

Suffolk County Council

Minerals Specific Site Allocations (Submission)

Consultation Statement

**Suffolk County Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk, IP1 2BX**

E-mail: planning@et.suffolkcc.gov.uk

1st August 2008

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Consultation under Regulation 25 (pre-submission consultation)	3
3	Consultation under Regulation 26 (pre-submission participation)	4
Appendix A	Regulation 25 consultees	5
Appendix B	Summary of the main issues raised in Regulation 25 stage and how they were addressed	6
Appendix C	Regulation 26 consultees	7
Appendix D	Statement of Proposals Matters and copy of public advertisement	8
Appendix E	Summary of the main issues raised in Regulation 26 stage and how they were addressed	9

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Minerals Specific site Allocations DPD is a statutory Development Plan Document (DPD), and one of the four main DPDs to be prepared within the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework. Prior to formally 'submitting' the DPD, it is necessary to undertake two separate periods consultations, in accordance with Regulations 25 and 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.
- 1.2 The Core Strategy is now at the stage of submission to the First Secretary of State followed by the second phase of statutory consultation, in accordance with Regulation 28 of the above Regulations.
- 1.3 This document comprises the two 'consultation statements' required under Regulation 28 (c) – the pre-submission consultation (Issues & Options) stage – and Regulation 28 (d) – the pre-submission public participation (Preferred Options) stage.
- 1.4 The two statements have regard to:
 - consultees and how they were consulted;
 - a summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation;
 - how those main issues have been addressed.

2 Consultation under Regulation 25 (pre-submission consultation)

- 2.1 A wide variety of consultation techniques were practised during the Issues & Options stage. On 16 February 2006, the County Council hosted an independently-facilitated seminar on minerals issues. 20 delegates, from a range of different interest and faith groups, attended a series of presentations, discussions and a visit to a working quarry. Feedback from the meeting was used to inform later stages of the Issues & Options period.
- 2.2 Following an inaugural meeting of the Suffolk Quarry Liaison on 28 November 2005, subsequent meetings have been held. The group comprises representatives of the minerals industry (with some members also representing the national Quarry Products Association), the Environment Agency and various Suffolk County Council officers. As with the seminar, direct feedback from that meeting was used to inform the preparation of the second Issues & Options paper.
- 2.3 During the Issues & Options stage, there have been a number of separate consultation exercises. The first of these exercises were three 'calls for sites', in September 2005, and again in January and May 2006. As a result, a total of 25 potential sites were submitted to the MPA for consideration (although Site 15, Culford/Ingham, was later withdrawn due to adverse geological results).
- 2.4 Criteria for selecting and assessing the sites were consulted on in May 2006, and the criteria were revised in the light of comments received.
- 2.5 The first Issues & Options paper included 24 submitted sites and was published for six weeks' consultation in July 2006. This was extended for a further 4 week period to allow comments on revised proposals for sites 1, 2A,

16, and 17 to be considered. No assessment or sustainability appraisal of the sites was made, with only factual information reported (e.g. any nature conservation constraints, possible after-use(s), the site area and the estimated quantity of material). The aim of this early consultation was to raise awareness publicly of the potential sites, and allow local communities and residents to feed back any comments prior to the MPA assessing the sites.

- 2.6 The document was sent to all statutory consultees and other consultees thought relevant (including environmental groups, the minerals industry etc) – see Appendix A for full details. All consultees were sent paper and/or electronic copies of the Plan, and all documentation was published on the Suffolk County Council website. The documents were also available to view at the seven Suffolk district council headquarters, and at all Suffolk libraries.
- 2.7 Criteria for selecting and assessing the sites were consulted on in May 2006, and the criteria were revised in the light of comments received.
- 2.8 A Revised Issues & Options Document (version 2) was published for consultation in April 2007. All consultees on the database (which was added to as new stakeholders expressed interest in the process) were sent copies of the Issues & Options papers.
- 2.9 Various other informal meetings and discussions took place with stakeholders during the Regulation 25 stage, particularly with the Environment Agency and the minerals industry.
- 2.10 A total of 692 respondents commented formally during the Regulation 25 stage. The main issues they raised, and how they were addressed, are listed in Appendix B.

