



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

This the second time this gravel pit proposal has been submitted in 8 years. I moved here after the previous application was rejected I did not expect it be re-submitted again in such a short time frame. I believe there should be at least 20 years between such a submission.

1. I feel that there has not been a material change in the reasons given for the last application to be refused I feel that M25.9 is misleading. Mr Simon Smith (Planning NCC) states 'The landscape & visual impacts of the proposed pit development including the construction of artificial bunds & land-raised areas would be detrimental to the appearance & rural character of the area'.... and....'The proposed development would adversely affect the amenities of nearby residents due to increased noise, dust & traffic that would arise from the proposed quarry' this applies to the whole of the the village of Haddiscoe & Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe not just the proximity to the church of St Mary. Therefore I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

2. I feel this leads on from my previous paragraph there is a 'small disused gravel pit' on the eastern boundary of the proposed site. This piece of land belongs to the Parish of Haddiscoe it is used by most of the local residents as a recreational area where the peace of the countryside can be enjoyed. It is used as a safe area to walk dogs and for local children to play. The proposed workings would produce a unacceptable level of noise & dust for this area to be enjoyed. At present children can play unsupervised safely in this area if they stray they will only stray onto arable land it would quite dangerous if were into a working quarry. This counter to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives MS07 state 'to ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled minimised C& mitigated to acceptable levels' also MW1 of your own policy which is there to protect 'Public Open Spaces, Local Green Areas the Rights of Way network & Outdoor Recreation Facilities. Therefore I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

3. M25.1 Does not address the matter of light pollution we benefit from 'dark skies' in this area where the night sky can be enjoyed the year round. The proposed site is central, very close to residents and is at one of the highest points in the village. I believe this to be contrary to section 2.4 of the document. Therefore I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

4. M25.2 says 80 HGV movements per day back & forth to Norton this will lead to considerably more overall traffic on our small & very busy roads. Therefore I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

5. M25.1 Of all sites MIN25 has the highest amount of residential properties with in 250m of the proposed quarry the other sites having less than 20 withing the same 250m. The proposed quarry is right in the middle of our Village is contrary to your own Minerals Strategic Objectives. MS07 state 'to ensure potential impacts on the amenity of those people living in proximity to minerals development are effectively controlled minimised & mitigated to acceptable levels'. Therefore I believe this to be unsound & not positively prepared.

6. MP1 The Haddiscoe site could be removed completely if all other sites were approved if not it would further increase the excess supply. Therefore I believe this to be unsound and totally not justified.

7. M25 The Breedon presentation on 16th June 2022 estimated that this quarry would only produce 0.65m tonnes therefore its removal would have very little impact on the plan. Indeed if include re-cycled aggregates it would remove totally the need for the quarry here at Haddiscoe. Therefore I believe this is unsound & not justified.

8. MS06 'to ensure the sustainable & expedient delivery of mineral extraction while protecting people from harm positively contributing to the natural built & historic environments & mitigating against unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts'. The Greater Norwich Development plan includes sites adjacent to A143 in the middle of H addiscoe village if any or all of these sites are approved the resulting time frames would overlap giving the potential of multiply construction sites/developments in and around the village at the same time. this would lead to extreme disruption in what is already a very congested road system. I therefore believe this unsound unjustified & ineffective.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The application should be rejected in full

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change. There will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes, I wish to participate
at the oral examination

☐

No, I do not wish to participate
at the oral examination

☒

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)