of the area' and 'the proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust and traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry' which applies to the area as a WHOLE not just to the proximity to St Mary's Church'

I cannot see where anything has changed! The proposed landscaping, IF and when done, will still adversely affect the area.

The proposal will have a detrimental affect on residents in the village with their health and mental wellbeing due to the increased noise and pollutants from the diggers and loaders dealing with the sifting/movement/shaking of the sand and stones etc along with the traffic and additional pollution from the 80 HGV movements each day and the loud reversing beepers.

The village and residents have everything to LOSE and nothing to gain whatsoever from this proposal. All properties will inevitably be down valued considerably and this will have a huge detrimental affect and impact on the residents and their families' stability, lives and future. This could potentially result in the village failing and negatively affecting the future of the village.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph

Policy ☒

Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is:

Please tick as appropriate

4 (i) Legally Compliant

Yes ☐

No ☐

4 (ii) Sound*

Yes ☐

No ☒

4 (iii) Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes ☐

No ☐

**If you have entered No to 4 (ii), please continue to 5. In all other circumstances, please go to question 6.*

5. Do you consider the Local Plan is unsound because it is not...:

(i) Justified ☐

(ii) Effective ☒

(iii) Positively prepared ☐

(iv) Consistent with National Policy ☐

6. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments

M25.1 Contrasting with all the sites, the MIN25 will be located central to the village and will have the highest number of residential properties within 250 m of the proposed workings. The other sites have 20 residential properties within a 250 m area. We note this is with the exception of MIN 40 which is an extension of an existing quarry. The extension to MIN40 is a real concern as Haddiscoe could potentially have the same adverse decision and problem with a never ending workings in the middle of the village and residential area which could desecrate and violate the village. This contradicts the Minerals Strategic Objectives, in particular, MSO7 which states 'To ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals developments are effectively controlled, minimised and mitigated to acceptable levels'.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)