3 Consultation under Regulation 26 (pre-submission participation)

- 3.1 Following receipt of comments at the Issues and Options stage, the Preferred Options paper was drafted, and consulted on for six weeks between 22nd October and 3rd December 2007. As with the Issues & Options reports, the DPD (along with the Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment) was available to view on the County Council's website, the County Council's headquarters at Endeavour House, the seven headquarters offices of Suffolk's district councils, and at libraries throughout the county. The consultation period was also advertised on 22nd October in the *East Anglian Daily Times* and the *Eastern Daily Press* newspapers, which together provide Suffolk-wide coverage. Consultees who were informed of the publication of the Preferred Options DPD are listed in Appendix C
- 3.2 A copy of the Proposals Matters and the public advertisement are attached as Appendix D.
- 3.3 A total of 269 responses were received during the consultation period. The main issues they raised, and how they were addressed, are listed in Appendix E.

Appendix A – Regulation 25 consultees

English Nature
The Countryside Agency
The Environment Agency
English Heritage

Government Office for the East of the England (GO-East)
Highways Agency
East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)
Babergh District Council
Forest Heath District Council
Ipswich Borough Council
Mid-Suffolk District Council
St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Waveney District Council
Broads Authority
All Suffolk parish/town councils
Neighbouring parish/town, district/borough and county councils

Equal Opportunities Commission
Electricity and gas companies
Sewerage and water undertakers
Telecommunications companies
Strategic Health Authority
East of England Development Agency (EEDA)
Strategic Rail Authority
Sport England

Minerals and waste operators/industry groups/agents
Local businesses and business associations
Local environmental and civic groups/bodies
Central Government departments

Minerals “Stakeholder Day” attendees

NB: A complete list of the consultees is available on request from Suffolk County Council

Appendix B

Summary of the main issues raised in Regulation 25 stage and how they were addressed

Issue raised	How this issue was addressed
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mineral Site 9 Leavenheath. Concerns by residents regarding environmental and highway issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Following appraisal this site was not included in the Preferred Options document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mineral Site 10 East Bergholt. Concerns by residents regarding environmental and highway issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Following appraisal this site was not included in the Preferred Options document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mineral Site 13 Creeting St Peter/ Mary. Concerns by residents regarding environmental and highway issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Following appraisal this site was not included in the Preferred Options document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mineral Site 25 Wetherden. Concerns by residents regarding environmental and highway issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Following appraisal this site was not included in the Preferred Options document.

Appendix C – Regulation 26 consultees

Natural England
The Environment Agency
English Heritage

Government Office for the East of the England (GO-East)
Highways Agency
East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)
Babergh District Council
Forest Heath District Council
Ipswich Borough Council
Mid-Suffolk District Council
St Edmundsbury Borough Council
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Waveney District Council
Broads Authority
All Suffolk parish/town councils
Neighbouring parish/town, district/borough and county councils

Electricity and gas companies
Sewerage and water undertakers
Telecommunications companies
Strategic Health Authority
East of England Development Agency (EEDA)
Network Rail
Sport England

Minerals and waste operators/industry groups/agents
Local businesses and business associations
Local environmental and civic groups/bodies
Central Government departments

Minerals “Stakeholder Day” attendees
Local residents who had responded to any previous Core Strategy or Specific Site Allocation consultation exercise

NB: A complete list of the consultees is available on request from Suffolk County Council

Appendix D – Statement of Proposals Matters and copy of public advertisement

**Notice of Pre-Submission Consultation,
Regulation 26 (Preferred Options) Stage**

**Suffolk Minerals Specific Site Allocation
DPD**

***The Town and Country Planning (Local Development)
(England) Regulations 2004***

Proposed subject matter and area of DPD:

The Minerals Specific Site Allocation DPD identifies sites throughout the county of Suffolk suitable for the extraction of sand and gravel within the timescale of the Plan.

Representations on the proposals may be made between **22 October and 5pm on 3 December 2007** to:

David Botwright
Minerals & Waste Policy Officer
Suffolk County Council
Endeavour House
8 Russell Road
Ipswich
Suffolk IP1 2BX
E-mail: planning@et.suffolkcc.gov.uk
Fax: 01473 216877

Online representations may be made at: <http://suffolk.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>

Copies of this Statement of Proposals Matters and pre-submission proposals documents are available for inspection during normal office hours at Endeavour House, the principal offices of Suffolk's seven district/borough councils (Babegh DC, Hadleigh; Forest Heath DC, Mildenhall; Ipswich BC; Mid Suffolk DC, Needham Market; St Edmundsbury BC, Bury St Edmunds; Suffolk Coastal DC, Woodbridge; Waveney DC, Lowestoft) and at libraries throughout Suffolk. The documentation is also available on the County Council's website at www.suffolk.gov.uk

Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address that the DPD has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination under section 20 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Suffolk County Council, 22 October 2007

Appendix E

Summary of the main issues raised in Regulation 26 stage and how they were addressed

Issue raised	How this issue was addressed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 6 Chilton Concerns by residents regarding environmental and highway issues and the evidence base upon which site was identified including economic viability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A planning application for the site was refused in March 2008 on highways issues. The applicant has submitted a new planning application with modified access to overcome the reasons for refusal. This site has been subject to the same rigorous sustainability appraisal as other proposed sites. The economic viability of the site has already arguably been demonstrated by the submission of a planning application.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 7 Kirton Concerns by proposer that site not include as preferred option as consider that adequate mediation measures can be taken to overcome concerns that cumulative working of sites in this location would cause problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative effect of working would cause unacceptable concerns and as sufficient mineral resources are sourced within the Preferred Options site not included in submission document
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 8 Acton Proposer considers that site has merits and that hydrological effect of development would not compromise environmental concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite precautions, the site is very sensitive and the potential detrimental impact upon the Crayfish is considered unacceptable. In addition there would be a detrimental change in the character of the landscape as a result of the creation of a permanent water body. The access from the site to the Strategic Lorry Route Network would also use narrow roads and junctions and could therefore have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 9 Leavenheath Proposer considers that site has merits and that development would not compromise environmental concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the site were to be worked over a short period of time as a satellite working to Layham Quarry and thus minimising the impact upon the local area and resulting in only left in and right out HGV movements, development may be acceptable. However such an arrangement is not certain and to allow for movements to the site from the south would require the construction of a 'right-hand turning lane' which would undermine the viability of the development based upon the small resource of 0.15mt, and therefore the site is excluded from the list of specific sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 13 Creeting St Peter/Mary Proposer considers that site has merits and that development would not compromise environmental concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The harmful environmental impacts of the proposal outweigh the the transport and economic benefits. The overall qualities of this site do not exceed the qualites of other sites selected for preferred options and the site continues to be excluded from the preferred list of options.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 22 Henham Proposer considers that site has merits and that development would not compromise environmental concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitted information does not provide sufficient information in terms of geology, justification for working within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other environmental constraints. It is not proposed to include this site because there are already considered to be sufficient, suitable sites identified to meet sub regional apportionment for sand and gravel. Although an area was submitted prior to the publication of the preferred options document, the proposals are now completely different to those originally considered. It would not be possible to include the site in its present form at this late stage without re-consulting and thereby significantly delaying the process leading to adoption.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 25 Wetherden Proposer considers that site has merits and that development would not compromise environmental concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not proposed to include this site because there are already considered to be sufficient, suitable sites identified to meet sub regional apportionment for sand and gravel. Although an area encompassing the site was submitted prior to the publication of the preferred options document, the proposals are now completely different to those originally considered. It would not be possible to include the site in its present form at this late stage without re-consulting and thereby significantly delaying the process leading to adoption.